"Malilla, torpona, facile, simple, vac <¨« ay another set of adjectives that are never flattering, but

could <¨ «an be m <¨ 's corrosive.

Upon entering the theater s <¨" the fit one asks: <¨ «be <¨« as bad as it seems, and when you leave s <¨ «the one answer could be

worse. <¨« Ojo! This does not mean, far from it, that it is good. mediocre, but it stays in the

clutter, clumsy, easy, simple, empty, and another series of adjectives that are never flattering, but that could

be more corrosive. Four thirty «¨« eros seek their place in the world, and

everything revolves, l <≥ «gicamente, around women, that if I want to marry, that if am <¨« they have left me, that if I

I do not eat a donut, that if I am a lig <¨ «n but I do not find love, in other words, four situations more seen than

the comic, that mix without grace or art and that s <¨« from time to time they are able to offer some situation ¨ "n

c <¨« mica worthy of sonrisa.Caf <¨ "alone or with them being <¨" another of those pel <¨ «particles in two d <¨" as are

forgotten. Taking advantage of the fame of a couple of actors of television and the pull of the format "" comedy rom <¨ «ntica <¨« or <¨ «a,

but funny, but not so funny or so <¨ «Or <¨« a "" are thrown into the cinema in the hope that the four

bored teenagers and the four clueless couples who swarm through the multiplexes will swallow this monster.

It is bad without qualms, but it does not kill with boredom. If you do not have anything better to do and someone pays you the

ticket, you may even be grateful for one of the four bullshit that makes you re ¨ «r throughout the film. In

fact, if they did not blatantly look for situations that are f ¨ ¨ cile, supposedly emotional or sweet, they will even have

had some «¨« n <¨ «s. And there will also be "what to change the greatest" of the actors, of whom I "save" the

plump. And also the soundtrack, with <¨ «successes of the 40 tucked to fill or to put you sadly ¨« n

without coming to mind. Well, I thought "well", there are so many things that there would be "to do another film" so thatwould

Ihave interest.

" 0

" A production made for Tom Cruise to shine from start to finishS <¨ "you saw the first two parts of this (now) trilog <¨« of Misi <¨ «n Impossible, you can already say that you saw the

third and <¨ «last (for now). M <¨ «s of the same, which does not mean that it is bad. Of course it is not

a film to think much, but a production made for Tom Cruise to shine from start to finish, as the

almost famous agent of the IMF (not the International Monetary Fund, but Force Misi <¨ «Impossible), Ethan Hunt. It can be

said that in the first Mission Impossible (1996, just one d <¨« each ) patale <¨ «as crazy because they destroyed the

sense of the television series, one of my favorites, making the l ¨ ¨« der the group, Jim Phelps turn out to be

a traitor. The grace of the series was teamwork and bulletproof loyalty among this "" family ""

of agents. But in the version, this is over and Tom remains James Bond himself, ready for several sequels and

several million. S <¨ «you like full adrenaline productions, where bombs and luxury cars pop like pop

corn , in addition to seeing exotic places, <¨ «this is your movie <¨«. Of course, the protagonist can fall twenty

times from a 50-story building and never suffer <¨ «or half-ara <¨« <¨ «n, but even as a spectator, he follows the game

and eats the ¨ ¨« as. Total, for that pag <¨ «entrada.Interesante the participation of the now acclaimed Philip Seymour

Hoffman (who won <¨« an Oscar as best actor in Capote, 2005) as the villain. For the other viewers, another

plus of the film may be the participation of Keri Russell (Felicity), as another agent of the IMF.

" 0

" A classic clique of "fantastic cinema" that has generated innumerable sequelae and that should be recommended with

contraindications. It is necessary a good predisposition to the shabby spectacle and fun without complexes.

August 1945: the episode b <¨ «lico m <¨« s dramatic <¨ «that the planet Earth has known is <¨« about to conclude.

In the West, Germany had capitulated to the push of soviets and allies, but in the East, the Empire

of the rising sun was resisting signing the surrender. Emperor Hirohito a <¨ «n aspired to a treaty that would not

dishonor his people, against the almighty American war machine. On the contrary, the United

States of America was not willing to grant even one d <¨ «am <¨« s of bic lic effort. On August 6, 1945,fell

the first bombon Hiroshima, three days later, another artifact did it in Nagasaki. At that

time, the world learned <¨ «as far as human perfidy can go, and what is the power of destruction that

<¨« it treasures. Jap <¨ «n remain <¨« to be marked by these events forever, and Godzilla is a good proof of it.

Almost once every year, director Ishiro Honda took the story to the big screen of acreature

Jurassicawakened, in the twentieth century, by the virulence of nuclear tests. The huge reptile (at the

time, the dinosaurs were not forerunners of the birds) emanated radioactivity from all

pores, and even developed a nuclear breath with immense destructive power. The monster,

angered by the belligerent human activity, stomps on the ground, destroying everything that is placed before it.

Meanwhile, the human protagonists of the film debate which is <¨ «to the course of action <¨« nm <¨ «s appropriate. On the one hand

the eminent paleont <¨« logo Dr. Yamane is opposed to the destruction <¨ «n of alima <¨ «a, arguing that being <¨« am <¨ «s <¨« useful

for humanity its scientific study. A <¨ «l opposes <¨« the rest of the country that, horrified, does not see the way to

destroy the grotesque animal. Even her daughter finished <¨ «asking for help to the young Dr. Serizawa, creator of a

new weapon mort ¨« fera.El message of the tape is clear. Dr. Serizawa has discovered the deoxygenator of water,

a tool that, through a process that is absolutely unlikely "thousand" in which oxygen is removed

from the water <¨ «? It is able to kill all life in the watery fluid where it is immersed. Despite the pressure

of his friends, the doctorrefuses to use the device against Godzilla, finally yielding to the

absolutelyterrible cat <¨ «generated by the creature. His regret for having discovered a weapon of mass destruction that

in the hands of men could "lead to unimaginable misfortunes, leads him to burn all evidence of his

investigations and, in the last instance, to end with the "last recipient of such knowledge. As <¨" the film "¨"

opts on one side, before the historical "¨" rich question of whether the scientists "¨" who discovered the physiology ¨ " "Nuclear power has

no responsibility in the genocides of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. According to this version, every man is

responsible for his actions and must have the obligation to amend them, if his life goes on. Very

significant is also important. n the destruction of Tokyo to paw, tooth, tail and radioactive blast by

Godzilla. In a «post-war period, in which Jap <¨« n tried to escape the crisis caused by the Second World War

, the devastated city evoked the calamities of conflict and the senselessness of the misfortunes that <¨ «ste

gener < ¨ «. All this transferred to the screen with an excellent staging, at a fast pace (even from

the current point of view) and with spectacular special effects for the <¨« little. The festival ofmodels

burnedand toy cars that explode is delirious. The scenes of cat <¨ «strofe do not have to envy in

anything to those that we see at the moment in our cinemas. Remarkable is that sequence in which Godzilla knocks down a

tower from which several journalists took pictures, as the bug approaches, one of them tells

live what is "happening" The monster is heading towards us? <¨ «We have no escape! It's horrible,

every time is <¨ «m <¨« s near? <We're going to die! Est <¨ «shaking the tower <¨« This is the end! Adi <¨ «to the whole world?

<¨ «Adi <¨« s! »The film is a continuous reference to the classic Hollywood Hollywood King Kong (1933), despite the fact that

this time the stop-motion is replaced by a simple disguise and, apparently, also "is" influenced by

other American productions of the "little time". It is curious how, despite the implicit criticism of the USA,

throughout the footage we can observe the strong foreign influence in post-war Japan, whether in the

clothing of the characters, in the vehicles they use or, directly, in the way of making films, which

fixes their gaze on their old enemies. In short, Godzilla is already a classic cl <¨ «of cinema fant <¨« that has

generated innumerable sequelae to each m ¨ ¨ «s pajera, and that should be recommended with contraindications. It is

necessary a good predisposition to the shabby spectacle and to the diversion without complexes; from ah <¨ «, maybe <¨«

m <¨ «s there <¨« of the fireworks, pod <¨ «is to glimpse an extraordinary movie.

" 1

" It is true that the film uses some t "peaks of the best horror film, and that it drinks from many films

of the reference genre, but" The orphanage "works . And he does it very well.

It's true that he was "really looking forward to tasting it," but he did not expect much from Juan Antonio"cinematic" debut

Bayona's, The Orphanage. It is not that they spoke to me very well about her, and I already fear "a disappointment". But it

has been the opposite. It is true that the movie uses some t "peaks of the best horror films, and that it drinks from

many films of the reference genre (The others , Poltergeist.), But The orphanage works. And he does it very well

. The gui <¨ «n has seemed to me quite good and sufficiently s <¨« lido to support the envestidas of those

who call it refrito. The story is good and it is "very well told, and in addition to the mied <¨" n it gives, it is quite

exciting and heartbreaking. Bayona shows us what she is capable of doing in one of the best works of

realization "¨« n <"¨« wave of a <¨ «or, keeping the spectator tense at the most spooky moments, and making her

jump out of the chair when you least expect it, in an effective and comfortingly frightening way (since you do

"in time that a horror film does not get it" really), without having to resort to the old

tricks f "¨« ciles to raise the volume of the music hit and hit to leave no tympanum to the spectators and

, incidentally, kill them from a heart attack «¨« n. The three hundred souls that were in the room tonight with me, give

faith. The soundtrack of Fernando Vel <¨ «zquez, by the way, quite beautiful, and perfectly fulfilling his role:

accompanying im ¨¨ genes, history, and reinforce your soul. The orphanage, in addition, has a very interesting

cast that is "excellent", going through the ni «¨« or protagonist, Roger Pr <¨ «ncep; for some anecdotes, but

correct <¨ «Monoserrat Carulla and Fernando Cayo, even a Geraldine Chaplin to gust <¨« simo in a paper that

comes as a glove, and a Bel <¨ «n Wheel that Surprises with a great interpretation, which may well help her to

assume her first Goya as the best leading actress of the year, or (remember that she already won <¨ «the Goya for the best actress

revelation <¨ «N by -the little movie that is not so much- Sea inside) .Alg <¨« n loose end of the plot (although

unimportant), and the fact that many elements of the film are the result of a cocktail of the best

horror movies, they make The orphanage does not take a score of honor. And before finishing, I like to

comment on the outstanding advertising campaign that He has had the movie. Being espa <¨ «wave, I am extra« ¨ «to much <¨« simo,

and I am glad that finally a national cinematographic product is publicized as it deserves, and the results are seen

only with the lean to the cinema closer and see the people who come to see the movie. Let the other Spanish producers

learn from The Orphanage. I foresee a "considerable international success for this film". In addition, I did not

miss out on anything that would become a corner in the upcoming Oscars ceremony. Of course, the Yankees are so

original that they have already bought the movie rights <"to make your own remake. No

comments

" 1

" Since his <¨ «prima prima Tarantino you may like it or not, but it will never leave you indifferent. In Reservoir

Dogs is now markedly marked his particular and personal style that later made him famous.

The irruption of Quentin Tarantino in the cinema was both a breath of fresh air, and a slap in the face of the

anesthetized mainstream cinema. From your "pear" premium you may like it or not, but it will never leave you indifferent. In

Reservoir Dogs is now markedly marked his particular and personal style that later made him famous. A

film that begins with the phrase: "" Like a virgin is about a girl who knows a guy with a big cock "?

It is a serious thing. Thefts or so-called "" tributes "" do not distract from the narrative, but derive insituations

new, in the hyper known an <"dota of his passage through the video club, but unlike the steal by steal,

<"these enrich their movies to the point that their incessant parade of tastes class B (Madonna, the movies of

Japanese gangsters, music and series of the 70's), do not bother us and Opposite, we findtastes

delightful. The break of time that will later make Pulp Fiction famous is already present, with the plus that it

deals with a robbery that is never seen (nobility obliges: this was already seen in the great The Killing by Stanley Kubrick).

Quentin advances his stories by means of di «" banal logos that become irresistible, crossed by a

rare freedom "as the total absence of women- and with much wave for his constant seduction even in

insignificant details, like those black suits parodied and appropriate with style. But the base where

Reservoir Dogs rests and Quentin himself is in his tremendous and effective assembly. Montage that shines in the same

way here "<" in Pulp Fiction and even, in both parts of the failed Kill Bill. As an example, the

sequence of the fake an <¨ «cdota of Tim Roth, far, the best role for his fetish actor of this first stage,

which then called for the episode of Four Room and that also ¨« n is the one opens and closes Pulp Fiction.The

fren <¨ «ticos flashbacks never or rarely-were better used, both for their information and for the

agility that provides the story / story. Reservoir Dogs is your vision, of how you should re-make the movies

so many times seen in the beloved video club of your adolescence. Not to mention his sound band, today already a

cl <¨ «total psycho. His cinema after Pulp Fiction is as irregular as that of any son of a neighbor. The

rumors of your future projects do not indicate any better <¨ «a. I came back to enjoy this new "physical" experience, which

I thought was "as pleasant as the first time". Likewise and with what has already been done, Quentin belongs

forever to the pante <¨ «n of the elect.

" 1

" Pel <¨ «on a child of 12 to <¨« who enters a youth group simply because he feels wrapped up. I do not

recommend it, given that although it has a dose of English humor, it is a very hard and crude film. A m <¨ «I like <¨«.

Director: Shane Meadows.Duraci <¨ «n: Hour and half past. Year: January 4, 2008. There are many ways to learn

the history of the countries. One who is "very good" is to be immortal, with which you may have experienced all kinds of

events. As this is not too usual, and given that we are too lazy to study or

read anything that does not start with "" Mar "" and end with "" ca "", we have to see movies. In particular, I have already seen

several films about the contemporary history of England, such as that of the ni <¨ «or that I wanted« to dance »or of those

who danced in the queue of unemployment, and I find it very interesting. Quiz <¨ «is even interesting the background

that the movie« ¨ «in <¨«. The film is about a child of 12 to <¨ «he has a very difficult life in Great Britain

<¨ «of Margaret Tacher (if you read it out loud you will sound <¨« better than read) since you have lost your father in

the Falklands war. Total, that since he does not have friends, all get involved with <¨ «and he is extremely ugly (this

information is empirically extracted) because he befriends the group that welcomes him. This group is nothing less than one

of Skin Heads, where his life takes an important turn. It is interesting to see this film without prejudice, given that

the group of Skin Heads where the boy enters has nothing to do with the concept that we have. The film in itself <¨ «

I liked with reservations, since it is very interesting and entertaining, but it keeps you in a tension that I do not

like. The actors are all unknown, maybe even "amateurs", which gives it a unique air, as much as it is

credible. The background of the film shows us how, simply by finding a bit of love, any

person can associate with any group, regardless of the end of them. And s <¨ «lo, after veryevents

serious, leave it. Curious, of course. Resuming, the film about a child of 12 years old who enters a

youth group simply because she feels wrapped up. I do not recommend it, given that although it has a dose of English humor, it

is a very hard and crude film. A m <¨ «I like <¨« .Besitos.PD: The treatment that is given to the humor can

turn out to be even black, but I think it is given more by the prejudices that I commented at the beginning that because

of the pel <¨ «in itself.PD2: The protagonist, with everything small ¨« ugly and ugly that he is, acts «¨« to very well and extremely

cre <¨ «ble.PD3: The documentary treatment of certain im <¨ «Genes, with m <¨« background music, is brutal.

" 1

" You hate hatred, frustration when observing human cruelty shown without concessions to the gallery <¨ «a,

crying oppresses your chest for the realism of what is told with a force rarely seen in the cinema current.

Gregory Wilson practically debuted in the direction, as his previous film HOME INVADERS was an amateur work

of action. For this he draws on a group of children who begin their careers and two television veterans in

the presence of BLANCHE BAKER seen in the series law and order and GRANT SHOW that starred theMELROS

cuckoldPLACE.Interpretes along with director do not have a curriculum too endorsed, in addition to a synopsis that seems to

sell the t <¨ «peak horror film based on real events with the excuse of showing a repertoire of atrocities

for a demanding GORE GOURMET extreme.Definitivamente is not what the author intends to be completely away

from efectismos in one of the films m <¨ «s brilliant a <¨« o.Ambientada in the a <¨ «os 60 perfectly in an

impeccable reconstruction of the« ¨ «that pl ically immerses you from the first plane in the recesses and

customs of all the characters. The f ilme est <¨ «clearly divided into two acts: A first act similar to

all these narrations of the birth of love in adolescence where you can see among theloves

juvenilethe perverse characters that give <¨« n succession <¨ «to the terrible events that the secondholds

act. An act where the foundations are raised is about teaching a final part that leaves you breathless at the

collection of tortures that a sick woman helped by her children orchestrates against an innocent young woman. You

hate hatred, the frustration <¨ «n to observe the human cruelty shown without conceptions to the gallery <¨« a, the crying

oppresses your chest for the realism of what was told with a force little seen in the current cinema. Without a drop of GORE,

that is not important when an author of enormous talent as WILSON shows wants to show something to see <¨ «doctor, he

does not take advantage of gui <¨« n for morbo f <¨ «cil simply poses some terrible facts with the hardness that they

they require.T <¨ «uniquely perfect in everything.

" 1

" Pere Lope Prus is the protagonist. It is very beautiful, it is very beautiful. From muchocine.net.net we welcome the greatest, the most critical among the critics, the unsurpassed

C <¨ «ndida. This is his particular tribute to Pedro Almodovar, the Manchego filmmaker m <¨ «s international. Enjoy

the criticism because it has no waste .Vorv <¨ «. Pere Lope Prus is the protagonist. It is very beautiful, it is very beautiful.

Well, it turns out that it's a girl cleaning the cemetery going to her house and she finds her husband withof

a lotcans and he says give me a bottle and says, "Well, if you've had forty, you have to go." to work and says

"" Nooo "", because I'm tired of working so <¨ "that this is going to end. Then she picks up and goes down to see her aunt who

is <" blind "</ i>, aunt You can not be alone because you are going to die here and it says clear with your husband it can not

be and he finds the husband belly down with a pool of blood. Pere Lope Prus is the protagonist eh, vorv <¨ «.

Listen to the Cr of "Volver de C <¨« ndida in gomaespuma.com (WARNING: put on your helmets if you're working, you're

playing the extra pay.)

" 1

" Una good proposal of fantastic film <¨ «that, coming from Espa <¨« to us adventure, personalized in Elio Quiroga,

something interesting and some guidelines that could be marked or followed in the future.

I do not know very well for what reason, I have insisted that the press pass was in another completely

different place, so <¨ «that after being 15 min. waiting in the center of Madrid as a "" pazguato "" and fre <¨ «ra SMS to the

webmaster of muchocine.net (which is ultimately who allows us to go to these" "Peacho de pases" ") I have finished

enter <¨ «Ndome (thank you Quetzal) where the nose was the pass, so <¨« that, ah <¨ «I was, completely misplaced by

Madrid, looking for how to get from Pza de Espa <¨« to Bravo Murillo in just 15 min. (taxiiii !!), thank goodness that the

GREAT Kiko of Espa <¨ «a was waiting for me to take me to the cinema (Blessed Qui <¨« n invent <¨ «the M <¨« vile and alive the mother

who pari < ¨ «), well, after this roll that has nothing to do with the opinion <¨« n, but that is great in

this, my blog, we go to l <¨ «o: Sincerely have <¨« certain reservations towards this movie, I do not know why, itme

causesthe sensation of discomfort produced by something as lamentable as "" M <¨ "s of a thousand c <" ¨ «maras." "(From now

I promise not to prejudge the Spanish horror film) and at the beginning of the film," one hoped that sooner or later they would

get into "" flour "", since, if the tape has a downside is the slowness with whichunfold

eventsand the first initial confusion; Once the presentation of characters and the explanation of the

plot, everything is much easier to understand, and to digest. At the interpretative level, Silke stands out (this time not

teach <¨ «to the breasts), Jorge Casalduero and Julio Perill <¨« n (this <¨ «last has had the kindness to come to discuss the movie

« with us nothing more <¨ «s finish the projection < ¨ «n), it is true that Perill <¨« n is completely unknown, with a

beard, without glasses and extremely thin, yaa <¨ «light as it is <¨« in person, Silke quite a lot more serious and

enigm <¨ «tica and Jorge Casalduero (I've spent a good part of the footage thinking about his resemblance to Fran Perea), in

addition to the young Nadia from Santiago (" "Alatriste" "), another of the ones I've shot a good part of the footage

trying to know where you had nosed the room before. Elio Quiroga composed a dark film, which plays

with the spectator, who manages to put the bad roll in the body or almost from the first minute, that does not resort to

the t <¨ «peaks t <¨« peaks of always, and where they appear from the bugs (brilliantly recreated digitally) to

Zombies, although neither the movie «¨« is bugs , neither of Zombies, but both are a mere plot excuse for a

tape that finishes d <¨ «ndote a pu <¨« stage in the est <¨ "magician of the spectator. Admit, and I must say it with certain blush, that I

expected another type of end, m <¨ «s light, m ​​<¨« s of bass and cymbal, go, more hollywoodiense, I have found

an end that, partly and as I said hit (within its g <¨ «Nero fant <¨« sci-fi) the conscience of the

stalls. Resuming, that I do not want to extend too much, a good proposal of fantastic cinema «, which,

coming from Spain« to adventure us, personalized in Elio Quiroga, something interesting and some guidelines that could

be marked or followed in the future.

" 1

" Casquer <¨ «a, terror and wax in equal partsAfter an insufferable first half hour, the house of wax begins to warm up, never better said, and

begins to" "delight" "with the gore terror m <¨ «It's disgusting that I've seen for a long time. Laughter is the beginning of the

movie, with characters more flat than the brain scandal of Mariah Carey and an American spark that r <¨ «ete your

Juanito Navarro. The house of wax begins to take shape at 40 minutes m <¨ «or less when one of the

silly blondes of the group occurs to follow the trace of the bad smell that exists in the forest. The beginning becomes

grotesque and surreal when, after removing her from a quagmire of blood from which she herself could have

gone perfectly, the boys find a hand buried between the bleeding and the skins. Then he made

the third killing brother appear in the movie with the Cherokee tuneao of shit up to the flag, a role that

minds of bineuronal thought will soon <¨ «n identify as" "the bad guy" ". At the moment the movie is more

like laughter than terror. But the thing gets serious when the two brothers of thetown appear on the scene

ghost, and the scenes become more and more intense in terms of gore and a few details

that I let you discover. ¨ «is.Joder that makes me dizzy <¨« when one of them says the c ¨ "lebre phrase" "do not worry,

we're going to take you out of there <¨« "", do not miss it because that scene is really frightening It is also astonishing

when the wax house is burned, which from what I understand on the set was really wax, something that you can see

on the screen. In the end, when you leave the cinema you are grateful and you do not know If you recommend <¨ «Give it to your worst enemy or

return to see it but without covering your face jejeje

" 0

"Discreet thriller that promises a lot of start and will languish And a d <¨« a volvi <¨ «Harrison Ford, which is not little . Retorn <¨ «to the suspense cinema, which historically is the one that hashim more

givenregular dividends throughout his long career. "" Firewall "" is a discreet thriller that promises

it starts to languish as the tape progresses, wasting many points of a script that

promised "a lot" and that is able to sustain the tension towards the final moments of the game. film. Little known here ",

" "Firewall" "is directed by Richard Loncraine (" "My house in Umbria" ", very interesting - can be seen by HBO from time to time

," "Wimbledon" "- here <" edited on DVD and other minor works for TV in the US, until now we do not know if

this man will take off <¨ «or be <¨« a dark face m <¨ «s of the industry) and has in his cast people as respectable

as Paul Bettany (here <¨ «for the first time as a villain in earnest), Virginia Madsen and Robert Patrick (talking about

returns !!!). The plot of Firewall is quite predictable. Jack Stanfield (Ford, acting as a good father and anman

honest, in his classic "bored posture") is in charge of information security for a prestigious bank

that is "about to generate a merger". <¨ «n with another company <¨« <¨ «to increase its assets. Jack has afamily

perfect, and he is "the target of a group of extortionists with h <¨« soft informational knowledge who will take

his family hostage by pressing him to commit a crime. large-scale crime. To me the topic at the beginning

seemed "very interesting, looking at the world of information security from the inside is very difficult and

we have access to the backroom of all this big business, and its vulnerabilities. That point is the extra <¨ «or, since

the gui <¨« n of Joe Forte promises a lot and resolves relatively complicated issues (in the

end, for example, the GPS tracker that owns the dog). of the family), dodging turns and simplifying

all the time, I suppose that to reach the average viewer who does not know thoroughly the technical language that is

spoken of. "" Firewall "" is a foreseeable thriller that s <¨ «fulfill it« ¨ «your expectations if you are a fan of Harrison Ford or you are

interested in having a superficial and cinematic idea of ​​how security in the

banking system. Fairly little to justify the price of a ticket. There will be to see if finally Ford is

encouraged to bring from the arch of memories to his Indiana, in the light of his "last performances, and to owe" to be

writing "himself" the gui <¨ «n of the fourth part ..

" 0

"Unfortunately the money has not managed to create a good gui <" ¨ "Wolfgang Petersen dares with a remake, although <" he says that only the initial idea has been taken , of the movie

"1972" "the adventure of Poseid <¨« n "". There is no doubt that one of the main attractions of this

proposal are its special effects, and there is no doubt that with the budgets of it, it has managed to

create something exceptional. Unfortunately the money has not managed to create a good gui <¨ «n, because although it starts

attractively and strongly (after five minutes the giant wave has impacted) in the future

many things are missing. But let's take it easy. In this concise beginning, Wolfgang has abridged the past of each

character, achieving that with several brushstrokes we know what they are like and what "hobbles" each one, whichthem

makescharacters somewhat "peaks". to say that I have a predilection for Kurt Russell (since he has

starred in several of my favorite movies) and in this new adventure perfectly fulfills the role

entrusted. Along with <¨ «l we find Josh Lucas, Richard Dreyfuss and Emmy Rossum among the most well-known,

performing quite normal interpretations, since the gui <¨« n does not work for me either. There is a scene that

recalls, well it is traced, the overproduction of Michael Bay Armageddon, but we are not going to gut it. We have to

make a mention to the design of production and to the underwent filming, because recreating the entrances of the ship and shooting in

those conditions is not easy, and although here "we are to criticize and comment, we must not forget how

complicated it is to make credible certain situations and m <¨ «s if they are as difficult as you are. In short

"" Poseid <¨ «n" "is a good movie" to spend the afternoon clinging to the chair, not suitable for claustrophobic "" and that

makes us get carried away by the adventures of this small <" ¨ «or group, which is torn between life and death,

for one hour and forty minutes.

" 0

" A prop <¨ «site of" "Infiltrados" ", by Martin Scorsese ... one of the greatest hits of? Donnie Brasco? was to

offer the daily activities of a few? gangsters? devoid of everything? glamor ?.

A prop <¨ «site of" "Infiltrados" "of Martin Scorsese. When it seemed <¨ «that he had already said« the «last word about

the mafia, on t <« titles like "" The Godfather "", "" One of ours "", "" Death between the flowers "" or "" The funeral "",

appeared <¨ "in 1.997 a small" ¨ "a play performed by Johnny Depp and Al Pacino. His t: "" Donnie Brasco "" is based

on the real experiences of an FBI agent, Joe Pistone, infiltrated for six years in agang

New Yorkwith the objective of gathering evidence for the arrest of delinquents. Gray and ordinary men

who could very well qualify as authentic workers of the trade. They had to earn their bread d <¨ «aad <¨« to

traffic or steal anything, from jewels to collections of a simple parqu ¨ «meter. Joe Pistone (Johnny

Depp) not reveal <¨« the secret or his wife. And develop <¨ «a sincere father-filial friendship with Lefty Ruggiero

(Al Pacino), a small-time mobster and a born loser who patronizes <¨« young Joe in a world, the one on the

other side of the law, who It does not lack attractiveness. So that the protagonist will end up "debati" between the

fidelity to his companion and mentor (and with the possibility that he will be "also" one of their own ""), and the

obligation to fulfill their duty as a police officer. A dilemma especially important in an environment where

treason is considered a crime worse than murder. Of course, it is a delight to see Johnny

Depp and Al Pacino together, or Michael Madsen as a secondary. The gui <¨ «n is precise and the intimate music, composed by

Patrick Doyle, perfectly defines the friendship. Directed by Mike Newell (" "Four weddings and a funeral" ") has a

slow, but fast paced rhythm, and a commendable strength in some images. For example, in the

initial "cr" ¨ «credits, and with the black and white close-up of the look of Joe / Johnny Depp, it already suggests that

<¨« he will become <¨ «in an observer fr <¨ «oy ambiguous.And the photograph <¨« a, of dull tonalities, does not infect of

monoton <¨ «a sin <¨« that helps the story to be coherent with gray characters, that can become both

mediocre and h <¨ «roes an <¨ 'nimos. (Note: s <¨« as a fact, in reality, Lefty, author of a score of

murders, s <¨ «he could be accused of <¨« blackmail !, but the movie "reserves another" "final" ").

" 1

" Biography <¨ «of a unrepeatable director, Bob Fosse. Musical Apote <¨ 'physical, legacy of a genio.Como does not attract me the musical, begins the spect <¨' ass (All That Jazz) did not suscit <¨ «ning <¨ 'n inter <¨' s when a

m <¨ «s well-stocked channel of payment the program <¨« a while ago. The interference of music in the cinema has not

been (it is not still holy) of my many devotions, but it fell into the generous act of sitting down to watch it

when it was released on DVD. I got a good dose of patience and told myself that I was going to endure until the

end given the fame and the soundtrack. S <¨ «for the piece On Broadway sung by a

vitamin George Benson (I said to myself) and I deserved it" ¨ "worth the drink. Reality prevailed over my prejudices: it usually

happens. I have no problem in asking for forgiveness, not in telling myself: I enjoyed much, I found a film that was "unique and

insightful, blatant, sharp". «Humorous and jovial, combatively dramatic, and covered by a thin layer of bad milk, a

great brand of the house, that is, of the great Bob Fosse, whom I had seen at <¨« os atr <¨ «Cabaret and which I

still keep my pleasant memories (despite, despite being musical cinema, of course). All that jazz (I

'm going to call it as <¨« instead of the less proteinic). spectacle ¨ «ass) is a v ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ igo of ingenuity, a

demonstration ¨« n of the talent of a man obsessed by death, in this autobiography <¨ «filmed the core <¨« graph and

director Fosse, stripped as seldom has the cinema shown a man and presented the letters of his death,

the mortuary evidence of a life always marked to excess, represented on the screen in the character of

Joe Gideon ( a never more convincing Roy Scheider). That the choreographed pieces and the music occupy a

considerable part of the footage is not necessary so that the film is not entirely musical. Music and dance

are the resources of a deeper idea: that of the descent into the underworld of a man who has escaped his

demons (his vices, his sins (and now looks <¨ "Health mines its challenge and wrings it to a bed,

where it makes dance epitaph of its tr ¨" nsito for the world.

" 1

" Audrey Tatou returns to the romantic comedy "¨« ntica, but this time not Does not like <¨ «neitherstalwarts

Audrey Tatou'snor lovers of romantic comedy ...

Audrey Tatou, enters <¨« able Amelie, abandons her disguise of d <¨ «lce and tender to embody a "" devours

men "", a beautiful and cosmopolitan woman who uses men to give her money and a life of luxury

Everything seems to be going well with her wealthy couple until a t <¨ " A worker in a hotel falls head overlove

heels inwith her, as she s <¨ «goes out with people of" "high standing" ", <¨« he pretends to be a

billionaire. mpre has way to come to light, when you discover all the cake and

we have the t <¨ «pica comedy rom <¨« ntica.S <¨ «what in this case the film does not work. The two main characters

lack the necessary charm for you to create their characters (and it is really painful to

see Amelie trying to be what she is not, a wolf with many curves). In fact there is even some «gui <¨« or the movie

«Jeunet, because Salvadori thinks of going up the two protagonists to a motorcycle (to whom does it

sound?). N of Salvatori is conventional and stagnant and as I have said the interpretations of the

actors do not help to fill the narrative shortcomings or <¨ tmicas of this film. Do not like <¨ «neither the

Audrey Tatou stalwarts nor the lovers of the comedy rom <¨ «ntica. I predict that it will last <¨ «little on the

bill, when it opens in June 2007.

" 0

"Much dislocation for so little oriental <¨" El Tito Chinchan will be <¨ «becoming a cr ¨ tico really? With this film, a verything has happened to me

strange, since instead of going for the current of the marooned mass that we go to the cinema in droves, I have

turned against it. <¨ «To be <¨« is she the one <¨ «that the photograms need to give me the opportunity I hope for?

I do not know, I do not know, I see "ales." The film is about a boy who lives in a community dedicated to praying and

living with elephants. They are part of warriors whose mission is to protect the legs of the king's elephant

(I think that was in the old age), so they raise elephants for the king. Total, that in a contest of

real elephants, they rob the elephant and an elephant, which triggers in a bunch of continuous hosts

until the movie ends. "The world society of physiotherapists warns that the vision <¨« n This film

can cause bruises and dislocations to thousands. For that, the movie <¨ «in <¨« is a little tru <¨ «o. The argument is not

"bad", a thailand <¨ «s pursues from his natal country Sidney a pair of elephants, slaughtering everyone

who is in its path. It does not seem like a bad idea, it's not original, but it looks good. But it has criminal things,

like for example the photographic montage. And it is interspersed with photographic scenes that do not come to mind in the middle

of the fights, which de-emphasizes a lot. The development becomes a little absurd as the film progresses

, until it overflows into the supreme stupidity at the climax. And the fights havelost

totallythe freshness they showed in Ong Bak. Now s <¨ «there are dislocations of all joints of the

body. A couple of dislocations, pass, but it is that you pass all the film "luxando" to "your" elbows, knees,

ankles, etc. And the end, the apotheosis of the tonter <¨ «ay of the dislocations, especially the attack of the elephant,

which is to troncharse.Resumiendo, dislocations to gogo for a film ¨« half-length hair that pointed high and that

crashes cochambrously against the ground.

" 0

" Bodrio monumental. S <¨ «comparable to the pain of the argument that presents us. As <¨ «that, infudable and

verg edible ¨« enza for their designers, who have not known (at any time ») to be up to the circumstances.

The issue is serious enough not to stay in these half measures.

Caramellated as some were with the J-Lo of glamor and ass assured in not being "d <¨" dres, this

version of the L <"fish promised" ¨ "a setback or genius , nothing neutral or "average" terms. And look for d <¨ «sincehas

the betcome out frog. Do not look for pr <¨ «prince. City of Silence is a poor product of Gregory Nava, director

bragado in the television (American family or American tapestry) or in the film biogr <¨ «without excessive artistic

pretensions (Selena, with a Jennifer L <¨ «Fish ten to <¨« os m <¨ «s young). Here <"everything has come long. Henot

hasbeen able to make a very interesting argument: the murder of women in Juarez and the negligence of the Government and its

"police" organs to stop this desm <¨ n. Scarcely saved by the excellent photograph of the Ju <¨ «night rez, with

its filth, its urban deterioration« and its criminal ne <¨ «n, City of silence attacks with neglect the denunciation of

an excessive barbarism , that does not have (in the film) feet or head. We do not finish to know to what "the" come

crèches, although they give us a slight stench of for which the shots can come, and not precisely thanks to the

work of a flat cast at all times. Neither Antonio Banderas (with a ridiculous "ass" role) nor Jennifer L <¨ "pez

(as a reporter coming from Chicago with a hazy past and wanting to escalate in his professional career with a

report by relumbr <¨« n) agree that we can to <¨ «add a greater point of interest. If someone wants information

about the events of Ciudad Ju <¨« rez, do not look for here <¨ «. Wait: there is still a project of m <¨ «s height. This is

a telefilm to see in a pass of the private at the time of coffee <¨ «, with pastries and the brazier creating that

feeling of a home so beautiful and that we all like so much. The problem (there is) is that the Mexican people

and the "victim of this small genocide" would have deserved a better film. And they have not had it.

" 0

" Harry Skywalker has returned to postpone the ineluctable plans of Destiny, but ... (they are "pending

bookstore", "hamburgers" and stores)

Francis Bacon said that science and magic tends to the same goal. That complicity was broken when

science left "behind" the magic when positing as m <¨ «everything more efficient to reach this goal. All that

he knew <¨ «to JK Rowling when he started <¨« the saga of Harry Potter. Sab <¨ «to that a ni« ¨ «or magician with a wand needed

a fabulous props and found« ¨ «a dazzling universe of false train stations,verbal enchantments

old-fashionedand worlds hidden below the apparent with its v <¨ «formidable battle of battles, litigation and even

schools erected in breathtaking landscapes. Literature gave the go-ahead to cinema and was born "afranchise

marvelous, one of the best views recently, billed with imagination" and desires to please theeye

adolescentthat before, with greedy fruition, "had ¨ «devoured hundreds of leaves. And the cinema has found in the

adventures of the magician Potter a robust film, unaffordable to the discouragement, well equipped of the usual round of

tricks that will make the delights of the chiquiller <¨ «a, although without neglecting the patient assistance of adults,

not initiated in the revelation "mist" of the rich books and alien to the symbolic alphabet of thisuniverse

fundancional. But we have reached the summer five or six, not s <¨ «now, the Potter era and the product enabled

for the circumstances is not obscure, as was the one billed by Cuar <¨« n, nor has it been strengthened with any

pyrotechnics new that dazzles the eye c <¨ «mplice of these filigree t" ¨ "techniques so pleasant to the vicissitudes of the

magician.All what anta" ¨ "or was" b "ically" "clean exercise fant <¨«, vitamin of rich characters, good

dramatic setting <¨ «tico and overwhelming imaginer <¨« to visual has now been diminished, reduced to a correct, but

soulless, armatoste cinematogr ¨ «f« ¨ «easy assimilation <¨« nym <¨ «Sf« ¨ «still easy to evacuate« ¨. No longer does the fact

that part of the bizarre machinery propagandize the film conf <¨ «and its connection to the public p <¨ «ber or already

l <¨" bristly pubescent in a stylized kiss that the good one of Harry plants a girl with "" mplice of her arts

mist <¨ «ric ace. The befuddled Potter, who occupies his most cerebral brain in ordering the meritorious dramatic chapters of

his childhood, does not find love: what he has entered through his eye is passion. carnal, the pull of hormones that

muscles his voice and guarantees that the adult magician has entered the scene to greater glory of the future

confrontations with the unnamable, true spiritual mentor of the whole adventure and, apparently, brazen

remake plot of another well-known saga, Stars Wars. Potter is a Skywalker of a dark

legend, with his familiar Darth Vader in the background, who skulks like the hero in the Propps, the usual obstacles

until he becomes a hero or villain. absolute only that the sidereal pilot of Lucas bland <¨ «to a spectacular lightsaber

, candy of ni <‖« from all over the world, and Harry wields the arguments of a wand of spells and

enchantments. The logistical support is the same. However, some specific episodes are attempted: the scene

of the balls of the prophecies or the majestic and clean of unnecessary baroque battles. Menci <¨ «

apart the character of Dolores Umbridge, an overactive, but gimmicky Imelda Staunton. Or a sweet and

captivating Ivanna Lynch in the role of Luna Lovegood (the one in the pudding, s <¨ «, with the face and the voice closer to

that <¨« woman who is Nawja Nimri) The creature JK Rowling still has bread to cut at the table of

these big-screen summers and dreadful queues given that the next literary installment (The

Priest mestizo) already makes the symphonic fanfares in press and similar. In the end, it is a question of carpeting

the next installment, of preparing the staff in new initiatory rites and leading them with a considerable

style and naturalness to the next queue. Ah <¨ «we will be.

" 0

" With the pedigree <¨ «that Scorsese supports on his back, it is difficult not to compare and judge him. You can only

add that El Aviador, is another example m <¨ «s that we are before one of the greats of cinema.

The megalomanic <¨ «of Howard Hughes, director / aviator / entrepreneur eccentric and insane, could not find today a

better vehicle than a biopic made by another passionate as Martin Scorsese. The same excess of Hughes is

also shared by the director in the almost three hours of duration, the lavish stages, and thepursuit

arduousfor twenty years of the character and his rare psyche. Another success is to focus almost exclusively on his

facet of aviator m <¨ «s that the obvious as a filmmaker.It is not true as it is judged, that of being a movie too

impersonal. In all its extensive footage, you can see the hand of its director, both in the assembly and in the

treatment of color in the different stages, and in the grandiose scenes inevitable in all his

filmography. "The aviator is for Scorsese his Ed Wood staff. The cari <¨ «or demonstrated by his" "creature" ", thisself-

conscioushomage, makes him look at the cari ¨« or demonstrated by Tim Burton in that film with his also alter ego.

Howard Hughes during the Golden Hollywood, was a key character both for his role as director (The <¨ «angels

of hell, The Outlaw), producer (Scarface) and the greatest pioneer of aviation <¨« n. Hisdisorder

obsessive, the visceral fear of the g "¨" germs, and the relationships with his famous women, did the rest to

be attractive to Martin. His verbiage and violence, visible flaws of Gangsters of New York, do not

repeat them here. ¨ «Scorsese. The aviator is m <¨ «ss <¨« lida than its predecessor. If you are "narrating with passion" - and-

stubbornnessAmerican history. Di Caprio goes ahead with his acting growth, although <¨ «this is not

the best of his career, but he more than meets. It seems that he stayed halfway in relation to the

interpretation of Hughes's old age, the problem of his eternal face as a baby that does not age with dishevelment and

a thick beard. Katherine Hepburn, found "in the skin, the voice, the claw and even the affectation" of Cate

Blanchett, a "living" without. The end, is revealed as a debit scene of Citizen Kane. It seems that

our mothers and their memories are a difficult obstacle to overcome in our psyche and we could even

replace the final phrase of the future, with the small and grandiose word Rosebud. With the pedigree <¨ «thatsupports

Scorseseon their backs (Taxi driver, wild bull, the <¨« last temptation <¨ «n of Christ, Casino) is hard to not

compare and judge. You can only add that El Aviador, is another example m <¨ «s that we are before one of the

greats of cinema.

" 1

" Michael Winterbotton has opted for the simpler and less risky m getting the leading role to Jolie

with that style of c <¨ «so pseudo-documentary mara that is divinely when you want to make a serious film.

I am suggestive. It is due to the fact that I lived in a hippie commune surrounded by French people who knew

better or worse to speak English, that's why when I listened to Angelina Jolie trying to imitate Gabacho accent I

felt a little upset It is funny the story that revolves around the fact that an American woman tried to

play a foreign role when there are so many French actresses who could do it without

resorting to such regrettable subterfuges. Well, it helps a little that your husband puts the peels to make the movie

. Although in doing so, they charge the credibility of the main role, but, <¨ «Who cares! If the

Americans are going to go in droves and everyone is going to praise her even if they do not even have a remote idea of ​​how aspeaks

Frenchmanin English. Or it may be that what has actually happened and people feel much better ignoring the

tape and going to see fiction is less compromised and lasts. The main point of the film is precisely that Angelina is

the center of the film. world. Understanding that the objective of the film is to denounce a regrettable situation in

Pakistan «through the drama of Mariane, a French journalist who is destined there« has to suffer the

abduction of her husband and despair <¨ «n of uncertainty while est <¨« waiting for her first child. Within the

drama there are many ways to focus on a story that is terrible and deep and Michael Winterbotton has opted

for the simpler and less risky, giving Jolie the leading role and neglecting a goodof

sidesecondary for greater brilliance of the < ¨ «Pitt's oration with that style of c <¨« so pseudo-documentary that it remains

divinely when you want to make a serious film. An Invincibleis a film inspired by the novel A

HeartMighty Heart: The Brave Life and Death of My Husband Danny Pearl written in the first person by

Mariane Pearl herself <¨ «who could not better have captured the experiences of the couple but there is something that seems distant and

insubstantial in everything that is told. There was a lot of talk during the shoot and it seemed like a "medial circus

" so that in the end at least the goal was for people to talk about what was going on in Pakistan. ¨ «n even if it was s <¨« what

to follow the illustrious couple and the s «¨« quito de cr <¨ «os but it is a pity that in reality the drama ends up

devouring the denunciation.

" 0

" Alatriste has seemed to me a rather slow and predictable film, but above all, it must be recognized that it

is "worked at the production level".

I have never been attracted to the overproductions, and if I have to be more clear, the Spanish films are generally less

so (with exceptions, of course). And it is that this <¨ «or we have reached a superproduction« ¨ «n spa <¨« wave with the name of

Alatriste. When I found out that they were going to shoot it, I never thought "that a star of such caliber (and also

North American) as Viggo Mortensen could interpret this super.perd <¨" n, anith <¨ «Roe espa <¨« ol. And s <¨ «, the case

was that the protagonist of El se ¨« of the rings was hired to give life to the fictitious character of Arturo

P <¨ «rez Reverte. <¨« And the director? For nothing more and nothing less than Agust <¨ «n D <¨« az Yanes, whose name I knew <"very

few. In f «¨« n, that the director of No news of Di <¨ «s was not approached <¨« nothing more than to put together five books of the

«Reverte and turn them into a single film < ¨ «cula. The result has not been entirely disastrous, but it could

have been much better. No, I do not think <¨ «is that it is« badly made or anything like that, what is «going. If visual effects and

production are a jewel. What fails is the gui <¨ «n. But well, I can not say that it is a birria

like Torrente or things like that. It's correct. He never had a "book" of the captain Alatriste. Well, I

could say to myself that I had not done it because the adventures of swordsmen have never interested me much. And

the fact is that the reason why I was fond of <¨ «seeing the cinematographic version was the following: the spectacular

cast. And it is that whoever does not have a motive, since Viggo Mortensen was accompanied by all the Spanish actors:

Eduardo Noriega, Blanca Portillo, Unax Uglade, Elena Anaya, Ariadna Gil , Juan Echanove, Javier C <¨ «mara, Eduard

Fern <¨ «ndez, Pilar L <¨« fish of Ayala and Pilar Bardem. <¨ «Who does not want to see a film with such a cast? Well,

nobody. And the fact is that I had a lot of illusion, and also if it was Reverte, I found him an excellent

writer. But, as was also to be expected, it became "the production" of the face that has been made in Spain,

and whether you want it or not, it always harms the quality of the film. ¨ «in relation to the gui <¨« n. And as it is also to be supposed,

this happened <¨ «, and what really startles Alatriste is not the gui <¨« n (<¨ «far from it!) But the design« ¨ «

of production <¨« n . Okay, you can say that you can also evaluate a movie by its effects and decorations, but

for me, the important thing is that it is "well structured, and Alatriste is not. <¨ «. First of all, to say that

D <¨ «az Yanes seems to take for granted your knowledge about the work and the <¨« little (well, this <¨ «last I also

find it l <¨« gica). The truth is that I must also recognize that the beginning is really good (a verything

importantin this type of movie). Everything begins with a silent battle (at times) in the middle of a

very disturbing atmosphere. Without knowing just the characters, they appear, so it is deduced, Diego Alatriste and

Eduardo Noriega, along with others that nobody knows until now. Well, I'm saying that the beginning is,

despite not presenting the characters, pretty good. And for what is the rest of the footage, it can not be

said that it is too clear (f <¨ «jense in the lious sequence of the ambush on the ship). It is too

short and you hardly have time to think about the stories of the characters, which by the way, are not quite

well drawn, but they are excellently interpreted. The election of Viggo Mortensen I find, in what

fits, quite right. His disconcerting voice, with that South American accent, makes his role much more

interesting, and is that in addition, he "Aragorn is an excellent actor (as he has shown us in A

History of Violence). The rest of the cast, as I said, do, and very well, what is their turn. The only

person I have ever had a special man for, Eduardo Noriega, is, precisely, the interpreter who makes it worse, om

, rather, more overreacting. Alatriste has seemed to me a rather slow and predictable film, but above all,

it must be recognized that it is "worked at the production level". The photo is really good, that's something to

say. But what I hope is that the Oscar nomination for best non-English speaking film is for

Volver or Salvador. In f «¨« n, which has not displeased me, but is not the best of this month, far from it.

" 0

" Bodrio, bodrio, bored, bored, bored, bored, bored, bored, bored. Seven were the writers recruited to give birth to the spawn. One with a head would be enough. The beheaded

who have perpetrated this abomination of film have not resorted to copying previous films of similar subject matter:

they have embarked on the pilgrim idea of ​​making a novel film (seg <¨ «n note the note of production <¨ «n) that does not

end up sacrificing" "the astonishment of the spectator" "with foreseeable rations of im <¨" impacting genes like the g <¨ "nero

usually. Well, attention, kind reader, here <"there is no wonder: there is (almost) no visual impact. The anacondas do not

arouse any awe. One sits down to receive a massive dose of shabby show B or Z and, in exchange,

s <¨ «we receive a drama of characters agile in a Borneo jungle that run, talk,again

run, are swallowed by the bicha bitch, with perd <¨ «n, and then they run again and talk again. It is <the

bad ego <¨ «that exposes its cong¨¨res of race to get their materials prop ¨« sites (a flower that gives

eternal youth, here is "the crux of the thing ) and that, in the end, it receives its deserved, of course est <¨ «. The silicone of

the f "¨" mines and the testosterone made in the pectorals anabolic and b "¨" ceps of the h? ¨ «on duty do not compensate an

hour and a half of clumsy idilio with the stupidity. Is that there is no edible fleshy: the anacondas come out little and

go wrong. There will be no pasta. The first apparition of the ophidian reaches us in the middle of the roll. It's as if one

suddenly decides to swallow a porn film and the first wild penetration takes place at forty-five minutes of

footage and the divos of hardcore, the males and females of turn, are thrown impressive rolls on the

unbearable lightness of being and the heavy burden of the soul in a sof <¨ «well escorted by minimalist

Michael Nyman music. No Please. Hard porn, without intellectual pursuits. And here "," what do you want me to tell you, what

I was looking for (Monday night, a digital pay channel, I had already seen the caption of the CSI) was entertainment

Monday <¨ «Tico, spasms cat <¨« dicos in the sof <¨ «with the home cinema bellowing in 5.1 the shrieks of the girls and the

waiters (correcci <¨« pol '¨ ¨ tica, eh) when they snack the bicha tremebunda Adi <¨ «s simple pleasures.

" 0

" A sequel whose "only virtue is to make, by comparison, its predecessor look like a

masterpiece.

About two years ago, we had the opportunity to see White Noise (2005), a supernatural thriller with Michael

Keaton at the head of the cast that sought to exploit the phenomenon of psychophon <¨ «as a basis for astory

horror. The movie was quite poor in terms of the results, dedicating itself badly to destroying a

plot with enormous potential. Well, two years after that failed attempt comes White Noise 2: Light

(2007), a sequel whose "only virtue is to make, by comparison", its predecessor looks like a

masterpiece. Fixed that at the end of this to <¨ «or, this t <¨« will appear <¨ «in several of the lists that are made by ah <¨«

with the worst that has fallen on the screens. The t <¨ «title of" "sequel" "is s <¨« the nominal, since in principle nothing

has to do with the first part. Although there is a mention of the psychophon that consisted in the

argumentative basis of its predecessor, White Noise 2 has a completely different plot, this time taking as a

starting point another phenomenon <¨ « paranormal rather controversial and "" documented "", that of

near-death experiences. The difference is «in that, contrary to the first part, in this film there is no

pretension to delve into the supposed reality of this quasi-m? ¨ event, that s <¨« it it serves as an excuse for the

assembly of a story that mixes (in a rather catholic way) psychic perceptions, unique satirical influences

and even a story of superh <¨ «heroes: the protagonist is a man who, after being rescued by the doctors just

before palming her, begins to perceive a luminous aura that identifies the people who are going to die. Moved

by this new faculty, and believing that he has found his authentic "vocation", he sets out to save the poor

condemned he finds d <¨ «aad <¨« a, without knowing that to alter the plan of the Death is not something that goes

unpunished. It is evident that those responsible for this film have mixed a jumble of themes and

situations that had already been played on much better films, from the deadly line. 1990) to Final Destination

(2000), as <¨ «like that masterpiece by M. Night Shyamalan, which is El protege (2000). The problem is that, to <¨ «nm <¨« s

that its predecessor, White Noise 2 has no idea what "kind of film" it is, and it shows it jumping

shamefully from a g <¨ " We can not go to another without any criterion and generating a terriblyresearch plot

confused and misleading, in which the protagonist discovers almost by chance a terrible curse that

surrounds those gifted as <¨ «l and who has his or <¨« genes in ultraterrenales spheres. Without the m <¨ «sm <¨« minimal

decorum, history is going through situations every time more ridiculous and (this s <¨ «that is unforgivable) is

improvising the rules at every moment. To make matters worse, the film uses, even from the "credit cards"

(<¨ «!) To the cheap" "cheap scares, those that make you jump out of the chair but after which you immediately start

laughing. Laughter is also the end, simply unbelievable for the shabby. Not to mention, in addition to the

shameful appeal of interspersing "dark" genes "in a completely gratuitous and incoherent way,

destined not to the characters, but to the spectator, that s <¨«, to leave them very obvious so that even the m? ¨ s

stupid man from the stalls catches him. A full-fledged mockery. It is impossible to take this film,

anywhereunthinkable to find in it any virtue other than to project a positive light on its mediocre first

part. In fact, the <¨ unique «positive reviews that White Noise 2 has received to date seem to come from

the unconditional fans of Nathan Fillion, the charismatic« ¨ «actor who has earned a legi <¨« n of fans

thanks to his participation in the sadly missing Firefly series. But even these can not

ignore that we are facing one of the lowest points of the a <¨ «, or a direct-av <¨« deo that collapsed ¨ «in movie theaters

by mistake ( at least, this is the "only explanation" that I have for its premiere). Olvid <¨ «mention that the director of

this desprop ¨« site is Patrick Lussier, sponsored by Wes Craven and director of "" curious "" products like Dr <¨ «

2000 (2000). It seems that the list <¨ «n was not too high after all.

" 0

" If you want to have a lyrical trip without the need for drugs, do not stop seeing the magician, you will not be

disappointed.

<¨ «What to do when Sidney Lumet thinks to get into a similar scrubbing? It seems that the man really

worked "with enthusiasm in the project, but I can not think of a worse way to close one day" each as bright as

the one I signed "in" in the 70s. magician is not One afternoon dogs. The lethal power of this tape served

to disrupt all the fen <¨ «meno blaxploitation. <¨ «Being« financed by the CIA There was someone who had the

happy idea of ​​putting on a musical on Broadway based on the classic story of The Wizard of Oz, but adapting it to

reality African American and counting s <¨ «what with singers and dancers of color. The boss of the Motown, Berry

Gordy, wanted <¨ «to take the musical to the big screen through Motown Productions, the film andsubsidiary

televisionof the famous company« ¨ «a black record. At first Gordy wanted <¨ «to the same music star

to play the virginal Dorothy. But the manipulative Diane Ross got in the way and convinced the

producer Rob Cohen to offer a production deal with her as the best star. <¨ «A thirty-something Ross

to <¨« making you Dorothy? <¨ «It's the magic of soul! The initial director considered <¨ «that he did not have <¨« the <¨ «gica

and abandoned <¨« the ship. Sidney Lumet, who did not know if he needed to pay the mortgage or was clueless, was in

charge of the management. Apart from the "Miss Ross" and some survivors of the cast of the musical were signed. ¨ «to another great

star (already disconnected from Motown) to play the Espantap <¨« birds. <¨ «And small star! Michael

Jackson, when he had not yet become Wacko Jacko, co-starred in the film with Ross. From

magician he got to the musician Richard Pryor, and a longtime ubiquitous Quincey Jones was in charge of the

musical arrangements along with a plot of musicians and composers. I suppose that to really enjoy The

Magician either he is a black brother proud of his race who hates Judy Garland, or he is a fan

of funk, soul and the m "disco". Within the desprop <¨ «site I can not deny that I have enjoyed the

experience. There are some good songs, highlighting especially those in which Jackson takes center stage,

although others, especially the ballads, are quite boring. Then there is "the collection of incredible

Wacko Jacko masks and their anti-log" logical celebrity quotes that is literally taken from the body stuffing (?). To the

kitsch sets and the past black characters of <¨ «I cide to <¨« adan di <¨ «logos that seem perje <¨« by a

schizophrian «¨« nico (gui <¨ «n of Joel Schumacher) and unparalleled scenes like the one of the persecution in the

subway station, where the bins and columns come alive and attack the characters! Not to mention some enigmatic

taxis that never take passengers and a long scene in the Twin Towers (s <¨ «, the world of Oz merges with that

of New York. <¨« Worthy of a genius!) With colors and dances that stretches to infinity (<¨ «and that was

cut by problems ¨« cnicos!) that leaves the best stuffed Christmas turkey <¨ «or at the height of aburger.

MacThe scenes are intertwined how can longanizas be interlaced, and it must be the musical ones with the least

di¨¨ logo "I have seen in my life. Like the fish that drink, here "they sing, they sing and they sing and they sing again. And

when it seems that Dorothy is going home, <¨ «she starts singing again! Spectacular, amigos.Supongo that

you have to have humor to enjoy a film so extra <¨ «o, but as I said I admit I've had good

times. <¨ «Repeat <¨« to experience? I doubt it, but if you want to have a lyrical trip without the need for drugs,

do not stop seeing the magician, you will not be disappointed. And someone will explain to me if you have any meaning in

a film where everyone is black, the protagonist returns home thanks to a white magician.

" 0

" It is not more than a dinner served with a taste of first quality, with a gui <¨ «n of the most perfect and some

characters enter <¨« ables. Nothing is missing, nothing is left over.

Like the little "protagonist" of this film, its director Brad Bird has an exquisite nose to

choose subjects (or in the case of the mouse <n ", food). First I designed <¨ «<¨« a family with really incredible superpowers

and now a mouse that travels to Paris to end up as "" chef "" in a famous restaurant. Undoubtedly, this

man can not be denied his imagination. Ratatouille is described as delicious. Following the line of

The Incredibles, this film begins with an incoming dish, of apparent simplicity and with a somewhat cold flavor.

To animate the thing, its outcome is like an exquisite second course that provides a journey through the

teaching ". And finally, the dessert, no less exquisite, with a final climax really apothecary. How to see <¨ «is,

the film of Bird is not more than a dinner served with a taste of first quality, with a gui <¨« n of the most perfect

and some characters enters <¨ «Ables. Nothing is missing, nothing is left over. It is perfect, although obviously, it is not

deep enough to be a masterpiece. The message, which is never lacking, is clearly impossible: if

you want to get something and put effort into it, you will get it <¨ «At a glance, you can already see that the film will be beautiful,

of air cl <¨ «Psycho and with touches of intelligent humor. And do not disappoint. It is more, apart from all this, it is a verytape

entertaining, at times t <¨ «pica (and surprisingly not annoying, as it is not repetitive or pretentious) and

inevitably unforgettable. Already the main battle in that house is "now" shows us, in some way, what

it is going to be. During the stay in Par <¨ «s (that is, virtually everything), our protagonist evolves

progressively, while the young cook does (also he could be <¨« to call protagonist). And it is that

both protagonists (now s <¨ «) are, in reality, oneself. I do not have to say why "¨", I already see <¨ "is.

Also, at the naked eye, it seems like the "sting" for children and no one else, but this affirmation is no more than

err. ¨ «nea. As more and more happens, this animated film can be enjoyed equally by adults and not,

evenalthough this time the gags are not as sophisticated nor are they hidden as in others. (Ahem Homer). And the truth is that it

is appreciated that a film like this one is less pedantic than some others (am <¨ «Shrek 2 seems great to me,

but I find that some of its adult jokes are left over). In Ratatouille, adult intelligence does not

notice so much, because the viewer already knows that it is <¨ «ah <¨«. However, it is also intelligent in the technical sense.

The quality of the animation is truly impressive (it is necessary to observe the movements of the characters or

the sequences of action (with the "c" in "" hand "") , which every time I'm surprised m <¨ «s (if you're lucky, maybe <¨« s

v <¨ «is in the cinema the teaser trailer of Wall-E.) I must admit that Pixar has surpassed once again with this

impeccable odyssey of this little mouse named Remy and his relationship with the kitchen environment (perfectly

realized). The characters are all crebles, enter <¨ «ables and smart From the beginning that Remy, the mouse,

you like her and that's why it's more pleasant to follow the plot of the film, not to waste the youngat all

chef, that also, together with the other cook, they get us to create them and that they make us nice,

but for me, the greatest achievement of the film is the cr? tico gastronomic "ico", a character s <¨ «lost that in a principle

is bad but when tasting the famous "" ratatouille "" recites one of the best reflections I've had in

theaters for a long time, about the art of being critical and all the consequences . Quiz <¨ «Ratatouille is not

the perfect work that the mouse creates in the end, although I do not think that it pretends to be. This is a great movie, but

unfortunately it does not become perfect because it is animated, and therefore, it can not be as

deep and complex as a non-animated footage. n. But if we focus on the field of drawings, we

can consider this the best film seen in a long time and, without doubt, the best film of animation

in the world. what we take from a <¨ «o. Completely essential.

" 1

" Weitz is a perfect example of someone who triumphs thanks to the American dream because he has been able to make this movie

.

I already imagine Paul Weitz, analyzing the news of his country and thinking to himself: "I have to do

something about it. I have to tell the world what I see but making smile. "" A prop <¨ "very praiseworthy in all

those writers and directors who want to make social movies. Yes, yes, social cinema, like <¨ «this movie <¨« cula.On the one

hand we have a current and real base like the USA: a foolish president, some terrorists that are not so bad and

can even be simp <¨ «Ticos, totally superficial social values ​​reflected in a television with and

for imbibles? go, just like in Spain <¨ «a: On the other hand we have the clear intention« ¨ «nc <¨« mica of the director at the

time of writing the gui <¨ «n: in <¨« he wants to make clear a cr <¨ «Clear language but also a declaration of

intentions that contributes something positive or a solution to those problems. And for that he seeks redemption for all

those real characters. And of course, the one that covers a lot of little squeezes. S <¨ "he manages to do a little tickle, a

decaffeinated international conflict, a calcoman <¨« a in the portrait of some characters? American Dreamz

is a movie so kind, t <¨ «itchy and pretendedly cr < ¨ «tica that at times looks like a bad series espa <¨« wave of

comedy (as if there were some good) and in others a funny portrait of "" the world at the back "" s "". However, the

f "formula" "real 2 comedy" "in a hilarious tone here" does not curdle and, apart from not provoking laughter, it remains in such a

pro-American allegation that anyone with two fingers of forehead see <¨ «the following: the president of the USA, who

surely expected a lot <¨« to see him in the film <¨ «s stupid, remains as a genuine hero <¨« and a great person who

s <¨ «is manipulated, that a society idiotized by a TV show has its generational relief, that the

superficiality that provides entertainment to that idiotic society (Grant and Moore) can find his soul

mate and, finally, that all the characters of the film "triumph in their own way". In fact, Weitz is a

perfect example of someone who triumphs thanks to the American dream because he has been able to make this movie. From the

pro-American pamphlets more shameless (and involuntary by a loose gui ¨ «n with ingredients that are supposed

inc <¨« modes) that have been seen in a long time. A <¨ «n as <¨« smile <¨ «is a couple of times. <¨« Ah! And it is a joy to see Dennis

Quaid. The rest of the actors, lazy, although it is surprising to see a Willem Dafoe so chamale <¨ «unique.

" 0

" Pel <¨ «infumable cell to like <¨« to his p <¨ «public and to the rest as it is almost going to be that no. No, do notme

convince, no, no and no, that is very bad.

A m <¨ «the duos of Spanish humorists who do not leave in the 2, almost that I can not stand them. Some grace do to me,

from time to time, but if we add and subtract, the operation is negative. Although it is true that, I was

surprised <¨ «this end of a <¨« or watching the special I do not know who and laughing like a tont <¨ «tail. <¨ «To be« ¨ «to the effect of

alcohol added to the excessive amount of food? <¨ «Or do I get older and like it <¨« Party night alg <¨ «nd <¨« a?

Ah <¨ «that's it. The movie is about gypsies selling antiques. A d <¨ «to a band of Russians -

Italians wants to buy a reliquary that inside contains the unique" ring of power that unite <¨ "to the.

this, the ring of Jose Merc <¨ «. So <¨ «that some do not want to sell, others no longer want to buy if not kill the

gypsies, there is an absurdity that ends with some tits and a mute that recovers the speech. Or of that it finds out to me, ja

kill to me! <¨ «What do you want that it says to you? Personally, the movie seemed to me "an infudable slop, but I understand

that it has its p <¨" public, since it is a sense of humor directed at a sector of society. Of course it is <"that, of

so many tonter <" as they say, some you have to make fun, but come on, the set is infumable. I can

emphasize the soundtrack, that it is certain that I will hum it a few times. When it comes down, I'll see how I can

like it to my public and the rest as it's almost going to be. No, do not convince me, no, no, and

no, it's very bad. Why do pechis come out? If not. Besses. PS: <"Did I mention that it is infumable?

" 0

" Behind the drama, the story hides a halo of optimism because, as the movie poster reads

: "If you do not like the color of your life you can be able to change it.

Blues are the costumes that Jorge saw when he had to face a job interview. But <¨ «he

prefers the black suit he always sees in a shop window every time he passes by a shop in his neighborhood. But thething

relevantis not the suit in itself <¨ «if not what it represents because Azuloscurocasinegro is a story full of

met <¨« foras. As with the costumes, Jorge aspires to a better job than the goalkeeper. This is a meta

<¨ «out of the struggle to improve in a society that is increasingly competitive </ i> in which it is dif <¨« easy to progress. The

dark blue color (almost black) is also the one that gives off the life of the young people who appear in the story,

some kids who are in the difficult process of building or rebuild their own identity, both

personal and professional. The situation is more worrisome especially in the case of Jorge, who is forced

to face the inability to move from his father after a heart attack, while worrying about

his studies; too much responsibility for a young man who has just started his career. However, Jorge

demonstrates the strength of moving forward without surrendering to see everything black. It is the story of personal battle

for survival in a competitive and hostile world that creates frustrated individuals. The character of Jorge

represents the struggle against the destiny of each one, the desire to overcome and the desire to live a life that

nobody chooses for <¨ «l. Jorge is not satisfied with working as a doorman, his father's trade, but he

wants a "better" job, which is supposed to provide him with "some" "better" living conditions. He fights with all

his strength to get it because he does not want to live a life he has not chosen. But the interesting thing is not whether to

get it <¨ «or not, but the development of the film« which, at the same time, entails the protagonist's vital development.

A personal growth in which he is accompanied by a brother who spends his days in the prison and a friendrelatives.

obsessed with spying on his neighbors through hisprism <¨ «ticos. Paula, the girlfriend of Jorge's brother, who is

also in prison, to change the life of the two brothers unintentionally. As theunfolds

story, the lives of all of them become intertwined until they become the same struggle for the freedom of

each one to be able to choose their life path. But although it is a matter of neighborhood, that does not prevent the

staging and editing are original and deeply taken care of in detail. The lives of Jorge and the

presidiaria Paula are literally melting on the screen, using visual and sound resources. But

these stylistic resources are not contrived, on the contrary, the film gives off a halo of truth, of

realism, so that anyone can identify directly or indirectly with what happens to

the protagonists. In addition to the success in the careful aesthetic, what captivates the film is thestate

emotionalin which it immerses us. A sad mixture of tenderness and humor that does not leave fr <¨ «or the m <¨« s indifferent. The

deep drama is tinged with moments of dye humor <¨ «as the final scene between the son and the father at the

door of the masseur, probably with the intention of demystifying the misfortunes and lighten the suffering of

the characters. Because the protagonists of this story hide aspects of their lives and they continue to be deceived by "mismos"

themselves, from there "the bittersweet aftertaste that remains on the palate of the spectator once the film ends" . However

, behind the drama, the story hides a halo of optimism because, as the movie poster reads

: "If you do not like the color of your life you can be able to change it. Because life is not black and

white or a single color, it is kaleidoscopic, it is full of nuances and the only way to survive is to try to

observe it from all possible angles. until we can see it in the color that best defines us.

" 1

" Children are idiots, parents are idiots, children are drugged, parents are drugged, childrenno

havefuture, parents had no past.

For what they say and not for what we see, Alpha dog may well seem like a porn movie: there is aroutine

lingualbased on sex and the absolute sacralization of massive drug intake. There is no rock

and roll: the musical plot is a hodgepodge of hip-hop, industrial rock with asalvajado and some touches (very

light, very dosed) of glamorous melod <¨ «as of fairy tale (Wild is the wind, David Bowie) The

story is the same as always, but here it is told with a certain grace: there is an interest in getting out of the

libretto and certainly, in the end, you like it or not, you accept it that Alpha Dog is not a movie ofguys

accelerated, tit-only spliced ​​and destined to be prison meat unless a speed

subrogation blows them up in one of those armchairs of no s <¨ "how many thousands of dollars that adorn the high-tech streets of these

or <¨« rich rich drug lords because of small children did not read Michael Ende nor had generous

rations of love <¨ «or motherly while the TV ruminated episodes of Looney Tunes. And if so, the youth

that Cassavetes portrays is not due to the imperative of chance or because of a social or cultural revolutionthe

inway his parents did in the final music of 60. The moral daze and the stupidity

patol <¨ «gica of these ni <¨« atos with 4x4 at the door and mastod sound chain «¨« nico in the salt <¨ «n obeys to the

absolute stupidity of their parents The teaching of the film round up that idea: these straying children have never

had a family as God intended. As <¨ «is observed in many sections of the film. Even the most deranged

of his protagonists (Ben Foster as brother psicotr "unique and placed on time total) comes a moment when he

confesses that he wanted to have a mother who overprotected him and gave him pampering in bed. In another scene,

a child almost hurried to the abyss pounding on the door of her house and s <¨ «she gets it that her mother, who celebrates the

wedding anniversary and has asked him to leave for a few hours, interrupt the fornicio with the husband and brake

the extra speed and pills that he has taken for the party to be complete. The mother, is understood, the

boss to take it in the ass, roughly said. In another order of things, or is the same, Cassavetes takes pains to give

us an amazing parade of human waste, cr ¨ «os est <¨« pidos and with little blood supply in the area

of the brain that governs sanity and sense com <¨ «n. Cr <¨ «os who snout the nose in the beer (they drink in peace

during the whole movie) or in the marijuana (they smoke without stopping while they drink) when a problem isthem

presented toin front. Cr <¨ «those who consider sex a cap ¨« a «¨« adid to the psychodic journey, but without making rites

of the pleasures or sanctify the absolute enjoyment of the flesh: they fuck as they drink and they smoke as Fuck, crudely

said, of course. In this thread of things, there is a kidnapping and a revenge that we do not finish to see resolved

because the law catches the criminal and there is not at the end brat who does not have his pa ¨ ¨ penitentiary. Bruce

Willis, who comes out shortly and leaves content, is the father-model of all this agilipollada rabble that sees in Tonybruce greyhead

Montana, the h <¨ «of Brian de Palma, the icon representative of his vital speech. Until at

some point we see a p <¨ «ster of the film: perhaps <¨« the <¨ «unique metacultural reference of this guild of

psych <¨« legs. Sharon Stone is a poorly drawn, overly protective mother, as if taken from a book of

archetypes of cheap psychology. Both are far from supporting any weight in the plot and are lost in

brief and very unnecessary roles. Disastrous, for not believing, the apparition of Sharon Stone, fatigued, made

up until it looks like a parody of makeup, as a mother devastated by the loss of her son. That everything

is <¨ « based on real events does not prevent us from appreciating the good intentions of the film. All his possible

goodness, his leg «¨« try to make it look like quality films, is «« ballasted by a drama sometimes imposed,

by characters that overact «« or by a certain concatenation of situations that inevitably they lead to an end

that is already predicted after a few minutes of film.

" 0

" A culebr <¨ «n made a movie that is followed with a lot of interest <" and that is <"made with passion" <¨ "Qui <¨« n was going to tell me (no, Bisbal does not have the patent) that my grandmother could "discover a movie" "very

beautiful"? Well, in a lost store, in that section of the DVD that nobody wants and that even pay <¨ «because they will

take them, I find "" The right to be born "", of 1952. At that moment a small "¨" or "Outlook" message appears in my

head saying "" pel <¨ «to give as a present» ". A little before I saw her and I discovered that this film was

"based on a Cuban radio hit" that shocked "the pa" and "hooked" her in the story of Mar <¨ «To Elena and the

Del Junco.M <¨« s family further on, the Mexicans shot a movie with the Clark Gable of that <¨ «little, Jorge

Mistral, together with Gloria Mar <¨« n and a cast of actors that includes a black chacha (of lie, clear). The

synopsis does not stop be delirious Atenci <¨ «n, alg <¨« n spoiler: Mar <¨ «Elena gets pregnant by a pimp who does not

want to take responsibility for the creature. In that "little time, having children as a single girl" means "a disgrace to the

family and obviously to herself, so that" the head of the family, Rafael del Junco, decides to have Alberto

but then tries to assassinate her. Mar <¨ «to Elena conf« ¨ «to her chacha, Mam <¨« Dolores, a black maid who takes the

creature secretly and cr ¨ «a as if it were his. When the baby grows, it becomes Alberto Limonta, a

prestigious doctor who is socially "unseemly for having a black mother. Also, the doubts of

knowing who their real fathers are are overcome him. And after that, there are coincidences and varied dramas that

turn the film into a historical portrait. ¨ «Rich interesant <¨« simple and obviously surprising for the times in

which we are. A culebr ¨ «n fact made a movie that is followed with a lot of inter <¨« s and that is <¨ «made with passion <¨« n.Eso yes, thiswith the Passion

film togetherof Christ, can become a perfect double session for a certain type of people: P

" 1

" A surprise and a breath of fresh air "¨" simo (never better said) that is eternally appreciated in these

times of green ogres throwing farts and eruptions and Several plagiarism between studies.

Despite its ups and downs of rhythm and some sequences that contribute little to the plot (but s <¨ «much <¨« sima diversi <¨ «n)

like the one of the seal or the orcas almost at the end of the tape, 'Happy Feet' I was fascinated from beginning to end. For the

first time in an animated film, I forgot while watching it, because it was just anfilm

animated. I have completely forgotten to focus on what "was the gui <¨« n and dem <¨ «s assholes which

s <¨« what the m <¨ «s geek-cin« ¨ «like me or those who I paid attention to her, I just had a

great time, I let myself be carried away by those pings so perfectly well recreated, and I enjoyed it like the ni <¨ «or

m < ¨ «s small« ¨ «o: from the Warner Bros. logo to the« ¨ «last of the cr <¨« closing credits. And I value that a lot.

Much <¨ «simo.Una surprise and a breath of fresh air <¨« simo (never better said) that is eternally appreciated in these

times of green ogres throwing farts and eruptions and plagiarism between studies. And on top of that, with anmessage

environmentally friendly.

" 1

" A bible of the interpretation "and an outstanding film that leaves some people with their mouths open.

Recently, in the already closed Daily Prices of La Coru <¨ «a, I had the opportunity to acquire this film in its

« ¨ «unique edition on dvd. The room had been rented at the time and had turned out to be one of the worst DVD editions

I had seen. To be unfair if I did not say that it looks like one of the first films in that format.

That's why it does not have subtitles in Spanish (although it does not have extras or (surprisingly) the function

of skipping chapters during the movie. ¨ «cula. A <¨ «n as <¨«, for the price for which he acquired it "¨" deserved "¨" the penalty. James

Foley had a surprising and very young cast on hand. We are obviously talking about a pel <¨ «cula

1992: Jack Lemmon to <¨« n was in a second maturity, Ed Harris ten <¨ 'bareback, Al Pacino seemed <¨ "to a receiv dandy <¨«n

degree, Kevin Spacey a teenager "" climbs "", Alec Baldwin had "received the first fasc" "assholes" "c" how

to act as a bastard in the movies "" But we can not forget the gur < ¨ «that surely brought them together ¨« to all: David

Mamet.The great playwright and author of emblematic and theatrical works and admirable cinematographic works (many

based on these scripts) is the great protagonist. Both the construction and the di "logos" are avehicle

masterfully structuredto give us a vision that is not dogmatic but is cruel and oppressive of how absorbing and

ruthless it can be. live to work. The great works are distinguished by the simplicity, to see how "something

humble can be great and it seems that it has not cost work to carry it out. <¨ «it is Mamet. In this movie,

the sentences of all the characters, including their verbiage, are not more than a met <¨ «metaphor. There is a big seller

who does not seem to sell, others who instead of selling to customers they sell big deals between them in order to

get what they ought to do based on "unsuspecting" and some damn facts cards with potential buyers

who put in check the values ​​of some "" greyhounds "" who must reach the goal before their third placethem

makeslose their jobs. A magnificent "film" and a great original work that leaves uncovered all the

manipulations and haves, all the dirty tricks that we can use in times of

despair <¨ «n.Con Foley collaborated Juan Ruiz Anch <¨« a, that great director of photography <¨ «a patrio settled fully

in the USA that brings the lights and shadows of this work and a discreet James Newton Howard. A masterpiece for

those who want to know more about how to make di <¨ «logos, a bible of interpretation <¨ «ny an

outstanding movie that leaves some people with the boc to open and a smile of "" fuck, go movie <¨ «n" ".

" 1

" The film is <¨ «resolved in a totally intelligent way and skips <¨« the t ¨ «peaks of thehorror cinema

current, it is in my opinion one of the best horror films in the world. that we carry from to <¨ «o.

Two years had to go by for the premiere of Wolf Creek to arrive on our billboards, an

Australian horror film that was backed by positive criticism and its viewing has turned out to be of the same kind. <¨ «s

interesting in what we take from a <¨« o.Tres j <¨ «venes, two girls and a boy embark on a journey that willthem

take<¨« to go through the cr «¨« ter of Wolf Creek, formed by a meteorite thousands of years ago <¨ «os. What at first

was going to be a peaceful trip, to finish <¨ «became« in the biggest of his nightmares. Until now, "everything indicates that it

is a film of more youthful terror that the Hollywood industry has accustomed us to, and in fact

in many criticisms it has been compared with the recent Hostel and Tourists. But nothing is far, andis

thatthat Wolf Creek runs his hand over the face of the two films together and beats them so easily that one

gets to wonder if it is so difficult to do one pel <¨ "molecule terror worth seeing and notproducts

mediocrethat do nothing nuevo.Rodada almost Dogma style to m <¨ 's realism to the im <¨' genes, the

pel <¨« cula It is much closer to the classic "La Matanza de Texas" than to the aforementioned. The director,

screenwriter and producer Grez Mclean chooses to move away from the casquer <¨ «to free and offer us a much morevision

realistic and accurateof what could really happen if we kidnapped a Homicidal maniac, in fact the movie

is based loosely on real events. In addition, the film is "solved in a totally intelligent way and

skips all the peaks of the current horror cinema, which is another success." calmly and

without haste, it may be a little slow to wait for a bit more action, that there is, but take your

time to present the characters and the situation, although <¨ «s a longish prologue is left over. Wolf Creek is,

in my opinion, one of the best horror films in what we have from a <¨« or, that really has been very loose,

and there will be no <¨ «to lose sight of his director from whom we can expect great things in the future.

" 1

" <¨ "How can you write a boring script with four books and the almostsupport

unconditionalof the author of the novels?

I remember how, when I started to get involved in this film, I devoured everything that had "something to do

with a movie" that I had liked a lot. I did it with a lot of Almod <¨ «var, with El Crep <¨" sculo de los Dioses de

Wilder, but above all I did it with Pulp Fiction. I saw it in the cinema (twice) and began my massive consumption

of elements of the film: the gui, the soundtrack, the posters, the interviews with Quentin Tarantino and

Roger Avary, the avalanche of cr "ics" that provoked "the" film ". and of course the tape on VHS, the CD with the movie

"DivX" and the corresponding DVD when "he left" on the street. I say all this because there was a time, notlong ago, when there were

so"movies" for which I deserved to do all this. From one to the other, I do not

find anything that fills me as before, it filled me a mere hour and a half of entertainment. I have to resort

to classical cinema (I do not mean only the movies made until the 60s, but the "doctors" in the sense that I understand by the

"physical": Landing as you can is a very good example of cl <¨ «physical) to be able to see something that does not sound to me, something that

surprises me, something that does not make me feel a bit more asshole. Yesterday, seeing Alatriste, Imyself

askeda lot of other similar questions, which justify a bit of this introductory paragraph: <"How canbe

the spectatordisappointed in this way? <¨ «How can a promotion be made so well done (by its level of

arrival at the spectator) so that it does not meet even half of the expectations created? <¨ «can you write

Howa gui <¨« n soooo boring with four books and the almost unconditional support of the author of the

novels? <¨ «d <¨« nde est <¨ «the director's hand in this mess? Because to my knowledge, Agust <¨ «n D <¨« az Yanes was a

good director, or at least he made a very good first film <¨ «. Blow luck to call it <¨ «n ones,team to

competentcall it <¨« n others, but there is no doubt that there is nothing of what there was.In this film <¨ «everything is great.

The light, the costumes, the make-up, the ambience, the music, the locations. Everything, except what has

to be great (and that is not achieved with money, as all the above): the gui <¨ «n. I do not know if someone from the team

has or <¨ «ever talked about the three acts. Or of the dramatic "¨« progression. Or stoppages in the narrative.

Apparently not. And that means that during the more than two hours the film lasts, you constantly ask yourself

when the turning point is going to arrive, where is the "premise of the characters and why". the secondary frames are not

interesting at all. Really, I did not make the four books in the film. It would not have been bad to

choose a main story for the personjae of Alatriste and a compendium of others for theplots

secondary, and to have taken them all at once and for them to converge at some point, and so <¨ « solve them in a

logical way. Instead, the gui <¨ «n condenses (rather squeezes) the four books into parts of the film,

about half an hour, with a parallel plot (that of Alatriste's love) that lasts all the time. pel <¨ «ula. This

makes the emotion shine by its absence in each and every one of the moments: neither the fencing

battles, nor the battles, nor the scenes of love nor the di <¨ «logos have the most m <¨ «Nima emotion <¨« n. Everything ends in, as I said

before, the atmosphere, the music, the costumes, the make-up, the lighting, and Javier C <¨ «mara.Un desprop <¨« site

that hurts , by the expectations that I had put, and that does not do more than confirm that the Spanish cinema <¨ «ol follow <¨«

depending on Almod <¨ «var and Amen <¨« bar for longer than desired.

" 0

" It can be seen, but it is certainly not recommended. Well, except for those who are thrilled to see

characters wrapped in Republican flags.

The t <¨ «title of the <¨« pera prima de Santiago Tabernero (director of the popular program Versi <¨ «n Espa <¨« wave and

co-writer of the bodrum titled Asphalt) refers to a collection of trading cards the a <¨ «70 on

animals, exotic places, anatomy <¨« a, etc? That narrative resource tries to link directly with Fede (June

Valverde), young protagonist who live <¨ «in Spain <¨« to 75 the apparition of the color TV, the death of

Franco and the consequences of a terrible event in his neighborhood. This film debuts d <¨ «to 5 and pretends to be (oh

surprise) a new film« retrospective on a historic stage «never treated by our cinema. The most

novel thing is that it is told through the eyes of a pre-adolescent. The director tries to combine several

stories without much success. All of them are interesting: while in one of them he enjoys makingpropaganda,

ideologicalbrazen in the other, he reserves the best cartridges to undertake moments that are very uncomfortable and

unpleasant, at the cost of a sickly but ambient history. ¨ «n little achieved and artificial. The

best point of the film is undoubtedly the actors, starting with the debutant protagonist, June Valverde. Carmen

Machi pleasantly surprises us with a dramatic role; Nadia from Santiago, Javier's "ni" no longer lives alone,

points out ways; Silvia Abascal, who is "very much", is "accompanied" by her sister in real life, Natalia

Abascal (in the bottom photo between the director and her sister), as the daughter of an unbalanced Andr <¨ «s Lima.A level

t <¨« technician the director has covered his backs well and orders the photograph <¨ «to the« Jos »« Luis Alcaine and the

assembly to the excellent Jos <¨ «Salcedo.A disappointing debut that tries to recreate a great story and stays

in a simple puzzle of loose situations, without any importance for the spectator and with a lessending

insulting. It is allowed to see, but it is certainly not recommended. Well, except for those who get excited when

seeing characters wrapped in republican flags. I do not like to be destructive in criticism, but the movie

speaks for itself.

" 0

" It's a brutal experience after an apparently serene first half hour that does not give rest to the

nerves of the viewer

The remakes, especially in horror movies, is "in the order of d <¨ «In the movie mecca, some better

adapted, others worse. We have to take into account that in the «best art, and especially in this« genre, everything,

absolutely everything is «invented», so the only thing we have left is knowing how to play with the elements thatalready

wehave and do something really "" visible "". We already saw in his d <¨ «a for example with productions such as" "Dawn of

the dead" "c <¨" mo you can take an idea back to the big screen with enough dignity with respect to the

original, as well as my way of seeing happens with this "" The hills have eyes "", remake of the production of the know "

" only Wes Craven (with detractors and defenders in equal parts), creator of sagas as Scream or Nightmare

in Elm Street. The story tells the story of a family on vacation that, at a certain point along the way, will

lead to a deserted area that had previously been a government nuclear testing zone. After a period of

accident with the car that leaves them momentarily abandoned in the place, they realize immediately that, in

spite of the apparent impoverished immensity of the terrain they observe, behind those stones, behind those

hills, lives "" something "", or "" someone "". "" the hills have eyes "" is a brutal experience after <¨ 's a

apare Quietly serene first half hour that does not give rest to the nerves of the spectator. It does not revolutionize

horror movies, that's more than clear, but it's an injection for that part ofthat we like to many, that

the genreof terror, without fear. sweetened for the p <¨ «adolescent public, but with the brutality that comes

with surviving a persecutor / s that do not attend to reasons. The fluidity of the direction, the incredible

photograph <¨ "and the distribution that, in spite of consisting of names not very average (maybe the m <¨« s in vogue today in d <¨ «to

be that of Emilie de Ravin, Claire in the famous series "" Lost "") they know how to slide into an argument-with cr <"

social etiquette including <" where the adrenaline and the sensation of claustrophobia lead to more results. " what's right

When I came out of the room, I stayed <¨ «with the same feeling as when I <¨« «" Kil <¨ "meter 666" ": I was expecting to

find a slobber of the 15th and leave <¨ «with the pleasant sensation of having attended the usual, but with a

way of combining the" "clich <¨« s "" well enough to make it fun and intriguing. I

repeat: do not wait <¨ «to find anything original, but if you like the g <¨« nero pass <¨ «is a while entertained <¨« simo.

" 1

" We have for the same price a comedieta, a beautiful love story, a story of human overcoming and

a small "drama" of final f¨ ¨ liz. <¨ «What can I ask for?

Alfredo Landa is one of the best actors that has given birth to the skin of bull in the centuries of existence of

it. You can say that he has made movies of topless Swedes and everything you want, but in this life you have to

eat. And deal with such mastery of ¨ «aa infamous scripts of ruffling and touching, replete with topicazos, does not

do anyone. I already like <¨ «to see am <¨« the modern actors struggle in these squares. The film is about

Miguel Ca <¨ «ete, noble farmer of the Espa <¨« a deep who is required to ranks to fulfill theservice

military, nothing less than the navy. In his naval journey he must carry a small brother who is "in charge".

To complete the misfortunes, it falls into the hands of Sergeant Canales, the most ruthless of all the commanders of

the San Fernando barracks. <¨ «Could <¨« our <¨ «hero overcome the different weaknesses that destiny puts in his path?

See it and you will know it. "" Precursory of the great b ¨ ¨ licas movies, in which the sergeants are bad with the

soldiers, but hide a heart more tender than the d <¨ " «From the mother. Long live Sergeant Canales. We have great

actors, such as Rafaela Aparicio in the role of maid, Florinda Chico as mother of the blind woman andwife,

Sergeant Canales'biting as always, Jose Sacrist <¨ «n of recruit or the greatest of all time, Don Alfredo

Landa in the role of cathetus. And the rest of the cast of actors, of the most granada of our cinema. When the

actors were of great <¨ «sima quality each and every one of them. The movie begins with a small "lesson" in

history, which only highlights the patriotic masses of the "few". And the tremendous finale <¨ «n,

with the sailor Ca <¨« ete de aut <¨ «nico hero espa <¨« ol.Resumiendo, a film indispensable in any caspoteca

that boasts. We have for the same price a comedieta, a beautiful love story, a story of

human overcoming and a small "drama" of final f¨ ¨ liz. <¨ «What can I ask for? They even want to enlist in the

navy as a volunteer !!! PS: "" <"Where should I get so much water?" "This is not a phrase, but a

declaration of principles. PD2: "" Uy, <¨ "navy!" "By Rafaela Aparicio, giant phrase.PD3: Do not miss the face

of Alfredo Landa after the phrase" "Ah <¨" where you see him, with that face, it has turned out to be a seductive "" of Oscar to the best

interpretation "" n, jua, jua.PD4: "" Short, round and pel <¨ «n" ", <¨" can be better defined Alfredo Landa?

" 1

" They will enjoy <¨ «n, we will endure, and we will have another tape more to talk about at Christmas

<¨" true?

I start being condescending, and recognizing that although I've been bored almost from the min. 1 of the film,

the "mines", as a general rule, from 6 to 99 years, that have entered the room, leaving their adult side

outside, have enjoyed almost as much as a "" pig in a quagmire "", for my part, I have no choice but

to yawn, half sleep, and endure, the time and peak that lasts this new sablazo navide <¨ «or Disney. Admit

that both the animation <¨ «n (between actors and their animated men there is a similar care) and AlanScore

Menken, has been the little I liked the tape; where, Susan Sarandon does not shine (there is so little on the

screen that one almost forgets to be part of the cast), Patrick Dempsey, James Marsden and Timothy Spal,

as always (these 2 <¨ «last, even in the soup to see them) perhaps you save <¨ "the freshness of Amy Adams, perfect

in his role is <¨" ask and simpering princess Disney, as <¨ "as simp <¨« tica digital squirrel, and that is, in

pel <¨ «Disney films, the special effects, although taken care of, is« ¨ «the order of the d <¨« a.I imagine that Disney, seeing

how well the movie has worked in the box office (from where the 50 % are accompanied "before consorts.", will make a

sequel, a "line" of toys and 150,000 merchandising products, and that is something else, but in the house of the

mouse <" n Mickey, selling the movies is the best thing they can do. On the other hand, I love seeing how the city of

New York, once more (they sell the city well, cohones!) Become a pers onaje m <¨ «s of the film <¨«,

«¨« why do not take <¨ «n example in other places of the world? In short, they enjoy <¨« n, we will endure, and

we will have another tape m <¨ «s to talk about at Christmas <¨« true?

" 0

" Lecci <¨ «nc <¨« vica, worthy of being exhibited in the faculties It is incredible (and depressing) that a story that occurred «¨« 50 to <¨ «may be as current as the narrated in

"" Good night and good luck "". The conspiratorial climate that exists today in part of American society does not

is very different from that caused by Joseph McCarthy during the d <¨ «each of the fifties-the difference is that

it is not an invented story, if in that <¨" little who questioned the feared senator were branded as

"" communists "" "Today, the critics of Bush and his cohort are questioned as to the" "patriotism" "they may

feel or, in extreme cases, classified as sympathizers of terrorism. What is missing today, therefore, is

that someone takes the place of Edward R. Murrow, legendary flagship of the CBS, and that in his program "" See

it now "" was shown "essential", with its criticisms and reports, for the collapse of McCarthy. Instead, the

periodical guild (including the Espa <¨ «ol) is being dominated by cowardly figures without" ica ", whose b <¨" search

for the truth is diluted "¨" in the time in favor of corporate and political interests: therefore, the figure of

Murrow, with his courage, his <¨ «ethics and his career, is a true kind of journalism (Good evening and good

luck duty <¨ «To be exhibited in the faculties only by the splendid discourse made by the" "character" "in

the beginning and the conclusion of the film" .Ambedded in a relatively long period of time short, from October

1953 to May 54 (with the exception of the aforementioned speech, which occurs in 58) thewritten by George

scriptClooney and Grant Heslow shows Murrow and his team in the boom of McCarthyism, when the climate of

paranoia fostered by the senator leads the American aviation forces to expel a lieutenant as a

function of enuncias an <¨ «nimas related to the father of the military (something that gives rise to an episode of" "See it

Now" ", dedicated to the case). From here, Murrow and his producer Fred Friendly, initiate a search to "give" a

place in which they use McCarthy's words against him. Returning to the director's chair after

his good «¨« Sima "" Confessions of a dangerous mind "", Clooney is rather content this time,

avoiding movements of c <¨ «mara sophisticated and concentrated in the di "logos" and in the climate of tension

inspired by the clash between two great forces: the media and the pol <¨ ¨ «Tica. Esforz <¨ «go to the top

to rescue the visual taste and mentality of the« ¨ «little, the director uses advertising pieces

produced in the d <¨« each of the fifty and includes small interludes throughout the narrative in which

Diane Reeves emerges singing "jazz psychos" that endow the film with a nostalgic tone.shares

Reevesrepresent <¨ "Nicas musical performances on tape, since Clooney following a trend

growingamong contemporary filmmakers <¨« neos- rulethe utilization <¨ 'n soundtrack. The photograph, in black

and white by Robert Elswit, uses the shadows in a superb way, adopting a realistic tone and emphasizing

that, in the whole film, there is only one outdoor shot, highlighting that dark tone in which it reflects how

"a battle is developing within the buildings." Clooney as an actor, also does a good job of

orchestrating the performances: in the midst of a very competent cast, Frank Langella deserves a Special mention <¨ «n for

giving life to William S. Palley, president of the CBS, and that he is portrayed as a man divided by his

corporate obligations and his commitment to the« ¨ «ethical period». We also find Ray Wise, who

plays the tricorne Don Hollembeck with sympathy and dignity, while Robert Downey Jr and Patricia

Clarkson taught us the problems of a couple who must hide their union with the bosses, who forbid the

marriage between workers. Finally, Clooney himself, with his usual charisma, establishes an air of

important complicity between his Fred Friendly and Edward Murrow, played by David Strathairn. This "last",

as it could not be otherwise, represents the absolute center of the film: famous andjournalist

prestigious, never accommodates itself in the status it has, searching, instead of maintaining this status, new

battles that make just the influence that knows how to exercise on the public. With an always formal air in front of

the cameras, the journalist tries to present a firm and secure façade, although the film "wins" <¨ "am <¨" s

dimension "¨« n if he had «¨« we are access to other facets of the journalist, such as his family life, or his well-known

attraction for danger, which he frequently demonstrated in risky reports during the Second World War

. Aware of the importance of this project, George Clooney uses Murrow as a s <¨ «symbol of the periodical

virtues: after the program in which they unmask McCarthy, we feel like those men

sleep <¨« n with pride at night. At present, what we have today is a programming that is increasingly focused

on the empty and the superficial. Television has become, as Murrow predicted in something banal, wasting its

informative potential in favor of entertainment, the greatest <¨'a of the times, emptied and disposable, returned a

weapon for the rulers who want to keep the population distracted in a constant vacuum of

information. Good nights and good luck is more than an interesting and efficient film: it is a lesson. <¨ «nc <¨« vica

as those that Murrow himself was responsible for imparting in his program.

" 1

" Delicious comedieta dram <¨ «tica, with tints revindicativosTito Chinchan presents, this, quer <¨« to say Mrs Henderson presents a film «¨« that is faithful to the poster that

announces it. A point for not lying to the spectators who are already tired of covering up tremendous trumps on

trailers and posters that have little to do with the final content. The film is about Mrs Henderson who in

1937 loses her husband. Since she is rich, she decides to spend the bad drink doing something new. A good day, goes

through an abandoned theater and decides to buy it, <¨ «to whom it has not crossed his mind to buy a theater? Total,

that to take this project, decides to hire an old dog in the business. After many disputes between

them, the theater begins its journey, although it needs a little push, something that distinguishes them from the others. <¨ «Qu <¨« to

be <¨ «? You see it and you will know. Well, I have to say that the movie did not call me anything, but

as the footage progressed, I was "dazzled". And the film is delicious, although I do not know what "g" is. She is one

of those who tell a story, with a little humor, a little bit of grief, a little bit of harangue to the

staff, a little bit. The actors do it wonderfully, I believe in every moment in that

London that is going to be bombed from one moment to the next. The soundtrack is also adapted to the wonder and the

gui <¨'n hooks a lot, because you do not have anything clear as the story is going to end. Resuming, I liked it a

lot. In addition, it gives a very interesting view of how we experienced the Second World War in London, which may

even seem cold, but it is not. Highly recommended

" 1

" Pel <¨ «youthful film about some kids who create their own university. They do not have hilarious moments, nor do they

take advantage of the potential that they could have, but they can be seen. Video store meat.

Look, these American student comedies I do not usually like. All this American Pie rollme

is boring to<¨ «simo, and that is that the American humor (except the Scary Movie type) does not reach me. With saying that of

that s <"I found it funny when I said" "to the girl" "In the camp of m" music I got "<" the flute for the co <"or" "

I think that I say everything about this type of cinema. But since I am brave, I am encouraged to see this, I know what I

owe to my public. The movie deals with a student who is a little nil, but smart, who He is not admitted to

any of the eight universities he chooses. To avoid confronting his parents, get a close

friend to make him a very realistic web page about a fictitious university, where he is admitted. To finish

the farce, with a few not admitted more, rent an abandoned building (a former psychic <¨ «trico) and give it

a university appearance. But things get complicated when hundreds of misfits and not admitted are presented, after

payment of the matrícula, in the supposed university. Well, well, what is the most curious, of those that

adorn the shelves of the nearby video-clubs. The story is not "wrong", it is original, though

quite crazy. It develops through semi-normal channels, s <¨ «what towards the end the thing loses the north,

reaching the summit in a subrealist trial that does not interest me <¨« or am <¨ «. The cast of actors, well what is

expected from a tape of these, very protot ¨ «peaks. Although the idea of ​​creating a university, let's say that special,

seemed "very curious and I liked it". Despite the fact that the final result of the work did not arrive to me at all. Resuming, a

juvenile movie about some kids who create their own university. They do not have hilarious moments, nor do they

take advantage of the potential that they could have, but they can be seen. Meat of videoclub. If there is material and interest, why

do not men and women come out in leather?

" 0

" <¨ "Why do <" animated movies are much better than normal movies? It's just that they do not shit on any, all the movies they do are getting better and better. They do not even fall into the

stereotypes in which it is so easy to fall, which is repeated and repeated, like the shit of American Pie 3, which

is to make the same jokes, poorly counted and predictable to the mile. <¨ "What <" hides behind these

films? <¨ «C <¨« is it that you are not bored for a single moment? <¨ «C <¨« How is it that they entertain neither thenor the

olderolder? I have no fucking idea, I throw the questions into the air, if someone knows them, I'll answer them right now

at home. This time something has happened to me that I had never had before with a movie (well, yes,

with Pocahontas a little bit). And is that the mother and the ni <¨ «a have put me little. The mother at the beginning of the

movie is this little one, she is all cute, and then at the end of the movie when she puts herself in a fighter's plan too, but

when she is mother she is the total penis drop. The little girl at the beginning so cool in a sinister pseudo

freak. But do not fuck yet, just to give you squeezes and agreements. It is later, when he throws his hair out for

the Laos when he is doing evil things. <¨ "Why do I see even in the possible cartoons f <¨" mines ready

for mating? <¨ «Why does a woman make me a woman, whether natural, in film or in

cartoon? I guess it's a physical defect of my hobbie to read erotic comics. They are cartoons, yes, but they

put you like jet skis, throwing water foam on all sides. Fuck, I want to see the second part

of the Incredibles, and the third. Because co <¨ «or do not do more of that kind of movies and are left with so much co <¨«azo

shot, serial killers, bad and good cops, natural disasters where everyone is saved, boring dramas,

comedietas not they make laugh, superheroes who do not count anything, and a thousand and one movies for teenagers that is like

to kill them all? Make more movies like that! And if possible with more good aunts! In this movie there is a phrase that

I love, which is when the father tells the mother, that what "the Yankees have in enlarging andcelebrate

continuallymediocrity. In reference to going to the end-of-year party or what the Yankees do when they

finish their studies, in my school it was called the end-of-year party. There they gave diplomas I think. Well, that, go to see

that great movie that is fun, witty, with lots of action and entertaining. That for once they get

a movie that is fine, it must be said!

" 1

" One of the best films of Kubrick, although it was always considered a minor work. It is also the best

adaptation of a Stephen King novel. And it is the best performance of an almost always outstanding Jack

Nicholson. <¨ «Do you need m <¨« s?

Well we shine onLike the moon and the stars and the sunWell we shine onEvryone come on (Instant Karma,

John Lennon) A start: A yellow car on a road that runs along a lake between mountains <¨ «as taken from

above: as <¨ «The Shining starts, taken from the Lennon song, but the director was not in

Oregon filming that scene: he delegated" the taking of Douglas Milsowe and the expertise of his daughter, who supervises "the entire

exterior location of the film". Jack Torrance is a writer looking for a novel, anwriter

alcoholic, married to a prude and the father of a son of an outstanding paranormal sensitivity. They

hire him to do the maintenance of the Overlook, a luxury hotel in the Rockies that closes in the low season

due to the snow. In five months of isolation, Jack is prefigured, he will be able to "write his novel and do ajob

simple. Grady, the previous watchman, they inform him, he became "crazy: mat <¨" to his wife and his daughters with axes and

then he committed suicide <¨ «. Life in the hotel leads to Jack going crazy andGrady during the "last

playingfilm footage. Everything else: Danny, Jack's son, walking the aisles with his tricycle. Richard Donner

accuses <¨ «Kubrick of plagiarizing him since a child with a tricycle appeared" in his successful "" The prophe <"" a "" The room "

237: Danny is invited by two twins to play with them forever. Earlier we saw an elevator that

vomits a ton of blood. A ghostly barman serves Jack a whiskey in a kind of party in The Gold

Room, the gigantic room of the Overlook. The hotel, except for the Torrance, we know that est <¨ «vac <¨« o. Room

237 again: Jack sees a naked young woman in a ba "¨« era: kissing her becomes an old woman with p «ula and

sores.The ballroom of the Overlook is < ¨ «Crowded with people: Jack suffers an accident, a waiter pours a

drink on his clothes. The animated chat in the service serves so that we know that the waiter is Grady, the

previous vigilante, the one who murdered his wife and his daughters with axes, although the Grady we see does not remember being

such. "I'm sorry to disagree. The watcher is you. You have always been the watchman. I remember it well. I

've always been here, "he says to Jack as he recomposes him." The machine to write: "" Although one will rise

early, it will not dawn sooner "" or what it comes to be. " the same. "" Not too early, dawns early "".

Kubrick, detached to the point of obsession, was personally in charge of the fact that in each country the most "typewriter"

exhibited a text according to the popular phraseology. The phrase repeats itself until the na <¨ «sea.Jack gets fucker:

Wendy, his wife, tries to escape when he sees a little touched Jack. He locks it in a closet and takes a

while. Jack, with the help of a reasonably nice Grady, escapes: he wields an ax (the most famous ax in

the history of cinema) and breaks the door of the room where Wendy fled. Ah <¨ «release the c <¨« lebre:

"" Here <¨ «est <¨« Jaaaaaaaack "", which has its legend, of course. Apparently the phrase was improvised by a

willful Nicholson and, although Kubrick liked him "," he had it repeated 157 times. We no longer know, at this point,

whether the bastard is Jack or Stanley. Jack kills Halloran, the old cook of the Overlook, who has come to the

hotel by telepath <¨ «to which he joins Danny.Jack, the ax, the snow and Danny, fleeing: the work oftechnician

Kubrick'sIt serves up an amazing steadycam exercise through the snow labyrinth or the hotel corridors.

A ghost with a wounded head tells Jack Torrance, already completely gone: "" <"A nice party, right <"

Jack Nicholson is "here" in the sauce of his savage, inebriated gestures. <¨ "same as we have rarely

seen. The final photo: Kubrick, in the hands of Grady, taught us" to the photo that closes or opens all the questions. We see

Torrance in The Gold Room, in the dance of July 4, 1921. Grady seems to be "right" with everything I

told him in the service. Inventory of curiosities: All the interiors of the film are real. A rumor:

debris from the initial shot of Kubrick with the car lining up the mounts were used by Ridley Scott for

the escape of Dekker with the replicant in Blade Runner. It is the film Kubrick, along with Barry Lind <¨ «n, in which

there are m repetitions of scenes. Jack Nicholson met ¨¨ repeatedly with Kubrick for this abuse. The

timorous Shelley Duvall was continually mistreated by the director to extract from her a more natural, in

his words, "" state of stress or of fear or bad grape. "" Kubrick cared <¨ «especially the soundtrack of the

film as always was his habit: Ligeti, Bartok, Penderecki, Berilos ... or the orchestra of Ray Noble in

the jazz songs that spice up some part of the film. The dubbing: the protuberant and splendid "voice"

Rafael Taibo covers Halloran, the cook. Neither the Ver <¨ «unique Forque that doubles Wendy nor the doubles player of Jack

Nicholson satisfied the p <¨« Spanish public «, although the election (something very funny, in truth) ran <¨« by

Kubrick himself. Stephen King was not satisfied with Kubrick's work. S <¨ «, on the other hand, got excited« ¨ «

with a television mini-series« ¨ «filmed by his friend Mike Garris. In King's novel, the hotel burns. Kubrick

saw it laughable. A vulgarity. Concluding: The best horror film of the eighties. One of the best of

all time. <"Only Nicholson's great madness is worth all of it. King was deservedly

honored at Carrie and Misery. <¨ «This is the most successful, which contributes m <¨« s <¨ «lily to his love for letting his films be

filmed.

" 1

" Los Borgia is a television product readapted p <¨ "very much like the cinema. In the combat of Fauno against the Borgia, Telecinco against Antena 3, I have been able to verify the quality of the

second p <¨« gil. And the truth is, I did not do "two hours and a quarter of a movie" to confirm the boredom of the

new movie «Antonio Hern <n". The truth, I hope that In the city The limits have not been a "mess" of

great coincidences, because a superproduction of this caliber could have been a "consecration" for a

director. However The Borgias is a television product readapted p <¨ "to the cinema similiarly. Although the pomposityartistic

of the sets we continue saying that theinvoice almost always goes well, the di <¨« logos and assembly does not

help not at all to create a product <¨ «peak, as it should <¨« to have been. To begin with the "" shocking "" aspects,

Sergio Peris Mencheta, who has a serious dilemma between his appearance of badass with his dicci ¨¨ "At times

incomprehensible, at times defined by almost comical shrieks; Mar <¨ «to Valverde, who can be everything

" "revelation" "n" "that they want, but that has been a p <¨« sima election to interpret a woman with supposed

car <¨ « character the di <¨ «logos, totally cheesy and misinterpreted. For many "" <"Who are you?" "To be written,

you can not say as if you were in the academy of One step forward. Well, and as <¨ «last point

against, the duration and the rhythm. Obviously, if we are talking about a television product, the digesti ¨ «n has

to be faaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaacil, so the characters have to explain absolutely everything (as <¨« ciese with

the aforementioned of the di <¨ «logos) and everything has to be little subtle. But of the things that are appreciated to see in

this film is the talent of Lluis Homar, the master <¨ «of <¨« Angel Illarramendi and the good work of Javier Salmones.

But of course they are not virtues that make me recommend seeing this movie. Sorry.

" 0

" Of alt <¨ "sima quality t <¨" technique, stands out in each and every one of the possible aspects. As a film

directed towards a small public, it has an infinity of gui ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ towards the elderly, making it essential

in this summer.

The other day he called me "my friend Rafa" and told me that if he passed us "we went to the premiere of Locos for surfing, which was

in the afternoon. Certainly, with that name, and after seeing the poster, I thought about it <¨ "very much, and after being left with no

excuses to give it, I had to say yes. Hey, I guess I'm bigger. To start, I like to go to the room that

Sony has next to Industriales in La Castellana. Seats prepared for fat people with wide backs, a

small room with a screen that fulfills its purpose. In addition to giving us a complete "simo cd with data of the movie

". Very happy with the people of Sony. The film is about a little boy named "ping" or "teen" named Cody

that since I met "the greatest big surfer of history" Big Z , s <¨ «wants to be like <¨« l. His family makes fun

of him, especially because he lives in the "Ant", until one day his whale-mounted opportunity arrives, a

great surfing competition worldwide. After not a few problems, our Cody manages to get to the

contest, but before starting he receives a strong blow, which makes him know a fat ping <¨ «ino with an

extra <¨« to filosof <¨ «a of vida.Muy big movie <¨ «, if I <¨« or. And do not take revenge on me for watching the animated movies

with too many good eyes. To begin with, the t ¨ «technical section is spectacular and impressive. They have

achieved a very rare thing, which is that the water effect and the characters intermingle perfectly. And that

is not easy at all. The effects of the sand are also remarkable, just like the hair of the

characters. Let's say chap <¨ «for the effects. The plot is a bit experimental, given that it is a

film of animation recorded as a documentary. That is to say, we see the film "through" the "camera" of some

journalists who record everything that happens. This gives rise to very funny situations, like the little ones who are

talking. Speaking of funny scenes, the c ¨ «mico plane is great, with very memorable punches. And I do not know <¨ «what for

neither <¨« os. Finally, the soundtrack deserves special mention. At all times it is more than adequate, and it gives a cach <¨ «

to the film« very important ». Resuming that today it is very necessary,« documentary film about the life of a

ping < "I do not want to be a surf champion". Of alt <¨ «the highest quality ¨« technique, it stands out in each and every one of the

possible aspects. Being a film directed towards a small public, it has an infinity oftowards

comic stripsthe elderly, making it essential in this summer.Besides. Additional information They have given a CD

full of interesting information, a couple of notes. For starters, the web page is complete, giving us an

idea of ​​the magnitude of the project we have in hand: http: //www.locosporelsurf.com, you have games in piles,

im <¨ «genes, trailers , and infinity of information about the characters and the movie. Finally, the choice of

characters is very large. We have on the one hand the t <¨ «funny peaks of all the movies of this style, a

p <¨« long-legged bird and a chicken fumeta that I ride with <¨ «l. The bad guys are pel <¨ «n protot <¨« peaks, until they go adeeper

littleinto their lives, where they begin to give more pain than fear. The good ones, there is everything. From the fat man with his

philosophy "to the little one" or "impetuous", passing through the "ping" beauty "inil". And not to mention the "" extras "", such as

Cody's family, the participants in the contest, the ind "¨

¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ª sPD: The cover of the Anglo-Saxon version I like much more than the Spanish <¨ «wave, so <¨« I put it.

" 1

" Loved footage that Meirelles leads with sobriety, without falling into the gratuitous gratuitousness of showing an

effective violence, disarmed of context, instrumentalized and greedy for the accidental spectator who thinks he

is watching a videogame of revenge.

The road of South American cinema is «paved with obstacles», but inevitably it prospers, it goes to «the international balcony»

and ends up being untagged cinema, «« clinker «« « Localists, although their scripts speak of what

is close to them and portray the life they have in front. Ciudad de Dios is a masterpiece of South American cinema

or Brazilian cinema, but we do not care about nationality. He would have liked her a Peckinpah during high hours or

the Scorsese with the br "¨ o of the seventies. We do not know if we are witnessing an accelerated session of gangster cinema

or a syncopated western with twentieth-century urban scenarios that are almost over. The masses of three hundred

characters from the six hundred-something novel <¨ «Paulo Lins's ginas, which I have not had the pleasure of reading, but which

I imagine addictive and delightful as the film, give for a loose footage that Meirelles leads with sobriety, without

falling jam <¨« s in the gratuitousness of showing an effective violence, disarmed of context, instrumentalized and greedy

for the accidental spectator who creates to be watching a videogame of revenges and turntable environments like

Tarantino. It impresses the verisimilitude of what we are seeing. One is "very accustomed to seeingcinema

Americanand to granting it more rituals, prestige and medals without any margin of uncertainty: for City of

God is probably the movie". <¨ "That this chronicler has seen in a long time. It reveals without restraint or

restraint the birth of organized crime in City of God, a neighborhood of R <¨« or of Janeiro. The rapporteur, the

omniscient eye, the demiurge of this choral history, Greek, is sometimes Buster <¨ «, a child who decides himself

apart from crime and who knows, deep down, sensitive, tender, artist. Nothing of these labels that has been on

since the beginning of the film has been twisted <¨ «n a <¨« pice: Buscap <¨ «the favela is fatigued: a world of weapons, of

drug trafficking«, subjugated bands Ac <¨ «Strict codes of conduct and bought police populate their universe. It is

articulated in three well differentiated parts, which can be seen without solution of continuity or spun in the plot

that shows us. Like Rayuela cortazariana, the referenced elements come to a well-cinematography

known, from which it feeds and to which it pays a simple, crude, almost invisible homage, but recognizable

if similar keys are handled. Est <¨ «Italian neorealism (I saw the black and white of the films of De

Sica in many episodes). Est <¨ «the western (there is a <¨« pica of revenge, of persecution, ¨ «n, of destiny as

<¨« unique s <¨ «recognizable symbol in the life of all its characters). Est <¨ «Coppola, very tangentially, and his Godfather

triumphant. Est <¨ «Tarantino, inevitably, with its urban madness, with its v ¨ ¨ igo of blood andthickness. Three

grammaticaldecades are going through the screen: all contain a seal of the house: c <¨« mara in hand,

deliberate interruption of the consummation of a scene to finish it later, at the convenience of

artistic creativity and montage. Buscap <¨ «is seeing how his world is falling apart: how his friends are

falling and of what form the differences between his neighbors are resolved at street level. <¨ «ls <¨« it has a c <¨ «mara:

its eyes are the c <¨« mara and the lens is giving us im «¨" amazing, amazing genes. Impressed, as unusual

in European cinema or ( m <¨ «sa <¨« n) American, the contest of children and adolescents as vulgar thieves or

drug addicts or murderers. It's Brazil: it's the favela. In this lies the subtle difference between themodels

Hollywood and South American. The South, this violent Brazil <¨ «simo, also exists: and now we know it with m <¨«

s <¨ «lida evidence, with a truculence m« ¨ «sn <¨« tida. <¨ "it is only necessary to follow the life of Z <¨« Peque <¨ «or, one of the

fundamental characters of history, to understand the hard life in the suburbs of poverty in this

Brazil occupied by misery and poverty. Survival at all costs, with all the risk.Lins tells in his novel:

"" Another wind, without homeland or compassion <¨ «n, took away" the laughter that this soil gave me, this soil that somearrived

menwith boots and tools to measure everything, to mark the earth. After that came the masters, who

razed the orchards, frightened the scarecrows, guillotined the trees, filled the swamp,

dried the fountain, and this became a desert. .) Surgi <¨ «the favela, the neofavela of cement, formed

of mouths and sinister silences, with desperate cries in the running of the alleys and in the indecision" of

the crossroads "". Nature, probably, was replaced by progress. And with <¨ «l, I conclude, came the

gun, the drug, the hate and the darkness, although everything is painted with a huge light, n« ¨ «, perfect, mottled of

life.

" 1

" I expected to find something absolutely transgressive. I think that the media diffusion of the film is not in

accordance with what is later shown.

If it were not for Kirsten Dunst (adorable to delirium), I would not bother <¨ «to make this criticism. I was hoping to

find something absolutely transgressive, since I have high hopes for the small Coppolina,

so savvy and intuitive not only to direct but to interpret. But apart from the wonderful costumes, the

direction of art (Outstanding) and the photography <¨ «a by the hand of Lance Acord (Lost in translation and pr« ¨ «lastly

" "Wild in the Streets" "), what is the film, it is not that it is slow, it is that it is torpor <¨ «fero. The cast is great, in

fact the direction of actors is another thing to highlight. I think there was no other actor better than Jason Schwartzman

(We saw him in Spun and we'll see him in 2008 for "" The Fantastic Mr. Fox "") to recreate that asshole face that he has

<¨ «to the king delf <¨ «n And what's more about this movie is that it has the Genial, the splendid, the incomparable,

the Sexy, the unrepeatable, the regal: David Bowie siiiiiiii Stay tuned because David plays to Nikola Tesla,

although it may seem incredible to you, this man who is my only love since I have use of reason has more

than 130 films in his possession. mode (l <¨ «ase BSO) the movie <¨« strong bet, does not get surprised and

if it leaves us with our mouths open it is because of the yawns that can provoke us. I expected a final something more

heartbreaking, since In fact The delf <¨ «n and the delphine of France, were decapitated in the guillotine, I do not understand

why <-" this is not shown in the movie ". Finishing with a romantic and familiar "hu" in the royal carriage.

Quiz <¨ «s Sof <¨« a wanted to keep the beautiful part of the story? I believe that the media diffusion of the film is not in accordance

with what is shown later, "" Sex "", "" Alcohol "", let's go god, have them, but at a very s <¨ «useful level <" to

me.

" 0

" A movie <¨ «b <¨« sica, of the best of friend Almod <¨ «var, although with these pieces of actresses any ...

Return to his place of birth" "La Mancha" ", and is that in this film you recognize everything you see (I'm

from La Mancha parents), from the houses with their patio, the gates, the waffles, bring donuts to

Madrid, the way of speaking of its inhabitants, etc. A very careful staging, and a great success to take

people from the place to shoot the odd scene. We <¨ «if it is sensaci¨¨« nm <¨ «a but the di« ¨ logos sometimesme

seemed to(especially at the beginning) with too many pauses between a phrase of an actress and the answer ¨ ¨ «N, it was

something strange for me. She reunited with Carmen Maura, who has been doing it for a long time, and she is one of the

best actresses of our country without a doubt, triumphing abroad , especially in France as Sergi L <¨ «fish

(<¨« and speaking in Franc <¨ «s? if someone can confirm that he does). Anyway, despite being one of the

main protagonists, it does not stand out much, it seems that it lets the others show off, that they take the witness

r <¨ «quickly. As <¨« this is aonly 4 women and the small role of Chus Lampreave)

Let's talk about actors. (MeLet's talk about them. Let's start with the younger one (to finish with the best flavor of mouth) Yohana Cobo that despite

being the one that m <¨ «s footage has, does not contribute much, I think it lacks something more than expressiveness, in fact she has

the scene with m <¨« s dramatic load < ¨ «ethics in which she kills the" "father" "and does not transmit barely. Due" ¨ "as with the paper" m "" s

"" dispensable "" and without much to show off, but we know that she It takes little, makes your presence

is the most essential, truly perfect. Adem <¨ «s has, for m <¨«, the best (well they are several times) point

of the film <¨ «, and it is when he opens the door, looks at his sister, pauses and says shouting:" "GOOD D <¨" AS

RAIMUNDA !!!!! "" jajajaja madrem <¨ «to laugh for God! Blanca Portillo, the eternal Carlota (her p« ¨ «loss in 7 lives,

is comparable to Paco's ), which makes the best role of the film, in the accent and its way of speaking, its way

of dressing and walking, of treating the family in front of it. His voice on the phone, telling Raimunda what isto him

happening, is bestial. And the final scenes of it are unbeatable, congratulations! I bothered him <¨ «much his march of

7 lives, but if he will perform interpretations as <¨« stas, I am happy. For the end we have left the great

Pen <¨ «Lope Cruz, because if I think that Almod <¨ «Var est <¨« overvalued, she is «very undervalued (<¨« to be «¨« because of its

relationship with that of impossible missions?). The certain thing is that it embroiders its paper, but it is that it is not that it

interprets well, that you create the character, etc. It's that when you're on the screen and you get a close-up, younot

canbe aware of anything else, especially when your eyes are watery, I think another one of those

actresses (like Meryl Streep) who with their mere presence, fill in they fill the screen and leave you at <¨ «nitos. By the

way, there is a moment when Carmen Maura says that Pen <¨ «lope was the ni« ¨ «of her eyes, remember that she was already« ¨ «" La

Ni <¨ «a de tus Ojos" "of Fernando Trueba, <¨ «coincidences ?, well only curiosities. As for the plot is <¨« very well

raised, with the surprise that we all know, but without becoming a big surprise, because it will not come <¨ «aa

cuento the movie would depend on whether someone is dead or not. The movie focuses onrelationships

mother-daughter, good relationships and in general, that makes it a movie closer and that pleases. So <¨ «that

we have before us a movie« b «¨« sica, of the best of friend Almod <¨ «var, and there is no« ¨ «n transexual !!

Come back to succeed (although with these pieces of actresses anyone !!).

" 1

" Hac <¨ "a long time that I did not enjoy so much in the movies. Guillermo del Toro has made his masterpiece and

for the one who writes the best movie "I've seen this a <¨« o.

I have already seen, at last, the film that I was expecting for m <¨ «from the« ¨ «oy, despite my high expectations, it has notme

disappointed, it is more exceeded. It is undoubtedly the best film of Guillermo del Toro and one of the best, if

not the best, of a <¨ «o. And it is Spain <¨ «ola (although in coproduction with the US and M <¨« jico, although the technical and artistic means and

most of the money are Spanish <»¨« oles). The labyrinth of the Faun narrates the arrival of a child and her

mother to an indeterminate place in the north of Spain, where her new husband waits, ageneral

Francoistdetermined to appease the rebellion. «N of the maquis in that area of ​​the country. Once there <¨ «, the ni <¨« a discovers the

entrance to a labyrinth antiqu «¨« that will serve him «¨« of refuge for the events to follow <¨ «n. Guillermo del

Toro is a filmmaker firmly anchored in the fantastic «¨« although in some of his movies he has made

approaches to the terror (Mimic) or the western (The Spine of the Devil). In this film, he mixes

reality and fantasy again, placing the action in the years after the civil war in Spain, as he already did in

El Espinazo del Devil, although the stylistic approach is very different. <¨ «This is a dark film,

where the evil is painfully real, which takes place in a mysterious forest with an oppressive atmosphere. In this

film with influences of" "Through <" ¨ «s of the Mirror" "or" "The Endless Story" ", evil is not something that

comes from the m <¨« s all <¨ «, it is not something intangible. An ogre, a human being, a soldier played by a Sergi L <«fish

exemplary, represents all the evil of the human being, shows up to where man can reach to achieve his

goals. It is an unforgettable character, disgusting, disgusting, real that, from now on, becomes the best

villain of the "last" to <¨ «os. In contrast we have the innocence, the purity, the imagination of the ni <¨ «Ophelia,

interpreted by Ivana Baquero, who takes refuge in her fantasy world to flee from the very painful reality.

Around teem other characters m <¨ 'secondary s but equally important played by Ariadna Gil,

Maribel Verdú <¨ "or <¨« lex Angulo (these two <¨ "last performed a nuanced interpretations, cre <¨« bles,

impressive ). The work of del Toro after the "maras" is of great height, of a director who knows what is

done. The film moves from reality to fantasy, in a continuous, seamless fashion. The director endows the

story with an increasing and oppressive rhythm, you do not know where it will take you, but you intuit that there is no light at the end

of the road even though you have the hope that there will be light. In addition, all the sections, incorrectly called "technicians", touch

the perfection from the clarity of photography of Guillermo Navarro to the music of Javier Navarrete, passing

through some <¨ «bles visual effects, taking into account the not very high budget of the film« «. But

above that, Guillermo del Toro is placed as a great orchestra conductor who knows how to extract the best of each part

to achieve a brilliant whole because the film is emotional, involves. Every apparition of the faun, every act of

violence, fascinates, disgusts, interests. Ha <¨ «a long time that did not enjoy so much in the cinema. Guillermo del Toro

has made his masterpiece and for the one who writes the best movie "I've seen this a <¨« o. S <¨ «what a detail,

for m <¨«, inexplicable, <¨ "why" was not in the short list of candidates for Spain for the Oscars? In M <¨ «jico they have

had more eye and it is their candidate to represent them in the Academy of Hollywood.

" 1

" An exceptional cast, a trace of intertwined stories, linked by one or more uni "links thatyou

strikein the magician, make up this unique spectacle.

They told me not long ago about this movie, quite after I saw the trailer thanks to the other blog that I have

"" Or <¨ «ass cin <¨« edge "" and my opinion <¨ «n no It can be more satisfying once it is viewed. "" Crash "" is afilm

different, as real as life itself and that in one more time leaves the viewer with his mouth wide open

(as has been my case). An exceptional cast, Sandra Bullock (nothing to do with her romantic comedies),

Don Cheadle, Matt Dillon, Thandie Newton, Brendan Fraser, Ryan Phillippe, Jennifer Esposito all trace

some stories intertwined with each other (al m <¨ «S pure style" "Pulp Fiction" "), which at the beginning are separated and at the end

with one or more" <"links of uni <" n hit strongly in this <"magician of which, from a window called a screen,

You see this singular spectacle, real, in the great greater of the cases. A film that, sincerely, is

worth taking a look at.

" 1

" Transformers has had the ability to have made me enjoy like a child <"or a child" </ i> or in a movie theater,

like no film has done for a long time.

Hallucinatory. Transformers, the new virguer <¨ «to the super merchant of Michael Bay (director of clunkers like

Pearl Harbor, but also of authentic« wonders like Two police rebels 2), has had the admirable

the ability to transport myself to the past, to make me feel like a crèche of ten while enjoying a

summer blockbuster like those that are no longer done, after leaving the cinema, fantasize and play on the

street on what is seen on the screen, and want to buy immediately action figures. The characters

are quite flat (despite the effort of Shia Labeouf, who is "huge"), Sometimes his sense of humor is

too childish and leaden, and the story is more simple than the mechanism of a Transformer (sorry for the

joke xD). but it is vertiginously entertaining, it has one of the best rhythms of a <¨ «o (lasts more than two hours

and it happens to you on a flight) and, best of all, it is not taken seriously as <¨ «Same.Bay is aware that what he

has in his hands is absurd to take him to the cinema, that a series of cartoons about giant robots with a life of their

own that are transformed into things and that are« in war cont¨ ¨ «nua s <¨ «you will have it« to be in that, in a

series of cartoons. He is aware of this and a disgustinglyRussian mountain is taken out of the hat

entertaining and enjoyable, with a great sense of humor (sometimes too much), sometimes even to

autopar ("attention" to the conversation). <¨ «n between a very irritating cop, embodied by <¨« <¨ «John Turturro !!, and the two

protagonist kids, inside a car, about the Transformers), without any« nonsense of pretentiousness (

Apart from wantingsell many mu <¨ «equitos of action <¨« n.) or delusions of grandeur, <¨ "that even allowedthrow

poison darts to the administration <¨" No Bush! by far the best big premiere of what we have in summer, and one

of the most spectacular films of the last ones. Pure cinema of evasi <¨ «n, full of fireworks of

the good ones, of which they are enjoyed, in spite of some movements of c <¨« mara too abrupt in the sequences of

action, to the Batman Begins. tipiqu <¨ «simos de Bay.Es a authentic <¨« ntica l <¨ «that a lot of people get carried away by their

prejudices, and they fall« to the movie «because it is <« directed by Michael Bay, or simply because it is a

film of action. If the movie were to be signed by James Cameron, another rooster would sing "A"?

" 1

" The cinema can die quietly after "the movie", a true "classic" of cinema. The movies are made

for things to be done as <¨ «. Whoever wants to see what's going on in the cinema, let's see Death Proof. cinema is pure state.

The cinema is a collective experience. Or at least for that is <"thought" despite theof videos and

appearanceDVDs. You get into a room with a lot of people you do not know and share, whether you like it or not, the same

experience. Because as <¨ «it is the cinema. And what you see, unlike books, is "happening at that very

moment. The screen is a window to the same moment in which you live, there are flasbacks and deliveries of that type or

not. Lately it happens a lot that the directors see in the cinema something more than what it is. The cinema has been defined

for a long time, and there is no way to redefine it, it is what it is, and to be sure until it dies. Tarantino is

possibly, together with Clint Eastwood and Silvester Stallone, the "last filmmaker really" classic "of cinema. The

cinema is something that must produce a reaction more than emotional in the viewer. The cinema is more a way

of transmitting sensations than emotions. Cinema is not an internal experience, it is external, unlike

literature. The cinema is an artificial experience on the contrary that, for example, the theater, but no

less pure. It is not time to redefine cinema, it is time to glorify it, to do with <¨ «what should be done

with < ¨ «l.Quentin Tarantino is the person who has possibly seen m <¨« s movies in history. Someone who loves

cinema m <¨ «s that all of us together, someone who understands it better than anyone else. LIVE PROOF is PURE CINEMA OF

TRUTH. It is cinema of what must be done and not done, it is a physical experience for the senses that puts you in

a race of cinical movement on board of movie cars that some may have forgotten but that

Tarantino It takes care that we know what they are and what movies they come from. From the beginning you breathe cinema, you drink

movies. All planes are cinematographic, all movement and history. Because not any story is

cinematographic, and <¨ «it is. The movie deceives you, a thing also for which the cinema is "made". The cinema should not

be sincere, the cinema is the opposite. The cinema should tease you but do not think you're an idiot. DEATH

PROOF makes you believe one thing and then show you another. It makes you believe that someone is the protagonist (or

protagonists) to then turn the tables and say no. All within a l ¨ ¨ «narrative narrative perfectly

constructed and carried. Tarantino looks to the cinema to rediscover what film is truly. It may be,

as I already commented in my review of PLANET TERROR, the <¨ «unique movie» "tribute" "of Tarantino. Here, in addition to stealing and

recycling, it pays homage to cars. All the protagonists cars, which also are; they come from some <¨ «n cl <¨«: from

physicalBULLIT to PUNTO L <¨ «MITE: ZERO and its conductor Kowalsky. Mike Stuntman's car has KrisducklingStuntman Mike

Kristoferson'sin CONVOY (Sam Peckimpah), one of the best movies that exist and the least valued.

is faced with two acts to his objectives, chosen at random among the girls he sees in any of your

trips. It shows us as someone who does this from time to time. We see what a bastard he can be, and then

put him in a situation in which he begins to wish he had not gotten involved. They are two acts, likefilms

Kubrick's, perfectly balanced so that he is not arrhythmic, so that he becomes cinematographic again and his film

does not smell like this "EXPERIMENT", because Tarantino is a filmmaker. The cast is the host. We return to recover the

Kurt Rusell that ech <¨ «we missed, the Rescue in New York and Blow in the Small <¨« to China. An actor who can

give much more than what they allow, and who here "shows us that he can be as good as Michael Parks and that

Michael Parks can be as good as Al Pacino or Robert de Niro. Michael Parks, actor educated in theTV

Americanof the 70s above all, is an underrated interpreter <¨ «simo and who has shown a lot so that they do not call him

m <¨« s. It is good <¨ «« simo, and returns to be Earl McGraw, as it already was «¨« in OPEN UNTIL DAWN, KILL BILL or PLANET

TERROR. And it seems that he has interpreted them at the same time, because it is exactly the same as when he did OPEN UNTIL

DAWN, more than 10 years ago. Does not clash at all. The girls are perfect and each one fits into their role asfitted in her

Madonnaleather outfit from FOUR ROOMS, perfectly. Normal girls doinggirls roles

normal. Speaking as normal girls and normal subjects. No artificialism in a part of the movie that

asks you <¨ «sto, girls ansolutamente normal.Tarantino plays Warren, the bartender, a role that looks like an

updated version of the roles of bartender who made <¨« to Karl Malden. Cameos for his colleague Eli Roth and for the

sobris of Rodriguez. DEATH PROOF is a completely cinematic experience, which goes at full speed, and

you want to see it more than three times. <¨ «This is pure cinema, really, of that for which it was invented <¨« sto of cinema.

You enter and upload to a film that you can not resist as a spectator, a film that makes you think that all the

movies should be like <¨ «sta, with <¨« this esp <¨ «rite without pretensions, only that of giving p <¨ «public a PEL <¨« CULA.The cinema

has forgotten that cinema should be so <¨ «, cinematographic experiences sustained by principles that

have been working in the history of cinema during a <¨ «Os, and that the cinema of many rejects saying that the cinema

must be more original and reinvent it on symbolisms and more committed ideas (see: Medem, Lars Von Trier and

dem <¨« s pe <¨ «a without idea of ​​what is to make movies) DEATH PROOF is a movie that reminds us that it is the cinema, a movie

with which we can enjoy how cinema was enjoyed before, when it was really made. The cinema can die

peacefully if it wants after a film with the quality of <¨ «ste. Absolutely perfect. Maybe Tarantino is

one of the best filmmakers in history, which is why we are very lucky to be alive when <¨ «he is <¨«.

Much will be spoken <¨ «of <¨« l as a genius, and of us as the great lucky ones to have

enjoyed it alive.One and again you have to see this <¨ «movie and realize that the cinema is this . Enjoy authentic for

which you WANT to pay to see.

" 1

" Its development is almost accommodative. It has in its representatives of the r <¨ "regime of characters that cause

aversion". There is no contrast, the bad is s <¨ «what that.

In the face of the overwhelming majority of positive cr? Ics, I am here again dissolving. It's not about the fact thatthe film

I did not like, which was the case, but the lack of creativity when painting the characters. It made me a

very long film to tell the story that I had to tell and especially the American story of

the films from the old continent that I saw recently. some exceptions, consider thecinema

Americanas cinema f¨¨ «easy, for recreation. With this I do not say that it is good or bad, each one will have ««

theirtastes. But of by itself <¨ «it is a cinema too much explained, with almost stereotyped characters andhistories

linearthat for good or for evil seek to satisfy all. The life of the others has many of those

« icas ». Its development is almost accommodative. It has in its representatives of the r <¨ "regime of characters that

cause aversion". There is no contrast, the bad is s <¨ «what that. There is also a climber who exerts his power with

arrogance and of course our protagonist who ends up in love with the art that as he could not "to be otherwise

changes his life and his perspective of things. There is always spectators who look for messages in the

movies, for all of them perhaps it is enough the conviction that art can do everything, that ideas are

not killed and that sooner or later good triumphs over evil ( although in this case the triumph is something as

alien to the "core" of history as the "ca" of the wall). "<by" <"that after winning the Oscar for Best Film

<" "Foreign film in Hollywood is already thinking of making a remake. I can assure you that your adaptation will be <¨ «

of the simplest, I believe that it is« enough »« to translate it into English <».

" 0

" In Babel its three protagonists are in hostile worlds, alone and frustrated by not being able to break

the cultural, social and physical barriers that prevent them from communicating with others.

Babel is the third in a trilog <¨ «that began <¨« with Amores Perros a <¨ «or 2000 and continued« ¨ «with 21 Grams in

2003. Three films, separated three a <¨« os entre s <¨ «, counting three stories each. In all of them, a

coincidence, an accident, crosses the lives of the protagonists, who otherwise would have

traveled separately. It's the pair <¨ «butterfly ball of chaos come true: a Japanese hunter gives a

rifle to a" Moroccan gu¨ "and, to" "after, this rifle unleash <¨ «a series of events that will end <¨« n affecting

people in various parts of the world.In Babel I <¨ «<¨« rritu, its director, reuses the assembly to give

strength to the magn < "Fico gui <¨« n of Guillermo Arriaga. The three stories are told in pieces, in a disordered way in

time, although at no time does the viewer lose sight of what is "happening". However, it does not occur

in Babel as in 21 Grams, where the montage was above a gui <¨ «n that counted in the classical waynot

wouldhave been so interesting. In Babel its three protagonists are in hostile worlds, alone and

frustrated by not being able to break the cultural, social and physical barriers that prevent them from communicating with the

others. In these situations, a look or a hug says much more than words and proves that, under what

is in view, we are all equal. Gabriel is a movie built with silences, so the

Interpretation of the actors is essential to give credibility to the story. And the truth is that there is nothing

to object. Both Brad Pitt, the Mexican Adriana Barraza and the Japanese Rinko Kikuchi have gotten into the

skin of their respective characters and the viewer enters fully into the story. The film has several

moments of great strength and, despite having tints of tragedy, it finally leaves a bittersweet taste. Thework

locationis very remarkable and the scenarios in Morocco, M <¨ «xico and Jap <¨« n are shocking. In summary,

Babel is a perfect brooch for this trilog <¨ «to which I started <¨ «Three years ago«, with Alejandro Gonz <¨ «lez I <¨« <¨ «rritu

directing and Guillermo Arriaga as a scriptwriter, although following closely the whole creative process. In fact, it

seems that from now on they will work separately, and many are those who think that together they add more to each other than

separately. But that will say <¨ «the future. At the moment, today we can enjoy this interesting film.

" 1

" Driving Lessons is an interesting proposal that nevertheless ends up in a terrific deflation

disappointing.

Driving Lessons is an interesting proposal that nevertheless ends up being a terriblydeflation

disappointing. The film is taken in a very irregular way and ends up being just as ins <¨ «asked (and sometimes

boring) that the main character (Rupert Grint), with a plot that does not end up interesting or connect

with the viewer. Fortunately, the direction of Jeremy Brock makes Driving Lessons a film that is "very

passable by the hair, with a thankfully light rhythm. Something in which the remarkable interpretations of

Laura Linney (for a change) and a huge Julie Walters (of Oscar) also have a lot more to say.

" 0

" Worst of all is that the seemingly interesting ending is nothing more than an absurd theory <¨ «to which I doubt

much <¨« that Dick would have told it that way.

Having a remarkable premise, Next of Lee Tamahori, director of the justita dies another d <¨ «a, does not manage to

engage the p <¨« public in any of its apparently attractive moments, which are the action sequences.

F <¨ «jense, maybe <¨« s what m <¨ «s has motivated me in this film are the moments where Chris (a sos <¨« simo Nicolas Cage)

sees what happens <¨ «in a little while (whether it's 2 minutes, 2 hours or what Tamahori comes up with at that

moment). First of all, Next is a movie with no sense, no coherence and hardly any rhythm. And then, friends,

think <¨ «n: <¨« qui <¨ «n is the fearsome screenwriter? Well now I do not remember, nor do I want to look at it, but what

I know is that it is based on a novel by the legendary Philip K. Dick, author of novels that have been broughtfore

to thecinema with absolute expertise <¨ «as Minority Report or Blade Runner. And the worst of all is that the seemingly

interesting ending is nothing more than an absurd theory <¨ «to which I doubt much <¨« just that Dick would have told it that

way.Rid <¨ «until he says enough, with hardly a decent Julianne Moore (her role is m <¨ «s fr <¨« o, distant and

antip <¨ «tico and she does not even have a reason to be) and a Jessica Biel that for <¨« Only one that is <¨ "is to

look body (<¨" and to provide two hours more time to the protagonist, I did not remember!). It is seen that the one who

has made the montage is an authentic ace of the bad films, since he does not have a single scene linked with the

next elegantly. <¨ «Even the« credit «titles are sopop <¨« feros! And it's a shame, because the trailer

also does not promise <¨ «so little and has a« ¨ «of stars of good quality (well, Moore is a bigger thing and Cage

when he gets it he gets it). But I do not know what "damn" Tamahori has done to make such a mess withoutor

headtail with a mise-en-scène (except when they are locating the bomb, at the end) and with somescenes.

action<¨ «n too little cre <¨« bles.No recommend it to anyone, or fans of action cinema. Let them go and

enjoy with Bourne, that they are big words.

" 0

" Quiz <¨ «refers too much to his other great work, but the intensity and sadness that the ensemble evokes, the

beautiful <¨« sima fotograf <¨ «a, and the inspired m <¨ sica make 'El wind that shakes the barley 'be one m <¨ «s worthy

winner of the Palme d'Or of Cannes.

I do not mind recognizing that Ken Loach is one of the directors that has moved me most with his films

('Ladybird, ladybird', 'Raining stones', 'Earth and freedom'). Many accuse him of excessive didacticism when

applying his leftist thesis in his films, others complain about the Manichees that are his characters. A m <¨ «, what

do you want me to say, they put a lump in my throat in the biggest <¨" of the time. Be <¨ «polical affinity (with

the a <¨« os, less and less) or simply identification with the characters, of humble origin and of flesh and blood.

The fact is that with 'The wind that shakes the barley' (2006) Mr. Loach returned it to get. Another llantina in the

movies.'The wind that shakes the barley 'tells the story of two brothers, Damien (very successful Cillian Murphy) and

Teddy (solid <¨ «simo Padraic Delaney) O'Donovan, who are immersed in the fight for the independence of Ireland in

1920. What at first is a fight against the English invader, becomes m <¨ «s late civil war, when

the Irish side is divided among those who support a treaty of peace that subordinates them to the United Kingdom and those who

believe that the treaty must be filed by the English king inside his august rectal cavity. Damien and Teddy

will find themselves at the crossroads of ceasing the fight and accepting the treaty or pursuing the ideal of agovernment

socialistfor all the Irish, by blood and fire. Unlike 'Earth and Freedom', 'The Wind that shakes

the barley 'does not focus so much on the political part but on the effects that a war has on people.

Damien, a medical student, becomes a l ¨ ¨ «der of a column of the IRA in the absence of his brother, having

to make decisions that mark him for life. Also his brother Teddy, savagely (very savagely, one of

those scenes that cover his eyes) tortured by the English, becomes a defender of the peace treaty with

his enemies. The families of the rebels suffer the punishments they can not inflict on the insurgents. The

English soldiers, after the nightmare that was the first world war, are killed by the IRA. Here,

in a more balanced way than in 'Earth and liberty', the dehumanization of all blic conflicts, and

the consequences of this dehumanization, are shown. In all sides. Loach also reflects on the use of

violence, that is, terrorism. While the first part of the film justifies that armed struggle for the

violence and injustice of the "black and tans" "English, in the second part of the film we show some

characters that, in their own words, "They have crossed the line", and believe that there is no turning back on

the violence they use. Alg <¨ «that another politician should <¨« see this film to realize that this

end of violence is not a question of someone saying "" we have stopped "" and that's it <". But that is another debate, m <¨ «s

all <¨« of the cinematogrÃ © ico.'The wind that shakes the barley ', altogether, perhaps <¨ «refers too much to his other great

work, and maybe <¨ "S the brutality of the English mercenaries seems that s <¨" it is <"to justify the armed struggle,

but the intensity and sadness that evokes the whole, the beautiful <¨« sima fotograf <¨ «a (work of the great Barry Ackroyd),

and the inspired m <¨ «sica (of the no less great George Fenton) make 'The wind that shakes the barley' is one more

worthy of the winner of the Palme d'Or of Cannes. A 8.

" 1

" Adaptaci <¨ «n" "free" "of" "The prince and the beggar" ", and an argument that will make blush any apprentice

scriptwriter.

Second part of that monster called "" Garfield "" <¨ "And what do I do when I comment on the movie? Well,

having a fan of the orange cat at home, takes you to the cinema in the head, meaningless jokes to the m <¨ «s pure style

" "Caca, ass, fart, pee." "That enchant <¨« na the kids of the house (the room was full of small children), a sudden

banging of stained people, and practical jokes; it is true that you can not ask for pears to the elm, before

a tape of such magnitude, especially thought for the p <¨ "child public, is what there is, or is taken, or left.

Only a couple of tonter <¨« so they have pulled out a slight (very slight) smile, the rest predictable, adaptation

"free" "of" "The prince and the beggar", and an argument that will make blush any screenwriter apprentice (the

gui <¨ «n has no meaning), although it is true that the recreation of Garfield and Prince (" "his twin" ") is

excellent (even in the shadows and reflections), the movie is PENOSE, unless you have a fan of thecat

orangeat home, as it is my case, or a few small children of children's cinema !! DO NOT GO !! (you will regret).

" 0

" Vulgar cinema, reminiscent of Mariano Ozores. Stereotypes, anachronisms and lack of ingenuity. So they can

say that the Spanish cinema loses spectators because it is not promoted.

Starring Pep <¨ «n Nieto, Concha Velasco, Rosa Mar <¨« to Sard <¨ «and Pablo Puyol, among others, Chuecatown tells

the story of a couple of homosexuals who unknowingly is related to a mafioso who murders to the

old women who occupy certain houses, with the intention of reforming them and selling them at high prices topeople.

young and affluentFollowing the line, which to the misfortune of the spectator, prevails in the light comedy of Spain <¨ «Ola,

Chuecatown resorts to a humor full of t <¨« peaks, vulgar, unoriginal and enormously predictable, with

characters caricatured in excess and a gui ¨ «n full of gaps and defects of form. The histrionics is the note

prevailing in the characterization of the characters, and both Pep <¨ «n Nieto and Pablo Puyol border the ridicule at

times, while Rosa Mar <¨« a Sard <¨ «demonstrates once <¨ «s that is able to interpret all kinds of

roles.Quiz <¨« s its director Juan Flahn, in a way, wanted to show that homosexuality is a subject

like any other, and that it can be used in any context. But undoubtedly, a disservice has done to its

normalization by resorting to as many stereotypes may underlie today in the mind of a citizen <¨ «who

can see in this film more reminiscences by Mariano Ozores than anything else. With the exception, of course

, that in that "period of uncovering, the productions were financed by private capital in its

entirety, while now we have a subsidized cinema from every imaginable sector. Perhaps it is the

fact that the amortization of production has been guaranteed since before it was started, that is the cause that has

led Spanish cinema to progressive and slow, but unstoppable, p <¨ «loss of screen share, collection, and

the interest of viewers looking for something more than a nude or an exaggerated fuss.

" 0

" The touches of fantasy <¨ «a, that apparently there are, are so casposos, clumsy, boring and crappy that they go

unnoticed, although the end is to despollarte of laughter. A "cull" of desprop "¨" sites without gui "¨" n or

interpretation "¨ n any.

Daniel Myrick codirigi <¨ «The Project of the Witch of Blair, an icon, a classic« «and a horror movie of truth.

That does not mean that the kid has talent, because seen his new telefilm quiz <¨ «s the criterion put his

company« ¨ «Eduardo S <¨« nchez (I doubt it very much, that was a flute that are <¨ «a Once and not come back <¨ «to sound, but let

them dance it off). Believers, a" "direct to dvd" "is a failed attempt to create a realistic terror that tells of

the kidnapping of two doctors by of the members of a sect. They are ninety minutes of garbage that a <¨ «ndo not

Iunderstand how aguant <¨«. <¨ «<¨« <¨ «But if you pass the movie in an individual toilet !!!!!!! The touches of

fantasy <¨« a, which apparently are, are so tacky, clumsy, boring and crappy that go unnoticed, although

the end is to despollarte of laughter. A "cull" of desprop "¨" sites without gui "¨" n or interpretation "¨ n any. It is what

is said, a fucking shit.

" 0

" The film "Kevin MacDonald is very entertaining, involving, shocking and even at a given moment has

a distressing turn in the line of The Midnight Express. With all this, it goes without saying, that Irecommend

highlyit.

The "Last King of Scotland" comes to join those particular memories of "Africa that is" making Hollywood

in order to sell popcorn and, in passing, denounce the abuses suffered by the continent bysociety.

Western: The faithful gardener, Blood Diamond and Hotel Rwanda. However, this story stands out from the others

. In all the aforementioned films, there is a hero who is less courageous than at one time or another of the

film, who becomes the conscience savior of humanity. The "thymus king of Scotland" is not just a

whiterous interpretive work by Whitaker, it is also the story of a Faust who sells his soul to the devil

for little more than solid mulattos , pool and bottles of Dom Perignon. The seller is a "Scottish doctor" who

interprets "lost adrenaline", James McAvoy - without a hint of heroism or an irreproachable behavior, in

short, one of our own. We see this character deflowering his innocence as he falls into the clutches of

the er «del del del del del del del del del del del del Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi Idi ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ,

psychoanalyst, counselor and above all buf <¨ «n.The figure of the tyrant, between crazy dictator, megal <¨« hand and child and

mentally horny friend, I can not think of another actor who could have done better than Whitaker. And even

to the surprise of her fans, Agent Scully, that is, Gillian Anderson, comes out and recently

saw her "also" splendidly and resigned from herself in Tristram. Shandy, the <¨ Last Winterbottom. The film by Kevin MacDonald

is very entertaining, involving, shocking and even at a given moment has an agonizing twist in the line of The

Midnight Express. With all this it goes without saying, that I highly recommend it, because although you've

never heard of Idi Amin and you care about African dictatorships, history is not at all distant and it

's a great film. ¨ «fico.

" 1

" It's one of the dumbest movies I've ever seen in my life T <"written in Spanish as" "It's not another silly movie" ", it's definitely a of the mostmovies

dumbI've ever seen in my life. In English it's called Date Movie, meaning "" movie <"for an appointment" "and its cover letter

is created by" "two of the six creators of Scary Movie" " . Calculate the level. <¨ «Why" <a

refined spectator like moi termin <¨ "in the cinema watching this kind of" "Laughter and Salsa" "gringo? Precisely

because all the movies that my "" date "" had not seen have already seen them and vice versa. We only hadstay

toin com # ¨ n if we had not seen this movie, for obvious reasons of common sense. But, <¨ "what <" devils! <¨ «Why do not you

let the neurons rest for a while and relax with the parody of all the romantic films made in

Hollywood? I have to admit that I re ¨ ¨« enough since the producers of this chicha film they did not forgive a single

movie of love, but they also suffered "ar" arcades of disgust in various parts. And that they see <¨ «to see Hostal yesterday and that

I have a good est <¨« magician. There were two or three scenes in which I had to really cover my eyes. I'm not going to say

that I was disappointed <¨ «, because the movie <¨« proved to be exactly what I expected. In contrast to my "" date "", which is

actually one of my "" best friends "", s <¨ «I saw it a little more disillusioned. "I did not think <¨" that it was so bad "", he told me <"

at the end. To go, please go with trusted friends and plan to "" do something this <"" I ask "". Do not think of

going with a true romantic date. And in the meantime, prepare yourself «¨« ndose, <¨ «that Scary Movie 4 is coming!

" 0

" Ortega surprises us with a film at times disconcerting, intimate, minimalist, almost without a

visible gui but always vital showing that with few words or even gestures, one can say too much.

Let's say to begin that the newcomer director Luis Ortega is the son of the singer-actor-politician Palito

Ortega and also "brother of the singer" Emanuel as if to put aside the prejudices and get fully involved.

in his <¨ «prima prima, which seems by intention and tone, wanting to detach himself far from his family clan. We say it

because his particular look does not accept any« «type of <¨« or <¨ «er < ¨ «a, addressing a raw issue such as old age and

complex relationships father / daughter, granddaughter / grandmother. Ortega surprises us with a film at times

disconcerting, intimate, minimalist, almost without a visible gui but always vital showing that with few

words or even gestures, one can say too much. Dorotea (Dolores Fonzi, partner at that time of the director)

must take care of her grandmother alone and at the same time rebuild the relationship with her dad <¨ «who has just come out of prison and who

is a character a few times seen in our cinema. A person d <¨ «bil on the edge of disability embodied by

Eduardo Couget (cacariturezco aspect) that the director found <¨« through the streets of San Telmo asking for alms

and that both in the film and in real life, lives in the Ej <¨ «army of Salvaci <¨« n of the neighborhood. Without pronouncing judgment or

condemning the characters and with a slow but flowing rhythm, he portrays the suffering and the isolation, the

deterioration and the helplessness in a natural way and at the same time, as if it were slightly out of control. hands. Costumbrista,

without definite direction and even with ambiguous repetitions of scenes, the filming in video pales a little the

good photography achieved. Point and set aside for the unique protagonist of the grandmother, character <¨ «outgoing

film« ¨ «embodied by Eugenia Bassi of 99 to <¨« os -not actress- due <¨ «a of a <¨ «enviable beauty and humor for her

age, died five months after finishing the shoot, with a senile warmth that was remembered in theat the

film reviewsend of a <¨« o.Luis Ortega then he is another representative of the newindependent cinema

Argentine, in the l ¨ «nea stylistic style of the Caetano, Perrone and Trapero, in a surprising and promising debut (<¨« 22

a <¨ «os!) and with a second film "(Monoblock, 2007) to explore for my part.

" 1

" One of the great films of this year <or "2007 is an outstanding result that only acan achieve

visionary and outstanding director like Mel. We surrender to your master feet.

A few times I give 5 stars to a film and this time I will do it. We have a born talent

for the direction. <¨ «Oops Mel has done it again! He has embroidered the project. It is an example to be followed by

those actors who are introduced to the world of management. Mel has surpassed the limits of what is

called "" Making movies "". His "last works are merged with a documentary background that makes their tapes unique. Telling

what it is to tell does not count much, but God," or, as he tells it, is abysmal, with a production ¨ «n of titans and an

Oscar art direction, Mel shows us the ca" ¨ «of an empire through a family history, of love,

of struggle and perseverance for beliefs. See Apocalipyto is not recommended, but essential. 90% of the

cast is from <¨ «gen ind <¨« gena and adem <¨ «s debutante, and believe me that nothing should have been f¨¨« cil.El fact that

est <¨ «shot in Maya , it is an attractive m <¨ «s but I do not expect <¨« is phrased edges </ i> icas in this language because the

conversations are "" very elementary "". I have loved the Scarifications (Reliefs) and the implants ind < ¨ "genas,

" "So fashionable right now" ". They are very successful, in some cases I have my doubts that they are partprops

of the makeup, for me, that there were more than one and more than two reals. My discovery in this faithful is Rudy

Youngblood, the actor who plays the <¨ «gil and intelligent" "Claw of Jaguar" "whom he <" he is known "" Spirit:

The Seventh Fire "" (of African American Mother and father Ind <¨ «gena North American) is going to give a lot to talk about, its

interpretation is totally organic, do not doubt for a moment about the image that is selling you and the

physical form (absent from steroids) is a naturalness and perfection that only Mel could achieve. There are directors

who care about a r "¨« if the musculature is cre ¨ «ble or not, it brings them to the cool show us an ind« ¨ «gena with

muscles that stinks of cycles but Mel, no, the cares, Pamper every detail. The rotten dentures are great,

without id <¨ «ac <¨« they were and are in reality (for which you have seen some live and ever live).

All this is more than admirable especially considering that this boy managed to "overcome a cancer" in his

childhood. He graduated <¨ «at Belton High School in 2000 and changed his« "last name" "Gonzalez" "to the current one (m <¨« s

<¨ «artistic). Another of the discoveries is the bell <¨« Chasm Dalia Hernandez (The wife of Claw of Jaguar, that waits to

be rescued in the well of the village) qui <¨ «n debuts in this film (by the big door) and it is let grow the

eyebrows to incarnate m <¨« s rightly its role, I am sure we will see it more than once? Also highlight the appearance

of Mar <¨ «to Isabel D <¨« az (Masala) to which we have recently seen in "" Volver "" by Almod <¨ «var en d <¨« nde

played Regina, a neighbor of the character played by the actress Pen <¨ «lope Cruz. Adem <¨ «s we have seen her in

Series as Central Hospital and clunkers as" "Crazy for Sex" "in any case this Cuban is an excellent

actress and proof of this is that she has worked with the best. In conclusion <¨« n one of the great movies of this

a <¨ «o 2007 (Delay of months Made in Spain) an outstanding result that can only be achieved by adirector

visionary and outstandinglike Mel. We surrender to your master feet, Ole tus Cojo? S.

" 1

" Wonderful show of good work, a step more in the complete filmography of the Canadian. A film almost

perfect, raw and wildly aware.

Violence has always been a very profitable subject in this of the "best" art. One of theexamples

clearesthas been the Canadian David Cronenberg, capable of surprising, anguishing and stalking the viewer with

acclaimed as Inseparables or La mosca, or of raising awareness with his pen ¨ «last and masterful A history of

violence. Of Eastern Promises he could not wait any longer. Well, it could be the second part of <¨ «sta

<¨« last, but the truth is that for me, this time it has surpassed <¨ «nm <¨« s, regal <¨ «ndonos a film almost perfect,

raw and wildly aware. There are two scenes of extreme violence (<¨ «and so extreme!) That appear in

the film. Two samples that make it clear enough that violence is not something free, or something that

benefits anyone. But Cronenberg does not fall short s <¨ «what with this subject, but explores the entrances <¨« ace of its

protagonists (especially those of a superb Viggo Mortensen) and consciousness as something hard to pay. And the fact is that

Nikolai's character is a cold, calculating and finally surprising. Along with Mortensen, highlight <¨ «the

presence of Armin Mueller-Stahl, whose car <¨« cter s <¨ «doctor and unpleasant, but with his apparent pac« ¨ «face,

makes us believe in <¨« nm <¨ «s fear and tension <¨« n. This is a film, in addition, perfectionist and calculated from beginning to

end, which has a gui <¨ «n of Steven Knight truly incredible and with some di« ¨ «logos with an air po < ¨ «tico

really fascinating. It contains scenes such as the b <¨ «search of the baby <¨« for the hospital or the

barber's one ¨ «, without leaving me the best of all, that located in a hot and bloody sauna. I could "cross out" the film

to have a somewhat elaborate ending, but I think, I think and agree that I can not be less successful. This is

a criminal drama, realistic, and hard, very hard, that deals with the issue of violence with a pulse and in amanner

stark. If that conclusion does not link too much with the contour of the film, it is because the surprise factor is

as it should be, surprise, not because Cronenberg decides to get away from his main subject (very attentive to the brilliant

final shot). Promises from the East is a wonderful show of good work, a step more in the complete filmography

of the Canadian and, finally, the true demonstration by Mortensen that he is a first-rate actor. .

" 1

" Allegedly criticizes the system and, in reality, tendentious and devious. The movie "action", even if it is a great phantom. In order to pass the time I saw it, it is necessary to forget

any hint of verisimilitude in the different and more ridiculous events that are happening without more

or less, in a way that <¨'is well hurried and lengthening the film to lamentable ends. It starts well, with a

good logo and until the first half hour the action is supported thanks to an assembly <¨ «gil. However, shortly

thereafter, the inconsistencies begin, teases (the way the bullet is removed and <¨ he himself heals,

until then, the wounds.), And the di <¨ «logos they become ridiculous. Everything is nonsense and it is derived to

some dangerous expositions even in its background, even though alleged pujas are thrown atactions

incorrectof the United States Government, as when it is said that "" s <¨ «, it is true, as there were" weapons of

mass destruction in Iraq. "" But in the end it is discovered that, when the Law fails, by its legal order,

there is that to do the justice by the own hand, justice that derives towards the murder, although it is of the bad bad

guys of the function. Something disgusting that clearly indicates the true intentions of the

film.Artero and pendency am <¨ «s can not, although narrated effectively by Fuqua, whose cinematographic career

goes at great speed to video club ground , if you do not care. In the end, you can hang out watching

this bullshit where the good ones do not miss a single shot and they can already shoot them with missiles, which are almost

unfazed, but it is tendentious and ends Shape m <¨ «s shameful, with an ep <¨« logo of court of

guard.

" 0

" It's not that it's bad ... or good. It is simply an anodyne thriller m <¨ «s, correct, but of those

who fall into oblivion irremediably as their projection ends. A shame

After four years "away from the big screen" ("Crime Ferpecto") was his "last premiere, because" "The Room"

of the Ni <"or" "are stretched <¨« on television <¨ «n being part of the" "Pel <¨" No Sleep ""), <¨ «lex of the Church returns

with its most orthodox work to date and, therefore, m <¨ «s impersonal. Counting with renowned actors

as are Elijah Wood, John Hurt, and Leonor Watlting, "" The Cr <¨ «Oxford Means" "is a thriller based on the

hom ¨« nimo book by Guillermo Mart <¨ «nez.Much has been talking about" "Cr" ¨ «Oxford" ", a film that has

ended up awakening so much expectation before its premiere as contrasted opinions after" "l. On the one hand there are

those who defend it with the best work of the Church to date, while on the other there are those

who think the opposite, that it is one of the worst ( if not the worse) works of the director. I, the

truth, I dare not say that it is so inferior to, for example, "" Perdita Durango "", although s <¨ "I can affirm that it

is the one that m <¨" s has disappointed me. And it is not because the peculiar director has left aside almost all his

personality rolling a thriller of all vulgar and current. The fact that sometimes a director who is part of his

identity and rolls something completely different from what we are used to does not have to be "

negative" (as David Lynch did, for example). A True Story "") The problem of "" Cr "¨«

Oxford "" is that it is not a good movie ". It has many elements that undoubtedly prevent it from becoming a

total and absolute failure, as it could be an elegant and sober design of production, the performance of John Hurt,

or some specific scenes in which it seems that <¨ «lex of the Church tries to put something on its part (the long

sequence in which it follows different characters without cutting planes, although falsified by CGI, is the mostm

remarkable); but many others who inevitably condemn it. Let's go in parts. To begin with, the story that the movie

planet is about, however appealing it may seem in advance (discover the murderer throughtracks and tricks

math), ends up being b <¨ «sic, very simplistic , and with just a couple of mentions to the science of the

n ¨ «mere. As if that were not enough, these words are absurdly simple to solve, but despite this the

characters seem to take eons to solve them, no one will say they are mathematical geniuses (for example, the game

of the n <¨ «reflected numbers). On the other hand, the gui <¨« n (with really embarrassing situations) is unable

to thrill at any time. Even at the moment of the final resolution, everything is cold, distant. Nobody

cares anymore to know who is "n is qui", and even the director himself seems to have more desire than anyone else to finish. Nor

is he saved from burning Elijah Wood, who continues with the aura of Hobbit all <¨ «where he steps, and he can not make his

character too believable, always being below Hurt or even Leonor Watling. Person,

this one, who could calmly have been eliminated from the assembly, since his only goal is to warm the

staff (although I also recognize that if it had not been for her, surely, I would have paid to see the

film. Finally, it highlights negatively the general assembly of the entire movie. Everything happens too

fast, despite the relative boredom it continually gives off, with scenes happening in a spectacular and

choked way. One gets off the bus because he sees his girl strolling down the street, and on the second day they are already

fused in a fiery kiss, despite the fact that before they had appeared arguing. M <¨ «s: a character embarks

on an airplane, and with hardly any time to pass the finger, the transport appears over the airport without

having had a temporary cut in between. Almost gives the feeling that "" the director's editing "" was

originally from more than two hours in length, and then in the production room had made use and abuse of

scissors.As <¨ «then, thanks to small" flashes, "" The Cr <¨ «Oxford" "prevents that can be defined as bad,

but unfortunately we can not say that it is a good movie <¨ «ula. It is simply an

anodyne thriller m <¨ «s, correct, but of those who fall into oblivion irremediably as theirends

projection. A shame

" 0

" is not <¨ "at the level of previous works of the company <¨« <¨ «a, but it is worthwhile to enjoy it on the big

screen

This afternoon I saw the <¨« last production <¨ «n that marriage finally well matched between Diney and the famous

company <¨ «<¨« a of animation <¨ «n Pixar. The small fish ate the big one. And I liked it, maybe it's because it has entered a

terrain that Pixar did not use until now, as it was a public p <¨ «s more adult than previous productions.

It's funny that the other king of animation, DreamWorks, with <¨ «successes aimed at a not-so-childish public (The

Pr¨¨ prince of Egypt, Antz, Shrek ..) has punctured to my way of seeing in his <¨ «last film, Neighbors Invaders,

precisely when he sinned as a child. He had" bad cries ", like Te <¨« filo, who lack humor, m <¨ «s

acci <¨« n, and they see too hard the moral for the cr ¨ ¥ os. However, I am tired of theRussian rides

visual, that is why I have enjoyed Cars, because it has a central development without a roar, withoutturns

bell, with established characters who know how to transmit the morals that we have also curiously seen. «N in Invading Neighbors

: the importance of friendship, of the family; s <¨ «what here" through "the nostalgia of a better

past time (in the form of a town abandoned by the construction of a highway) that must be rescued at the same

time as the protagonist rescues himself from his conceit, learning to work as a team.the

Althoughprinciple defrauds me, it is true that it is not exactly a hilarious movie but of half smile,

flip <¨ «with each song« ¨ «n, with the road passages and with the bell <¨« sima invoice t <¨ «technique, as <¨« as with some

moments of the end, with enough emotion <¨ «n like to go out to the taste of cinema. It is not <¨« at the level of previous

works of the company <¨ «<¨« a, such as Toy Story, Monstruos SA or Los Increibles, but it is worthwhile to enjoy it on the

big screen, although one believes that this type of movie is to be seen at home with the nephews.

" 1

" I wish <¨ "all the films" that pretend to explore human sensibility were like "¨". And it is that he does not know what he is

exploring, but that he also transmits it to us. A masterpiece.

Within my ideals, I believe that achieving perfection is impossible. Florian Henckel von Donnersmark does

not achieve it with La vida de los otros, but s <¨ «reaches a level of absolute polish, contained feelings and

exceptional beauty that undoubtedly deserves a well deserved Oscar. Germany has always been a country where the

cinema that is being made is more than pol ical. There are small "wonders" of cinema, less "commercial", such as Good

bye Lenin !, but I think that if there were to emphasize a European country with the highest level, cinematogr <¨ «physically

speaking, to finish <¨« by opting for France or England. But with this powerful and sensational film, I do not

have to think that the cinema of this country is beginning to like me more. It is true, also, that many of the mostfilms in

famousGermany have tended to favor political issues (I do not say that the lives of others do so, since

of espionage here <¨ «is a tel« ¨ «n pure and hard background), the largest <¨« of them located in the ca <¨ «wall

berl« <«not the <¨« little of the Nazism (here is <¨ «the, considerably recent The sinking). A <¨ «ny as <¨«, I admit that

I have not seen enough films belonging to Germany to compare or judge if they are better than

those of other countries. I do not believe, om <¨ "Well, I do not agree with those who call cinema in its purest form, for example,

He's the one with the rings. It will be <¨ «visually speaking, but I think that to reach the top of the best cinema

you have to explore many more aspects. Donnersmark's film, for example, is "to reach" this

totalism. And it is really difficult to talk about the life of others centering on a single point. The good thing about

this film is that everything is perfectly done, everything is absolutely dazzling. And this is what

masterpieces have. I, unlike some, who think that this is an overrated film (very

few, that is also true), I think that this powerful mental exercise, is meta <¨ «aboutdecisions

humanand the distinction ¨ «n between the good and the bad, is, frankly, masterly. Besides, I do not know <¨ «what is <» directed by

this, until now unknown, Florian Henckel von Donnersmark, but also written. Maybe you do not agree

with me, but it is that the author's cinema is always much more creative, more profound and, above all, more personal.

S <¨ «, habr <¨« directors who do not write their scripts and are authentic masters, but I at least see that they are

different from those who are authors. The author's cinema is more risky, maybe <¨ «sm <¨« s simple and less spectacular

and, finally, I have realized that many times it is the best, something that before did not have <¨ «to so clear. But Inot

'mgoing to be childish either. I recognize that there is an infinitude of filmmakers who direct and do not write their films, which are, without a

doubt, overflowing with creativity (I will not give examples, there are too many). What is clear, and I stop

deviating, is that the life of others belongs to this type of cinema, risky, difficult, concise, measured,

apparently simple and very, very deep. And it is that one of these strong points (which are all, more than) of those

thatwho spoke about the film is Florian Henckel von Donnersmark, creator of a disturbing, captivating,atmosphere

realistic and jointly formidable. The life of others is a necessary film, a kind of Thelife

secretof words without hope as the main theme, a relationship between two people, although here "

without contact f" "Physical, between two worlds, although here", one of them empties "¨" and another not so much. It is that envy, that

fear of loneliness and that fear of losing the most beloved, more than the hope. And I do not know what is necessary, it is also

very intelligent. A film like this has to be directed with conscience and knowledge, I do not know about

politics, but about human feelings of more depth. Here "there is that sensation of being

living what is happening on the screen, it's those two terrible and tragic stories that keep you in

tension during these 135 minutes, and not the political plots." ¨ «ticas (which are very simple to understand). The connection

between parallel lives, behind that, already old, tel «in the background that are, in this case, theseintrigues

political, s <¨« is dif < ¨ «It is easy to understand everything, and it is not that the film presents a structure to the Arriaga,

but that it maintains the firm composition of the« physical »approach, node and outcome, but it is that complexity of

the personalities of each one and their intentions which make La vida de los otros anfilm

extremely deep. As I commented before, what prevails here is emotions contained. One sometimes

does not know if what is happening is what is desired by the protagonists. It is that restraint, no less

superb, that makes you go deeper into that wicked inner world of the protagonist and into the private life of the

couple of artists, spied at the same time by the professional spirit and by us .Podr <¨ «to consider the end of

this film as a teacher. It belongs to that type of end that are absolutely round, without being

grandiloquent, above all. Those in which you have to stop to think in an instant, not because of the speed

with which the matter progresses, but with the extreme difficulty to which the characters are subjected. Do not reveal "

no" detail about what is happening, but I assure you that you will be speechless, especially with that null physical

contact and those emotions that are so contained and at the same time expressive. discovery of the terrible

events that happened. And attentive, above all, to the situation and final phrase, a small jewel that rounds out this masterpiece.

I also consider the brutal ones to be given "similar interpretations of the whole cast. To be <¨ «unfair not to

start with Ulrich M <¨« he, the protagonist and esp <¨ «of the work. His performance is indescribable, or rather good, so

superb that it seems to be real. Undoubtedly, he is a terrorist character, with hardly a life of his own that manages to

awaken his feelings by watching the lives of others. And I do not know "what he shows us with the aesthetics of his

apartment, also with the most chilling expressions he shows when listening to the scenes of the couple or

with The aforementioned final. It is not only the central character of the film, the one that refers to goodness and

apparent naiveté, but that it also exercises the delivery of "¨« nm <¨ «s dif <¨ "Easy, with just a few words

transmits what you have to transmit, and that deserves, without a doubt, a long applause. Although do not leave <¨ «to mention

the also great performances of Sebastian Koch and Martina Gedeck, two totallycharacters

different, who however, are united by the complexity of feelings and pain. They simulate that apparent

perfect, bohemian couple and where everything is going well and in reality, both need help from others. <"What he

really needs is support and he does not want solitude in any way. She, on the other hand, wants to end her

terrifying (at least for her) life, wants, once and for all, to stop feeling that pressure inside her

(also present, in some way, in <¨ «l) and do not want m <¨« s lies, but do not lie either. Undoubtedly, this tr <¨ «o

of characters, which more complex, is the one that perfectly develops the story, because without them not be" ¨ "to

anything. And as I said, this is a movie where everything stands out and each aspect needs the support of the

others, since they are all more brilliant. An unforgettable movie all your senses,

exciting and at the same time contained. Sensitive and captivating, terrifying and human, contained and nothing grandiloquent.

His final, absolutely masterful and emotional (not maudlin), reminds us that this is an absolute

masterpiece of modern cinema. I wish <¨ «all the films« that try to explore human sensibility were like

«¨« sta. And it is that he does not know what he is exploring, but that he also transmits it to us. A masterpiece.

" 1

" And I who see "here" to recommend not going to see her because she is a boredom sovereign, and it turns out that she has a

criticism to the church that I could not enjoy because I did not understand. «...

<¨« Go! I just found out now that the church and the ultracat groups recommend not going to see the

film because it makes a criticism of the church. And I who see <¨ «here <¨« to recommend not going to see it because it is a

sovereign boredom, and it turns out that it has a criticism to the church that I could not enjoy because I did not understand it.

Qu <¨ «sad that on top of the pol ¨ ¨ mica do him a favor (because you know that with these things you win

spectators instead of getting lost) and also ¨« s ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ «in the eyes of the poor and silly spectator, who already finds it difficult to go

with an open mind to the cinema, which is directed to see something that is not, to look for three feet to the cat and to ask

Jos <¨ «Luis Perales to Luis del Olmo.The movie is a going from pot in which there is an alternate universe where each

person has a pet in which his soul is "deposited" (hmmm, almost describing the real world, now that

I realize, with old women with their poodles, disheveled hippipunkis with his hungry wolfhounds, MariCarmen and

his mu "¨" echoes. ", where a child travels to the North Pole to provoke a war between witches, polar bears, Siberians and

gypsies and to save others nor <¨« os to be subjects of experiments with their mascotalmas. <¨ «Ah! And the excuse of all

are some mechanical powders that connect different universes. To top it all, the movie ends abruptly, that is, it does not

end because I suppose that it is expected to appear a continuation "sooner, than to decline" kindly go see it

claiming to have forgotten this first part. PS: No, neither Daniel 'James Bond' Craig nor Eva 'Bond Girl' Green save

the film because, to increase the fraud, there are few minutes left. <¨ «Ah! And Nicole 'Botox' Kidman is <¨ ° horrifying.

" 0

" Medieval crime thriller teol <¨ «Gicos, black cinema with gothic borders, commercial cinema very well done

for the enjoyment of the whole parish of lovers of Sherlock Holmes, Borges and Caravaggio. <¨ «Someone gives m <¨« s?

For a time, it was very thoughtful to have read The name of the rose. Umberto Eco was a writer

with more shadows that you see for the great public and it was the first time (not after the last one) that a professor of

Semi <¨ «tica he got into fictions instead of promoting what was his own, that is, the brainy essay of

"unaffordable" for the uninitiated (Reader in Fabula, Apocal <¨ «optical and integrated or Open Work). They were

all bedside books of the university of Letters or of the always curious reader, tanned infiligree

thought, tireless diver of the, in the words of a good friend, the back room of the language. After the

book, best-seller, boom, milestone in the consumer literature of the eighties, Eco tir <¨ «of this new acquired fame

and gave birth to its Apostilles to the name of the rose: op <¨« a variety of lesson in which the writer, as

extras in the dvd that we consume, interrogated the reader, questioned the nature of the fact of

reading and gave, tutipl <¨ «n, without regard, compilations, anecdotes, chapters not related to the plot of the book,

but assemblable in it. <¨ «And all this jumble of literary string reflections to write about the movie

«? Well, a little of all that has the film, which smells of the same "culturalist character" (joyfully

semi-ethical, as I would like "Eco") than the book. Annaud does not fall into the trap of making a film about a book: it is

obviously unnecessary and, for that matter, in <¨ «til. Annaud recreates a dirty detective-medievalist universe, <¨ «rough,

relegating the abundant Latines of the book and its corp <¨« reo discourse teol <¨ «gico to slight brushstrokes that do not alter,

at any time, the esp <¨ «ritu <¨« gil of his work. Let's say that Eco's apostilles are green (very

metaphically "written") in the film: everything becomes thinner, everything is simplified, everything is contaminated by a

formidable precision, which differentiates the cinema (word in movement) with literature (word that

needs the necessary decoder, that is, the reader c <¨ «mplice). Annaud is ambitious: he poses his film as a

very demanding raid on History and far of pretending to monopolize a project that was especially

pleasing to him was accompanied by a director of photography <¨ «am <¨« tico (Tonino Delli Colli) who drank «¨« in Rembrandt, in

Caravaggio to impregnate his light the darkness of the abbot of the Middle Ages. The plot of The name of the rose

is very simple: in v <¨ «If a Benedictine abbot celebrates a theological summit some monks

appear sinisterly murdered. Fray Guillermo de Baskerville and his young disciple Adso de Melk observe the

malign influence of a certain book. Crimes, books: nothing new.Detr <¨ «s there is a naked vision of the pull <¨« a

of the Catholic Church and the notable role <¨ «of the monasteries at the time of transmit (or hide or

cut) a culture. The librarian himself (grand homage to Jorge Luis Borges) is blind. And the book

that is the cause of all the crèches is one of Aristotle's about laughter because, according to Jorge de

Burgos, the blind librarian cited above, laughter prefigures knowledge, its truth m <¨ «sl <¨ «dica and less

controllable, and although I do the rese <¨« am <¨ «s long transcribe what it says about <¨« it because it has no waste

: "" Laughter frees the villager from fear of the devil, because in the party of the fools also the devil

seems poor and foolish, and, therefore, controllable. But this book could "teach" that freedom from fear of the

devil is an act of wisdom ". When r <¨ «e, while the wine gurgles in his throat, the villager feels himself master,

because he has reversed the relations of domination ¨« n: but this book could «aense« to the learned the artifices

ingenious, and since then illustrious, with which to legitimize that investment. Then the "inis transformed into

operation" of the intellectthat which in the unthinkable gesture of the villager to <¨ «n, and fortunately, it is operation of the

womb. That laughter is proper to man is a sign of our limitation as sinners. <¨ «But how manyminds

corruptlike yours extract from this book the extreme conclusion, according to which laughter will be« at the end of

man! Laughter distracts, for a few moments, the villager from fear. But the law imposes itself through fear,

whose true name is fear of God. And from this book I could "jump the luciferian spark that ignites <¨" to a

new fire in the whole world; and laughter be <¨ «to the new art, even ignored by Prometheus, capable of annihilating

fear. To the villager who r <¨ «e, while r <¨« e, does not mind dying? "" An absolutely masterful Sean Connery plays

Fray Guillermo de Baskerville and endows the character with a light spark of grace, eloquence and

naturalness . It does not happen as <¨ «with a rookie Christian Slater in the role of the learner« ¨ «z, whose hieraticism (later

amplified with the a <¨« os of trade) equal until convenient.

" 1

" Once the blunders of some of our colleagues, as illustrious as <¨ «graphs, and the

myth of feeling offended by people who existed ¨« twenty-five centuries ago, let's get into the matter:? 300? It is

a singular comic book, a thrilling adventure of action and war that is one of the first attempts

to bring to cinema the aesthetics of videogames that today make a furore in the world. ...

Let's go in parts: let's disrupt some of the presumptuous majader <¨ «as some illustrious colleagues of

the criticism have said about this film: one, it is not a film made against the Go <¨ "n of the ultraconservative

President Ahmadinejad (remember that <" he threatens to turn his country into a nuclear power and wipethe

the State of Israel offmap), for the simple reason that the new president entered "to govern in August 2005 and

" "300" "began" to be shot in September of that same to <¨ "oy, as you know the cin« ¨ «edges, a film« (and less

tan mastod <¨ «ntica as <¨« sta) is not prepared from one month to the next; before Ahmadinejad it was the reformist Khatam <¨ «the one

who directed« ¨ «to the country, and the relations with the United States, although not totally replaced, were in a period of

clear restoration, until he arrived <¨ «the fundamentalist and jodi <¨« the invention. The second point to be refuted is the

supposed lack of historical truthfulness of the film; but let's see, unlearned, we are in front of a version of the

"mic" that Frank Miller wrote "in 1998," inspiring "freedom" in the battle of Term <¨ «piles, but without

pretending at any time to have a treatment adjusted to historical reality. <¨ «Is it that now we are going to

ask for rigor to a" c "mic? <¨ «What <¨« to be «¨« next thing, do not believe that the kryptonite does da <¨ «or Superm <¨« n? Another thing: the

bounce that the Iranians have caught is </> The supposed bad treatment that the film gives to his people is the desire to

hunch, to say the least; the Persians that appear in the film were, supposedly, the inhabitants of

Ir <¨ «n more than two thousand five hundred years ago; it is as if in Spain, when the movies put on "

d 'mine", the Iberians and Celts that populated our bull's skin makes me less "or less" that time. Once

the blunders of some of our colleagues, as illustrious as <¨ «graphs, and the morass of feeling offended

by people who existed ¨« twenty-five centuries ago, we get into the matter: "" 300 "" is a singular comic book «¨« simo, a

thrilling adventure of action and war that supposes one of the first attempts v <¨ «lidos to take to the cinema the

aesthetics of the videogame that today make a furor in the world: I do not know what the struggles are, choreographed and slowed down as

if it were a game for Play 2 or the brand new Play 3, but even the whole set is reminiscent of

the virtual landscapes imagined by the new creators of this art of the 21st century, to which I

would have to go and look for a numeral (to the way in which the cinema is the S <¨ «Best Art). Of course, the heroes

headed by King Le <¨ «nidas est <¨« nm <¨ «s close to the" fantastic "genre of the historical" rich ", with that iconography <¨ «

as the supermen of the Neolithic, with their red cloaks, their heavy shields and fearsome spears; let's not say

of those bodies sculpted by "" body-building "", with m <¨ «sm <¨" abdominal muscles that we never thought

could exist in the human body? Visually fascinating often, prodigious scenes stand out,

like the rain of arrows that, as the emissary of Xerxes anticipates, literally obscures the sky, and that he will have "

a formidable bluff, ic <¨« unique, conceptually speaking, on the scene end of the battle, when Leonidas

faces imminent death. The own visual creativity of Miller's "mic", beautifully reproduced in the

film, brings us unforgettable characters, like Xerxes himself, a god-king painted here as a cross between an

NBA basketball player and a "" drag-queen ""; powerful instruments of war, like the fiercelyrhinoceros

harnessedthat the Persian soldiers ride; or tenebrous characters, such as the so-called Immortals, theguard

personalof the god-emperor, a tide of chilling beings closer to the zombie than to man. A comic book

can not be asked for philosophy, nor ideology, even though those of them have always been quick to point out that it

is a pro-Bush film that justifies the invasion. of Iraq and the (hipot <¨ «tica) of Ir <¨« n. But the truth is that the

central idea that remains of this lavish spectacle, apart from the own visual joy of seeing tremendous battles

choreographed as if they were "" Seven brides for seven brothers ", is the one that must always be done what is

right, what we believe in, whatever it may cost, including our own life; and that we must do it from

honesty, that rare word: undoubtedly, today d <¨ «a <¨« this is a revolutionary idea, in a nihilistic universe that

abhors the effort, idolizes the beautiful task of looking at the navel and touching the noses and zascandilea

scandalously with the scale of values ​​of each. No, if in the end it will turn out that "" 300 "" is going to overtake

Lenin on the left?

" 1

" Qui <¨ "reme is a movie" totally recommended for lovers of sentimental melodrama, who

enjoy <¨ «ny cry" ¨ "in equal parts.

Although it sounds at <¨ «peak, in many occasions the reality surpasses the ficci ¨« n. And for those who do not believe it, there

a multitude of examples, one of the ones that I called "the attention" was that the US government hired

Hollywood writers to write them fantastic acts and prepare them for themselves. But not

always have to go so far to find an example, and what happened to the child <¨ «to Cristina Valdivieso,

protagonist of Qui <¨« reme, is good proof of that. The movie tells the story of Pancho (Dar <¨ «or Grandinetti),

a fifty-one who meets a child, his granddaughter (Cristina Valdivieso), when her mother, Luc < ¨ «a (Kira Mir <¨«),

she sent it to her father v <¨ «victim of despair <¨« n. Pancho must find his daughter and try to help her, and at the

same time do the same with her granddaughter. Qui <¨ "reme is a story of characters, feelings,

emotions, which tends to soft and gratuitous melodrama with great ease. Beda Docampo Feij <¨ «or has not known how to

establish the limits between the sincere emotion and the cheap pastry in which she has just turned her tape.

In addition, the gui <¨ «n is somewhat weak and unbelievable, and has some details that border on the spermatic (in the

pejorative sense), as the di <¨« logo between the characters of Luis Brandoni and Dar <¨ «or Grandinetti. Precisely, the

work of the Argentine actor is the most remarkable of all the film, although he also deservesa

mention ofgaunt Ariadna Gil. ¨ «totally recommended for lovers ofmelodrama

sentimental, who enjoy <¨« ny cry "¨« in equal parts. The rest of the audience, better abstain, except

those who want to see Ariadna Gil emulating Rita Hayworth in Gilda.

" 0

" Pel <¨ "low-cost film and with a newcomer director -James Wan, recently from anfilm school

Australianthat also collaborated" in history "that gives us hope for a g <¨ «nero, who each time makes a

better effort to be what he was.

This original thriller, mixed in equal parts of terror with the now more famous psychic thriller, is

a pleasant surprise in the genre. Not because of his idea, which sends us back immediately in his first minutes to Seven

but to its construction, full of all the clichés known but this time used in verydoses

useful. Unlike the cited film, it does with unknown actors or secondary eternal: only the face of

Cary Elwes is barely recognized (pieces of paper in Twister, Robin Hood, The shadow of the vampire, Liar, liar,

etc.) being the best actor by far of the film Danny Glover appears as the <¨ «unique exception <¨« n -e unnecessary- of

the gallery <¨ «of celebrities. With almost one <¨ «unique stage, a ba« ¨ «underground« where theare imprisoned

two protagonistsand who are v ¨ ¨ «victims of a macabre game and of dif« ¨ «easy resolution» ¨ «N. These first moments,

oppressive and loaded with flashbacks gores, are what define all the dark tonality of the film with a rhythm that

does not decay almost miraculously. The use of a c <¨ «nervous in some passages seems to go against the

narration <¨ "N, but then it is used as a resource to make m <¨« s flow "¨« some passages and not as a vacuous

modernity, also gaining in agility. The successes of the gui <¨ «n - also co-star Leight Whannell-

make it s <¨ «lida, without bumps or loose ends, not at all obvious and that with the arrival of the famous" "twists

" "do not make him lose the l <¨ «Nea and coherence obtained in all the footage. The game of fear -the original in

English <¨« s is Saw: "" sierra "" (<¨ «originals are ac <¨« in Argentina in putting names!) - is a low-cost movie

with a newcomer director -James Wan, who recently came from an Australian film school that also collaborated <¨ «In

history- that gives us hope for a« gender », that every time makes a better effort to be what it was.

" 1

" A film that is beautiful, beautiful and whose positive message is able to encourage one to d <¨ «a. I need more

films like this in the rooms.

She has been the winner of the prize for the best film of the Sitges festival, ahead of even the

masterpiece "" [Rec] "" (which, that s <¨ «, has been the overall winner of the a <¨ «o). Its director, Tarsem Singh, became

known with "" La Celda "", pesti <"or endless precious invoice, in addition to having shot music videos as incredible

as" "Losing my Religion" " ", by REM. With "" The Fall "" he has remedied his mistakes, convincing with anstory

emotional and attractive, that engages and falls in love, and again, of an infinite formal beauty. The premise is very

simple. Una ni ¨ «a recovers in a hospital. All <¨ «, she meets a double actor who, also admitted and forced to

stay in bed, tells her a series of adventurous stories, which unleash theimagination

protagonist's, and make her When you read

the summary, it is difficult not to think of other similar films that have always been appearing in the past.

movie screens, with m <¨ «or less fortune. The most recent, "" Big Fish "" and "" Labyrinth of the Faun "", are

essentially the same, but luckily, the two pale (especially the second) before "" The Fall "". And it is that all <¨ "

where they fail, in the excessive weight of the imaginary slope (" "Big Fish" "), or realistic (" "The Labyrinth." "),

Tarsem achieves a balance m <¨ That's remarkable, preventing his film from falling into the superficiality of the

previous ones. And m <¨ «s dif¨¨« still easy, despite its two hours of duration, "" The Fall "" never falls into tedium,

became an entertainment from beginning to end. I do not mean by this that his pace is devilish,

it is not an epic movie, much less. But s <¨ «administers the doses of drama and adventure with

intelligence, excitement or fun when the situation requires it and preventing the viewer from taking a

look at his watch. This task (to lower the look) extremely complicated , as I say, the beauty of each

one of its planes, from the m "¨« intimate to the m «¨« apote <¨ «physical, is infinite. Tarsem directs as if he were painting pictures,

for <¨ «there can not be anything out of place on the canvas. Bell <¨ «simas fotograf <¨« of impossible landscapes

intermingle as «¨« with the colorful outfits of the various characters, merging into an almost perfect,harmony

extremely addictive. "" The Fall "" is therefore an incredible way to the joy of living. A film that is more sensual, beautiful in

sight and comforting in the soul, whose positive message is able to encourage one to d <¨ «a. I do not want to say

much more because I believe that I have already revealed enough of its charm, and I think it is a film that is

worth discovering during its viewing. Just say <¨ «that it takes more than this in the cinemas

" 1

"28 Weeks Later is not more than another failed and unnecessary sequel, whose argument sometimes seems like a

joke, and that has neither feet nor head.

There are some films that by themselves can revitalize a whole cinematographic genre, or at least a

whole subgenre. This is what Danny Boyle did with the zombie movies, or undead, with his 28

D <¨ «as After <¨« s. I do not know why I caused it to be an alluvium of new jobs that I followed in my line, but that I reached the "mmm",

by giving rise to the fun "¨" parody of Zombies Party.And with those ingredients, which I had to ¨ «to ¨« add a

great «¨« success of criticism and p <¨ «public, chewed in the environment the appearance of a sequel. 28 Weeks Later it is

a second part at <¨ «pica, since neither the director nor the survivors of the original cast repeat. Six

months after the virus of rage has destroyed the United Kingdom, NATO begins its reconstruction, and

the first refugees settle in central London. Among them is a family that was

separated by the crisis, and one of its members hides a dangerous secret. In order to bring the company to fruition, the company

was selected as "Canary Filmmaker Juan Carlos Fresnadillo, winner of a Goya Award for Intact, and nominated for an

Oscar for Best Short Film. From the first scene it is obvious, never better said, that this sequel is not

recommended for these sensitive magicians, since it is a tricky, violent and bloody one than its

predecessor. . The gui <¨ «n has more gaps than the region of Ruidera, and as it shows ah <¨« there remains the sequence in

which Robert Carlyle looks for Mary McCormack in a military installation of m <¨ «maximum security. Not to mention

some elements, which more than fear give authentic laughter attacks. In fact, the whole plot could be summarized

in the following sentence, which should be interpreted with the maximum, sarcasm and recollection: "Come children, what dad

wants to give you a hug? "" Fresnadillo has almost six years of inactivity, since he has lost the

mastery of the cinematographic language that characterized him in his previous works, and offers a direction

mon "¨« tona , with an ap <¨ «rhythmic and tiring rhythm. Of the actors, they save him from burning Robert Carlyle and Rose

Byrne, but the one who takes the palm is the ni «¨« or repellent, Mackintosh Muggleton; no doubt, a greater major <¨ «of

spectators wishing <¨« his character a fatal and tr ¨ «final. 28 Weeks Later is not more than another failed and

unnecessary sequel, whose argument sometimes looks like a joke, and has no head or tail. The worst of all

is that we can prepare, if the box office does not avoid it, for a third delivery, which in a display of

originality is called "probably 28 Months Later".

" 0

" Mathematics do not fail, and in cinematographic matters they tell us that when many disproportions are added

in the same film, the result can be a huge mess. caliber, as it turns out to be this spawn.

The truth is that I did not expect much from this film either. Suppose <¨ «what to be <¨« to the t <¨ «pique ofadolescents

uninhibitedwho spend their time apologizing ¨« of drugs, alcohol and chabacaner <¨ «a; something

similar to Friday the 13th, but to the espa <¨ «wave and m <¨« s modern. But I was wrong. "Even if in the worst of the

hip" thesis "I could have assumed the magnitude of the mess I was going to find, no doubt illuminated in the

light of some subsidy." It is the state of those that governments grant certain artists as payment for services

rendered (v. "Never take more, not war, etc.)." Let a film like La Central be rolled, produce and premiered

in Espa <¨ «a is indecency, at least. In addition to an absurd gui that resorts to all the existing "peaks"

and far surpasses the limits of the bearable, the characters are abject subjects that give an image of

youth deplorable and vomitive, to the point that the one who most sympathetic to the awake is the murderer who is

going to knife little by little to the gang of ni <¨ «atos that make up the cast, which is to be grateful.

Constant procrastination and retah <¨ «the nonsense are the base of the gui <¨« n, seasoned with a little tomato sauce

and a lot of nonsense.The interpretation is of the m <¨ «s artificial , without giving any of the <¨ «actors? in no

time "feeling of credibility", while the soundtrack is non-existent. Maybe it's the only thing that can be

saved a little, and that at certain moments is photography, but that being very generous. This monstrous,

naturally, pas <¨ « with m <¨ «s pity that glory for the cinemas. But the simple fact that it has been projectedalready

isby itself <irritant. And it is that this film has no where to take it, because everything in it is disastrous:

from the gui to the characterization of the characters, the supposed startles or the constant hysteria of the

riffraff appears on the screen. But above all, that pretension to give it a touch of cheap Americanism (or <¨ «

pap <¨« with huge mansi <¨ «n, who drink beer, smoke non-stop marijuana and frolic around the corners) they make La

Central an infumable garbage that so s <¨ «is capable of arousing contempt and provoking drowsiness in the brave one that

manages to reach the end.

" 0

" Great film, a western against the current in the current cinema, who knows how to find the right

balance between action and inner development of the characters.

There have been many attempts in the last years of the western resurgence, and all in vain, to have

been made samples of proven solvency and great generic quality. Pel <¨ «like the excellent (and

despised at the time)" "Open Range" ", or the estimable" "The Perd <¨« n "", staged some great

reflections on the meaning ic <¨ «nico of g <¨ «nero m <¨« s alien to any external influence in the form of literature or

even historical ¨ «rich, being the largest <¨« a film rolled in the g ¨ «nero a compedio of a < ¨ «little of thesociety

Americanreally limited in time (a period of 10-12 to <¨« at most), being all allus ¨ «na

<¨« few outside of that pure fantasy period <¨ «a created with the aim of mythologizing a way of life that is «romantic» and

absent from any moral imposition. That is why a review of that remarkable western by Delmer Daves (great movie

, but not perfect at all) seemed a priori, a commercial decision (as a the immense list

of remakes made in American territory in the <¨ «last to <¨« os) that art <¨ «ical, looking for seg <¨« n the most

optimistic in this of the remakes, a revisitaci < ¨ «n of history for the new generations (sic). Remarkable

surprise has been for a server (although being honest, if he deposited hope in this film) to

find a great western psycho <¨ «gico with a wonderful moral description and profound

characters. The argument of the film, Like the classic version, it puts us in the shoes of twocharacters

antagonistic, on the one hand the farmer Dan Evans (Christian Bale), and on the other the outlaw Ben Wade (Russell

Crowe) ). When <¨ «he <¨« last is seized by the forces of the law, Dan offers to accompany them to the

nearest town, where to climb «¨« na Wade to a train bound for the jail of Yuma, with the «sole objective on the

part of the humble farmer to collect two hundred d <¨« rewards and refloat his indebted family farm,

with the hope of a better future. During the journey, the band of outlaws headed by Wade,them

follow«on the track to release him, in a race against the clock before they climb to his charismatic« leader »to the« ¨ «n

vagjail.Detr <¨ "S of the" maras ", and trying to bring to port such a suggestive project, is the

New Yorker James Mangold, a director who presents a career full of effective work, but lacking

personality, say a correct craftsman in t < ¨ «terms of current cinema (do not forget that those who

considered artisans dozens of years ago, are now considered essential directors). In his journey

as a filmmaker, he has offered works of proven solvency, such as his <¨ "prima prima" "Heavy" ", the interestingthriller

police" "CopLand" "or products at the service of stars such as" "Interrupted Innocence" "for Angelina Jolie or "" On

the tightrope "" (both films with their corresponding Oscar for such limited actresses as Reese Witherspoon or

the aforementioned Angelina Jolie). The great scourge that has dragged this director since its inception, manifested in

its detractors through attacks to his scarce personality as a filmmaker, unable to create a staging or

a personal point of view of the stories he told, and that aspect has taken a radical turn in his <¨ «last

work for the cinema. In "" 3:10 to Yuma "", Mangold knows how to give the whole set a consistent package and a

close look at those characters so different that the story presents, dominating an effective and direct staging

, naturalist in many moments and of an overwhelming sincerity in his intentions. In this case, artisan

yes, but brilliant without a doubt. You can not imagine a cast of actors more appropriate to the story after

viewing this great film, the great major being < ¨ «to them at an exceptional level. Especially

noteworthy are the performances of four of the characters in the film, the two main actors and twoactors

luxury. On the one hand Bale and Crowe embroider without any "kind of effort their two roles of characters faced

in appearance, but not so different in the background. His two characterizations reach such a level of brilliance, that

when they meet face to face on the screen, they give off a level of compenetration and empathy that is

absolutely overflowing, which is undoubtedly the best thing about the film by far. On the other hand, twoactors

secondarystand out above the rest, sticking their heads out and shouting for a greater level of

prominence in future upcoming productions, this is Logan Lerman in the role of William Evans and Ben

Foster in the role of charisma. ¨ «tico Charlie Prince, faithful compan <¨« of fechor <¨ «ace of Ben Wade.This great

acting show can stand out due to more than nothing to a tremendously effective gui¨¨n, endowed with an

impeccable "dramatic" progression, which is not limited to show us gimmicky shootings or gratuitous scenes as in

the greater part of modern westerns (whose names I do not even want to name), being subtle and h < ¨ «distributed

The scenes of action arethroughout the footage impeccably, at the most precise moment. This creates a

narrative that takes place with a balance beyond doubt, a perfect narrative duality between the physical action

and the inner development of the characters, without becoming heavy at all, and like lightning through

our retinas. An impeccable narrative and formal equilibrium. Besides, one can not ignore the subtle met <¨ «fora that is

supposed to have given greater importance to the journey undertaken by the agents of the law to take their

prisoner to the train for Yuma, In contrast to the version of Delmer Daves, I am perhaps interested in the

final confrontation than in the evolutionary process that leads to such an outcome. During this brilliant journey,

we attended the development of several trips, all of them parallel and indissoluble to one another. On the one hand it

becomes special incapi <¨ «in that physical path between the two populations, but is accompanied by another trip, the

intern that Mangold shows us with special brilliance between the two main protagonists, passing to be

finally little less than soulmates in the background, despite not sharing objectives or principles, personalities

opposed at first, but finally equidistant. Shown all this in a subtle way by means of brilliant

di <¨ logos, looks of complicity and acts that honor or portray both characters. Not only is that

interesting <¨ «aspect between the two main characters shown, but also the relationship itself. ¨ «n between Wade and his faithful

outlaw, or Evans and his son, is increasingly developed and increasingly empirical in one case, or

distant in the other. I sometimes blur the line that separates good from evil, the duty of honor, or the

morality of pragmatism, in short, as the great human stories show. The negative aspects

are scarce in the film, being perhaps <¨ « s slightly forced certain attitudes of the characters of the film, especially

in the final stretch of the story, resulting in overeating taking into account the situation in which they

are at certain moments in history. And it is also evident some debtors tics of a

current cinema too obsessed with the blows of effect by attitudes too tied to amodernism. In

prepotent and overloadedshort, a great film, a western against the current in the current cinema, who

knows how to find the right balance between action and inner development of the characters, shown with

a brilliant solvency. With some actors in a state of grace, some great action scenes (a <¨ «n without

surpassing the brilliant final scene of the wonderful" "Open Range" "), and a buried message m <¨« s debtor quiz <¨ «s of

the <¨« current little that of the versioned film, but that does not make it less convincing. Remarkable film, to which

only the minor r <¨ «mora commented above prevent becoming a new" classic "(a <¨« at risk of appearing

risky).

" 1

" Despite its errors, what it achieves and represents is a very "remarkable" film "Crash" "is a political film. But it seems that facing a criticism of it results in <¨ «nm <¨« s pol «¨ ico.

Let's go by parts. The film has a lot in its favor. It is a work, first of all, very overwhelming, with

abundant doses of good films and know-how. The former screenwriter of the Oscar-winning "Million Dollar Baby"

shows that he knows something more to write. His cinematographic knowledge is broad, there is no doubt about it,

as shown in his first film "Direction". The sequential shots are a marvel, the most

crucial moments are "directed with a mastery" worthy of mention, the emotional m? ¨ sica is "stuck in

the Exact moment, and the distribution borders at a great level.Among so much good performance (an exceptional Dillon, a

big Cheadle, some Newton and Howard incredible, the whole cast) and so many characters, that of

Sandra Bullock goes completely unnoticed.But. s <¨ «, the movie <¨« has several buts. They can be given more or

less importance (seg <¨ «n the degree of emotional impact that caused the film in one), but whatnot

canbe denied is from a point of view as <¨« optic.It is obvious that Paul Haggis deals with a controversial subject, and forreason

thatit is necessary to take into account that any resolution may "cause collateral damage". As <¨ «, the best in these

cases (only if you want to avoid pol ¨ ica"), is usually to treat the film with the greatest ambig ¨ «possible age. And it

is evident that the director knows it, tries to disguise his ideological position, but succumbs in several

attempts. First of all, it must be said that, in a global sense, "Crash" deals with a subject as delicate as

racism and incomunicaci <¨ 'n culture shock due to very cleverly, without excessive stereotype and without

going into trivial and Manichaean land. But there are characters too close to the caricature and

tend to exaggeration, without being able to avoid, therefore, fall into the so feared t "peaks. And it is also true

that the decisive moments for the characters, they may seem somewhat manipulative and emotionally

speaking, pulling toward the effectivism with that ultra-slow "c" and the celestial m? sica as the background. As if Paul

Haggis tried to provoke the spectator. But those moments, and their cinematographic quality, also elevate the

film. It reaches levels close to the overwhelming. And it moves.The gui <¨ «n is very good, no doubt, but (in addition to the

subjective sensation of irrigating a certain level of hatred) the characters do not finish framing themselves completely. It

concludes with the impression of not having given the necessary game to the spiritual and vital concerns of

the protagonists. It seems a kind of incomplete description that, it is true, does not affect theappearance

generalof the film, but it may have raised the complexity and quality of the final product. Therefore, this

kind of bastard son of "" Crossed Lives "" by Robert Altman or "" Magnolia "" by Paul Thomas Anderson, does not

reach the level of greatness of them. Not even approaches the depth (especially on the

characters and their b <¨ 'SEARCHING vital sense), complexity and level <¨ "peak" "Magnolia" "Maybe with more

footage is could <¨ «to have corrected the error. Maybe. It is true that what is more valued in a director and his

intelligence is that he shows himself as "optical" and knows how to take that feeling to the viewer, without trying to make judgments

or justify, let him go. «Give us the role of decision« ¨ «n. As <¨ «, it shows that he really understands and is able

to deepen in what is« speaking », giving the opportunity of redemption« to any positioning. That's what

Kieslowski defined as "" craftsman. "" But we're going to give him more opportunities, since it's his first incursion into

this world. And it's a huge first step. Few begin as well as Paul Haggis. And I think it deserves to keep

moving forward and correcting possible mistakes. As <¨ «grow <¨«. Then, we'll see. For now, as a tribute to "" Magnolia ""

(which comes to remember a lot at times), we will preach with the perd <¨ «n.Eso s <¨«, which is not morally

acceptable nor does it make sense that we complain about the obviousness of the anti-racist message of the film (which is true

that it is partly true) when we get upset by the ambig ¨ «age that other films give off when dealing withissues

such complicated. This is called contradiction. I am not going to be the one who denies it, the film is very

exaggerated and difficult. But it also has an extra beauty, abstract, subjugating and almost poetic. And it makes clear,

once and for all, that racism, prejudice and intolerance are not things of a single race. Not on the basis

of who does not invent it, but on the basis of who practices it. And, in essence, it is something more dangerous,

dehumanized and globalized. Therefore, in the end and despite its errors, what it achieves and represents is

a very remarkable film, since it impacts , it makes you think a lot and, in a certain way, you risk. You notice the

landing on the screens of <¨ «this type of films, and that does not happen very often. Undoubtedly, it is a fact very much in their

favor. "" Brokeback Mountain "" is a rival too hard for "" Crash "", both from the qualitative point of view

and from the simple and probable positioning of the votes. however, it can not be said that it does not

maintain the type. It is a very dignified film. There is a phrase in the film that surely belongs to the most

significant: "". A <¨ «we pray so much that contact, that we collide with others s <¨« it to be able to feel something "".

" 1

" The film offers an enjoyment for those who abandon themselves to view it as a long videoclip basted by a more

minimal but not insipid argument, and far from it, boring.

We live in times of eclosi <¨ «n musicals for these payments, where before the resonances ofjust arrived

the blockbusters of Broadway and London. I do not know if recent film adaptations of works as

popular as Chicago or this Dreamgirls have received the overwhelming tribute of the first crossover classics of Lope de

Vega or Apolo. And even if it lacks exact data, I doubt very much that both phenomena have achieved "success"

homologables. In my case, that I have never declared myself an adept of g <¨ «nero, both films seemed fascinating to me

because of their balanced bet between a history of certain inter <¨« s and a brilliant audiovisual spectacle. And

topicazos on the sidelines, because the history of rise and fall of the 'Dreamettes' abounds in the hackneyed structure of

the fashionable' biopics' on m <¨ 'sicos (Ray, On the tightrope?), the film offers an enjoyment for those who

abandon themselves to view it as a long video clip, bastioned by a more minimal but not bland plot, and far from it

, boring. Sheltered between the beginning of the 60s and mid-'70s, the film recreates c <¨ «mo this

tr <¨ 'or women resisted <¨', first, to its preordained subordinate role as showgirls and reached <¨", After that, the

stardom in a country where "it" seemed "reserved" for white artists. In this regard, it is

very eloquent the passage of the tape in which is shown c <¨ «mo was common currency <¨« n the birlarle <¨ "success togroups

blackdistributed locally, versionarlos with a white band and then get juicy r <¨ «dices

in the national lists. In fact, this theme, that of the hits and the struggle in the lists of <¨ «successes, is« very

present during all the footage of the tape. To the point that many of the conflicts between the

'Dreamettes' comes motivated by this issue, and by the jealousy of one versus another in the bid for higher levels

of prominence. For the rest, some other good reasons to watch this film are attending the magnificent "

recital of that powerful whirlwind that responds to the name of Jennifer Hudson, discovering a surprising double

facet dramatic <¨« tico-musical in Eddie Murphy and enjoy with great «¨« soul themes that waste the rhythm in torrents in

their more danceable versions and a lot of feeling in their ballads.

"1"

A simpleton television tape consumption r <¨ "I ask and where only looks" "something" "Kyra Sedgwick, the rest not

even serve to highlightso m <¨« sm <¨ «nimo, bores themselves and Extra <you.

What do you think I have broken one of my good props of 2008, and that is, I thought I would dedicate it to <¨ «or 2008 to see" "GOOD

CINEMA" "and, yesterday, while my woman made a zapping, in some channel whose name I do not remember, put this movie

, which, proving to be the debut in the direction of the actor too Kevin Bacon, results from the m <¨ «s simple,

bland, torpor <¨« fera, est «¨« asked, predictable, vacuous, and without any «¨« n 's possible. Perhaps, the < "The only grace of the film

is" to see how well the 40-something Primavera has been doing now (thanks to "" The Closer "") Kyra

Sedgwick, or as Kevin Bacon once more turns into a character (very well characterized) opposed to everything we

know, Sandra Bullock, Oliver Platt, Marisa Tomei and Matt Dillon complete the cast in small

roles, scattered casually in the bulk of the film. . For the rest of us, we face the one in <¨ «simo telef ilm

loaded with the usual, that does not contribute anything, or even reach the viewer, and that a

server gave him more desire to fall asleep in the sof <¨ «(I doubt if in some <¨ «I did it for the moment, for sure),

on the other hand, and taking away that a television movie of this type can not be asked more, to be« a «exercise»

ridiculousthe requirement of it. I do not get longer, a simple television tape of consumption I ask for and where it only

looks "" something "" Kyra Sedgwick, the rest do not even serve to highlight them the m <¨ «sm <¨« nimo , bores to own and

extra <¨ «os.

" 0

" <¨ "or <¨" a, disconnected and boring, but it is worth seeing in action "¨" n the C ¨ ¨ «ndida.El universe of Javier and Guillermo Fesser is the m <¨« s at < ¨ «peak of our filmography <¨« a. From 'El ritmillo' or

'El secdleto de la tdompleta' to 'Miracle of P. Tinto' have managed to build a kind of giant comic book

where the Man of the Bombona, the shoddy, the Martians and the narrator type NO-DO have an entity of its own, and

silly humor <¨ «ne ingenuo disguises itself as surrealism and is highly effective. All this to say that

s <¨ «, that I really like the film work of the Fesser up to 'P. Tinto'No however, when they leave their

territory, the results go down considerably. 'The adventures of Mortadelo and Filem <¨ «n', in spite of their brilliant

appearance, did not go beyond being a collection of vi <¨« etas that came to dizziness when painted. And 'C <¨' candida 'repeats

the same mistakes, m <¨' s one <¨ "I adido: the direction <¨« n is performed by Guillermo Fesser, which is clearly the least

gifted of the two brothers put yourself behind the c <¨ «mara. The truth is to go from the hypervitamined rhythm and the

baroque of one to the parsimony and lack of daring of the other and to be "enough" to think about seeing

this movie. But, unfortunately, there is more. The argument of 'Candida' could be as simple as '' Things that

happen to a woman who has to move her family forward on the basis of scrub floors "". Because, simply, the

narration does not exist as such. Javier Fesser adapts the book of the entrusted employee of the home,

with a plot excuse that I suppose is "based on the relationship between C <¨" ndida and Guillermo Fesser (in the film

<" ¨ «he became a stressed and antipatiquist« ¨ «a mere presenter of A3TV, deficiently incarnated by Jorge

Bosch), but who ends up being more" "than the saga of the Fr. Tinto. Presents characters to later

forget about them, after releasing a couple of jokes about them. Extends unnecessarily the resolution of theframe

main, until scratching on the <¨ «or <¨« er <¨ «a. He tries to sell us the story of a redemption, and he never goes beyond the story of a bunch of miscreants

with a bad conscience. I have not read him the book, but <¨ "really, the life of C <¨« has not given to me.

</ I> From the chapter of interpretations, it is better not to speak. It is taken for granted the amateurism of the protagonist (a <¨ «n

as <¨«, it is the one that m <¨ «s successful) and several secondary, but really that Jorge Bosch has no name.

Until Ra <¨ «l Pe <¨« a (ex UPA Dance) gives credibility to his junkie with the four tricks that we can all apply to

that type of character, whether we are actors or not. But it is that of the Bosch guy is painful, being also <¨ «s <¨" l the

character with which the average viewer must be identified. And saying all this, he could "say that it is one of the

worst pel <¨ «I've been in my face for a long time. Well, look, it's not like <¨ «. Simply because

C <¨ «ndida, that character that Gomaespuma rescued from his gray anonymity, rises above all the bad that

his" "biopic" "has and achieves what Viggo Mortensen could not achieve in 'Alatriste', because example: that you

forget all the bad things and you r <¨ «not of her, but of her peculiar vision <¨« n of life. And do not leave the room

with a feeling of manifest scam. And that you forgive, at least for almost two hours, all the blunders

around you. C <¨ «ndida (and with it, all the C« ¨ «ndidas that in the world have been) deserved« a tribute, without a

doubt, but one much better than this. <¨ «or <¨« a, disconnected and boring, but it is worth seeing in action "the C".

A 5.

" 0

" I am not an expert in musicals, I will only say <¨ «that I do not like <¨«, that I get bored <¨ «and that I prefer that I get

bitten by a bee than to have to swallow this kind of film < ¨ «culas.

I have never liked the movies in Disney's "real image", maybe, except for exceptions like "Mary Poppins",

"" My friend the fant <¨ "sma" "or those of" " Herbie "" I've always been bored like an oyster, before the other side of the moon of the

mouse "Mickey, so when last Friday, my wife started watching this movie, I, wallowed in the sof <¨ «, the

result of a gastronomy, the only thing I did was to turn slightly sideways, listening, meditating and almost

contemplating, the <¨« last out of the Disney pot; since we are before the t <¨ «Pica teen tape, accompanied by an

easy soundtrack, which hopes to sell (and sell <¨«) discs and m "¨" s discs, and where the actors, cut chicks

by the same patron of Justin Timberlake or Hillary Duff, they carry part of the singer (never better said) of

the plot, sometimes traced to Grease (which does not even reach the sole of the shoes), or West Side Story

(ahem), and which aims to keep the kids stuck to the screen. Anyway, I'm not an expert in musicals,

just say <¨ «that I do not like <¨«, that I get bored <¨ « and that I prefer to be bitten by a bee than to have to

swallow this kind of film.

" 0

" Sofia Coppola has been left with the cantinela that the smallest stories can be great stories, butminimal

yours has remained in astory of a potential great story.

Pretending to live from a «success», not from a great film, like Lost in translation, can create the false hope

that what comes afterwards will be just as good. The pompous world of Marie Antoinette is presented as the

Titanic of Sof <¨ «to Coppola, only this time, the movie« ¨ «if it sinks. This new experiment, supposedly

irreverent, by using totally anachronistic songs in the film, which portrays Marie Antoinette from its link

of convenience to her "last days". One of the virtues of great directors and screenwriters is that they can

turn an allegedly boring story into something slightly entertaining. and passable, but in this case it has been

converted in the back. This vehicle for the director and the main actress to show off becomes one

of the most boring movies. of the current panorama. An outstanding "art" management that remains the

protagonist of a vacuous discourse. As the protagonist. It is incre <¨ «ble as little effort (when

directing and writing) can convert a character in someone totally hateful, shallow and inter <¨« S.da

the impression <¨ 'n that Sofia Coppola has remained with the cantinela that the smallestcan be greatminimal

storiesstories, but yours has remained in astory of a potential great story. A pity.

" 0

" Hipocres <¨ "to the American in its purest form, hand in hand with the unique" c "on this side of Atl <¨« ntico,

Antonio Banderas.

I do not feel special filia for the cinema of social denunciation, because normally it is an interested denunciation that does not

show the reality of the things, but what interests in front of a ticket office or God knows what to "interests". If on

top of that he is "stuck" by Antonio Banderas, the degree of credibility that I deserve is even less. City

mutes recounts the tr <¨ "events gicos that for a <¨" will affect Ciudad Ju <¨ "rez, whereseems

an oligarchy <¨« Pol <¨ 'business tico rampant and thousands of women are murdered without anyone seems to

have even the m <¨ «m <« minimum interest in clarifying the crimes. This denunciation, as is usual incinema

American, is presented < ¨ «ndonos to an M <« almost savage Mexican in opposition to a civilized and magnificent United

States. While it is true that it alludes to corruption on both sides of the border, it does so in a veryway

different, as if in the case of Mexicans it was the normal, the accepted, while it is something extraordinary

that occurs in the pa <¨ «s that electrocute prisoners or simply imprison them indefinitely and without judgment.Jenniferinsipid and antipicuous

L <¨« fish is still asas ever, and for the moment she still thinks that having her

behind in her site is also enough for the cinema. De Banderas, little to say; once he becomes a Mexican in

a movie that distills hypocrisy on all four sides. Because he is not the one who says he cares about

Mexican women who work in subhuman conditions. , but at the moment his "only measure has been to keep

the money that they have taken to a film that exploits the drama. For the rest, what is the film in itself

is "unstructured", it is boring, lacking in rhythm and heavy to see. Once again, the "" Based on real events "" that

appears at the beginning, was a bad omen.

" 0

" Di <¨ «intelligent logos, strong interpretations, perfect direction, sublime gui, precious music. A

masterpiece

"" A senator tells a journalist the whole truth about the legendary bandit Liberty Valance and of c <¨ «mo <¨" l, a

young man recently graduated in law, came "to the wild West with unshakeable ideals of justice" "A

masterpiece. However, I must confess that the first time I saw her I felt "disillusioned". I had to have about

fifteen years. My father, when I was very childish or "I had told it," but I know "it" in its part of action, shots and fights.

When I saw her I felt "overwhelmed" because it was not evidently how I had told her, it was much deeper. Aago

few yearsI came back to see her at a cinema forum in my neighborhood, and I stayed "ecstatic". <¨ «Qu <¨« beauty <¨ «Di <¨«logos

intelligent, strong interpretations, perfect direction, sublime gui, sublime, precious music. In short, a

masterpiece where love, friendship, justice, law, truth and legend are spoken.

Sublime.

" 1

" Planet Terror, arrive <¨ «to become a cult film, since it has all the necessary ingredients

to be it, even though maybe the p <¨" public en masse is not "prepared to value the real magnitude of this project.

Planet Terror is part of the GrindHouse project carried out by R.Rodriguez and Q.Tarantino and consists of two

parts, Planet Terror and Death Proof, <¨ «sta <¨« last is the one directed by Quentin. We all know how good

these two are, well, fruit of a night of sex, drugs and school, this project is born that has not

reaped all the "success" that was expected. Since you sit in the chair and begin put the trailers you enter

the ochentero world of films of series B. I think I'm not the <¨ «onlywho has been amazed with the

trailer for" "Machete" "is m <¨ 's assure you that more of one (among which I include myself) to be <¨ «willing to see her. The

effects of noise in the film's frames, the "credit" titles, all the absurd stench of the eighties and

their Z series. It's incredible. For me Robert has left the peyejillo with this film.Planet Terror is a caviar

not suitable for all palates. You have to know how to appreciate it and understand it in your enviroment. "" It is not a

bad movie "" zombies "" as I have done "" by ah <". It is an aunt ¨ «a tribute to the terror of series B of the a <¨ 80 years. The

di <¨« logos, the plot, everything is perfect. I have to show my weakness for the divine Rose Macgowan (Ex de Marilyn

Manson) who is «leading his cinematographic career with effort and intelligence. One of the examples of

superaci <¨ «n. An actress who deserves a place in Hollywood's Star System for all her talent that she has

forged herself since nobody has given her absolutely nothing. From here <"my unconditional support for this great woman. Rose

is the soul of Grindhouse and especially of Planet Terror. It represents the most romantic person whodiscovers

accidentallyhis true fate, surrendering himself to him and basing his own existence on it. <¨ «there something more pure and

Istrue? It is absolutely strident and at the same time intoxicating the moment" "Pata de Palo" "and when I wanted to die

of emotion" ¨ "n is in the moment" "Amazing submachine foot" " , go s <¨ «per hero <¨« na that friendhas been created

Robert. Of course Rose has taken all the juice out of the character. Est <¨ «loaded with sensuality, claw and

daring. Two against the world. the love story is fabulosa.Creo that Planet Terror, get <¨ "to become

a cult film, because it has all the necessary ingredients to be even quiz <¨« s p <¨ «PUBLIC mass

is not < ¨ «prepared to assess the real magnitude of this project.

" 1

" Very good movie "Buster Keaton, misunderstood in his time because it contains <¨« a, in the key of jocular

amusement, elements more serious or at least that should not be taken as a joke.

"" A young man who can not find work in his hometown, travels to New York in search of a better future, but

within minutes of his arrival, he is overwhelmed by the life of the big city and decides to try his luck in

any other site. He falls off a train near a ranch and becomes a very special cowboy. "" Very good movie

"Buster Keaton, misunderstood in his time because it contains <¨« a, in the key of jocular fun, moreelements

seriousor at least that should not be taken as a joke. Actually, and so <¨ «I would have thought a lot of

you / as, it is not a pure western, because there ¨« to be by Law, to include it in the g ¨ "nero of the comedy , and not of the

comedy, but of the cinematic film, which is different. However, and because it is also a western and this is a

blog of that g <¨ «nero, I include it. Without m <¨ «s. It consists of three parts, differentiated but complementary, each

better. It is said that inspire «¨« beautiful poems to the great Spanish poet «¨« Rafael Alberti because it is a heartfelt work

with poes <¨ «to a torrential, containing an intelligent dissertation, ¨« amusing and imaginative , about the attempt

of the human being for the achievement of his dreams and the importance of destiny in the future and future of it. The

friendly cowboy, clueless, but deeply honest and honest, timorous but determined to triumph in a world

at first very alien to its h <¨ «natural bitat, but that dominate it <¨« for its constancy and something of luck. A

film to recover, that supposed an economic expense in the shoot much higher than originally agreed between

Keaton and Joe Schenk, the famous producer. The reason for the high cost of production was. <¨ «a cow! The cow

"" Brow eyes "", of the Holstein breed, chosen among the herd by Keaton himself because he believed <¨ «to be <¨« a <¨ «s list that

his cong« ¨ «neres. She soon realized she was as clumsy as the others, but she tried to teach her tricks and

behave on a plat. As <¨ «, and in the midst of a scorching heat, not in vain were these scenes filmed in the middle

of the desert of Kingdom, Arizona (USA), having to be careful when wrapping the camera with ice so

as not to the tape melted, I say that so <¨ «, Keaton gave the cow carrots and took him« ¨ «first with a

cable, then with a rope and at the end with a thread. But this was not what made them lose m <¨ "s time, but

to the cow he entered" ¨ zeal and there was no "¨" a way to "" concentrate "". He "" presented "" a nice bull but this

rejected him "". There was no other remedy than to wait for the smother to pass, and it continued to roll. Joe Schenk, theburied, said

producer, when he was, "Where did you go?" «To raised the shooting exclam <¨« very angry: "" <¨ «That is Keaton! If there is

a costly way to make a film, <¨ «he will find it <¨« "".

" 1

" The worst, in my opinion <¨ «n, of the film" is no longer his gui "" not his actions or his slowness or his direction ".

Worstof all is its pretentiousness, its intention <¨ 'n go deep and art <¨ «stica. I have come to consider putting

negative punctuation as <¨ «that with that I say everything.

I was waiting with curiosity and certain enthusiasm for the premiere of the new movie «Antonio Banderas» as director. His

debut, "" Crazy in Alabama "" seems to me a good film, interesting and very well directed as <¨ «that the intention of

Banderas to tell us a story about the M <¨« laga his childhood made him presage an emotional film. It was not that he

expected a masterpiece but that it was a good movie. After the first comments, generally not very

positive, I reduced my expectations a bit. But what I did not expect under any concept is a brick of

this caliber, a tost, an authentic fright like the one that found me. I will be able to talk for hours about how bad

the film is but try to be brief and concise, something that the movie is not. Especially if someone commits the

imprudence of going to the movie. cinema to see it, it is better that you are «warned that in the first 20 minuteshappens

absolutely nothing. Nothing. Im <¨ «genes presumably po ¨ ¨ ticas, one after another and little m <¨« s. But whenstart to

thingshappen and the story starts, it is worse because each situation is more ridiculous than the previous one. The

characters are very poorly defined. They do not have any sense, and it is really hard to feel more or lessbunch

identified by thatof morons whose behavior is not at all justified or explained. That s <¨ «, they

all give it to fil <¨« sofos that it seems that now it is «¨" fashionable. Nor does it say that the actors can not

do anything with these characters so </ i> « I remain with the doubt to know if they are good or not. What isme

clear tois that diction is still one of the outstanding accounts of Spanish cinema. The film is such a

disproportion to the plot that it came to me. the head "" Mulholland Drive "" but with the difference that, even when it

does not make sense, Lynch's cinema has magnetism, atm <¨ «sfera, hooks and does not bore. Banderas does not get the

same and I'm not even sure he tried it. In fact, I'm not clear about what he's tried. The

worst thing, in my opinion, is not his gui, nor his actions or his slowness or direction. <¨ «n. Worst of

all is his pretentiousness, his intention to go deep and artistic. I have come to consider putting

negative punctuation as <¨ «that with that I say everything. But as the soundtrack is not <¨ «nothing bad I have decided not to

do it.

" 0

"? Treasure Island? I felt <¨ "the rules of the g <¨" nero of pirates; Gore Verbinski has found his inspiration in

the multiplication of the characters and the sides.

"" The treasure island "" sent <¨ «the rules of the g <¨" nero of pirates. Jim Hawkins and his friends had the treasure, but

John Silver and the pirates had the ship. Each one had "something" that he wanted "to" the other and they fixed themselves with a deal.

But it was a deal with pirates, and pirates sometimes keep their word and sometimes live up to their fame. The

"" Pirates of the Caribbean "" by Gore Verbinski have found their inspiration in the multiplication of the characters and

the sides: the English navy, Sparrow, the girl, the boy, the Captain <¨ « n Barbossa, the Holand <¨ «s Errante, and in the

exponential increase of the deals and exchanges, which are countless. For us to create the incredible,is,

thatthat a pirate will respect his word, the Pel <¨ «he resorts to the legendary. The pirate has to keep his

word because, otherwise, a curse ¨ «n fall <¨« on <¨ «l. Curses and rules proliferate like

mushrooms to drive an endless plot without the spectator failing. Jack Sparrow is the second motor

of history. Her inoffensive and mannered gestures, whose influence on Keira Knightley at first undermined

the character of Keira Knightley, mean that we should not take it seriously. In a universe of pacts, <¨ «he is the

rogue, in a drama of ideals, <¨« he is the ego <¨ «sta. He is also the captain without authority and the negotiator without power.

And yet, he is the only one who gets away with it. Participate in the complicated weaves-manejes with many

plays in advance, like a Kasparov of a chess that changes the rules in each turn. The two protagonists

fight ballasted by the lack of malice, and put the trip on one to the another s <¨ «lo in the name of their

parents. Their final union or tragedy depends on the confidence that creators and p <¨ «public (each d <¨« am <¨ «s united

in the s <¨« lido business of celluloid) have in the triumph of love eternal, or in the contrasted disbelief that

the experience has taught them. The long executions of the principle are exemplary, with that ni <¨ «or that challenge <¨« to the

pat <¨ «hoax with its song <¨ "No, the hideout of Sao Feng composing a complete storythe style of pr <¨ 'logos

Indiana Jones, the multiplication <¨' n Jack Sparrow and crabs in the universe on <¨" rich land of Davy Jones,

the brotherhood of the pirates, and that demented swirl of the final battle. I do not understand the obstinacy of the

criticism to defend its indifference towards a work more than remarkable.

" 1

" Deja vu makes us commune with mill wheels, as I say «to my grandmother. Huge wheels, in this case. A

gigantic mill, to <¨ «ado me. Once swallowed the candy, it does not taste bad, deep down.

Now in the movies of action the pulse of the political cinema beats. In this Deja vu of Tony Scott there is a film of

hond <¨ «sima concern <¨« pol «¨« tica that takes from 11-S its material of reflection with popcorn and a coca coca light.

Do not believe the kind reader who is going to swallow a farce of deep parliaments. Nothing of that. In a film with

the Bruckheimer stamp it is interesting that the viewer is "two hours attached to the chair", it is important that the argumentsnot

areexcessively complicated and, finally, it is interesting that the sensation ¨ «n never, under any circumstances, be

that the money has been wasted. The dance of g «¨« neros that Scott tries to sneak in (thjriller, drama,

romance, science fiction) is not happy: there is an enormous effort to bill a competent,film

entertaining, but it breaks down in the m level <¨ «s rational, which is the verisimilitude. The film, in this sense,

is a disaster. The tool of technology that allows us to observe the past is frankly absurd.

Leaving aside this functional resource, Deja vu is an appreciable film of entertaining consumption, which is left to be loved in its last stretch

, but which is listed (in excess) to the ramploner when arguing when setting its limits. <¨ «gilesconcepts.Est

narrative<¨« completely wasted the character of the territorialist (Caviezel). The brief touches

about his patriotism and his sense of duty towards a richly lost America could have given him agame

huge, given the excellent actor who represented him. Deja vu makes us receive communion with mill wheels,

as I say «to my grandmother. Huge wheels, in this case. A gigantic mill, to <¨ «ado me. Once the candy is swallowed,

It tastes bad, deep down. Scott has forms and manners of director espl ¨ «ndido (The fire of revenge is a

formidable film) and Denzel Washington is an actor of the first order. <¨ «D <¨« nde est <¨ «then the error? It is the

fifteen minutes, or were more, of metaphoric "paranormal" language that put us in the back so that we can

understand the time travel and the viewings of the past. In other movies, even in other

films less successful than this, they do not bother explaining so much about the magic of cheating. It justus

cheats. Without so much verb. <¨ «Does anyone remember Frequency?

" 0

" D <¨ «j <¨« vu is a film that can be ignored. History is nonsense withtravel in time

impossible.

D <¨ «j <¨« vu (2006) is a film that can be ignored. History is nonsense withtravel in time

impossible. The film begins with a crowded ferry of sailors celebrating Mardi Gras with their families.

Suddenly, boom, explodes and almost all die (another excellent idea for terrorists). Denzel Washington

plays the agent assigned to the case. In the process of investigation, discover the cad <¨ «view of a woman burned,

however, does not belong to the explosion. More or less that falls in love with the cad <¨ «see, extra <¨« or as it sounds, all of

course can be attributed to the t ¨ «title of the film. Anyway, also by chance he discovers that another team of

agents, led by a cacheton <¨ «zimooo Val Kilmer, has a m" machine "of time, that can record in video

the past, exactly 4 d < ¨ «as and 6 hours ago <¨« s, not m <¨ «s, not less and s <¨« what that. And so <¨ «begins to get more and more

m <¨« s pastrula history, because of course Denzel wants to stop the terrorist (s <¨ «it is one, not an

organization, simply a madman» "patriot "" played by James Caviezel) and save the girl, changing the

destiny and the present. S <¨ «a <¨« n est <¨ «n interested in seeing the movie« ¨ «gango, but do not say that in EBCnot

werewarned of a loose story where you look. Extra <¨ «or what good actors have agreed to

participate in the project. Denzel, <¨ «Why did you do it? Ah, to all this, the scenario used is New Orleans,

as a kind of tribute to the v ¨ ¨« hurricane victims «¨« Katrina, even many of the survivors of the

disaster, participated in the production as extras.The funny director, Tony Scott, was ordered to make a pole

that read: "" Malcolm X, Jesus Christ, and Jim Morrison: Deja Vu. How Can We Fail? "" My opinion <¨ «n: Still, you failed

:(

" 0

"A very cinematic adaptation for a story that shouted for it all at once. Adapt is a difficult exercise and easy at the same time The cinematographic language is more similar to that of the comic than

to the literary, which does not mean that it is the same or that it resembles much, and m <¨ «s if we talk about Frank Miller, who

uses many literary resources to define their stories. The case of 300 is very specific because the story is

very specific, it deals with something very specific: an attack and a defense. But that's not bad, that's very

good, because it gives the author a fat canvas to work in. The story of the 300 SPARTANS of Le <¨ «nidas

fighting against the Persian troops of King Xerxes is real, or The reality does not have to

be very cinematographic (or very comical), therefore, the obligation of the author is NOT to be faithful to the

facts and convert them in something cin. ¨ tico.The story about the comic, in this case, is already quite cinematographic ¨ «fica

by its rhythm and its duraci ¨ n. It's relatively easy to adapt and Zack Snyder makes antransfer work

absolutely fantastic, making a really great comic book. It has a fast pace and a

very successful gui, despite of some structure and adaptation errors ¨ «n. For example, the fact of putting a

plot on the woman of Le <¨ «nes away from the context of combat, which breaks a bit the rhythm oftension

constantbetween the Spartan warriors. It is possible that a subplot was necessary to enrich the movie,

but I think that was not the most appropriate. Ephialtes's subplot is "perfectly constructed and does not bother

anything, for example. SIN CITY opened" the closure to adapt Miller's grace to his "success", from which we must expect

sequelae, some of them directed only by the same Miller. 300 uses the same technique as that one,

perfected and adapted to the plot, with more coppery cores and more dry contrasts. This was the most

efficient way to bring this story to the big screen, because it demanded a kind of modernized version

of Don Chaffey's movies. It is a game of artifice, unreal, extreme and violent. Almost musical, it's a kind of

concert more like a movie. You can watch the movie in sequences, and they only make sense. Because so <¨ «work

many managersnow. They work their movies in pieces, like puzzle pieces that work by themselves.

As a mosaic.300 is a very good movie with some elements that make it limp as its extreme duration

for a movie that may demand some brevity for what is "counting". The action is r <¨ «ask but the plot

sometimes slow and the gui <¨« n suffers a little. In spite of everything it is one of the best and m <¨ «s cool movies of the

<¨« o, f <¨ «easy to see and easy to enjoy. If you are not a person who demands faithful historical facts,

which I repeat, in cinema it should not be, since reality can be a great foundation for a story, but its

development does not have to be cin <¨ « tico Who criticizes the movie for its lack of historic truthfulness, who does not see

cinema, and read history. Something highly recommended on the other hand. It's a movie to see in the movies, part of its charm

is <¨ «ah <¨«. It has that "old movie" character made for the big screen. The well-used technology of

today is the cinemascope of our generation. If you do not join well, you get a real crap.300 is a

comic easy to adapt because the story is ah <¨ «, is not like adapt, for example, SPIDERMAN, in

which you have to have many things in account, because there are thousands of comics, villains and moments. SPIDERMAN IS,

therefore, less cinematographic and, possibly, more television than cinematographic, because there is much to be

condensed. 300 to the contrary tells you a story in the same comic, period. And it's not because it's anovel

graphic, because that's not why a comic book is easier to adapt, SINCE HELL it failed and from the beginning it was known

that it would fail. It's not because of the adaptation <¨ «n in s <¨«. Many say that "" that story was for Tim Burton "". Tim

Burton would have been the same, because a story is not good because of the, a story

aesthetic you give itbegins to be good in the gui, and not to give it a very cool aesthetic. FROM HELL, the comic is

long, and it has a lot of "very few moments of research, much less similar conversations that, in the language of the

comic, you can reduce to two or three drawings and long di <¨ «logos. But that in movies they have to expand, because one does not

read at the same rhythm that listens, and the concentration is not the same, nor the fixed image as much as the one that is

in movement. FROM HELL it became interminable, slow and vague. The same thing will happen with WATCHMEN, or even

worse. WATCHMEN is a story that only works in the comic, that's why it's a classic "cl". It is thestory

perfectfor the perfect medium. It is so dense and complex that you can not get into two hours of film, it takes

much more. WATCHMEN be <¨ «failed, unlike 300 which is a magnificent work« ¨ «fica, funny, extreme and

satisfying as a film.Very good.

" 1

" Efectivist, half resolved and empty in content. This is how you could summarize this film globally

, which, if it were not for the excellent performances of Foster and Howard, will make the waters everywhere.

The basis of the argument is quite good: "" A couple who walks through the park at night, get

beat up, and the woman carries out a personal transformation to try to overcome the loss of her boyfriend "" Up to this point

, everything is correct, but the moment we enter into this process, Jordan fails miserably. I

explain: "It shows us an almost instantaneous change, where Foster supplies his trauma and his fear <¨ «to the society with

a coldness and a skill at the time of killing, brutal, that will be« at the height of the «Hitman». All

this connects us with a historical background, which Howard and his police team play, which

contributes nothing to the film, and when produced so abruptly, it ends with all the m < ¨ Foster's interpretative rite. (

Let's see, if it's important for the story because of one or the other Foster and Howard have been known, but

also, Jordan, less subtle, everything) In the middle, the film suffers. ¨ «important rhythm drops, but it solves them

quite well with a few deaths by Foster, and excellent interchanges between Foster and

Howard. Finally, and after waiting for an hour and a half, Foster begins a brief revenge, r <¨ «ask and all

the product ends up closing justly, and with a hasty end, more or less as cr <¨ «Tica, and wherenot

the four cheap reflections arelacking. And after this, dir <¨« is, and why do I have to go see <¨ «this film <¨« ula «? .

Well, why is not everything bad. It is necessary to emphasize the great performances of the protagonists and the "magic" that is

created around them, stay above all, with the coffee scene "; the simplicity of gui <¨ «n, which is currently

appreciated by seeing so many empty and unnecessary turns, a justite direction, and a shivering Foster. (More than

one already likes <¨ «to enlighten as <¨«).

" 0

" That does not cheat you <¨ «in, it's a musical. Run, flee, pretend fainting, whatever it is before you go see this if

you do not like musicals. Also, as always we like big donkey walk or not walk, because the abominable

volume can make us bleed by the ears.

I have to admit that although the film has seemed to me like a tru <¨ «or infumable, they sing like God. Well, like

God when he wants to say something to the voices, why are the girls howling. I also have to admit, that

in Spain we do not have singers like that, or if we have them, the shit of triumphs eclipses them (this has

nothing to do, but ah <¨ ). The film is about three girls of color (of a more mulatto color) who lose

a contest of promises of cante, but they win a manager who must throw them to stardom. For the time being, he manages

to act «¨« in making the choirs of a fashionable singer, but the ambition of these three girls does not remain ah <¨ «.

So one goes to bed with one, another with the same, another with the other and as <¨ «, singing and giving the subject the film

runs. These things happen to me to see movies without knowing what. " go. It turns out that nothing happens

at all the time, more that these girls and Eddie Murphy sing. And is that as they spend all the time

cantanto, because nothing can happen. In the synopsis I have told you until the last ten minutes, to give you

some emotion. And of course, if we knew English to understand the songs, maybe we could get on

the action bandwagon. But as we stay in My tailor is rich (which means my namesake the Richi) because

we do not know anything. Resuming, that does not cheat you ¨ «in, it's a musical. Run, flee, pretend fainting, whatever it is

before you go see this if you do not like musicals. Also, as always we like big donkey walk or not

walk, because the abominable volume can make us bleed by the ears.

" 0

" It is clear that the intentions are very good, although Pope "to Lawrence must" to give some lessons to his

son before embarking on a second episode. Surely, everyone will come out "we" winning.

Entre Mujeres is the <¨ «prima prima of Jon Kasdan, son of the renowned director and screenwriter Lawrence Kasdan; an

inconsistent work that picks up very little of his father's "cinematic" wisdom since, in his debut,

apart from dealing with a subject that is too hackneyed in other similar films, he shows very little nerve narrative and

certain inability to baste an argument m <¨ «extremely attractive and hooked.Under its false appearance of

auteur cinema, Entre Mujeres is a kind of bland desktop telefilm in which narrates the awakening to

the life of a young screenwriter from 27 to <¨ «os who, abandoned by his girlfriend and tired of working forbyproducts

televisionfrom three to four, decides to move away from his" usual "environment to take refuge, for a long

time, at his grandmother's house, which begins to trigger numerous memory problems. All <¨ «, while dedicating

part of your time to take care of it, start <¨« the writing of the book that always yearns <¨ «and establish <¨« an unequal

relationship with the «« mines of the family of the house opposite: a mature woman, dissatisfied in her marriage,

and her two daughters: a beautiful teenager and a precocious little girl. The gui <¨ «n, written by the director himself, bets

for a realistic tone, but the precipitation and predictability of what it exposes, the little entity of its

male protagonist (a decaffeinated Adam Brody) and that feeling of emptiness that leaves in the viewer,

make forget even the perfect interpretations of an at <¨ «pica Meg Ryan and an excellent and fun

Olympia Dukakis who, giving life to a senile old woman, rises as the best of the stereotyped product.In

short, <¨« this is a new and failed approach to that "air of disengagement" or family and collective that Sam Mendes

plasm <¨ «, A thousand wonders, in his masterly American Beauty. It is clear that the intentions are very good,

even though Pope "to Lawrence" should give some lessons to his son before embarking on a second episode.

Surely, everyone will come out <¨ "masters winning.

" 0

" Comedy m <¨ «s to use and throw, of those that husbands consorte endure in the movies, and women are

happy to contemplate what happens on screen.

Tells the story of a newly married couple Carl and Molly Peterson (Dillon and Hudson), who decide to welcome

in their new home the best friend of <¨ «ste, Randy Dupree (Wilson), the godfather of the wedding , who just lost his

job and his house. The stay for a few days, however, soon becomes permanent because neither of

them knows how to say enough. Some already do (and forgive me). ), the

G-Men sang that "I can not stand your cousin", so take that song, stretch it to the point of satiety, place

David Summers's heavy cousin, Owen Wilson with his face bobo and already have the movie «, simple,

shot with 3? and pretending (as they have succeeded) sweep screen, ah <¨ "have a comedy m <¨ 's

throwaway, those that consort husbands put upin movies, and women are happy to contemplate what

It happens on the screen, and try to transmute it to your real life. How much will my friends laugh at the movie

when they know that in this, again, I had to go through the box office.

" 0

" Magisterial exercise of cinema: impressive cat <¨ «logo of emotions, perfect interpretation <¨« n .... I do not understand <¨ «Screams and whispers when I saw it for the first time and maybe now it has not arrived either,

depth, to understand Ingmar Bergman's fiery discourse, his devastating panoramic view of pain and

death. There are times when I find the director more boring and burdensome of Film History and others

in which it is inevitable to admire his talent and conclude with the certainty that he is one of the capital filmmakers

of the 20th century: which arouses fiery adhesions and the one that provokes yawning maintained. I was encouraged to see

Bergman's films when I read him that Woody Allen admired him. For <¨ «l arrived ¨« to Kurosawa in the same way. I also

heard Bach listening to Bach when I heard that Keith Jarrett, the pianist who tutored my income in the mid-'80s

, had it on him. <¨ «to his favorite music. These things usually happen: read one a

story of Cort <¨ «zar, he is captivated and wants to read the Complete Works. A deadline is even marked. At the beginning,

in honor of the holy truth, I did not see anything in the filmography of the Swedish director that aroused my amazement. Cheers

and whispers is the story of a woman who is devastated by the matrix. and the beautiful bodeg <¨ «n family that

enlivens her« «d« ¨ «as formed by two sisters and a maid. In the wrong hands, I suspect that thisdramatic

episode of absolutelydyes could have billed a film of sensitive, butheeled

involuntarilyto yellowness, a certain immodesty in showing the pain as if it were a cuasier object. «Tico it was

. In this case, Bergman makes a sober study of the pain, a visual document that lacerates the asleep

modernized view of the spectator, in excess fed by narrative solutions of minor intensity. Faith,

death and lack of communication, the great themes of the Bergman, appear here, but they are not written with the

metaphysical incontinence of anta <¨ o. What is narrated here is the evolution of the illness, the oppression of thepalace

family, the redness of the soul as a pulse. Bergman goes from reality to fantasy, from the present imperturbable to the

past as h <¨ «lice that still drives the mechanisms of frustation and visible conflicts. The women

who escort Agnes to death are also dead, emptied, stripped of all vital life and

interred in a gray tenebrism, capable of bringing out secret hatreds, iniquities, the foundations from the fear

of facing the vision and the existence of the other, even if it is the sister, the one that has grown in her interior and has

recorded all the vicissitudes of life in the same page of a newspaper. Bergman films with shame the

faces of their heroes <¨ «dead, of the women destined to silence and to the radiant splendor of alife

bourgeoisthat does not seek any spiritual happiness. Shouts and whispers is a stark journey to the very center

of disenchantment: there is no love, there is no humanity in those spectral characters, who exude misery and exhibit

behaviors of those who have lost everything and know that they will never recover what they crave. The review

of the tape has hurt me as it did not before: perhaps it is the subliminal message or

blatantly explicit "I quote, I do not know" from Bergman: the offer of a neat inventory of emotions <¨ «only

translatable if the age or the experience of the spectator possesses the appropriate reading instruments. I imagine that

if I give you a third revision in thirty years to find new meanings: good cinema is this, the

lavish possibility that each film will be different each time we face each other to her. Good cinema or

good literature or good music, Art, in short. Photographed <¨ «justly worthy of the« ¨ scar at the

ceremony of 1972: Sven Nykvist, Bergman's habitual, apabull <¨ «To the jury with its genius when it comes to creating

oppressive atmosphere.

" 1

" It was presented as an interesting proposal, which is lost by resorting to a too long structure,

in which split screens are mixed with others of classic style, and that in no way manage to create theclimate

necessaryto make this interesting history, we get to seduce.

Under the premise of based on a real fact, we get to the screens a gangster story, whichus

remindsat times of great films of the genre (or subg <¨ «nero) as" " neighborhood boys "", "" 187 "" or "" The

law of the street "" among others. Nick Cassavetes tells us the facts that led the young Jesse James Hollywood, to

become one of the ten people m <¨ « In order to tell this story,

Cassavetes chooses to show us a fake documentary, in which interviews are interspersed with the events

that have occurred. "" Alpha Dog "" becomes a very irregular product, in which that greatmoments are mixed

cinematographic, including doses of adrenaline, violence, intrigue and empathy with the characters; but that it

manages to throw down with others quite unnecessary, little believable and that take to the spectator of the happened thing.

Justin Timberlake becomes one of the revelations of the film, giving a good package to his character,

like Emil Hirsch, Shaw Hatosy and Ant <¨ «n Yelchin.Bruce Willis, Sharon Stone and Ben Foster complete acast

choral, that could have taken much longer. In short, "Alpha Dog" was presented as an interesting

proposal, which is lost by resorting to a too long structure, in which split screens are mixed

with others classic style, and that in no way manage to create the necessary climate for this interesting

story to seduce us.

" 0

" Infumable product for the m <¨ «sj <¨« venes that takes advantage of Christmas to secure a place in the market

of the trilog <¨ «as.

With a budget of US $ 205 million, this film became one of the most expensive productions of the

New Line Cinema production company. This film is an adaptation of the famous and award-winning book Luces del norte, by Philip

Pullman. The golden bridle is the first part of the trilog <¨ «to dark matter. And I'm afraid we're going to

have to put up with the last installments since the production company wants to make its own August thanks to

Philip's novels. Sincerely, so much imitative history of "" Narnia "" already tires me. In addition to the fact that it is "

horribly adapted, the novel itself is already loaded with inconsistencies, to give an example, the figure of the

Gypsies (Gypsies = Gipsy = Gypsy = bone that is like saying Gitanoid < "This is not offensive, whatever it is is

not original, they wear skins to dress themselves. but let's see, if all the animals are Dimons (souls of

humans) and when the human dies the Dimon evaporates <¨ «From d <¨« nde co <¨ «or remove the skins ?. In short, the story

sucks on all sides. We have everything, lack of pace, racord failures, good, good, disaster. Nicole,

Daniel! <¨ «C <¨« did they convince you ?. I imagine that the poor, think <¨ «that the producers were going to hit

the blockbuster as they did when they adapted the <¨« successful trilog <¨ «to El Se <¨« of the Rings. But the truth

is that it has been a genuine tru <¨ «o. I have to clarify that both Nicole and Daniel, get all the juice possible to

their characters "" the gui <¨ «n is that it does not give for m <¨« s "". Eva Green (very pretty) also participates in the film, in

principle her character does not have much relevance but she is winning over the next installments. The

protagonist Lyra Belacqua played by Dakota Blue Richards (born on April 11, 1994) is aactress

britishborn in South Kensington fu <¨ «chosen from more than 10,000 girls in various cities of the Kingdom

Kingdom: Oxford, Cambridge, Exeter and Kendal. The director has said of her that she completely illuminates the camera with

her face. Dakota has no previous experiences in film and has already signed the 2 <¨ «and 3 <¨« delivery of this

saga. (Please see if the teeth can whiten your teeth because they are yellow and it is a

bad one.) Perhaps this is the most remarkable thing about the movie. If you want to see Nicole, Daniel, Eva and the

new Hollywood boom Dakota Blue, you can go see her, but if you expect to find a kind of Harry Potter

"" no way "" go see her. Although you can always enjoy the FX and the costumes.

" 0

" Neither this is a western, nor is this coming out of the closet. It is, at times, quite gimmicky, but delves into

aspects that do not develop the main plot.

Today he has gone to the cinema to see the new work of the irregular Ang Lee. I looked forward to this movie, and

much more after the Golden Globes, but it has not been as much as I expected. I notice that this comment contains

spoilers of the film, so that he who has not seen it does not read it, or he reads it at his own

risk. Many prizes, mentions and nominations preceded him. name of 'Brokeback Mountain', what I

took advantage of <¨ «to make me enormous expectations about what he promised <¨« to be the movie «a« ¨ «o. Well,

come the day, and once out of the room I have to say that I liked the film very much (I do not know if it's the

quality of the film itself, or because my subconscious tells me that he has to like me), but that it has several

aspects that do not make her a "round movie" and, far from it, to my sane judgment, a movie Oscar. The

story, that pretend <¨ «to show itself as 'a story of gay cowboys', is, at times, quite gimmicky,

but delves into aspects that do not develop the main plot (the love between them), but in some subplots that

aim to enrich a main plot that is not at all developed and is almost non-existent, so in

the end there is a film "something lame and unlikely" with what I pretend "to be the risky proposal of

Hollywood. <¨ «No corrections, in the absence of a good original version ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ that I put to face, I must say

that neither Heath Ledger is <¨« of nominaci <¨ «n, nor his wife in fiction, the repellent Michelle Williams of 'Dawson

Crece', is not worthy of her either, whereas it is the emerging talent of Jake Gyllenhaal that stands out

above the rest <¨ «s giving an interpretation very very creble (also has ah <¨« Jarhead ', which earned him «

many points), I bet for this boy for the possible nomination to the Oscar. The rest of aspects of the

film are nothing out of the com »¨ n that fits, although the music of Gustavo Santaolalla comes very

well to the I tell you, Rodrigo Prieto's photography is quite normal (the landscapes are those of showing off, but

this guy has passed) and the direction of Ang Lee is quite normal, with some scenes that are really beautiful,

that's <¨ «. Anyway, the only difference is that the film does not put all the meat on the spit, it could

be a lot more incendiary, but it prefers to be discreet, diplomatic. ¨ «ethics A <¨ «n as <¨«, and as I said a little before

writing this: Neither this is a western, nor is this coming out of the closet. But I liked it, although with limitations.

" 0

" Although there are those who approach it to the brutal humor of jackass, for me, it is not more than a turn of the screw to the

films of Manolo Summers "" Tol mundo is G <¨ «eno ""

I was surprised at this "" fake documentary "", especially because of its criticisms, some labeled it as an

intelligent tape and absurdly hooligan humor, and others as a spawn created by this extra <¨ «or clown

named Sacha Baron Cohen Once seen, I can only reiterate in something that I have already seen, and that is that, although

there are those who approach the brutal humor of jackass, for me, it is not more, than a turn of the screw to the "movies

Manolo Summers" "Tol world is G <¨" eno "", where it was placed to the Spanish ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ ¨ òÀ en in situations as m

òÀÙs absurd better.Borat, or Sacha Baron Cohen (that pal case is the same), plays with that formula again and again,

although I have told him that during the filming of the same, the participants were deceived. ¨ «ndo that was for an

educational film that can only be seen in some Russian regions (or Romanian, now I do not remember well), it is incredible

some situations if they are not prepared, both the hotel with Borat and his Buddy running around there, the

antique store, like the final part with Pamela Anderson, are little crebles, if they have not been prepared

previously. Ribbons with hops, m? lost? Paco Mart <? nez Soria recently arrived in Madrid, there has been and will

always be in the cinema, and they will always provoke the same sensation, a mixture of ridicule, together with tenderness, and

restlessness, the time While it is true that "" Borat "" is a paleto that knows perfectly how to provoke the

staff. In short, a <¨ «criticism of American society, those little Americanitos on foot, who are not so

different from any citizen of another region of the world <¨ «or maybe yes?

" 0

" M <¨ «s hard Dogville, Von Trier shows, as he did in <¨« sta, that people are real

shit, only this time it comes further, because they are not saved or the cotton pickers <¨ «n.

People are fucking shit. That could be the t ¨ title of the saga devised in the head of that great son

of the great whore who is Lars Von Trier. Manderlay, 2005, is the second of a trilog <¨ «to which I started <¨« Dogville (2003)

and that close <¨ «Wasington. Now Grace is with a village where slavery is still present and decides to

intervene. Sometimes things, even if we do them with good intentions, should not be fixed, the great

plot turns of the film are responsible for demonstrating. M <¨ «s that Dogville, Von Trier shows, as He did in

<¨ «sta, that people are real shit, only this time it comes further, becauseare not saved

the cotton pickers. They remain invisible almost all elements "" present "", but what dazzles

at all times is a prodigious gui «¨« n and excellent performances, especially a Bryce Dallas Howard,

which I have definitely fallen in love with and that is In all safety, the best work of Ron Howard. (<¨ «To be« ¨ «

yours» Well, redhead if that is) John Hurt keeps narrating the story, divided into nine parts or

chapters ¨ «Extra« ¨ «a is my relationship with the director , since Dogville, this Manderlay or Dancing in the darknessme

seem prodigious to, what happens is that The idiots seems to me one of the biggest offenses that I have ever seen

, which made me reject of <¨ «l until I saw "" the musical "" with Bjork. I resent themovement

intellectualoidthat the smartass invented as <¨ «the Vinterberg and of which, look t <¨« where, for now there

is no trace. (<¨ "Or in Dear Wendy, is there some fucking point on the fucking oath?) I suppose when they

discovered the most pop music, the assholes gave up their principles. And we all win. Geniales

cr <¨ «final credits. A 9. PS: Go on a streak of highlights, hopefully <¨ «stay, although I doubt it very much. PD2: Despite

the rumors, there is no "dead animal" in the movie, although there was, ah <¨ «the news remains.

" 1

" Cinema from before, from the good, not exempt from depth, and whose "unique and disheartening end" ought to

make us reflect.

"" The black book "" (Zwartboek) assumes the return of Paul Verhoeven to his native Holland and, truthfully, he

could hardly "<й« to be a happier return because to <¨ «success Cr <¨ «tico has accompanied him« ¨ «a notable« ¨ «commercial success. M <¨ «snot

canbe asked. The gui <¨« n tells the story of a young Jewish woman who, after various adventures, joins the

Resistance fighting against the Nazi occupation in the Netherlands . Written by Gerard Soeteman and Verhoeven himself isVerhoeven

framed within the patterns of the genre of esp <¨ «as in its aspect II World War.gives the film a

certain tone cl <¨« psycho although a <¨ «Adi <¨« ndole his personal touch, clearly visible in the frankness of the treatment of

violence and sex, two of the recurring themes in his filmography. "What elevates the film, besides" ¨ «s of the

aforementioned, above the average of the films of his g« ¨ «nero, maybe it is the unusual depth of the

characters and the great interpretations of the whole cast, headed by a Carice van Houten that endows

her character with an unusual beauty, sensuality and maturity in an actress of only 30 years old.seconded her

Sebastian Koch, in a state of grace after also participating in the winner of the Oscar for the best film <"foreign

" "The life of the Others" ", which gives the necessary human touch to his role as general Nazi and a tough and effective Thom

Hoffman. The rest of the secondary ones are also luxurious. It is surprising, although perhaps it should not be from

Verhoeven, some moments of pure suspense, to entertain him. film and the ability to tell

the epic of the protagonist in a reasonable amount of time, which, moreover, flies by the

spectator. In short, cinema from before, cinema from the good, no devoid of depth and whose "only" and

final discouraging (and with this I do not wake up anything) must <¨ «to make us reflect.Valoración <¨« n moonfleet.es: 9 out of

10

" 1

" The film <" m <¨ «st <¨« itchy and foreseeable that I have seen for a long time, a complete disappointment, although ideal for

a p <¨ «public little demanding and lover of the dispassionate folletines.

As already happened before, two films of a similar nature are released in a short space of

time. After the cases of Deep Impact and Armageddon, Bichos and Antz or Las Amistades Peligrosas and Valmont, arrive

El Illusionista and The Prestige, both set in the world of magic. The second, directed by Cristopher

Nolan (the director of Memento) and starring Scartlett Johansson, Christian Bale, Hugh Jackman and Michael

Caine, will not arrive <¨ «until January, but the first one we already have among us. As in the detailed examples

In the past, when two similar films coincide, one is usually the little sister of the other, theduckling

uglya priori, trying, in addition, to get ahead of her older sister at the premiere. The Illusionist falls into

this category <¨ «a. With a limited budget (for American cinema) of 16 million dollars and with adistribution

solvent, full of well-known faces (Edward Norton, Paul Giamatti, Rufus Sewell and Jessica Biel), the film

is <¨ «made by the unknown in these parts Neil Burger and tells the story of impossible love between the

fiancee of the future emperor of Austria and a mysterious wizard recently arrived in Vienna.Hac <¨« in time they do not have < ¨ «to

the feeling that I had nothing more to start the film. Around the quarter hour or so <¨ «, I was not liking it anymore.

In those scarce fifteen minutes, the shortcomings of the film were evident: there were "peaks and truisms

everywhere and a flat accomplishment, incapable of giving rhythm or visual innovation to the visual arts." flashback of thechildhood

magician's, which is as predictable as one can imagine. Unfortunately, the film does not detach itself from

that sensation during the entire film. Even during the film, the lack of means by which it

was shot is also revealed. The shooting took place in Prague, pretending to be Vienna, but, and in this I remembered <¨ «Alatriste,

just in a couple of external enclaves, showing the budgetary deficiencies of the film. Something that

is not negative per s <¨ «, if the rest of the elements could compensate, but it is not the case. For structure, the

film refers to Habitual Suspects: two characters, one of them narrates by way of flashback the

events that have occurred up to that point, to which we return at the end of the movie, and from which

the narration continues with final turn included. In addition, the story of the film refers to Casablanca, the tri-¨ "angle

loveincluded and with a representative of the law corrupt but with a good heart, like the captain" Renault "

interpreted by Claude Rains, and that in this film is interpreted by Paul Giamatti.El gui <¨ «n is <" plagued with

t <"peaks: j <" lovers in love separated by their class difference, their reunion to <¨ «afterwards she is

betrothed and <¨« l under another identity that gives her much «¨« success, the jealousy of the powerful and future husband,

etc, etc. To this series of elements we will "add" to the most logical element of the matter, as an original element, which is

also not taken advantage of. It is a dispassionate gui, there are no great tragedies, there are no edges, there is hardly any

conflict, everything is a range of grays. The characters are barely "drawn", do not evolve, and little more do you know

about them apart from their generic "rich" description. And, in addition, it is predictable, final surprise included. The

performance of Neil Burger is flat, worthy of a telefilm, incapable of giving something of life to the subject, and clumsy

directly in the moment that triggers all the plot that being so t <¨ «itchy and obvious,

prevents you from entering the game because you know what has happened and what will come <¨" below ". In addition to the

realization of the magic tricks, something that should be surprising or disturbing, it is artificial and

incredible, since they opt for a solution to the computer, which It is totally impossible not for his "little" but

for the present too, because, if something is made clear in the film, it is that the magician is a conjurer, not

a being with powers. special.The cast is correct, little more can be asked to the actors with the papers

they have, although perhaps Giamatti is <¨ «a little past the threads in the final stretch.The photograph <¨« a, the costumes,

the art direction, are very suitable, refer you to the old cinema, even with tonalities andsolutions

montagetypical of the <¨ «little of the silent cinema. The music on the other hand, composed by Philipp Glass, does not help either,

due to the style of the composer, maybe it's not the most appropriate for a project like <¨ «. Glass, a prestigious and

innovative composer of the minimalist genre, has a very characteristic style based on the repetition of

patterns that achieve wonders in a movie like Las Horas, whose soundtrack is prodigious, but here <¨ «that

patron ¨« n is wrong due to the absence of life of the film. So the music instead of enhancing the

im "genes" enhances the tired, constant, gray rhythm of the whole film. In short, the movie "<m" «st <¨ «Itchy and

foreseeable that I have seen in a long time, a complete disappointment, although ideal for an unpretentious public and

lover of dispassionate newsletters.

" 0

" Empty characters, artificial decorations, bloody and "imaginative" deaths and an almostseries

endlessof clichés that occur without pause, demonstrating to aspiring filmmakers that s <¨ ¨ You can

build a film based on topicazos.

Before saying anything, we must remember that Los ojos del mal (2006) was at the time the first movie

of the WWE Films, a production company born by the federation that sponsors that show <¨ « acrobatics ass

homoer <¨ «ticas that is the North American lucha libre. The production company, in fact, was created with the sole aim of

launching a series of commercial films that would open the way for the great stars of this show in the

world of cinema. After this first horror film, the WWE Films has released two other films, The Marine

(2006) and The Condemned (2007), covering the futuristic thriller action genres, respectively . Itbe

shouldnoted, however, that the use of wrestlers in the cinema is nothing new, since there has always been an

endless parade of luminaries that took their first steps among the twelve strings, such as Hulk Hogan, Roddy

Piper, Jesse Ventura or the m <¨ «s recent The Rock. The use of these stars at the head of the cast is a

treacherous resource, since as one friend wisely once said, "for every Est <¨" n living (1988) there are ten

Suburban Commando (1991). At the beginning of this story we see how a cop is defeated and mutilated while

trying to catch the serial killer Jacob Goodnight (played by the immeasurable Kane and whose namewell

maybe that of a real fighter), famous for his obsession. ¨ «n with the eyes, which starts from their v ¨« lests and

then keep them in brine. Several years later, the same agent of the law, now turnedguard

prison, is hired to watch over a group of young inmates who must work to restore a

dilapidated old hotel if they want to reduce their prison sentence. As if the fact that a group of

juvenile convicts staying overnight in a gigantic building with s <¨ «a disabled guard to watch over them

was no longer a monument to the unlikely ¨« thousand, we witnessed here a surprise turn: the ruins of this hotel are

precisely the refuge of Jacob Goodnight, who is «m« ¨ «s who is delighted to have v ¨« cool victims

to «¨« add to his collection of eyeballs . It is clear that this initial situation, ridicule until,

it can not be maintainedcan not be maintained for a long time, so that the film can not be maintained. quickly embraces stereotypes and commonplaces

of the g <¨ «nero to turn the characters into a gang of hyper-hormone youngsters whocrappy

transform that slave work into a party worthy of the moreaftermath of Friday the 13th (1980) ). If

there is something to be acknowledged to Gregory Dark (pseud <¨ «a man who has directed a n ¨¨ abysmal mere porn movie

and a v« ¨ «deo Britney Spears) is that he has managed to mix all the ingredients of what is a

horror film of those that today are produced by the hundreds: empty characters, artificial decorations,deaths

bloody and "imaginative"and an almost endless series of clich <¨ «s that occur without pause, demonstrating to

the aspiring filmmakers that s <¨« a movie can be built based on topicazos. From the unbearable little

characters and the victims (conveniently exploited in their sexual attractiveness) to the inescapable references to

the traumatic past of the murderer and even a final surprise turn that can be seen leaping. The fact that

history reverses in a certain way what could be expected of the characters and their final destiny (b <"only

who survives and who does not) is not enough to recommend this loss of time" . We speak of afilm

genuinely bad, which repeats and repeats the most common places of the slasher, but without iron. Thisus

leadsirremediably to the most lamentable of all: Kane himself, a gigant who goes through the whole movie

breaking walls, pouting and putting on a laughable bad face that makes him look like he's

constantly smelling shit, a puppet with absolutely nothing of the charisma from other murderers of the past, an

albino gorilla that gives more laughter than anything else. It is true that in a film like this one does not have to wait long,

but I imagine that after having seen so many movies of terror you inevitably end up demanding more of

things. Ignoring this waste called Eyes of Evil is mandatory for any viewer

over fourteen years old. Personally, I pass ol <¨ «specifically about this thing.

" 0

" Maybe you do not want to go to the movies, but then I will not miss you on your DVD. I have never liked Alias, nothing at all, and Lost has not hooked me, so much so that even if I have <¨ «titles

of the second season, I have not even passed the fourth. As <¨ «, although I recognize JJAbrams' good ideas, the

truth is that he is not an author of my list, in the sense that when he creates a new work, I go running to

enjoy it. As for Tom Cruise, I recognize some great works, along with other forgettable and some

interesting. The truth is that it seems to be bored sometimes, and does not strive, except when there is a Spielberg

demanded <¨ «ndole.Con this background, Misi <¨« Impossible 3 was not on my list of essential films , but I

recognize that seeing trailers and im ¨ «genes was increasing my interest, and in the end I went to see her on the day of the

premiere. And when I realized. I had already finished the movie. Considering that it is a film of

action, it is one of the greatest compliments that can be made to it. Combining scenes of fast-paced action,

together with phases of dialogue, and where the character's life tells us, for the first time in three movies. "Maybe"

the style of c <¨ "mara very , very close, moved to the crazy, did not allow you to do a general picture, and

jumping like a madman, does not just convince me. A current fashion, which allows to disguise badfights

choreographedand little athletic actors, but JJ knows how to move it, like Paul Greengrass in the second

part of Bourne, and when he knows how to use, it is when he gives an unparalleled rhythm to the movie. The scenes of

dialogue, we are finally creating a character of Ethan Hunt m? ¨ ¨ s complete, that although it will not deserve an Oscar,

Cruise makes cre <¨ «ble.Junto a <¨« l, the rest of the actors are perfect for their roles. Their interpretations do not

stand out excessively (except for Philip Seymour who is simply perfect, especially when he faces

Cruise) but each actor fits the character like a glove, and you believe it. And that is essential in a

film like this, where you must accept the abilities and skills of the characters, especially Ethan, in a

world like ours, but a little more than videogame. , m <¨ «s extreme, with impossible jumps, miraculous escapes

and perfect disguises, but in which Ethan now shoots the bad guys without any" remorse, correcting a

detail of previous films that do not I had just convinced.The story, very well, a simple argument, with

a well-constructed and well filmed gui, where you vibrate with some scene (grit <¨ "ndole" "take it once" "to

Hunt in a moment that falls an object between the cars of a Shanghai avenue) and although it does not surprise you at

all, it does not let you fall asleep. In summary, a vertiginous action, a few touches of dialogue and construction. <¨ «n

personal stories, actors perfectly coupled to their characters, a very bad bad guy, and aactor

mainwho create your paper. You may not want to go to the movies, but then I will not miss you on your DVD.

" 1

" Olv <¨ «date of that overexcited green ogre, or of animals in danger, or of zool <¨« wild giants: Monster

House is the best animated movie in a <¨ «os.

<¨ «Do you remember when you <¨« twelve years ago </ i> and saw for the first time a hallucinatory gang? <¨ «Or cu ¨« ndo ten «¨« as sixteen

and you went to the movies to see J <¨ «hidden venes? Well, I do remember, and I remember the sensations I had

watching those movies, and how funny the cinema was then. That is the word that explains what is Monster

House: fun <¨ «n.Peli of animated terror macabre enough to distress a small" little creature

", full of details and, above all , good cinema, becomes from the first viewing in a cl <¨ «

instant physical« ¨ neo.Fortunately, and following the criterion of Amblin (Zemeckis and Spielberg produce, only this time

produce well), there is no "" stars "" in the dubbing, there are actors, and that is appreciated that they have also carried

out it in the version of the Spanish "¨« wave. The original voices, for Steve Buscemi, Maggie Gyllenhaal (you know who "is, his

character is the same"), Jason Lee (brief role, but as it is cool.) Also, it was the "incredible" ) or Jon

Heder lent his voice to a geek who has little to envy his Napole <¨ «n Dynamite. And you will see how great

Kathleen Turner is. Well, you'll see. Seriously, do not miss the opportunity to see a real movie

, only animated. Olv <¨ «of that green ogre so overrated, or of animals in danger, or of

zool <¨« wild giants: Monster House is the best animated movie in a <¨ «os. It is said. A 9.PD: Yes, The increibles

also are a 9, but Aladdin is the best cartoon movie in history !!!!!

" 1

" Dreamworks, the house created by Spielberg is making a place in the complicated world of

digital animation

not only Pixar dominates the animated cinema, but also <¨ «n, ah <¨« we have Dreamworks, the house created by Spielberg is doing

step by step a place in the complicated world of digital animation, and if already with "" Shrek "" I

got "what I <" ¨ «s of one pretend <¨« a (that curious "" touch "" of the classic stories "), now with" "neighbors

invading" "gets a ribbon" "of animals" "originally oriented to the p <¨ "child's public ends up in an

excellent comedy for all the p <¨ public, the people, already adult, who occupied the room when I saw the film ¨« could not

stop laughing and not is for less, Hammy, with the voice of Eduard "" Neng "" Soto (nothing to do with hisvoice

usual), is perhaps the character m <¨ «s simp <¨« tico of the whole movie <¨ « . Animation is quite successful The

time in the human characters weakens a little.), the fur of the animals, the skin of the turtle, everything is almost

real, a 10 to Dreamworks for its 3 to <¨ «os (almost) of work. Anyway, take away the prejudices thinking that it is a

tape for "" kids "" because you are going to enjoy it all.

" 1

" An interesting documentary, heartbreaking, funny, sad, essential to really understand what

the dreams of the filmmakers are, and essential for anyone wishing to face the adventure

of professionally directing a pel <¨ «ula.

Terry Gilliam is a peculiar film director, with a couple of great movies and several

antol <¨ «gicos' misfortunes. Wonderful "" Brazil "", "" 12 monkeys "", interesting "" Fear and disgust in Las Vegas "" and "" The king fisherman "",

but without a doubt, his personal Titanic was the accident <¨ "soo shooting of "" The adventures of the bar <¨ «n M <¨" nchausen "", where

the filming of the film was on numerous occasions about to be canceled, surpassing thebudget

estimatedin an unimaginable way and which achieved «¨« finish with difficulty. (As it happened before in

Brazil that ended <¨ «for doubling the initial budget of 23 million d <¨« lares) .P <¨ «public and critical, in addition, theyhim

gavethe back, partly also because of a regrettable promotion that made a production of 55

million dollars, collect barely 4 million. From then on, Gilliam was tattooed "¨« in the chest the reputation of

crazy director, deluded, irresponsible and cursed. But if what is good is difficult to overcome, what is badalways

issurmountable and at least later, Gilliam will confront one of the filming m <¨ «s calamitous and unfortunate

history. Among many other reasons, because its filming in Spanish lands <¨ «waves that already dragged almost 10 years

of planning, several unsuccessful attempts of preproduction and of b <¨« search for financing </a> ¨ «n all over the world, was

suspended" irremediably to the sixth day ", dragging with it a budget of more than 30 million

d \" lares.Este documentary, which at first so it was only thought of as a usual making off, ended <¨ «for

being a document <¨« only about the unsuccessful shooting of the project "" The man who killed Don Quixote "". Delay of the

actors in the preproduction <¨ «n, failures of communication and organization, unstable planning and something

ut "pica, disasters and natural inclemencies, planes that ruin the shots without remedy, aactor protagonist

limpingthat ends up abandoning due to a double herniated disc, extras on stage without previous tests,

the pressure on the shoulder of the investors and producers of the film. A shocking document to

understand what really lies behind the film industry, the creative process and the real nature

of the artist faced with the success failure of a cinematographic work that always depends, irremediably, on

too many factors: the weather, the technical equipment, the art, the luck, the health, the insurers, the

empe <¨ «o, the divine will. Orson Welles suffered" the unspeakable in a similar crusade when faced with another version

of "" Don Quixote de la Mancha "". As if it were an extra <¨ «a curse <¨« n, that filming was not over <¨ «either.

First I died <¨ «the main actor in the middle of this and shortly after the same director leaving the work unfinished. An

interesting documentary, heartbreaking, funny, sad, essential to really understand what

the dreams of the filmmakers are, and essential for anyone wishing to face the adventure of

professionally directing a film. «Cula.

" 1

" It may not be a wonder, although it reminds me of the nocilla. It is not haute cuisine, nor in the Bulli

find <¨ «s but at home with your bread up your ass will put you <¨« s.

Director: Vicente Escrib <¨ «.Duraci <¨« n: Less than an hour and a half, nobody gives more for less.February 15,

Year:1979. Viewers: 1,010,657 human beings. In Valencian est <¨ « written, translated into Spanish, I'veI've

laughed, andeven been happy with the whistle. A film of constumbres, although more than one, for one, would have ended in

the fire. A criticism They ask for this film, which by chance I found, "tits and asses for averted with

avidity." "Extra <" or speech the listener, more of laughter I have cried, with the misadventures of Visantetavirtuosa wench of

rich tits. imagine, see a rhyming movie, that up to this point would encourage me to make a

rhymed criticism. A certain Josu <¨ «dressed as a Roman, I did not put him <¨« s <¨ «the hand of the virgin of Visanteta, that at nine months Pavara

brought a criajom <¨ «s well criaja, because between legs he had <¨« a rajaque his the dinividad obstaraizara that no "¨" n

young man penetrated it. He wants to make her a saint, although she prefers to play under the blanket. On the other hand, Uncle

Collons, at night with dissimulation, gives his wife his ass, leaving her without fulfilling his function. He has

put the cheerful bone happy , the laughs have arrived, with what to this film that I have seen all the

world I recommend. It can not be a marvel, although it reminds me of the nocilla It is not haute cuisine, nor in the Bulli I

find it <¨ «rough at home with your bread up to the ass I'll put you <¨ «sPD: As the refr <¨« n says, in the ass they did not even

give me back <¨ «n.Uy, no, as Santo Tom said <¨ «S, this and no cr <¨« tica as <¨ «m <¨« s.

" 1

" Strong emotions, startles, (a lot) gore (but a lot) and, especially in the final stretch, a

rabid direction that always goes to me and that does not decay even a single second.

Ovaci <¨ «n (m <¨« s of a) in the room for the new savage of the French <¨ «s that will save the g <¨« nero. With "High

tension", "I was just warming up, who was going to say it," "Right? Aja has won in narrative, getting an

hour of footage in which the tension is loaded with an inhuman atmosphere that manages to get the viewer fully

into the plot for a brutal second part in which, literally, There is no t ¨ «tere with head. Something (wonderful)

is <¨« happening in the g <¨ «nero, especially with the remakes. In the last years we have seen a facelift more than

right of dwellings of fear, remarkable Texan massacres and outstanding resurrections of the dead. The hills

have eyes 2006 enters into this <¨ «last category <¨« a. An overwhelming logo that seems to take place on aplanet

reddishand some scary creatures give the starting signal for a movie that is enjoyed in crescendo and in

which Mr. Nicotero leaves his signature every five years. minutes. Strong emotions, frights, (a lot) gore (but a lot

) and, especially in the final section, a rabid direction that always goes to me and that does not decay even a single

second. Menci <¨ «n aside for the prodigious soundtrack of Tomandandy and the <¨« rida fotograf <¨ «a Maxime Alexandre.

Curious name, it serves to define the film, "" M <¨ «ximo Alexandre" ". A 9.

" 1

" The Host is not a movie of monsters, but criticizes a naive society and another not so much.

We are, then, before a social film.

For s <¨ «, with two words we could define the new movie« of Korean Bong Joon-Ho, director of the

acclaimed Memories of murder. First of all, to name The Host as incomparable for several reasons: the

press compared it with two of the most famous monster-movies of all history, Alien (an absolute

masterpiece) and Tibur <¨ «n ( entertaining and nothing more, and I believe that such a comparison is totally unjust and inexplicable,

since they have nothing to do with each other, except that they belong to the special g <¨ «nero. And it is that

Joon-Ho's film can be bought with Spielberg's film because of the social criticism that is involved in both

films (attention to the scene in which the film appears). monster in the lake and the face and reaction of the entire

population. Otherwise, the bugs of the three films can not be compared at all, because they are all

very different. But I do not know what this is, but The Host is extremely original, since it deals with

many subjects at once, has incredibly drawn characters and a gui <¨ «n at <¨« peak , since, as much as

the base structure follows, the film is decanted by holes similar to those of the sewers where thelives

monster, all of them sinister, long and with an end that does not know where it ends. So <¨ «that we could say that

the film is innovative, original in all its aspects, spectacular (attentive to the scenes of action <¨« nm <¨ «s

important), it is« perfectly coordinated, it has some special effects that deserve an Oscar and it keeps you in

tension throughout the entire footage, and in the end, letting go of your touch more dramatic and realistic. As I have said, The

Host is also a social and political criticism, something that I do not know if it increases the number of g <¨ ners of the film, It

also makes me more interesting and beast at the same time. Everything in this wonderful movie dazzles,

absolutely everything. The most important thing about this film is that it knows how to look good. I will explain <¨ «: when aends

film of this type(well, I mean s <¨« what to the monster movies) we usually use several t <¨ «peaks in all of

them (the bad bug dies and all, or except all, are safe). Another thing is that later they resuscitate forty

times, as is the case of Alien. In short, that the film by Bong Joon-Ho is not that it ends in a very different way (I

'm sorry with the small <or "spolier, although it was foreseeable), but you can tell, and a lot, that <¨« this is different Of all the others

, much more innovative. And this happens thanks to the sensitivity with which the film is treated. S <¨ «, it is a

sinister and claustrophobic film, but it has several of the most exciting and sad moments that have been

seen in the years. And this is what differentiates the feature film from all the other monster movies, its incredible

ability to unexpectedly attack scenes at "pikes" within its apparent context, that of adventure. And the fact is

that the movie, which has nothing, has a moral and political background, which I find most interesting of

all. The Host is not a movie of monsters. It is a film that criticizes a naive society and another not

so much. We are, then, before a social film. As we say, this is an elegant film, which knows how to attract the

public. And one of the most important factors that make her so special is, apart from the hidden g "¨" neros

that she shows throughout the film, her incredible "gui <" ¨ n. There are hardly any fissures, pauses in rhythm, urination,

aspects that do not come to mind. Thanks to its variability of genres, both fantastic, adventurous,

dramatic, political and comic, its gui is allowed to present many details, an <¨ «ctodas (<¨« c <¨ «mo me re <¨«

with some fun and depressing scenes at the same time!), etc. And of course, like any good gui <¨ «n, it presents a

formidable structure, extra <¨« a, clear and precise. I am especially excited by that sudden change in history

that develops as the desperate family of the ni <¨ «to the est <¨« looking for the sewers and

suddenly, it looks like a father and a son who are displaced <¨ «< ¨ «go for ah <¨«, because they have no home, and suddenly, the

director chooses to follow his story until a terrible event occurs and both stories are mixed. It will not be necessary to

say that there are a lot of spectacular scenes in the film, and therefore, not to emphasize "none in a big way,

since they are each more impressive." ¨ «Last, highlight the formidable performances of each

of the interpreters. All of them, especially those of the family, make brilliant performances, without funny faces

or in ¨ ¨ useful actions. Perhaps it is Song Kang-ho, the most expressive of all, and the one who appears the most, since he

is the one who interprets the father of the kidnapped child. He makes his role a wonderful creation of cluelessness and

courage at the same time. Although I would not be satisfied if I did not name the one who plays his father, Byeon Hie-bong,

with a nostalgic and brave role, he is also very alert to the scene he is facing. to the monster,

awesome). And to finish, I also have to name the kidnapped child, who makes a superb act,

worthy of a high recognition, at the level of Dakota, Ivana, Haley or Freddie. His role is strong, but

above all, intelligent. A wonderful film, rare, almost perfect, entertaining, bad, unpredictable and

spectacular. The recommend <¨ «to especially those who are looking for something new and know that it is not about Alien

or Tibur <¨« n, that it is The Host.

" 1

" Highlight the final part of the film, "very exciting and fren <¨« tico and what "mica" between the two

protagonists played by Russell Crowe and Christian Bale is absolutely great. Great Pel <¨ «ula.

In 1957, Delmer Daves created the Train of the Three and Ten, a film starring Glenn Ford and that became "

a cult film, for having a different treatment, a western psycho", "<¨" s close to S <¨ «before the Danger

and Deep Roots, by the tension they produce, than the westerns prevailing in the <¨« little. It was anfilm

imperfect, somewhat improbable, but really entertaining. Fifty years later, and in the midst of

remaking all of the existing film, James Mangold proposes a new version of this classic film, and

surprisingly, the film ¨ «is very good. Nothing changes with respect to the original, maybe it deepens more in

the characters and the plot becomes more contemporary, although traced to the original but. <¨ «It is better than

Originally? Actually, what the "mica" between the two protagonists played by Russell Crowe and Christian Bale

is absolutely brilliant, is undoubtedly the best of the movie, their conversations and their relationship. Russell Crowe gives to

Ben Wade, that nuance of bad boon, intelligent and wanting to leave his outlaw life, which makes you

like him. Christian Bale gives great strength and credibility to your Dan Evans, a man in search of reconseguir the

respectboth his own and that of his family, very honest and interpretationman <¨ 'n gal Actor <¨' s you do

that too <¨ «n identify yourself with <¨« l. Colossal this duo. But in these two actors the thing is not over, the

secondary ones are, also, sensational, Ben Foster making bad bad <¨ «simo with a lot of charisma and Logan Lorman

playing Bale's son with a lot of aplomb. Apart from the interpretations, both the photography and

the ambience that makes the old and dangerous west, as a great soundtrack of Marco

Beltrami stand out. As for the direction, it is sober, direct and with a frenzy pulse. James Mangold is a craftsman that

a director demonstrates his talent in this film, and remakes himself of previous works d <¨ «ndole a stamp of its own,

with personality and bringing out the best of a good gui <¨« ny great deal. I want to highlight the final part of the

film <¨ «, very exciting and fren <¨« tica , maybe the last final turn is not the taste of everybody, and during

the film some of the actions of the protagonists can be considered improbable, but it is a film. molecule

adventures in the west as the lifelong, and so must be seen. I really enjoy <¨ «and I am excited <¨« the

story. I recommend it to everyone.

" 1

" Pel <¨ «melodram« ¨ «exacerbated tics maybe <¨« s in other <¨ «a, with some other low blow included, but of

infinite sensitivity and revealing of his personal world; a clear summary of both his life and his character

that at this point prove to be only one.

His film «m« ¨ «s autobiogr ¨« fica. The gui <¨ «n reflects the many sufferings and some obscure aspects of his

life. She also recreates her painful childhood with her sick mother and even chose the protagonist because of the

resemblance to Ona, her current and "last wife". There is the fear of his notorious decline and the slow loss of his

beloved public. An ode open to the beautiful women who am <¨ «throughout his life. In this case as in no

other, it is unavoidable the soundtrack of Chaplin himself, almost as famous as the film itself and that accompanies

the film in a show of its versatility and good taste, despite not being able to write m <¨ «sica.Pel <¨«tics maybe

melodram ¨ «exacerbated<¨« s in others <¨ «A, with some« other low blow included, but of infinite

sensibility and revealing of his personal world; a clear summary of both his life and his character that

at this point prove to be only one. The final scene played in a d <¨ «oc <¨« mico next to the great forgotten by the

sound film as Buster Keaton was (but not apparently by his archirival Chaplin); it demonstrates both a gesture

of greatness of both, as the weight of validity and intact quality of their geniuses. Just to see this scene

of two great, gold is worth this film.Resumen: In 1914 Calvero is a retired music-hall artist. Save the life

of a dancer who had wanted to commit suicide and helps her regain her confidence in herself. The dancerhas

thenan affair with a humble musical composer. Meanwhile Calvero returns to acting in theater suffering a

failure, and then triumph and die of a card attack ¨ «aco in full stage; after insisting that the dancer

continue her career.

" 1

" The 3 <¨ «sequel to this Marvel saga is an authentic« disappointment ». There is no where to take it. Good friends we face a mess of incomparable size. The 3 <¨ «sequel to this Marvel saga is an

authentic« disappointment ». There is no where to take it. In the first place the writers have stood out, what is in s <¨ «

the c <¨« mic they have gone through the ass and have remodeled the story as they have wanted and over bad , without

imagination and with fabulously pathetic moments. When you work with a production of this caliber, with thoseis l ¨ l

monotonous budgets and, above all, with an idea thatwith basic hook since it is about adapting a "

c" mic, it is unforgivable that the final result provokes laughter. Of course it is laughing to not cry, because I

assure you that if it is to re ¨ ¨ red, then go to see it because not to lose <¨ «is your time. On the other hand, if you expect to see

something "" like m "¨" nimo "" at the level of the previous Spiderman, I advise you to think it </ i> "twice. Of all this

disaster that is Spiderman3, I want to highlight the following unforgettable moments: - Great Moment Moment: This

is the beginning of the movie «¨«, an authentic «horror», it looks like a culebr «¨« n latin of series Z.- Chepamoment

Wonderful: But let's see, < ¨ «what« happens to my beloved Kristen ?, est <¨ «desmejorad <¨« chasm, with extreme thinness,

adi «¨« s the brand new M <¨ «Jane of the previous films. She did not know "I would have told her that she was beautiful, because she is

horrible," someone could "give her a little punch." On top of all the more than 45 people who were on the

set when she sings "" Wonderful "", co <¨ «oy reco <¨« or there was no one able to shout "" Kristen my life,

get straight that the hump is horrible "". Fuck. someone tell you to go straight, is that in thepass of

pressMadrid equal, chepuda lost and like a noodle, with how wonderful it is, I do not understand it. Let's hope he

returns to his <¨ «little dor <¨« e.- Moment American flag "" because I'm worth it "": Osea, I have to put up

with the American imperative, seeing the superh <¨ «hero in a moment of glory in which art of

m <¨ «gia a US flag appears. There is by God, as I re ¨ «, absolutely pat ¨« tico. Anvindication.-

unnecessary nationalistMoment I get the hairpin: Nobody has noticed, that when Grandma Parker

is "giving her engagement ring to her grandson, she starts to get a huge hairpin of the mo <¨ «o, hahahaha,

momentazo will <¨« pray, pause pause and laugh without stopping. <¨ «A d <¨« nde looked at the script at that time? .- Moral moment: And

if there was no "little, above, on top, fuck, I get the sugar to remember it, in the final moment they throw us

the moral patri «idealistic ethics. Go, go that go writers of the pedo.meteos the moral where

I'm more pleasure of .- Moment I like the pepper: I forgot this, is very good. When James Franco (this man

has me in love like a fifteen <¨ «was, I can not with <¨« l, is the m ¨ ¨ s) and Kristen Chepa is ¨ «n in the kitchen and <¨« l

he says "" You like peppers "", as if to say "" what do you mean here "" same "". Oh! James contr <¨ «beats son that you are very

sexual, of course I would have said at the time:" "sisi <¨« with rubber or without rubber?. In short, a horror show.

" 0

" Entertaining, recommended, almost a masterpiece. Bayona's debut has the Del Toro label, but contains

(however) enough charms to understand it as a separate discourse ...

There is a reasonable rule, which prescribes that the Spanish cinema <¨ «ol of breath g <¨« tico muri <¨ «with Narciso Ib <¨« <¨ «ez

Serrador, but Alejandro Amen <¨« bar torci <¨ «the patron ¨« ny factur <¨ «an outstanding exercise in ghost cinema

aureoled with melodrama and pure fantastique Juan Antonio Bayona, the director of El orfanato, builds another s <¨ «lida

exception ¨« ny, without reaching the classicism of Amen <¨ «bar or the viscerality of Ib <¨« <¨ «ez Serrador, recovering face to

the gallery <¨ «a patria - the g <¨« nero in a way we hope that definitive. Everything we can arg <¨ «go to knock down the

general tone of magnificence awarded to the tape does not cease to be excess of cr < ¨ «tico committed to its

impartiality - or we are all unequally ¨« partial and of that, in the end, it is about - an outburst of

intransigence. Because the orphanage is a very interesting film and its successes shine above its

(natural) deficiencies. In addition, the cinema, as an industry, requires orphanages like <¨ «ste, which prestige our

billboard and procure, on the outside, an image that up to now <¨« only has <¨ «a La Mancha signature or specific

products already installed in the memory of time (Bardem, Saura, Erice, Neville, Berlanga). M <¨ «s that a movie« ¨ «

(or while a film <¨« ula) The orphanage is a path where the film industry must go onfor

its ownfun and extra <¨ «oy consolidation of a market and reasonable andprofit expectations.Bayona

dignified, which comes from the videoclip, relaxes the dynamism of concise writing of three minutes of

song «¨« n to film a horror story that at no time goes to the foreseeable inventory ofscares

syncopated, that the American cinema of id <"unique pulse picks up perfectly", but that gathers,handmade

perhaps, voices, timbres, echoes, landscapes and sonorities already seen. It seems that the film has already been seen, and

that impression beats during some part of the footage. Not so <¨ «in the end, po <¨« tico, exalted, a producer

like Guillermo del Toro to print to the film the air he likes, that special mixture where dreams,

reality, stories and the voracity of life embrace each other to create a unique, relevant, narrative weapon,

worthy of being included in our memory, after having attended its staging. "The orphanage is an

irregular piece, that's for sure. It lasts too long: it may not incur the resource of the filler, but it stimulates

even those hollow pieces, possibly difficult to connect with the main subject of the film. There are

lost characters, even missing. This unquestionable evidence has its justification: the whole ribbon

rests on the bony shoulders of Bel <¨ «n Rueda, which is« sublime ». It is a film absolutely focused on

the sentimentality of a character thrown on the edge of the abyss and shaken on that threshold by forces he does not

know and to which he must pay due respect. The portentous gui <¨ «n of Sergio G. S <¨« nchez, who belatedly «« in

writing ten to <¨ «os, according to a press interview, makes possible the fantastic artifice <¨« In fact, the hazethe gothic

ofstory that I made reference to when I started this review. The impeccable technical invoice dazzles

over the certainty of knowing that we are witnessing a jumble of scenes seen throughout life in a

multitude of tapes. It is excused: Bayona reformulates the clichés, the narrow ones in a very precise drawing of characters,

in a lavish display of knowledge of classical cinema. It seemed to me that Hitchcock had enjoyed

it, but there would be someone who would deny me that whim. M <¨ «o es.Ajeno a sensibler <¨« as, Bayona has built a

sensitive physical space. Is not the same. Let no one expect a melodrama, an interpretive tour de force supported by

di <¨ «outstanding logos. They do not need The (I insist) intelligent gui <¨ «n pespunta ideas that do not requireseams

subsequent. Neither semiannual boasts. Everything that is said is "very well said, and could not be said otherwise." If

the spectator is not a friend of childhood as the engine of a story and they load the idealized landscapes

around the mist and of mystery, then <¨ «this is not your movie«. The orphanage abuses thatatmosphere

intriguing, of classic servitudes and dark visual style. The narrative <¨ «intimate of the ni <¨« to Laura (Bel <¨ «n Rueda)

and of her adopted son is a modern extension of the Poe or Lovecraft story, but without the help of

entities bad <¨ «ficas. The horror we witness is of a poetic nature: it disturbs, but it does not saturate; It shocks,

but it does not scandalize. Everything is «rocked by the inversion of the Peter Pan myth and its offspring of children who

want, at the bottom of the« meta «of the metaphors, to return to life, or, in any case, that life does something so

that its lethargy (its dream, or its beauty, its cosmos of games and silence) seems as much as possible to it. This

deconstruction is Bayona's unparalleled commitment: a realization of the power of faith and how beliefs

can open new worlds and allow us to enter them. The Poltergeist effect may have been omitted.

It is the weakest part, despite being one of the most colorful and best mounted. Neither does Geraldine Chaplin

create a merely casual character, hardly relevant in the narrative journey of the film. This chronicler of his

vices does not enjoy, even if it seems, as much as he would like: he let himself be carried by a excess of love for the g <¨ «nero and

did not respond <¨« with the appropriate delivery. S <¨ «he felt it ¨« relieved, rewarded, when he attended «¨« to the v <¨ «final rtigo, to

that prodigious and contained episode of poems <¨« to pure. Laura / Wendy is the hero <¨ «na of this risky (and healthy, and

accomplished) ghost story. It is not the hero <¨ «na afraid of the others because here« I will discover «the truth with

fear and <¨« this, here is «the outstanding turn, seeks the truth to get lost in it and , in <"last instance, get

lost too".

" 1

" A film that reconciles us with the romantic idea of ​​those who believe that money is not the solution,

nor the "only" option. And that even, does not change anything or anyone. A thought as dark and pleasant as The

Aura.

After that miracle that was Nine Queens, being a "pear prima" with "success of criticism" and "public"

superlative, many things surely happened in the head of the director. That is why he took <¨ «five to <¨« os to meditate on

his next step. That coincidentally, it was a project of its own that dates back a long time and that the <¨ "success of Nine Queens

changed" «in tone, to make it easier to do it at its birth. The bet was made to wait and it turned out to be "the

confirmation of a new star of the Argentine, speaking exclusively of talent, demonstrating

leadershipthat it was not a coincidence that it was done. It's m <¨« s , this time the best Argentine actor -Ricardo Dar <¨ «n- does not become

the most exclusive of the film, he does not have to display all his expressive baggage with this taxidermist epil <¨« optic,

m <¨ « exclusive rite of the director, who even seems to tell us that his first film, was s <¨ «what an excuse to perform

this.Adem <¨« s, in the films of Fabi <¨ «n it is very rare that alg <¨« n actor out of tune The Aura is the ant <¨ «perfect thesis of

its precedent, but also it is like that, round, with a gui <¨« ns <¨ «lido wherever you look at it and it is«

excellently filmed in all your items. But it is dark and rests more on its climates than on the rhythm, slowed

without being slow; only the beginning sends us to Nine Queens with the scenes of the cashier and the so-called "robbery, filmed

with the precision" and the timming trademark already registered by Bielinsky. There are references s <¨ «. The use of the classical music and

the beautiful frames refer us to Kubrick, the climates to the classical thrillers of Hitchcock, theforests

thickto the same ones of Shyamalan. Until the assembly of the beginning, with his sorry and aesthetic "protagonist,

reminds us of the great Buster Keaton of The 7 occasions. Details nom <¨ «s of a gui <¨« n of watchmaker <¨ «a, but m <¨« s

relaxed. Only one "" lapse "" would be disposable, which is when the protagonist tells his experience with his

attacks. A scene debtor of the expl <¨ «Argentine cinema cito. A film with several layers, which escape in a «unique«

look. A scene of theft averages the film and the part in two. So much for the form at <¨ «pica to approach it, almost

absent-a steal that feels more than what is seen-, and that adds a dose of" "chance" "to the gui <¨« n, that

does not harm the same either. In the end, Bielinsky not only does not disappoint, but it is overcome. It only

remains to hope that it is not another five years. Thank you also for a beautiful open end, detail almost in «¨« in

the film industry of the «last 30 years». «A film that reconciles us with the romantic idea "Ethics of those who believe

that money is not the solution", nor the "only option". And that even, does not change anything or anyone. A thought

as dark and pleasant as The Aura. Another new cl <¨ «classic Argentine cinema. The death of the director is going to be a

difficult fa ¨ «to overcome.

" 1

" Opportunity lost to have done something important in historical cinema ¨ «rich ¨« ol. Again being <¨ «.Setting culebr <¨« n of historical dyes <¨ «rich and vindictive, produced, I want to believe, with the idea that a

serious and tr <¨« gica situation <¨ «n that occurred <¨ «Truly in Spain«, do not forget and remember, as a tribute,

the good people who lived them (and died). And I say "I want to believe" because I do not see it very clear.

Cuadri has strength and elegance in framing the shots, with a powerful staging, using well the

depth of field and getting, sometimes, aeffect, despite not having many

dramatic dramaticwickers.This is noted, for example, in the load of the Army "against the poor people of the place. There are no shots of

many extras but more than a few, but the good use of the frencial assembly, close-ups and

proper music, achieve the desired effect. And so <¨ «two or three times m <¨« s. But, in the general lines, the story gets out

of hand, filling it in a more coarse way with numerous t-shirts, one and a thousand times seen in the cinema.

As <¨ «, little by little, a film« that went down the interesting historical path «rich, drifts to the culebr <¨« n, with loves,

heartbreak, hatred, revenge and all kinds of human feelings, mixed in a way <¨ «eve, noisy, little

rigorous and undoubtedly haste, I say that to be able to cover much of the exposed in the novel in which est <¨"

partially based. The result is very irregular, never boring, but not interesting too much, more

or less, although the events are seen without any problem because the rhythm is <¨ «gil, or at least effective. But

I think that Cuadri does not get a good movie, but unconvincing but careful and laborious as regards the

technical aspect. I hope that the undoubted international effort of the company does not fall on deaf ears, but it is a

bit sad to see how another great opportunity is lost if we have done something truly remarkable. Another time, it will

be <¨ «. <¨ «Ah! As for the characterization ¨ «n (no interpretation, ¨« eye!) Of Fernando Ramallo, better to pass p <¨ «gina. They

are worth it.

" 0

" Pel <¨ «pretty loose, with great special effects and some little m <¨« s. But with aargument

convolutedwith characters trying to be complex, but they become ridiculous. <¨ «Why do not they do this?

We want to eat popcorn while disengaging the brain.

That already begins, that already begins. No, what are the trailers. Papa, <¨ «when the murci comes out« ¨ «lake? That is another,

that you do not find out. Chissst, which is already beginning. <¨ «am, <¨« am, <¨ «am, chup, chup, chup, rasss, rassss. Ah <¨ «comes out piderman,

ah <¨« leaves, ah <¨ «leaves. Give them strong. Papa I have pee. Tooomaaa, tooomaaa. Mabuuuurroooo <how much is left? <¨ «Are you going to

die? Dad, I'm dreaming ¨ «o. <¨ «iaaaauuuunnnn. (Note from a server, he does not see her in a morning session, which is filled with children

, the movie is about a boy who has a superpower that It turns him into a man ara <¨ «a (for

those who do not know the saga). The plot of this third installment is «divided into several stories. On the one hand

Spiderman has become a popular hero and everything is going well, so something external has to ruin his

life. His girlfriend goes from triumphant to harsh reality. His enemies continue to hate him. Um, now that I think about it,

the same as always. I have to admit that I got bored <¨ «like an insomniac bear during hibernation <¨« n. On the positive side

we have that the special effects are incredible, but as we are getting used to these things, they do

not surprise us. The soundtrack says my half courgette <¨ «n that was also« ¨ «well, but to me it seemed«

inadequate in some scenes of struggle. And some Peter Parker moments are very funny. On theplane

negative, what else? The argument is very extra <¨ «or, given that in a film« «where we expect a cold rhythm,

we get a lot of stuff. The sand man is too much more "rustic". The Spiderman with teeth if that mola, resentful

and with bad host. The normal Spiderman does strange things that are not understood. The black Spiderman is also

cool. And the elf's son is bland, and even absurd. Resuming, the film is quite loose, with greateffectsbit more

specialand a little. But with a convoluted argument with characters trying to be complex,

but they become ridiculous. <¨ «Why do not they do this? We want to eat popcorn while unhooking the brain. A

roll. Bits. PS: The kiss of Spiderman does not believe anyone, it is absurd. PS2: As the spidy toothy mounds, it

hurts to leave so little.

" 0

" The feeling of discomfort, of misplacement, takes over the room throughout the film thanks to a

staging that deals with familiar characters and situations that are vetoed in the cinema more than usual.

With two years of delay, Pal <¨ «ndromos has arrived on our screens, the <¨« last work of the controversial

American filmmaker Todd Solondz. Once again, as he did with his previous filmography, he will show himself "

capable of dismaying, in one way or another, all kinds of p <¨" public. Pal <¨ «ndromos It deals with the story of Aviva, a

twelve-year-old girl who believes she sees herself as a mother, she solved her emotional problems. Do not

take <¨ «to get pregnant and your parents will force you <¨« to abort. After the traumatic events, Aviva escape <¨ «from

the house of his parents and undertake« ¨ «a solo trip (of those that, in principle, changes your life?)

For an extra world <¨« and full of possibilities. Solondz's work is often understood as a radiograph of a «

American society (and, by extension, Western society) and, at the same time, as a Walk along the border that

separates drama from humor. This definition falls short before Pal <¨ «ndromos, am <¨« to understand, his personal work

in which he manifests a philosophy «¨« a «¨« intimate, intuited but not developed in his previous works. It is from

the constants of Hollywood cinema (often, through its negation) that the American director

develops his personal narrative, his poetry "a". A concrete example is found in the use of music in

the soundtrack, introduced in the dramatic moments of the conventional form and suddenly cut off, making

the viewer uncomfortable. It is this feeling of discomfort, of dislocation, that seizes the room

throughout the entire film, thanks to a staging that deals with familiarity with characters and situations that are

vetoed in the cinema. Aviva's journey, as if it were a story, was <¨ «explained through a

series of episodes. The spectator, accustomed to the edifying journeys in which the character gives meaning to his

existence, accompanies ¨ «¨« to the kind Aviva (and it seems that for Solondz, kindness is the result of

ignorance, of unconsciousness) for some adventures that end <¨ «n where they started. Be <¨ «Mark Wiener,

inform <¨« ethical and presumed ped <¨ «deterministic thinking edge, who, through some words that seem to

come from the mouth of the director himself, remember <¨« to Aviva its impossibility to change. It will be of no use to the

protagonist to be interpreted by six very different actresses, because her story ends <¨ «at the point where I left

<¨«, in the same way that happens with her name and with any other pal <¨ «Ndromo (for Solondz, met <¨« fora of

human nature). In the symphony of characters that accompany the girl during her trip, the spectator

intuits <¨ «something very familiar that she does not perceive in the heroes of conventional cinema. In its ambig ¨ «existential age,

often hidden under a double morality, we will see our fears reflected more intimately. As <¨ «, those beings

that at first seemed to us grotesque, remind us <¨« n our immediate reality ¨¨. Accustomed to

identifying with ideal characters that they choose, they transform and give meaning to their existence, Todd Solondzus

awakensfrom our sweet dreams of freedom by destroying the great discourses that try to justify the

human being, endow it with meaning, and record <¨ "ndonos the nonsense that surrounds us. In the face of such a drama,only

wehave to re ¨ «r.

" 1

" The n <¨ «mere 0. Schumacher has to« ¨ «added another fiasco to the inventory of fiascos that leads to cuestas.Flojo pulse, oblivious to the cinema that made him have a name in the n <¨« mine filmmakers with ideas (Tigerland, A

d <¨ «a fury or The customer), Schumacher has <¨« added another fiasco to the inventory of fiascos that he carries on his back. If

forgettable are the mental holes of Batman Forever or Batman and Robin, to name two of the most sonorous and

unfortunately memorable ones, we now have El n <¨ «mere 23, a test more than the talent it dissipates like

a gaseous drink exposed to the warm sun of the morning on a balcony. The artisan has become operator and the

interesting director in crass workers. This new approach to the supernatural, a subject that is already pleasing to him from

his promising beginnings (L «¨« mortal line, J <«hidden venes) is not more than a funny and trumpeter plot of

pitag conjectures <¨ "Rich, harshly developed from what, in other hands, with another enthusiasm, I

could have given a film decento.Es the story, say, of the normal man of a man that

a dog bites or the cartoon of a man that is reflected in a book that suspiciously brings him his

childhood and in the relevant recurrence of a n <¨ «mere, the pu <¨« etero 23, that harasses him on the fringes of summer and in

the dregs of the coffee <¨ «. Jim Carrey, so outstanding in other recent films (The Truman show, Olv <¨ «date from m <¨«

) now seems to me a comic in an astracanada with a hint of seriousness. And it is not serious. It is bad. This inconsistent, hackneyed

, twisted and disheveled spawn of film "around a mere" has disappointed me so much and I have

suffered so much with the time spent in recognizing my mistake that I will not write. <¨ «s.

" 0

" Quiz <¨ "s a bit long towards the end, but I give my first excellent of the course. The surprise of a <¨ «or, until

now.

When I finished seeing the movie, I was left with the impression that I had seen a "Weapons

Women's" review, without had nothing to envy to the cl <¨ «Mike Nichols' physique. The resource seen a thousand times of "" girl seeks

the top "" gets a freshness in this film that makes me understand why it was "" the "" sleeper "" of the summer in the

USA: a great fundraiser "" for a film that deserves it. At last something of coherence.S <¨ «that the girls will

see <¨« nm <¨ «s identified with the theme, that is why of the aggressive and cruel competitiveness between them, but it does notyou

scare<¨« is the boys, boring has nothing. His version of masculine light could be "In Good Company", but he

lacks the bad humor and funny situations that "" El Diablo "" gets in abundance. Hathaway started <"with

" " Princess by surprise "" and that has given her the background to make a comedy like <¨ «sta. The girl falls sympathetic and

responds in an impressive way to that monster that is Streep. It starts being the "" I am Bea "" of the

magazine, and you believe it, to become afterwards, by necessity, the best candidate to model that

program of Four. You can think that it is superficial, but it is a truth like a temple: to ascend we

do everything. That's what Hatthaway shows, and embroiders it. Not even remotely is ridiculous in front of hispartner

multinominated, which is "getting out." Meryl Streep gets you to hate her until she comes in, and you end up

giving thanks to God for not having a Boss as <¨ «sta. He's the best villain of this season, well above

Lex Luthor, and with that I say it all. The actress, in an impressive technique of ways and looks, crushes

mercilessly, and without ever raising the tone, to which "many people have around her in a way that seems totally like the

date. He asks for everything, he does everything to annoy and lead to exhaustion in the suffering attendants, and to <¨ «n as <¨« we

have to thank him for his time. <¨ «And who can interpret that role better than anyone ?, Streep, of course. I

re ¨« much <¨ «simo with the vicissitudes of the protagonist to get the book 7 of Harry Potter for the Daughters of

the Chief It shows that all of us can more than the ego of getting a "you're the best" "than our owndignity

personal. The protagonist travel <¨ "that way without return that is to sell your soul to the boss, knowing <¨« he that

has left him very cheap. The secondary does not disappoint either. Stanley Tucci is the stylist of the magazine who has

his own dreams of flying, and Emily Blunt is the secretary that sells for a good party. Two

great interpretations that are at the height of the whole film. It is undoubtedly the comedy of a <¨ «or, and not to be« ¨ «

crazy to think that Meryl Streep could <¨« get her nomination ¨ «nn <¨« mere 14 of his career. Of forced

viewing for those who want to see a comedy well done and with good performances. Maybe it's a bit long towards the

end, but I give it my first excellent of the course. The surprise of a <¨ «or, until now.

" 1

" A work of worship, although somewhat slow in its execution, which is directly linked to "The Rocky Horror

Picture Show" and "The Phantom of Para <¨" so "in terms of bizarre musicals it means.

Directed by Tim Burton and starring Johnny Depp, Helena Bonham Carter, Sacha Baron Cohen, Alan Rickman

and Timothy Spall among others, Sweeney Todd: the diabetic barber of street Fleet has obtained two Golden Globes and

chooses three statuettes , in a musical based on the work of Stephen Sondheim and Hugh Wheeler.Sweeney Todd tells

the story of Benjamin Barker, who is imprisoned due to a false accusation of Judge Turpin, who s <¨ «he

intends to stay with his wife and daughter Upon returning from his unjust captivity, Barker returns looking for his

family, but discovers that his wife committed suicide after the fact that Turpin wanted to take advantage of her and that she

keeps her daughter captive. Then, Benjamin Barker changes his name to Sweeney Todd, returns to his former

barber, and begins to plot his revenge. To do this, we will plot <¨ «with Mrs. Lovett, the lonely due« ¨ «of the place

located under the barber <¨« a. In the bloody revenge, she will find <¨ «a way to revive herbusiness.

beef pattiesTim Burton is a director <¨« unique and, therefore, drags a number offollowers

unconditional, is no novelty. Through the most traditional tones such as Eduardo Manostijeras, Bitelchus,

Nightmare before Christmas (despite not being the director) or Sleepy Hollow, the Californian filmmaker has created

a universe <¨ "Unique that intersperses the ghetto, the bizarre, the romantic and the tenebrous. In fact, when he has

rehuped the said aesthetic (l <¨ «ase Mars attacks !, the planet of the apes or the marvelous Ed Wood and Big fish),

Burton has not been as successful as I would like to go back to that, so the return to that neogic aesthetic with Johnny Depp

in the forehead foreshadowed a "resounding success." In the general lines, "we can" To affirm that Sweeney Todd is a good

film, although by far the best of Tim Burton: in spite of all his awards and nominations, of the

excellent criticisms he has received from the American press, And despite the fact that the sixth collaboration

between Depp and Burton contains all the ingredients to become a new classic, there is something that never

ends, and that something is its duration. a footage of almost two hours, the adaptation of this dark

Broadway musical can exasperate anyone who is not "familiar" with the Burton universe, since

its There is too much delay in a succession of musical permutations that are very successful, although somewhat tedious,

especially due to the almost total lack of prose throughout the film. So <¨ «Well, Sweeney Todd is a beautiful

film, with a fun plot but maybe" too predictable "and whose main handycap falls,

" only "in its musical base, despite containing moments certainly brillantes.Ya the fact that Sweeney

Todd is <¨ "nominated for Best Dise <¨ 'or Costume, Best Actor and Best Direcci <¨' n Art <¨« stica, not what is <¨ 'to

Best soundtrack, says much of what have been the priorities of Tim Burton at the time of making the

film. And it is that the only thing that differentiates Sweeney Todd from, for example, geniuses such as La novia cad <¨ «to see or

Nightmare before Christmas, is not the animation, nor the plot, nor the ambientaci < ¨ «n, but forty minutes of

footage. On the other hand, if something deserves to be highlighted by Sweeney Todd, without a doubt, it is his design" ¨ «of production and his

artistic direction, like always, beautifully executed and painstakingly conceived, transferred to a

Downtown London l <¨ «gubre and bewitching presented with a simply masterful sequence shot, although a

server reminded him in a way that Coppola used in Dr < ¨ «during the phase lic <¨« ntropa de

Oldman. And it is that if something is a teacher Tim Burton, is to recreate bizarre worlds and on <¨ «rich at the same time as

extremely beautiful and romantic. Resumiendo, dir <¨« that Sweeney Todd is a good movie < ¨ «in the

general lines, a kind of Sleepy hollow merged with The Rocky Horror Picture Show that contains great achievements and

a beauty that is plastic, on the contrary, habitual in Tim Burton's films, but that he blames quiz <¨ «an excess of

duraci¨¨« no, rather, a slowdown ¨ «because of an abuse of his musical numbers, seg.¨'n''look.Inside of

everything, your viewing is essential.

" 1

" Pel <¨ «series B where murderous clowns from outer space make a stop on Earth to

have a snack <¨«. Frankly I recommend seeing, without pretensions, s <¨ «what you want to drink a beer and

laugh. Insured

At present, the names of the films are enigmatic and extraneous, as if trying to deceive us to

hide behind them empty films. and based on special effects without rhyme or reason. Anta <¨ «o,

have« ¨ «names like" "Clowns murderers from outer space" "which is not a summary of the film". If theyyou

askwhat the movie is going for, you can quickly repeat the story and that's it. Certainly the name can be thrown back

, but friends, they do not know what they are missing. The film is about a typical town in the USA, where

couples engage in prostitution in an open field, the police <¨ "they believe themselves to be Judge Dred and the word hooligan is

heard without anyone looking at you like a coet <¨« neo of Matusal <¨ «n. Suddenly, a meteor falls from the sky (if it falls

from the ground to outer space will be <¨ «to the host) and in the place of impact appears a circus tent, from

which clowns come out who are trying to get into the People in a ball of cotton giant ¨ «n to go

eating them with a straw. Tempting, <¨ «true, see that the movie« does not attract me «to almost nothing, more

than to put it to give birth with pleasure and ensa <¨« miento. But here is <¨ «we have an original 100% gui, of those

that surprise you because of the extra« ¨ «o, but that you like for how well elaborated you are <¨«. Well, it's not art and essay,

but you'll tell me that clowns come from space, that their weapons are like toys, that they throw popcorn

that moves and turn into bugs of those that come out of the boxes with a spring, that they wrap you in

cotton candy, that their spaceship is a tent, etc., it's not enough to give it a chance. The

makeup and decoration seems great, surpassing many of those made today with a computer.

And it is that these are more human, more credible, and even tangible. I loved it. When I heard it, it was a series

B movie where some murderous clowns from outer space made a stop on Earth to have a snack "¨".

Frankly I recommend seeing, without pretensions, s <¨ «what you want to drink a beer and laugh.

Secured. Great, without me.

" 1

" A De Palma the gui <¨ «n is big and finally decides to cover everything to catch nothing.Le <¨« once that distanced the big stars of the simple actors was the beauty of his face

in cer <¨ «mica. That is, the transcendence that reached his aura. In the <¨ «last film« of De Palma, Mia Kirschner,

aka Elizabeth Short, aka The Black Dahlia is an aspiring star who pretends to be an actress, and who in

part for "ought to be the first does not reach to be the second. In fact, in one of the fewsequences

notableof the film, an indignant casting director asks him why he is unable to interpret

sadness. She states that she can "but" the frozen smile on her face betrays her. Paradicamente, the

only time when Elizabeth Short looks pain before the camera is in the filming of a porno movie in which she

never wanted to participate, but that she understood. as a necessary toll for his dreams «¨« osAs <¨ «in the same way as LA

Confidential, the novel of The Black Dahlia also disfigured the <¨« little golden age of Hollywood, b <¨ † ically because

Ellroy followed </ i> ¨ «the m ¨« maximum of the g <¨ «black nero that defends that behind every crime there is always a tragedy, a

story that deserves to be told. That's why fiction <¨ «the murder of La Dalia Negra, despite the fact that the policemen of Los

Angeles never succeeded in resolving the case and used it as a" vehicle "of a soulless city, erigi <¨ «ndose of step

in the great renovador of the American black novel. .De Palma wants the same in Cinema through the

stylization of the plans, the homage and at the same time the modernization, but the problem of the Black Dahlia film

is He has chosen a too complex story for his tour de force. Without eliminating subplots, never knowing

what story to prefer, to De Palma the gui <¨ «n is big and finally decides to cover everything so as not to catch

anything. Captained by a group of stars, which at least here have been far from being actors, theDahlia

Blackis not so much that it is a bad movie, as it is not authentic. In the end, it has too much to do with that

cinema served on a silver platter with which Hollywood surrounds in luxury the trash and pornography <¨ «a. The same as

La Dalia Negra could never star.

" 0

" An excellent classic "80s" that is worth remembering. On Friday, while playing the new Buzz of Playstation 2 (Buzz Hollywood) I found myself "with a film" about

one of my favorite directors. , John Hudges where as a reminder he made a review of the most

successful of his filmography <¨ «a, among it" "Rogue at full speed" "(pel <¨« by which I have an extra <¨ «a adoraci <¨« n),

"" 16 candles "" and "" The Club of the Five "" another one of those tapes to which I have special fondness ¨ «o. Being a teenager, a

Summer at night I found myself «with this tape, it goes without saying that I felt <¨« completely in love almost

almost instantly with Molly Ringwald who occupied my heart «« and my adolescent mind for quite some time, apart

from the rest of the cast Emilio Estevez, Anthony Michael Hall, John Kapelos, Judd Nelson, Ally Sheedy, Paul

Gleason. In addition to the main theme of the film, the "m" ¨ "tico" "Do not you forget about me." "Hymn of an entire

generation of thirty" ¨ On the other hand, among those 5 characters it is easy to feel

identified with one, the athlete, the clever but clumsy, the criminal, the princess or the crazy idealist,

forming between them a simple group where he is stuck almost the entire population. In addition to the argument, which is

missing (some kids are stuck in a school), am <¨ «s during the hour and a half of footage, a tape thatperfectly well be

couldrepresented in a theater, could <¨ «be theatrical to the most not able <¨« Alg <¨ «n theatrical producer espa <¨« ol

has not thought about adaptation? ¨ «n? <¨ «Or even in the musical? hahahahaResumiendo: An excellent cl <¨ «ochentero physical that

is worth remembering.

" 1

" Gui <¨ «n perfect in that all its parts make up a watch mechanism <¨« a. The prestige? it is a

glorious, enveloping, t <¨ «useful and wonderful film.

Infamous way to title a memorable film, possibly motivated by the distributor's fear that

the Hispanic staff would think that he was facing a progressive-solidary recreation of the shipwreck of that

oil tanker off the Galician coasts and the Subsequent repercussions he had with the government of Chema

Graznar. And it is that the lack of imagination of the patriots is regrettable and pathetic. That we are dealing

with a film of magic, since it pulls, to put a "" trick "" on the title, "nobody is going to be called a cheat" or,

precisely when the deception is "<" and the simulation is in the ra <¨ «of the <¨« last film »of Christopher Nolan, one

of the most interesting directors that we have active and that , for shooting movies of superhikes, like the

last Batman; or polic <¨ «acas, como" "Memento" "or" "Insomnia" "; or a fantastic cut "like this" "The Prestige" "is"

going too far inadvertently between the viewers and, of course, the Academies and

Associations that grant the annual prizes of the thing.Such as, let us pass on to glossing the enormous, powerful

and powerful virtues of this "" The prestige "", a film with so many edges, folds, shadows and bad milk as

that other portentous "" The War of the Rose "". And when two artists begin to climb to the top, there

are many sensations and feelings that cross each other, from admiration and

recognition to envy, hatred and the desire to destroy the adversary, to see him sunk, crushed,

razed and annihilated. In "" El Dorado "", one of the great masterpieces of Howard Hawks, twoagree

gunmen. One of them, Nelse Mcleod, asks John Wayne to join his group. Given

Wayne's refusal, Nelse blurts out something like: "" Quiz <¨ «be better as <¨«. When two men like us ride

together, always emerge <¨ «the question of who is the best." "And on that basis is <" built "" The prestige "": two

magicians of remarkable talent that work together are separated by a trical ¨ «ical accident, starting from then a

destructive rivalry that will take them« ¨ «to grow and rise up to the skies in their art and to sink and get

muddled up to the disgusting in their relationship ¨ «N personal. With a fascinating narrative <¨ «n fragmented based onunpalatable side costumes

continuous jumps in time and thanks to a majestic interpretative work of both the main actors

and theof Michael Caine and David Bowie-, with a gui <¨« n perfect in that all

its parts compose a watch mechanism <¨ «that works with Swiss precision and with a dirty environmental realism

that serves to emphasize the vileness and corruption of the characters; "" The prestige "" is a glorious movie,

enveloping, t <¨ «useful and wonderful that, without manique <¨« smos, becomes a prodigious game of mirrors in which

the contradictory essence of the human being is perfectly represented. It seems that Nolan, Bale and Caine repeat

together in " "The dark knight" ", la esperad <¨" sima sequel to her also "splendid" "Batman begins" ", in which

duality also plays, of course, a role essential and that we are already waiting, surrendered with admiration ",

all the spectators that we have hallucinated with" "The Prestige" ". Hopefully the wait is not too long.PD.-

<¨ «Someone knows if the t <¨« title of "" The dark knight "" refers to the famous graphic novel by Frank Miller that

has so excited to the readers of comics of the «¨« last twenty to <¨ «os?

" 1

" The cinematographic adaptation of the bestseller Memories of a geisha? is v <¨ "victim of an address <¨ 'lackluster n

and a gui <¨« n with m <¨' s holes than cheese Gruy <¨ 're. His excessive footage and his pretensions of great film

make the viewing slow and heavy.

A couple of masterful sequences, an invoice and an excellent technique and some actresses in place, do not save a

film of suspense. The cinematographic adaptation of the best-seller Memories of a geisha? is v <¨ "victim of an

address <¨ 'lackluster n and a gui <¨« n with m <¨' s holes than cheese Gruy <¨ 're. His excessive footage and his

pretensions of great film make the projection slow and heavy, especially in a large part of the

beginning and from the middle. Rob Marshall leaves in evidence that the excellent? Chicago? I came out of chiripa,

fruit of his remarkable talent with the musical, something that perfectly demonstrates in two or three scenes of the film

that takes up <¨ «this cr <¨« tica.Suspiro to think what I could <¨ « to have made Steven Spielberg if instead of producing he

had directed (which was about) this literary adaptation of Arthur Golden's novel. And even if they

had left the project in the hands of a Japanese director and Japanese cast. Eeeen end, a l «¨« stima?

" 0

" It is not simple enough for theunderstand, nor does it use the

smaller ones todramatic and symbolic elements with sufficient intensity and fascination. ¨ «n as to catch the

attention of the p <¨« adult public.

From the first seconds - which mimic the beginning of the community of the ring, first part of the successful

trilog <¨ «a Peter Jackson - we see that, unfortunately, once more we are before a brand product,

prefabricated to try to repeat the commercial effect depending on some formulas, which are a recipe for a "success"

sure. New Line bets again for a story <¨ «pico-fant <¨« literary origin, this time ¨ «n« <«gone

with a sharp edge, no longer so digestible for p < ¨ «public of any age and condition, contrary to the

story of Frodo and the ring. Without daring to make predictions, of course - seeing the result as a

whole - not to be "extra" or "seeing" the bet is shipwrecked and becomes a resounding commercial failure for

a company. product that for months was announced as the beginning of a trilog <¨ «a destined to leave anfootprint

importantin the culture cin <¨« row and popular. The content of the story is interesting and has the ingredients

that every epic fantasy must have, but the narrative fails completely. Lyra Belaqua embodies the journey of the hero

, an essential element in the cinema of fantastic adventures, according to the canon established from the

best exponents with an effective result: The empire strikes back (Irvin Kershner, 1980) or even the

aforementioned The Ring Community (Peter Jackson, 2001), or Inside the Labyrinth (Jim Henson, 1986). The key is

to make the spectator get involved in the journey of the protagonists, with all the "dramatic,

" "symbolic," or "symbolic" elements that tend to enrich this type of story that, at the same time, , they have made cinema the best

way to express universal motives through the esp «¨« ritu l <¨ «dico of adventure (literature is an art that

also has given excellent results in this« field », but for the sake of saving time, the cinema is much more

accessible to the greater major of the public. The canon does not establish an inviolable rule, but a sign of the

singularity achieved in a specific "narrative intention", a "bridle" that leads us to recognize -

indisputably - what is "good" fact and what is not "well done", something that in the end the passage of timeus

shows, overcoming the test of subjectivity. The Golden Compass has an excellent design of production,

good use of photography, and the contrasts between spaces of Victorian architecture and the geography of

an ice desert. The story aims to become an allegory of ¨ «a on the control of information (the

Truth), being this the best weapon of the physical powers. It raises an opposition between freedom and authority

inconsistent and very questionable (<¨ «We have to accept, because s <¨«, that we can only be free by destroying

authority?), Inspire <¨ «ndose in the institution <¨ «N cat <¨« lica to represent the sinister guardians of the secret

(<¨ «?). The interrelationship between parallel universes defines part of the enigma and the situation that adventurers

must "amend" in the next installments. A world of fascinating and visually represented subject matter,

but to which Chris Weitz does not know how to give it a soul. The dramatic articulation does not exist, but a set ofpieces

loose(p <¨ «simple use of assembly and irregular rhythm) that, although well ordered so that the narration can

be followed without problems , they are too warm and fleeting, there is no common thread that concentrates the attention

so that the little hero - and her antagonists - take the spectator 's hand and can is getting involved in the

adventure. And a problem even more serious: the very indefinition of the product. It is not simple enough

so that the smaller ones can understand it, nor does it use the dramatic and symbolic elements with

sufficient intensity and capacity for fascination. ¨ « as to capture the attention of the p <¨ «adult public. In

short, it only results in a bland pastiche, an excellent untapped idea, which is only saved by

some murky sequences, the interesting qu "¨ mica in the relationship between Lyra and the polar bear and the m <¨« It's a

hope that I can take flight in the two missing films.

" 0

" Comedy to the Torrente that made a very good box office in his d <¨ «a. It has a "unique motivation", that of entertaining the

viewer, and "there" of hidden aspirations. He flees totally from American stereotypes, as she

proclaims.

S <¨ «by the ma <¨« ana, the baby <¨ «gets up at an immoral hour from any point of view. My half courgette <¨ «n

tells me" "go down, I'm going now" ". After a while I realize that they have cheated me like a Chinese and that he has

fallen asleep. It's okay, I'm a dad with resources. Rebusco in the deuvedeteca something that can be

educational for the child and I find nothing more and nothing less than the second part of Florentino and

Segura's movie. This is 100% educational, which I tell you. The movie is about a group of jevis called the

Dead Rat. By avatars of fate, they face a stratospheric "fine", which leads them to participate

in a new television contest that seeks the most brutal heavy rock band in history. But behind this,

the Machiavell hide the "licas ideas of a multimillionaire, who s <" wants to get rich at the expense of theseThese

pringaos.movies I like, since they are made by for fun. They have everything to please me

, like women in leather, lumpy jokes, famous and famous in diverse roles, humor ca <¨ «amero,

etc. I think he did not tell me anything. The argument is the least, although it has a gui <¨ «n that at least follows in aline

straight, with a small« ¨ «debacle in the« ¨ «last part. The n <¨ «famous mine is good <¨« chasm, Torrente style, with

Luis Coll (in his <¨ «last movie) of drunk, porn actresses of porn actresses, the Great Wyoming of bad that act <¨« a

wonder, Ar <¨ «valo de polic <¨« a (this does not kill me), and a few more that you have to go look for them (like Monkey

Burgos). I do not know why, but I left the box for the whole movie, while the baby looked at me

hallucinating. Resuming, comedy to the Torrente that made a very good box office in his d <. to. It has a "unique motivation",

that of entertaining the viewer, and "there" of hidden aspirations. She flees totally from the American stereotypes,

as she proclaims. It's bad to die, but I get rid of laughter.Besitos.PD: It makes me more than 300 cr <¨ «ticas

comenc <¨« the blog precisely with the first part of this. As time goes.

" 1

" A couple of moments "" Made in Haneke "" stupendous crown the function causing the usual discomfort.

Michael Haneke is not a director, but I like it. After getting one of the most important films

of the nineties, "" Funny Games "" (essential and in my particular TOP3 of that d <¨ «each next to" "Pulp")

Fiction "" and "" Ed Wood "") and works of notable repercussion, such as "" C <¨ "I say unknown" "or" "The pianist" "(the m ¨ ¨ s slack in

my opinion ) returns, after the apocal <¨ «ptica" "The time of the wolf" ", to embitter the existence of his characters. This

time it is a marriage that begins to receive videos with recordings of his home and threatening letters,

with his raci <¨ «n of consequential paranioia. Haneke, as always, places the "camera" and "gives it to the REC" ", filming 75%

of the film with its usual extremely long and desperate sequence shots for beginners. A couple of

moments" "Made in Haneke" "Super crowns the function causing the usual restlessness. A phrase: "" I called you <"

because I wanted" "to be" ". A 7.

" 1

" It surpasses in faith <¨ «smo and dandruff at the same <¨« simo Torrente in this "" Super Nacho "" that takes place in the world

of wrestling matches.

After "" Cars "", the world of cinema must have "muted one day" in terms of competitions and

laurels. That should <¨ «happen whenever a brilliant mind shows everyone how thick it spins.

But it has not been the case, the world of cinema not only has not taken off its hat, but pursues and harasses us

with two niceties about the world of competition. Will Ferrer shines his campechan <¨ «to sure <¨« a with the frame of the

car races in "" Past de vueltas "", and Jack Black surpasses in faith <¨ «smo and dandruff at the same <¨« simo Torrente in this

"" Super Nacho "" that takes place in the world of wrestling fights. I do not say that they are not worth seeing although

I recommend more joyful experiences, such as, for example, undergoing endodontics, om <¨ «s surprising,

as, for example, listen to an interview with Carmen Sevilla.Jack Black pass <¨« to the history of cinema for having

discovered that the spectators always put on the side of the losers (or underdogs) and we want

They win when they pursue high ends like helping sick mammals or or "hu" orphans. The idea of ​​choosing to

cast a nun guap <¨ «sima complete with a touch of realism the social background of the work.

" 0

" The "only" hit is the duration, a 128-minute comedy is impossible, although the wait is rewarded

with a few "final" apotheosis.

That the best American comedy is born in the SNL (Satrday Night Live) is a fact. SNL is what here <¨ «LHC (

Chanante Hour), only that it takes twenty years to <¨« os on the air. A long time ago C + (Canal plus) emit <¨ «a, the <¨« last

month «of the month a SNL. From John Belushi to Jack Black, through Bill Murray or Chevy Chase, all, without

exception, have left the show. In "" Virgin at 40 "" the role falls to Steve Carell, who achieves a tender

portrait with his Andy Stizer, that one enters "¨" able virgin of Jewish features with some friends that already want many. With

fat and sometimes not so fat salt is easily seen chaining a good number of laughter. The only downside is

the duration, a 128-minute comedy is impossible, although the wait is rewarded with some

final cries "apote <¨" sicos.A phrase: "" I have nothing against the queers, I have friends who fuck them. In the

c ¨ "jail" ". A 8.

" 1

" The movie "is well" in the b <¨ «lica but laughs in the diplomatic or pol ร tica. The "" 300 "", a

feat of <¨ «technique, a shame of a pro-American movie.

This film has two very different analyzes. From the visual point of view, of effects, of treatment of

the image, of technical quality, of ability to engage the spectator,? And another, terrible one, that offanaticism

politicaland its placing at the service of the American Empire. Because, my friends, the United States does not look

anything like the Greece of the 6th century BC. Nor the film. "This is nothing like the original, which was the basis for

the Comic. Greece defends itself from a Persian invasion, in clear inferiority, with a multitude of doubts in its

strategy, with a <¨ «little where there was no« ¨ «a ses, but cities-state. The movie was ci <¨« well in the part

b <¨ «lica but gives laughter in the diplomatic or political, we are not in the Antig <¨ «age or in the Middle Ages, nor if you want

in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, where art was used by the church and the power to manipulate your

s <¨ «credits. Please! <¨ "Why" <"destroy what could" "have been a great movie"?

" 0

" Pel <¨ «focused on a very small public. Of those that make the imagination of the little ones fly and

the seams of the mouth jump to the older ones to yawn. Apt s <¨ «what for ni <¨« os.

<¨ "The girl who appears on the cover is not the one who did gymnastics in the movie that I saw from aschool

gymnasts, that was a rebellious girl who either went to school or had a <¨« a to go to jail? I leave the question in the

air, which intrigues me more than knowing how they put the gas into the soda. The movie deals with super heroes

who were treated with a radioactive to <¨ «os, causing two brothers to fight each

other as if it were the same good and bad. The past to <¨ "I, who went back evil for m <¨ 's the

good has to train a group of kids to be ablestop Superheroes and his brother. And this

is what the meninges have been doing, no. <¨ «What do you want me to tell you? I get bored <¨ «a little bit with the movie«, the children

seem repellent to me, especially the little one ». The super power of the fat is offensive and absurd. Do not leave

pechis or anything that resembles it (<¨ «qu <¨« m <¨ «s it is a movie of ni <¨« os ?, nipples always encourage and do not

offend). Total, I thought to crucify her, but she told me my half courgette <¨ «n" "Was the movie okay, <¨" no? "" And I

have less psychological strength than a celery, I said, "" psssi "". So <¨ «that now I can not retract, ha, ha,

ha.Resumiendo, pel <¨« focused on a p <¨ «very small public. Of those that make the imagination of thefly

little onesand the seams of the mouth jump to the older ones to yawn. Apta s <¨ «what for ni <¨« os. Exclusive use for

children.Besitos.

" 0

" New contempt of the American industry to the intelligence of the spectators, to those who do not offer more

than trash canned in a few meters of celluloid whose best destiny will be "to feed a herd" of

marranos.

With an argument slightly more original than usual in this type of physical waste, Cry Wolf is another

byproduct of the decadent and abominable part of the American film industry aimed at producing a

mess after another one for teenagers whose intelligence constantly belittles and offends, offering them "garbage

in the form of <¨" films? that they lack the most elemental of the myths and are limited to being a succession of cries,

v <¨ «absurd sults, deaths and persecutions in which a guy who walks at a step light reaches people who run

desperately. As I said before, his gui <¨ «n has certain touches of originality, although insufficient

to turn this aberration into a film. Plagued by t <¨ «peaks throughout its entire length (the m ¨« vile

with voice distortion, the hooded, the suspicions among them, the historical shouts <¨ «rich, etc.), it is

shameful that arrive at our country with two years of delay, and do so in order to subtract possibilities of

projection "into real" films that will be "ostracized and rotten". ¨ «Go to warehouses. Meanwhile,

this slobber, however difficult it may be to believe, will surely have a "decent collection" thanks to the horde of

teenagers who come to the halls to hang out, and fortunately I will lend him "little attention". Of the

actors, little to say, except that the pathetic presence of the decadent Jon Bon Jovi is striking, he began to

appear on the big screen although be to make the ridicule. Cry Wolf is not a thriller, nor is it a

movie of terror, or suspense, or anything at all. It's just an hour and a half thrown away.

" 0

" To be a masterpiece, which some will want to blow our alica <¨ «national thriller,

if that is what we want to call it, it needs a less grandiloquent tone. If Lynch saw her, he would see her. And

that's a huge compliment.

This is the film that the Coen brothers would have signed, if they were born in these parts. Or is it the

film to which a Camilo Jos <¨ «Cela had put his signature as a scriptwriter, which is to say a lot of this opera

prima of moderate truculences and provincial tragedies of those of all the life.Tambi <¨« I have seen David Lynch:

like those Blue Velvet characters who fatigue the streets in search of redemption and who, in the end, find

in the desolation of his life the "for" so they sell the p <¨ «litos and the vendors of b <¨« bias at home. Cabezudo

sketches the ocher of the Espa <¨ «to deep, that color trist <¨« just as it scales the walls and devours without compassion <¨ «n the green

of the roofs. It is the Espa <¨ «that we have once seen sketched out in the rancid iconography of some past not

necessarily remote, rejuvenated here, invested with an oppressive liturgy. The actors embroider the characters, which

are extreme, and clustered around a complex narrative tour de force that, at times, can mislead

the viewer little c <¨ «mplice. Suffice it to say that the captions on which the gui is mounted belong to a thread

necessarily linked, but strict, useful, to be a masterpiece, the one that some will want. «An

to blow our alica <¨« do national thriller, if that is what we want to call it, it needs atone

less grandiloquent. The magnificence of the feelings that populate the film do not drink indramaturgy

Shakespeare'sbut in the nutritious corpus of the rural folkloric tradition. If Lynch saw her, he would see her. And

that's a huge compliment.

" 1

" An ingenious and fun plot with some depth load that reveals the system's shortcomings. It is good that the answering geniuses are occasionally lowered into the arena of commercial cinema, among other

things because they usually bring different and even personal points of view. Both things are fulfilled in the "Last movie

" of Spike Lee, Hidden Plan (the original title, Inside Man, has a lot of "bad" grape, a game of

mirrors against which you can barely play the t <¨ «title in Spanish </ ol« ol), because from the first planes we see a New

York and its streets with an aspect and a light that had not been seen before , and above the director does not hesitate to cast

in a witty and funny plot some depth load that reveals the shortcomings of the system. It is

a movie of bank robberies, of those we have seen so many times and that we have bored half of them, and

yet here "," despite the long footage, the viewer has no time or eyelash <¨ «ear even Lee moves the camera

to his shoulder, nervous, when the false painters led by a masked Clive Owen l <¨ «the cue on thebench

Manhattan, and have time to create touches of personality both in <¨« l as in his opponent (Denzel

Washington, aging in dignity "and waiting for his own Clint Eastwood) or in the enigmatic couple that

make up the cold negotiator (Jodie Foster) and the president of the bank de marras (a Raymondian Christopher

Plummer who forgives that he does not have the almost ninety to which he must have his character). Not content with the

nervousness of the situation, the wait, the p <¨ n of the hostages and the hieratism of the kidnappers, Lee

jumps in a fast-forward burned image of what happens after the assault and the liberation, getting to increase

the mystery of the theft and personality and the real number of the assailants (because these, very

cleverly, dress the almost fifty hostages in the same way as they do). The pel <¨ "molecule is especially

pure entertainment, almost versi <¨" serious sin that n <¨ "a gem that is Die Hard, but not

dead. Lee is able to go on clues, from the first scene, of what is going on, and yet heus off

shutsat all times, until the end, what the thieves (and <¨ «himself ) are brought between hands. Knowing that

the spectator is usually on the side of the bad guys in this type of robberies (ask him if not Cary

Grant - well, to <¨ «he can not be -, Robert Wagner, Robert Redford or the gang from George Clooney), here <¨ «

adem <¨« s that empathy is reinforced by charging Owen with moral reasons (or unloading them to Plummer), even if it is not

until the end that we see his bluff discovered Robin Hood type. In the end, Spike Lee can not stop

denouncing, from fun, the origin of money and much of post-9/11 psychosis in the USA. Unpayabledetention of

thethe reh <¨ «n Sij and his confusion with a« ¨ «Arab, as the scene is priceless with the violent videogame

that the ni <¨« or teach <¨ «aa Clive Owen and the reaction of <¨ «ste. After more than two hours of film, you still have to

wait for me. And a curious detail:is the first time I see you in t <¨ «titles of cr <¨« dito mentioned

all m <¨ «musicians who play the soundtrack.

" 1

" Pel <¨ «on the search for a wreck full of emeralds in the waters of C <¨« diz. Fighting between thethe

sinsorgue andplacid moves the same one, balance <¨ «ndose in the stormy world of the adaptations of novel,

until sinking <¨« like a lead fish.

Director: Imanol Irube.Duraci <¨ «n: 108 minutazos.Estreno: August 31, 2007. Viewers: 275.744 ofbeingsPersonally

human., P <¨« rez Reverte is not my favorite writer. Not for anything in particular, that I do not finish

liking his style. But I think that the mistreatment that is "suffering" in the adaptations to the cinema does not deserve it

anybody. In the end I'm going to have to buy all the books of Alatriste to compensate this one, "I'm

sorry. The movie is about a saltwater sailor who is on the ground for a while. little problem with the boat (

some rocks scratching the same, or something like <¨ «). Total, which is involved in the rescue of a wreck (ships

sunkenare called as <¨ «, dear readers) with a girl who works for an official agency. Next to

them, they look for the aforementioned wreck, an Argentine and another type who acts as a foreigner (and who acts "bad", everything

is said). And little thing m <¨.s.A little bit of a roll if that's the movie, yes. Is that really, keeps a pace

sooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo The contributions of the actors is

very poor, paup <¨ «rrima if you hurry me. The one who acts as a foreigner is nothing believable, Carmelo G <¨ «mez still does not

convince me and Aitana does not know if he laughs or cries (although he gives us totally dispensable nude scenes, which

do not hit anything and which are not put to awaken the viewer, although appreciable breasts the viewings,

pardiez). And the story has very little strength, very linear, with a final surprise that can be seen from afar. And

if you do not see it coming, it is that the film is so similar to you that you have not even been interested in playing a fortune-teller. Resuming, the movie

over the search for a wreck full of emeralds in the waters of C <¨ «diz. Fighting between the sinsorgue and the placid

moves the same, balance <¨ «ndose in the stormy world of the adaptations of novel, even alg <¨« n

malicious dir <¨ «that sank <¨« ndose like a lead fish. <the best? I relax that you leave the

exterior.Besitos.PD: I am pleased to see that the binomial Spanish cinema <¨ «ol - tetas is still valid. Something you take to the

binomial visual.El cinema espa <¨ «ol - guys with f <¨" horrible SICO unfortunately for the sector f <¨ 'mines, remains

same.

" 0

" A giant step, but for back <¨ «s. Only Thomas Haden Church is saved, excellent in a role that

needed more footage or in a movie that needed fewer characters.

No news from Sam, so <¨ «of course. Spider-Man 3 could <¨ «be directed by Brett Ratner, Tim Story, Mark Steven

Johnson. there is no trace of Raimi's imagination, neither an original proposal nor a coherent approach.

everything is rushed and noise, and in addition it takes ninety minutes to start. It does not reach the extremes of Batman and Robin,

but they have things in common. The first movie of the amazing araña man seemed an excellent attempt with a

sensational first hour that later was lost among software. With the second I was pleasantly surprised: the

humorous blows worked and the characters did not get out of hand. Now neither good jokes (only one, after the first

encore with Flint Marko) nor excellences in the visual section, m�� It's the same but worse, faster,

bigger: boring. The adult stage of the character has eighth EGB dyes A giant step, but

back. Only Thomas Haden Church is saved, excellent in a role that needed more footage or in a film that

needed fewer characters. ��� Venom? Yes, I passed by there. The rush is very bad. And that mana not to wear a

mask.

" 0

" Artesana like few movies lately, the story is told without thunderous blows of effect, withoutrises

musicalor free scares. Get terrified enough to have to shower after the film

to remove the mud and blood.

I am amazed seeing "" Calvaire "", by Fabrice Du Welz, since, without becoming 100% original (something extremely

complicated at present, from that piece of 9 that I gave yesterday to "" Kiss kiss bang bang ""), gets terrified

enough to have to shower after the film to remove the mud and blood. Taking as models

Michael Haneke, a "" Straw Dogs "", a "" Psycho " ", to" "The Texas Massacre" ", to that great movie that was" "The Dam" ",

by Walter Hill, (another day I tell you how great this man was), a "" Deliverance "" and with a European touch that

by close manages to terrify the viewer, as the director of "" The time of the wolf "" or

Alexandre Aja with " "High tension" ", hyperthyroid movie, but that shows a director with manners and that will drive us

all crazy with his remake of" "The hills have eyes" "Marc Stevens, a shabby singer, act in a

residence of an crappy cyan Before, we see how in silence, makeup for the function. We are warned,

uncomfortable film and Hanekian echoes, open the belts. When Marc starts the trip for his next

performance, the van that drives is damaged in middle of nowhere. Begins a nightmare of madness, false

reincarnations, torture and brutality. Craft like few movies lately, the story is told without

thunderous blows of effect, without musical rises or free scares, keeping the viewer in constant

tension. It has at least three antol���gicas sequences, namely : that camera that crosses the glass of the van

to enter and then to leave, the dance of the buzzards of the town (possibly the most frightening seen in a

long time), and an extraordinary zenithal plane, although somewhat confusing, vaguely reminiscent of the famous

traveling of the overrated "" Old boy "". Incomprehensibly in���dita in our country, I thank people

like Max Renn, for recommending it, and KesheR, for being a fantastic "" subtitler "". A 7���5.

" 1

" A film absolutely essential in this summer, which without stridency shows us a complex

portrait of characters about a violent murder.

Interestingly, this movie has a more appropriate title in Spanish, than in English. It is the follow-up

that Truman Capote did of the crime of a family of rich farmers in the American Midwest. This follow-up

lasted for 5 years and gave rise to his masterpiece, "" A sangre fr���a "." The film begins with a series of

scenes that they show the integration of Capote in the New York high society of the time. During the footage there are

moments in which a kind of interview is shown to these characters to qualify the actions of the

writer. I do not know what the real Truman really was like. Here it is presented with an effeminate pose and some

"" outfits "" of the most picturesque, which cause a spectacular contrast with the sobriety of acity

traditional American conservative. This serves as the basis for fun moments that are splashing the first

part of the film, before the tone becomes more dramatic. When the killers are stopped, thebegins.

real n���cleo of the film, which is the relationship with them to get reflected accurately in his

book, and how the emotional implication is making a dent in the writer. The role of Capote is magnificently

played by Toby Jones (I have not seen the movie "" Capote "" of the year, so I do not know if better or worse) ,

showing a complex character, capable of being frivolous, incisive or tremendously comprehensive, as the occasion

requires. Exemplary is the Christmas food scene where it begins to enter the closed

rural society.An important pillar of the film is the relationship with Nelle Harper Lee, childhood friend and

great writer � Success (what causes Truman a certain amount of professional jealousy). It is a support

for the writer outside of his circles of high society. And she is magnificently played by Sandra

Bullock, an actress who has always been nice to me, but whom I've never seen in a great performance,

until now But no doubt, the other character is the murderer Perry Smith, with anDaniel Craig

equally huge, totally removed from his last performance as James Bond. An absolutely

essential film this summer , that without stridencies shows us a complex portrayal of characters around a

violent murder.

" 1

" It is one of the worst horror premieres that we have had this year, from its guilt memez to the

obvious lack of talent of a director who completely ignores the reasons why this saga It has

worked.

There is a whole range of options when choosing the arguments of why The Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Origin

(2006) is one of the worst horror premieres we have had this year, since its of gui���n (that contributes

absolutely nothing to the universe created by the original of Tobe Hooper) to the evident lack of talent

of a director who completely ignores the reasons why this saga has worked for more thirty

years, not to mention the shameful greed of a producer (Michael Bay, ���qui���nm���s?) who seems willing to

order this cow until the � Last drop However, the most overwhelming reason for dismissing this film is its

excessive arrogance in trying to explain the origin of something that did not need to be explained in the first place. The

tape of Jonathan Liebesman (prequel to the 2003 remake) solves this with a couple of empty phrases that allude

to the childlike math in the hope of giving birth to an "" icon of terror "" self-conscious and shameless. And the worst of everything

is that, as it happened with his previous film, Darkness Falls (2003), the first minutes of

Liebesman are not bad: a dirty sequence and inc�� Enmoda in which we see a woman give birth in the middle of a

slaughterhouse to a deformed child. The child is obviously our friend Thomas Hewitt, who will later grow up to

become the gigantic Leatherface. Thirty years later, when the closure of the slaughterhouse decrees the economic death

of the town and our friend and his family are left without their main source of income, thebegins

slaughter itself. These first minutes, in which the character of R. Lee Ermey (undoubtedly the

best of the film) "becomes" "Sheriff Hoyt and makes his declaration of intentions to the family of

never going hungry again, is the highest point of all the footage, just before the tape plummets into

the slasher territory and shamelessly passes through each of the clichés s that are normally attributed to him. However

, in this case such self-awareness is even more pathetic, since this is a prequel (

three years before the Marcus Nispel version). ) It is known from the first frame how it will end. Therefore,

any emotional investment that one can make in the victim characters is, at first, wasted. The

film then becomes a festival of excess design, free but with paste, conceived and

executed as a vulgar prefabricated geek-show for the average subscriber of Fangoria and for everyone who

b�� I just wanted a completely banalized cookie. At first you might think that Tobe Hooper's original

was little more than that, but nothing is further from reality . Apart from the fact that his excesses were

genuinely original there by 1974, the original film based his horror not so much on the blood (whichnot

wasso much) but on the portrait of that America that people refused to see: one from a backyard full of

ignorance, poverty and excessive violence. And yet, nothing in that film was free. This

prequel to the remake throws all that overboard. One example makes it clearer than none: the scene in which the

protagonist is tied to a chair and forced to witness the dinner of the Hewitt family, a scene that without a doubt

everyone will know is a direct reference to the original movie. Well, in the original, this scene had

meaning and reason of being, whereas here it has none, it is only a pop reference in the first place,

and in second place of a sample of free sadism on the part of the characters. I could give many reasons more

than the repetitive, predictable and unlikely that each of the sequences of this film results. ���Violent?

Certainly, but that is no longer any in a genre where Rob Zombie, Alexandre Aja and Eli Roth have

become names known to all. The killing of Texas: the origin is totally bobalicona, sup���rflua and

useless. Pass it without any remorse.

" 0

" Nine short stories, nine entertainments of sophisticated voyeur, nine dramatic artifacts that, in the

strictly cinematographic, are of a moving conciseness.

Nine short stories, nine entertainments of sophisticated voyeur, nine dramatic artifacts that,

strictly cinematographic, are of a moving conciseness. Rodrigo Garc���a, son of Nobel García M���rquez,

explores the feminine world for the second time after Things that he would say just by looking at it, and he does it with the same

narrative tool: he does not sophisticate the discourse, it is enough for a solvent casting (shocking, in some cases) and some

stories of absolute minimalism, but that touch the sensitive fiber of a spectator who never, in any n

case, is alien to the emotions that are coming, episode by episode, demolishingly. Nine lives iscinema

simplebecause it does not require the monstrous alembic Hollywood brand cinema to which we are so accustomed.

Author cinema, some would say, although that of the author���a is a very bombastic label that requires a very precise

definition of its scope of action. What I know is Nine Lives is quality cinema, intimate cinema, guilty in

some chapter of an artifice that strikes us, but which we forgive. The shots are direct,

brutal planes-sequence, camera on arm, fleeing the assembly, which would alter the spirit of the film.

Rodrigo Garc���a knows exactly what is appropriate so that what counts does not get burdened by apresentation

hollow, gimmicky, far from the small print of the lives that are told I was enthusiastic about the episode of the

supermarket, where a Robin Wright Penn, never better used, leaves us glued to the chair,

moved, altered in a deep substratum of our sensibility, so demolished by diverse astracanths and

lacerated by all sorts of films-blockbusters, understood by those who cry out for their

preferential placement in video clubs to continue their glorious income portfolio. Not forgetting Glenn Close

in the cemetery or a Kathy Bates with comedy touches in his hospital prison. Garc���a instories

this film of short, in an interview caught in flight on the network that he loves I'll tackle a

long story. Let's hope that he approaches it. We will see if it impregnates the veracity of the first two.

Life has its instructions: the film has among its many functions is fundamental to explain

these instructions, close them, help us live with them. Art, the purists would add.

" 1

" Nothing to do with the millenarian struggle between licentiates and vampires I do not know if I've already said this, but if it has to be something I'll keep the vampires, that the magicians do not have

any glamor, na They are uncouth and rude, much better vampires, where he goes to stop. The film is

about a vampire who has killed a great vampire and now all the other vampires are chasing her to kill her. She is not

alone, given that there is a hy���ntropo hybrid on her side (although it does more than bother, but it is). On the

other hand is the primal vampire, who has mutated and now has wings and very bad milk. And he goes after

these two to get some little things. And then there is a gentleman who does not understand who paints until the end, who

runs an organization that has weapons that kill a lot (in the theory, which are then poop of cow). Well, nothing

to do with the millenarian struggle between lic���ntropos and vampires, as they say in advertising. On the one hand we have

large doses of special effects, with transformations of human-lic���ntropo and human-vampire that really

They are worth it. The fighting actions are brutal and brutal. But the theme of the script islax

pretty. I think that these films that can not open a door because they need millenary keys,

since the invention of dynamite, seems to me a total stupidity. In addition it is quite long, but it is not understood

why, since few things happen. Basically, nothing, more than fight and fight. And by the way, the lic���ntropos

have become mere puppets that die with staring at them. Oh, I forgot, thestoryvery good

parallelof the birth of the vampires is, that could be made a film only of that. "Habemus

prequel" In short, or going to the movies to get your hands on the times you do not kill yourself, or sof��� and mantita when you

convalesce from a disease and do not want to think.

" 0

" He has fun, you have fun. We will all have fun. Strike to penetrate a story that you are as guilty as the one that m���s.Atr���vete to feel the fear, to feel

very closely the reality that nobody is � Free from sin or suffering.to look inside yourself,yourself

Gobetray, recreate yourself in your unjustified violence. Go play. It's too late. You were playing a

lot earlier than you thought. Once again, the Austrian director hits hard on theconscience

viewer's, doing what he wants to do well. one stops to reflect, realizes

that he has fallen in his experiment, in his particular trap for humans. Haneke is the puppeteer, acrobat

demon���aco who observes, manipulates to show reality. We puppets, forced to open our eyes

even if we look the other way. With a lucidity that gives real fear, terrifying, frightening, Michael Haneke does

not let us escape. There is no possible excuse for exercising your master of personal imprisonment. The only way

to escape is to press the "stop" button on our players or leave the projection room. .N Although

if we neglect, the tape may reproduce again before our eyes. If we have seen the film,

like it or not, we have succumbed. He has got away with it. The reason lies in the true meaning of the film. "" FunnyFunny

Games (Games) "" is not entertainment cinema, although it entertains perfection to

achieve its purpose. " . "" Funny Games "" is not, at all, violent cinema, despite its plot line. Nothing is

shown. Violence is contained, frivolous, psychological: the most hurtful. The only ones thirsting for aggression,

fury, and insatiability are ourselves. "" Funny Games "" is self-reflective cinema. Through gui���os, looks, gestures

of "" delinquents "", Haneke makes us accomplices of his misdeeds. It makes us feel real

murderers. Two kids educated a priori, the typical couple, the smartass and the fool, the fat and the skinny.

Figuradamente well settled (because of golf). Young people kill, hit, play. They just get bored. There is no

apparent reason to do so. There is no relationship, no movement. It is a nonsense in which we, the spectators,

recreate ourselves. Although, being part of the plot, maybe we find it complicated, we do not want to continue with the

macabre game. Lie. Let's not cheat. We want the killer to be shot in the whole body.

We want to continue, we want revenge.if we know the reason, like them, we want to see violence, we want to be

Evenviolent. Then, when we jump of joy and gloating when justice is done, the director introduces one of his

aces ( for many very questionable) and leaves the public with a face of imbecile amazement and disappointment In the end,

what we are celebrating is a crime. In the earthly life, in the movies Fiction fiction, at all

times, we cry for revenge. We want the person who pays it, but, if possible, with blood in between.

Shots, blows, machetes, a feast for the senses. The cause that our environment is

becoming what it is becoming. Haneke could glimpse a film in all that and created afilm

necessary, a film that makes us see in the screen our own reflection, and we are frightened of what we are

envisioning. Yes. That is us. It's about time that we realize. The two players are game

, taking it with some compromise, very borderline with the humorous. However, on the other side, the

tragedy can be felt with the fingertips. This mixture makes the film something really controversial

(provocative if possible). Are we having fun? "It terrifies us?" Is it contradictory to have to resort to such a film

to condemn the violence of today's society? Let us reflect seriously on this, and meditate ifreally

thereis another more accurate and lucid way, that is not hackneyed, obvious or easy to relate things. Influencing

the fact that, of course, the film is hardly shown. On the contrary: it is avoided. It is not manipulative to

convert the spectator into a convention by means of signals, insinuations, and then, on the contrary, recriminate that

attitude? That's what the game is based on, gentlemen. Pretentious, eg, laughter, mockery, teasing, lack of respect for

the audience? Maybe it's hating us to recognize that we're like that. Haneke is a goon. But a cabron without

pints. Basically, although it is embarrassing, we know that fundamentals are not lacking. The rest:plans

oppressive, tyrannical, draconian, asphyxiating. We do not know at what moment we can explode before the coldness and the

calm, deliberate, calm of the shooting of sequences that, in essence, are brutal. Tension of the Haneke house

one hundred percent. Neither the music is necessary for the director to submit us to an uncomfortable atmosphere, close

to the unbearable. All a fruit salad that took the same Susanne Lothar to undergotreatment

psychiatric. As additional information, the "" remake "" American "" Funny Games "" is expected for this same year, with a

cast headed by Naomi Watts and Tim Roth An uninspiring news, if not for the director will be the

same Austrian director. Anyway, it seems to me very little necessary, unless it is done to

teach film classes on the other side of the pond. And coming from who comes, I do not rule out that option. What do I think,

therefore, of the film? What is a Masterpiece and, without a doubt, one of the most clairvoyantof

filmsthe last decades. Let Michael Haneke tease you. With me he has achieved it, there is noreturn

possible. But I love it.

" 1

" Tarantino was shamelessly inspired by Kill Bill in this series b, a true jewel of the Grindhouse with

all its elements. That is violence, explicit sex, martial arts, in a universe full of dirt.

For the exploitation cinema revenge is one of the most recurrent themes, that of female revenge has

an important role in films as unsettling as the violence of sex or COLT 45.One of my favorite films

of These characteristics and apparently also of the director TARANTINO is THRILLER A CRUEL PICTURE, aproduction

Swedishwith performers that come directly from the PORNO and a director known only by to be the assistant of the great

INGMAR BERGMAN in a couple of productions. TARANTINO was shamelessly inspired by KILL BILL in this series b, a

real gem of the GRINDHOUSE with all its elements. That is to say, Violence, explicit Sex, martial arts, in

a universe full of dirt. The violence of this production is totally dry without artifices or half

measures, pure evil in all the characters, with moments of pure adrenaline Perhaps the best film of the subgenre

of female revenge, with an excellent performance, masterful interpretations, excellent photography. A

masterpiece of the most stark subculture.

" 1

" Incredible guide, great cast of actors, rustic sets and surrealistic dialogues. An

essential must in any Caspoteca worth its salt.

Damn, I do not know why they record new films, having wonders like this one in the Spanish film library. They

had Rocky and us Roque with his "" roquina "", where he goes to stop. The movie is about two schoolmates

who are not doing very well. One of them (Esteso) has a wife and children, while his

companion (Pajares) lives as a gorr���n for a dubious favor that he did at the tender age of 6 years. Both

work in a nonsense of a detergent called Pil���n, which causes the first gag of the film. Roque

(Pajares) was boxer and champion of Melilla, although many years ago. On the other hand, Federido (Esteso) is a

retired jockey given that he has gained weight (and is old, that a kid is not). Total, that Federico decides to get rid

of his companion tending him a trap so that he fights against the champion, to see if it destroys him. And there

appears Paco (Antonio Ozores) as owner of the gym. And it's already gone. Well, this is the one that does not go beyond Spanish cinema

. Fuck, it's great, everything absolutely everything. To begin with, the cast of actors, which is the most granada

of our cinema. Then, the script is incredible, of those that no longer exist. Why did you think of this? And

the originality of the title, what do you tell me about this? A marvel. In addition, if we add that nipples come out from

time to time, that the dialogues are surreal, and that the sets are "" rustic "" we have before us a

masterpiece of casposity ib���rica.Resumiendo, essential in any "" caspoteca "" that boasts. Although

to taste it well, well, it is better to have it recorded on VHS with the "" fly "" of Telecinco in the lowermargin

right. Fuck, I'm dying of laughter, that's good! Mythical phrases from the movie "" I do not know if you cheat or operate on the

appendix, almost better first. "" "" I do not have cervical, I'm poor "". Just to hear this, it's worth seeing.

And to tell the truth, it is very good to see her. She is so stupid that she is grateful in this crazy world that we have

lived.

" 1

" Brilliant product that reminds us that in the current cinema there is still a gap for quality, and that

this does not have to be related to entertainment.

Mart���n Scorsese has always had a predilection for movies in which gangsters, gangsters and policemen

settle their differences with a submachine gun, as he left � record at Casino and more recently at Gangs of

New York. He is a man who likes well-crafted plots, and for that he does not notice the footage, since

his creations rarely go down in the two hours. In addition, this former seminarian has the extraordinary

ability to surround himself with the cream of interpretation, also aware that Scorsese is a director

capable of bringing out the best in each one of them. . Infiltrados is a new version of a Hong Kong film from

a few years ago, and although it retains the spirit of the original, the American has endowed it with thattouch

personalthat He has always characterized his productions. The film tells the story of a police infiltrated in

the mafia, a mafioso infiltrated in the police and everything that entails. With his usual moral ambiguity

, the director makes us see that neither black is black nor white is white at all: neither the policemen arepetty

saints nor theand narcissistic mobsters demons full of evil. DiCaprio, Wahlberg and Sheen are at a

high level; Special mention deserves Jack Nicholson, teacher among the masters and who is capable of making a good

movie alone. The musical themes of the Rollings and Pink Floyd (played this last by Van Morrison and

Roger Waters) embellish the final result. It would not be strange that after five nominations, Scorsesegot

finallythe ���scar, or that Jack added another to his collection. Brilliant product that reminds us that in thecinema

currentthere is still a gap for quality, and that this does not have to be related to entertainment.

Sparkly.

" 1

" Vibrant, emotional, splendid story against the death penalty, not in the abstract, but very specifically, that

of this dreaming boy who made a mistake of dreaming and He ended up landing in a nightmare.

In 1974 the Francoist regime executed its last political prisoners; and I say penniless, and not last,

as the official forgetfulness is saying because of this film, because we have to remember that the following year,

1975, in September, He will execute five more inmates. It is possible that the confusion is in that,

while the one pictured here is Puig Antich and the Pole (which turned out to be German from the East, it seems) Heinz Chez

were executed by garrote vil, those of 1975, members of ETA and FRAP (of course, whoremembers

nowthe FRAP, let alone what its acronyms mean?), Were shot. Apart from that nuance,

there is another: this film is entitled "" Salvador Puig Antich "", and so it is registered in the Ministry of Culture. Therefore

, title it, in compadre plan, "" Salvador "", as it is being done commonly in the media,

is not correct. And we go with the film: I have to say that it took me a pleasant surprise. Theawaited me

typical life of a lay saint, as it is so usual today, with the consequent political pamphlet, in tost���n plan,

and I found myself, However, with a film that, although its first twenty or thirty minutes suffers from those

shortcomings, with antediluvian ideology at its peak, from the moment when Puig Antich is arrested, it changes

radically: we are then the tragedy of a man certainly mistaken (the utopia proclaimed by the

Ibérica Liberation Movement, MIL, to which he belonged, was a marciana of great care), but that,

even in the event that, as it seemed, he had killed a policeman in a skirmish, he would have deserved to die

executed. Those who read Criticalia know of my intransigent stance against terrorism: I am one of those who, as

Gandhi said, believes that there are many causes worth dying for, but none

worth killing for. That said, no one, not even the State, can claim the power to take the life of anyone;

Another thing is that some (that these days give the cante behind a plexiglass grille?) deserve to rot in

prison? "" Salvador Puig Antich "" then becomes a vibrant, emotional, splendid story against the death

penalty, not in the abstract, but very specifically, that of this dreaming boy who made a mistake. ��� of dream and ended up

landing in a nightmare. The tension is accumulating through the successive moments in which his

lawyer and next try to avoid the finger of fate, which fatally signaled to this boy Catalan, and whose

confirmation as death row would be given by the assassination of Carrero (after which the regime decided to

give a warning , although Salvador and his group had nothing to do with the famous Txikia Command of ETA, which was

the one that sent the Admiral to heaven?) will be the point of no return. All this is given with emotion, but

without incurring the lacrimgen. The heart shrinks, but not because of what the central characters cry, that they

hardly do so, overwhelmed by the terror that is looming and that they can not, for more than they want, avoid.

Beautifully recreating the time, based not only on costumes, hairdressing and props in large size (cars,

locations, posters), but also of small details, the film also narrates with great credibility

that deaf fear with which one lived in Francoism, when the police were not perceived by the population as

a protection, as fortunately happens now, but as a threat. That dull fear that is reflected in the

face of Leonor Watling was the one that felt then, an insurmountable but perfectly explicable fear: it is

the one that is born of the fear towards the total impunity with which the State, that te�� He ought to watch over the

citizen, but he constantly besieged him. Brilliant performance of Manuel Huerga, who from

"" Ant���rtida "" did not get behind the scenes: although with some forgivable errors, it is his n

visually very creative, in addition to a good narrative rhythm. The interpreters well, with special mention for

Daniel Br���hl, who perfectly embodies this boy in a scrub that surpassed him; we also have to

mention Leonor Watling, always such a great actress, here also in an ungrateful role.

" 1

" C���ndida possesses a natural talent and a charisma that would be appreciated by many demented and drunken stars

of a more mediatic than cinematographic glory. And Guillermo Fesser has managed to exploit that quality. Go that

he has.

A few years ago, almost ten years ago, I had the opportunity to personally meet the components of the Rubber

Foam day, on the occasion of the presentation of a book on internet for clumsy people when this network was somewhat

incipient in Spain. Since I was young I had followed them and I had always liked their surrealist humor,

full of wit and sharpness, and so different from the one I usually have because of my condition. Den of

proud Cadiz who acts as such. The Miracle of P Tinto seemed a huge breath of fresh air, for

its many characters, bizarre scenarios and revolutionary approach. All this combination of

factors conferred a very special nature. The case of C���ndida is different. Here, C���ndida is the sun

around which the whole film revolves. This good woman, whose character has her own real name, dreams of

having a house in America, and thanks to her work as a matchmaker, she manages to get to him. The ingenuity based

on the simplicity of the dialogues, brilliant at the same time that they are intelligible for everyone, is thefeature

mainof this film. Observing this lady's manner of functioning prevails in the interest of

any other aspect of the film. She alone achieves what many great stars do not achieve, and that is to fill the

screen and make the rest of the cast and the purely cinematographic issues languish. And

although it may seem exaggerated, Fesser defined this woman perfectly, without any academic training,

when she said that having had access to appropriate studies, surely today I would be sitting on aMaybe it's

stool in Congress.not a masterpiece, but the pleasure of seeing a simple and charming lady

like C���ndida, makes up for almost the five euros that today have nailed me through the entrance.

" 1

" Nothing was the same and what is more important, no one was the same again. There are millions of horror movies a year. In fact, most are copies of copies of old remakes.

But the one that concerns us, reinvent the genre. Nothing was the same again and what is more important, nobody

was the same again. At no time do I deny that this is one of Hitch's most overrated works, but as

with the Beatles the audience connected in a special way, and when that happens, everything becomes

a fantastic madness. Let's remember, the great success that supposed Psychosis was due more to marketing than to the

novelty of the invention, still thus, all that confused guiding structure that left the spectator without a

protagonist in the middle of the film was shocking. The public perceived a type of terror that they had never before lived in a

movie theater, a terror towards the unknown, nobody had no idea which It would be the next movement of the

master of suspense. And is that studying the film in detail one realizes that the protagonist of

the novel is terror in its pure state. The absence of a face to blame for all the evil that is

happening in the Bates Motel was what the director wanted from the beginning, because as you tend to

say, there is no greater fear than the one do not know The simple and shocking slashing scenes make

our blood freeze to the rhythm of that disturbing music that takes over our nervous control and

makes us forget about failures as incomprehensible as the fact that while Marion (Janet Leigh) is being

stabbed in the shower, not a single blob of blood is seen on the knife. If I had to make a brief

synopsis of the plot for all those who have not yet had the pleasure of seeing it, I would say that the tape tells the

story of a young embezzler who arrives at the Bates motel with $ 40,000. In this section you will have

to do with an odd owner and his dominant mother. I remember that the first time I visualized the

film I loved it, it was something avant-garde and of I liked it, even though it retained its classic touch. Something that

undoubtedly makes it a unique piece. And although in the years after its release there were sequels that would

try to take advantage through the success harvested by the original, they never even reached the sole of the

shoes ( Psycho II / Psycho III / Psycho IV). As with most sagas of terror, if they see that a

character has success they squeeze it to the maximum, systematically destroying the charm and mystery that it possessed.

Still one of the best movies of all time, this was not without a remake, which is so

fashionable in modern times due to the lack of imagination. nya the compulsive need to acquire

income. This fact denotes how today the industry prevails over art. To finish I would

like to refer to the soundtrack, which, in my opinion is part of the most memorable genre

along with the Radiance.

" 1

" The talent of Johnny Depp is made up and wasted in the hands of an unbearable character Freddy: I ​​have no words to express how much I like this man. And do not think that what I mean is mitomania

, it's just that Johnny Depp is one of the best actors today, and he's one of the only ones he can get ahead

with. cap a film that a priori could seem vulgar. Yes, it is a bit Lord Byron, but it shows very well,

and it is not the first nor the last one that does it, the fall from the top of a true genius of the poetry that It has

been everything for women (and men). But its twist is very appetizing, really. The Libertine

has di���logos of those that make vibrate because more than interpreted are recited with intensity. And in addition, it

immediately engages with a principle (and an ending) that directly involves the viewer. After this

performance, I mean, I'm looking forward to seeing, as I get, the best of the pirate Jack Sparrow. By the way,

she, although unattractive, is a love. Jason: I totally disagree. We can not let ourselves be carried away by our

personal passions when analyzing The libertine. Depp is one of the best actors and with theregisters

widestthat move today through the cinema screens. However, and although it is hard to say, in

The Libertine his talent is made up and wasted in the hands of an unbearable character like Marqu���s de

Sade during low hours. And, speaking of Sade, Quills was a film in which the actor, Geoffrey Rush, became

the absolute protagonist. On that occasion, despite the simplistic subject matter, the result was

acceptable. The same can not be said for The Libertine. Here, not even Depp can do anything to bring

forward a film doomed to failure from the first minute of footage, which promises something that never

comes to fruition. Luckily, of course.

" 0

" It is absolutely disappointing and disheartening that such an interesting and exquisitely well-story as

craftedthat of 'Death Note' is missed to the maximum in its cinematographic adaptation.

'Death Note' has undoubtedly been the manganime phenomenon that has hit hardest in the country of thesun

risingin the last few years. His original and addictive plot has caught many mangakas throughout all this

time. An army of followers has emerged and that has been noticed. especially in the portfolio of the creators and

editors, that seeing the calico, adapted in a record time the manga in a fabulous anime. But, undoubtedly, those

who were smarter than the hunger were those of Warner Bros. Japan, who quickly put the batteries and

premiered in 2006, the year 'Death Note' par excellence, two films based on the manga of Takeshi Obata and

Tsugumi ���ba.It is absolutely disappointing and disheartening that such an interesting and exquisitelystory as

well-craftedthat of 'Death Note' is wasted to the maximum in its cinematic adaptation. Directed

by Shusuke Kaneko, 'Death Note' has characters that are blurred to the dome, without any hint of a soul

nor charisma, simple caricatures of what was presented to us in the manga or in the anime. Mere specters wandering,

expressionless to say enough (Tatsuya Fujiwara or Asaka Seto reach the Nirvana caradeparedismo), who

fail to connect with the viewer at any time. It is terribly sad that it transmits a thousand times more

computer generated monkeys, such as the Ryuuk shinigami (who, by the way, sings La Traviata from the

moon.), Not the cast itself. But that is not the main thing. failure of this movie. The really serious thing is that

as adaptation is really painful. While I was watching it, it put me in the situation of someone who has not heard about

'Death Note' in his life, and I was wondering if he really found out? Something. It gives the feeling that someone

was telling you the manga or the anime so far above, without going into details that, although they may

seem small, are vital.As���, ��� This film lacks the true essence of 'Death Note', and is positioned

as a simple complement (and gui���o towards the fans) to the whole universe that is being built around the

phenomenon. �� less. The rhythm of the film, at times frantic and at times tedious as a day without internet, does noteither.

helpHowever, highlight the work of directing in the final minutes of the tape, very correct and vibrant.

although arriving late. Also the work that Ken'ichi Matsuyama performs playing L, therival

protagonist's, Yagami Light, which expresses with a resounding and rewarding success to the character. And finally,

underline the film's prologue: next to L (for a change), best of all, without a doubt.

" 0

" Failed attempt to emulate an atmosphere of concern that at no time is up to what its

director has shown he is capable of doing.

Since I was pleasantly surprised with Time of Brave (whose criticism can also be read on this

website), I was curious to see El Fondo del Mar, Daniel Szifron's previous work and that the own

producer fits within the genre of suspense or thriller. I do not think I can fit exactly into

any of these categories; rather it is a kind of drama with slightly anguished tints, as if it were

intended to create the Hitchcockian atmosphere so persecuted on many occasions. All this while

recognizing a certain quality in the cohesion In the gui���n, quite coherent and well assembled, as well as in the

sober and correct interpretation of all its cast, with the curious testimonial appearance, in the manner of a caneo, of

a then semi-unknown Diego Peretti, current undisputed figure of the Argentine cinema by own m���ritos. In

any case, the film is predictable and disappoints not to find any surprise or plot twist.

The film is therefore excessively flat, which makes it a bit boring at times, because it adopts antempo

excessively slowfor the story it wants to tell. And much more so if you want to qualify as Thriller.

Released in 2003, it makes no allusion to the political economic situation of the country at that time, since

it focuses on Few economic characters, at least, medium high, that although it seems lie,

still exist in the plundered country that one day was an economic power I came to the aid of Spain when

I needed it the most. In general, a little disappointing after the high expectations that I had created with

Brave Time. Although maybe it's my fault to see the most current movie first and leave it for later

, when its director was a lot less expert.

" 0

" Fun, tender and at the same time devastating with the American lifestyle. It is worth going to see her to have

a good time.

Every year there is a small film, low budget, unpretentious and with little known faces

that makes a hole in the tastes of the public and the cr� Ethics and ends up even put in several nominations to

the oscars. We do not know if it will be the case (I say it for the oscars), but the truth is that this is a film that

can be recommended, just not very enthusiastic but with the security that will please everything The world narrates

the adventures of an American family in low hours that has to take the girl to a beauty contest.

This simple plot excuse serves to make us laugh for little more than an hour and a half of thelifestyle

Americanbased on winners and losers. All the members of this peculiar family are

losers who will have to learn to live with it and live with each other. The type of family and thes���tira

presentedof the average American family is parallel to the one we know from the television series Malcom or The

Simpsons, only that in this movie everyone has aspirations of The whole cast is

great, from the father and the mother, who are the best known (Greg Kinnear and Toni Collette, respectively),

to the drug-addicted grandfather (Alan Arkin), gay uncle (Steve Carell) and silent brother (Paul Dano). But the one that is

incredibly excellent is the small protagonist Abigail Breslin, who cries as I have not seen anothercry

childin the cinema. In short, a funny, tender movie and at the same time devastating with the American lifestyle

that is worth going to see to have a good time.

" 1

" The film is a perfect example to explain to those who do not know what the western is. One of the best

western in the history of cinema.

Passion of the strong is the anti-western: Ford discards its talent in pure action, although it comes

in its time and fixes the typical tone and tr��� gico of the genre. Nor is it a baroque western: the economy of media and

the absence of artifices gives an unusual poetic splendor, subordinated to the conquest of ideals and the

romanticism of the birth of a nation. Because Ford says that: the foundation of a country, the progressive

seat of the laws that will govern it and the conditions of life for the settlers to create a folklore,

allow the worship of a religion. And, above all, subscribe to the stereotype of a nation, because the United

States of America is born with Wyatt Earp and with these characters on the backs of fatality, driving cattle through

dusty landscapes and forging legends where the heroes obey strict codes of honor. The film is

a perfect example to explain to the one who does not know what the western is: towns that appear in the nothingness and that

live around the tavern where the bars are endless and the whiskey is the leisure of the

dispossessed and those who lampan for a better future; sheriffs with a strict strict of duty and a well-

established moral integrity; pianists who come to be juke-box of the time. Passion of the forts (My darling

Clementine) is, on the other hand, Duel of titans, The hour of the pistols, Tombstone, Duel in OK Corral or Wyatt

Earp: they are all the same movie. John Ford makes the free version of the primal argument, the one that most

departs from the libretto and dramatizes the sociopolitical vision of a man who invented , in his way, a genre, the

western. Tombstone, the antològic town, to which Bob Dylan dedicated an accelerated immortal blues, is thisTombstone

Ford. Henry Fonda is Wyatt Earp, the rancher to whom chance and revenge make him sheriff. Doc

Holliday, that tormented, troubled, and continually self-redeeming surgeon is Victor Mature. And

John Ford, of course, who has the wit and sensitivity to turn violence into poetry, to subvert

an argument necessarily fragile and prone to action in an intimate picture of customs, in a beautiful

portrait of a nascent society, where men killed and died for trivial matters and where the law was

a conversation between gentlemen leaning at the bar of a bar.

" 1

" A film more than remarkable and an outstanding debut that unfortunately has gone unnoticed by the

undercard. Of the best of the year.

The "" raw "" is a test of fire. The directors are "" sentenced "" according to their first work. More

curiosity awakens if they are actors involved with filmmakers. And can they be qualified within a wide

range of adjectives: promising, bland, great? However, I would add another adjective that defines ���sta and

other two films like Un franco, 14 pesetas or Zambrano's second film, Habana Blues: SENTIDA The

stories that have an autobiographical touch, written and shot with enough talent, are able to touch

the sensibility of the viewer and give the sensation that all that is told, although he has not lived it It has

been real.Andy Garc���a, born in Cuba and exiled when Castro came to power, has wanted to

pay tribute to his beloved land through the history of a family that could well be yours. And I had an exceptional

scriptwriter: the late Guillermo Cabrera Infante. It is a pity that this film has taken

so long to arrive in our country. It reveals the history of the Fellove family, wealthy and with business in a Cuba

governed by the Dictator Batista. Within the family there are rebellious children who want a change

in the country and advocate the coup of Fidel Castro and many other "revolutionary" groups. However,

Fico (Garc���a), will always be on the side of his family, for better or for worse. And the family, as soon as Batista

leaves the country, begins to destroy himself like Cuba. Garc���a's character is reminiscent of Rick's in

Casablanca. And it's not a comparison that subtracts points, of course. Although the synopsis sounds a bit typical and

bland, it hides a passionate and passionate film. It has an enviable cast in which In���s (de) Sastre remains,

which takes the viewer off the story. It should be noted that Garc���ae Infante has given Bill Murray one of

the best characters of his career and of the film. Definitely. It is the humorous and almost "unreal" counterpoint

in this story. But it's great and it manages to raise the list of the film. Making a heartfelt movie also

involves getting wet historically, as is the case. The film exudes tropical heat, catchy rhythms and

recreations of characters and very successful historical situations. Nor does he let a figure like Ch��� pass, the

other Fidel Castro frustrated. Maybe it is that portrait of nothing progressive and idolized of that "" liberator "" (Jua) throw

back some. We already know to which.A film more than remarkable and an outstanding debut that

unfortunately has gone unnoticed by the undercard. Of the best of the year.

" 1

" A loss of time and money, which will only please the most unconditional of the most unconditional, and it

may only be they cheat themselves.

There was a horror film marvel in 1979 whose main virtue was that thewas not taught

monsteruntil well into the movie. Almost ten years later, an intergalactic hunting enthusiast

sweated the gout to the very governor of California while waving his dreadlocks to the sound of music. tribal music

of Silvestri. In 2004, Paul WS Anderson, in his role of paladon of the adaptation of the videogame to

celluloid, brought the first delivery of this crossover among extraterrestrial bugs, version that I did well not

seeing in the cinema and waiting for the DVD; something that has not happened with its continuation. It is true that Cameron added

a more attractive and spectacular environment to the history of Alien (development of the Weyland Corporation -Yutani,

all the paraphernalia of the Space Marines.), That David Fincher contributed the subjective vision of the Alien that

gave us so much joy to those of us who play the video game Alien Vs. Predator and his sequel Jeunet also did

something productive for the saga. although right now I can not think of what, the truth (well, Dominique Pinon in a

wheelchair convertible into a cut-out, it may be interesting) my inner voice tells me, and I

reject it with a faded gesture. �do of the hand). Predator 1, with the same McTiernan from The Crystal Jungle at the

head, had his grace. And in the second part of 1990, I was curious, to say the least. I even dare to say

that AVP: Aliens Vs. Predator, the first installment of this mini series of two movies (and I hope no more),

was entertaining. But the BODRIO with capital letters of the Strause brothers, is more than a bunch of

depredations, typical and stupid one after another, in single file, that are shelled as the movie progresses

and the yawns increase. In spite of everything, this film has its audience. Without going any further, when I left

the projection I could hear two people talking about the new features brought to the

universe of aliens and predators. And they talked excited, hey. But, let's not cheat. There is

real cinema, popcorn movies (as I call it, which only serves to have a good time), and spawns thatnever

shouldhave seen the light of a projector; not even the flexo that the scriptwriter used when writing it. I played

videogames. I put myself in the shoes of an Alien and a Predator. And I enjoyed it. But, Mr. Strause, thisnot

isa video game. And neither is a true film. To begin the script it can not be more obvious, typical, typical

and meaningless. Stuffy characters taken from the popular imagery (the prota just out of

prison, the scared sheriff, the silly pretty one), subplots that start and end in one or two sequences,logos.

grisly Shane Salerno, who comes from television and whose greatest achievement seems to have been to collaborate in the script

of Armaged���n (1998, Michael Bay), delights us with a whole string of tonter��� as unconnected from the very beginning

of the film. Music, not to vary in this type of productions, is the most scandalous. Instead of

supporting the film, it seems to try to compete with the image in terms of pretentiousness and grandiloquence. It hinders

more than it contributes, and one has to make real self-control efforts when seeing part of

Goldsmith and Silvestri's music dirty from the original films, inscribed between fanfares and cymbal hits. And that

Brian Tyler, the composer, has a couple of interesting works, like Constantine and, well, okay. Only

Constantine. And almost by the hair. Let's talk about the photograph. Daniel Pearl opts for a notam lighting of day,

and dark as cricket armpit at night. And 70% of the film happens at night. The moments of struggle between the

predator and the hundreds of thousands of aliens that seem to suddenly come out of nowhere turn into a

succession of reflections between black spots and sound effects, in the backlight of a Enoooooorme Fresnel of

gazillion Kw so you can see the rainwater, which is very beautiful. It is because of the screams that there are differences

or what appears on the screen. It will be to give you imagination, and thus, fill in the holes - huge gaps -

of the film. Out of the world of the videoclip, Pearl seems to be lost in the celluloidthe direction

. I do not even speak ofof actors. It is wasting time talking about nothing, and, as Natalia Mateo says in Traumalog���a, by

Daniel S���nchez-Ar���valo, "" In nothingness there is nothing, asshole "". as to the realization. ���U, the realization!

The Strauses, appearing from the universe of the Special Effects, seem to have seen no more than the

extra contents of the DVDs of the great films. Its accomplishment is trite and meaningless. They want it to

be seen, but they do not want to tell anything with it. In short, and in short, a waste of time and money. A film that comes

out of the market studies that will only please the most unconditional of the most unconditional, and it may

only be if They are a little bit like themselves.

" 0

" As a movie it will be a marvel, but for the viewer of popcorn and flat encephalogram (I) becomes

infumable

In the movie poster, it seems that Truman is ready at the barrier to get a foul. Ah,

grabbing the urogenital area with that limp and mannered hand that holds an eternal cigar. By the way, how

sensual was tobacco before, did not it? The film is about the period of time in the life of Truman Capote, who

invested in writing his masterpiece "" A cold blood "". One day, Truman reads in a newspaper a horrible murder

committed in a small town. He goes to town to write an article, but after meeting the alleged

murderers, Capote gets too involved in what he sees as a tremendous literary film. The truth is that the

film �cula has disappointed me enough, since I expected something more exciting, and the life that we show

Capote is very boring. They teach us the obsession that came to reach for this story, and outline how

this writer should have been. But the truth that does not get to hook, it is long and you do not understand well the bitch

that gives him for this crime. The performance of the actor who plays Truman is very good, also highlighting the Spanish

dubbing that makes this man totally repellent. The assassins also do their role very well, but

the story is not so interesting as for almost two hours. In the end, a long, smooth tost���n

for a short nap (or meditation). long). I suppose that as a movie it will be a marvel, but for the

spectator of popcorn and flat encephalogram (I) it becomes infumable.

" 0

" Very bad, of the worst of Gilliam, and that once more would have to be included in the batch of films that arrive

with great delay (it's 2005) and has been released in counting ���simos places. At this point we are already

used, and in this case, better than better.

The former Monthy Python Terry Gilliam has managed to create a career with some fame, along with John Cleese although

this in the field of interpretation, outside of what is that funny group of chemists. Movies like? The

Heroes of Time? and? Brazil ?, and to a lesser extent? 12 Monkeys? and? El Rey Pescador?, are good examplesgood

of Gilliam'swork, films of different themes but very recognizable in the style of a director whoalmostwants

hasalways done what he, although for it he had to deal with a good part of the

criticism, and also of the public. Something that has had its greatest exponent with? Tideland ?, which is receiving

some of the most ruthless criticism that is remembered, and the truth is that I did not miss it. Ena at all. The

amazing argument of? Tideland? It begins when the absolute protagonist of the story, a girl named

Jeliza-Rose flees with her father, a rock singer finished and heroin���mano, after his mother dies v��� victim

of an overdose of methadone. They will take refuge in a house lost from the hand of God, in which the father will leave

"" vacations "" thanks to the doses prepared so carefully by his daughter, and to create ��� his own fantasy world

, full of strange and extravagant characters. My partner Beatriz, in her film criticism, talked about the

evident similarity of this film with? The Labyrinth of the Faun? of Guillermo del Toro, who was also on the

same courses. The truth is that one is a demonstration of how to do things well, and the other of how to

do them wrong. The funny thing is that in? Tideland? you can see Gilliam's hand at 100%, his style is clear and

recognizable from start to finish, but this time things do not have the slightest sense, and Gilliam has

made a film with the same intention. Quen that other authors, reputed and hated at the same time, have from time

to time: live from the story. I almost dare to say that this is closer to David Lynch's sillyness

called "Inland Empire ?, with which he laughed half the world and part of the other. Gilliam, like Lynch, has

a name, and he knows that with that comes. But one thing is to skate and offer a film far below the

possibilities of its director, as it may be? The Secret of the Brothers Grimm ?, and quite another, do whatever

you want, without feet no head and pretend to defend you only because s���.Perhaps it should be clarified

that in the filming of? The Secret of the Brothers Grimm? had to make a pair for the complicated filming that had

this film, and Gilliam neither short nor lazy went to shoot in record time? Tideland ?, so if this

movie �cula responds to a need to relax from Mr. Gilliam for all the stress accumulated in the film

starring Matt Damon, well, it can be understood. But to us, as a public, it is up to us to decide

what the film has looked like, and seeing it becomes clear that Gilliam has not liked the public , going through

the lining all the commandments, or rules, or as you wanted to call them. Things in? Tideland? They happen because I know and

without explanation. The dizziness that occurs in the viewer is not because Gilliam has shown a

confusing staging, no, that's not the subject, but thematically and argumentative. To begin with, theflight

father'swith his daughter, after her mother dies, is totally incomprehensible and unbelievable. From then

on, everyone who believes in his head does not respond to any logic, which would be funny

if presented in an attractive way, but lack of interest and boredom are the general techniques

of the film. We give absolutely everything what we see in the film. We do not care why the girl

invents everything that is invented, and it does not seem that it is because her parents are drug addicts with noses, because

she looks very happy with them, not even because his mother does not let him take his chocolates, something

really absurd. Then, in the imaginary world, to call it that, disinterests are total, although in this case

we have to put up with some other character of the most unbearable. And I'm not going to talk about the disgusting

allusions to pedophilia or necrophilia, to put just two mild examples. The film does not come with being

absurd, boring and bad, it also has to be disgusting. Probably the only salvageable thing of all this

desprop���sito is its young protagonist, the girl Jodelle Ferland, who surrenders his character with passion, and

despite all his paranoia, manages not to be burdensome, even when talking to his unbearableheads

doll. All the other actors seem hispanic clowns managing to upset the viewer, especially

an unhappy Jeff Bridges, with a character badly drawn. It would also save the soundtrack, the work of

the brothers Mychael and Jeff Danna. Otherwise a very bad movie, of the worst of Gilliam, and that once It would

have to be included in the batch of films that arrive with great delay (it is from 2005) and has been released in very

few places. At this point we are already used, and in this case, better than better.

" 0

" What could have been and was not: a failed, although worthy, example of a cinema ruined by a vulgar gui���n,

devoid of any claim.

It could be another film of visitors stuck in a spiral of violence in a hostile environment full of

evil locals, but it remains in another rural thriller cradled by all the conventions of the genre. . It smells like Sam

Peckinpah (Straw Dogs) and it also gives a whiff to John Boorman (Deliverance), although there is noplagiarism

flagrantand everything is in evidence of respect and tribute to those two masters of cinema, but

Bosque of shadows (The backwoods) ballasts a guide of an amazing precariousness taking into consideration the

almost artisanal work of a director (Koldo Serra) who pampers his work andof a quality out of

dresses itall discussion. :N: the photo shines, the acting aspect and a sort of location of exteriors of which we did not

have news in the recent national cinema. The argument punishes us with a slowness that exaspera: it is not a

tempting moroseness on which some wicker rests from the gui���n. We all have certainty of the course over which

to turn the plot. Partly because we've seen Straw Dogs or maybe because the work of writing has not been

as good as everything else. Not an absolutely great Gary Oldman (who wins in this small

role in his career, but great in his quality filmography) gets us to get more involved

in the film . Well supplied with clichés to the use that populate the genre, Bosque de sombras does not bother to

retouch them, to lead them to their land. The stylistic patterns are filmed with superb style: one is

very pleasantly impressed by the light (there are scenes that remain fixed to the memory after seeing the

film), but the set is disassembled with a little noise that encourages us, because we wanted (it is my case) that

the tape contains other songs to reach fully where it points: towards a film. round in a

debutante, look what's the hardest issue. Jorge S���nchez-Cabezudo obtains it in his primorosa La noche de

los sunsoles, already criticized in these pages. This abrupt and dry portrait of violence and incommunicado

ends up defenestrar its undeniable successes with a final also abrupt and dry where we do not know more and (

positions to be fascinated by the plot) well we would like it. This lack of information does not contribute tothat

the factthe review is more greedy in beautiful adjectives and adheres (without dissimulation) to that unfortunate inventory of

great films (some almost works teachers) who are dying from some revisionable hemorrhage, due to some

failure in the screw that causes the building to come down just at the moment when we were

enjoying the most its climbing. To highlight the presence of a Lluis Homar in a state of grace in the role ofgarrulousgarrulous

vengefulsurrounded by tare. The three films I know of him (Bad Education, The Borgias and ���sta

) demonstrate an enormous trade and a future (and man already has his years) to consider.

" 0

" Lola: The film falls into all the defects and typical of biopics, but it also hasas a major virtue

exceptional interpretations.

Until a few years ago, to say that someone was wearing "a movie life" was more a phrase than anything else.

But that was before Hollywood discovered the cinematic potential of certain public figures

, especially artists. Since then we have witnessed an explosion of biographical

films, or biopic, and like so many trends, it was not long in being imported by the rest of the world. It took

longer to import this trend, more than anything because with the existence of certain television programs it

is difficult to make a tape of these characteristics. ��sticas that contribute something new or different. If it was Camar���n

de la Isla first, now it's time for another of the myths of Spanish flamenco, Lola Flores. Lola: La Pel���cula

narrates the first thirty years of Lola Flores' life (Gala ���vora), focusing on her human side and her

turbulent personal life and the various relationships she maintained with men like Manolo Caracol (Jos��� Luis Garc���a

P���rez). Miguel Hermoso (who directed Lola Flores in Truhanes) faces the challenge with courage, but

unfortunately he can not give the film that vision that distinguishes him from the typical biopic. The film lacks

originality and freshness, as it is full of very hackneyed situations, and incurs a large number of topics.

The rhythm that Miguel Hermoso prints is not the most appropriate, of such a slowness that it ends up becoming tedious

and monotonous. However, and despite its shortcomings, the film manages to convey a great dose of realism, with

a very careful setting. The best thing about the film, without a doubt, is its exceptional cast, all brilliant,

although especially Ana Fern���ndez, David Arnaiz and a great Jos��� Luis Garc���a P destacan stand out rez Older words

deserves the exceptional interpretation of Gala ���vora, authentic revelation of the season, which departs

completely from the imitation, endowing his work with a great strength and sensitivity. The young actress from Cádiz

fills the screen at each appearance, and without a doubt we actively recommend that she go looking for a place

for the Goya for Best Actress Revelation.

" 0

" ns��� same the film is like a great act of magic, where only the end will reveal its own

"" prestige "". If you have not seen it, see it, it's very good. After all, the real magician in the story seems to

be Nolan.

A few hours ago I saw The Prestige (2006), translated into Spanish as El Gran Truco or El Truco Final. I saw it on the

recommendation of several EBC editors, for which I was surprised that this is the first review of the film

in this blog (���chiquita!) I loved it The performances were spectacular and the theme for me is

exciting: the behind the scenes of the acts of magic. I suppose trying to summarize the story without falling into the

spoiler is quite difficult. Easy, so just say that it is the battle of two young magicians to take revenge on each

other, for being the best, for marveling the world with an impossible trick. These magicians are Robert Angier "" The Great

Dalton "" (Hugh Jackman) VS Alfred Borden "" The Master "" (Christian Bale). Two characters will be his accomplices

throughout their careers: the designer / cheat engineer, Cutter (Michael Caine) and the beautiful assistant Olivia

(Scarlett Johansson). The film describes a world of illusions, secrets, rivalry and obsession. n, where you can not

really trust anyone except yourself. And only one can sacrifice for himself. If younot

dounderstand this last line, you will have to go see the movie and only then you will make sense. Why the t�title

Originalof the film? The Prestige or The Prestige. For the explanation is that every act of magic consists of

three parts: 1. The promise (an object is taught). 2. The change (the object disappears). 3. The prestige (the

object reappears) and only then the magician receives the homage of the applause. Without the prestige, the trick is

worthless. In itself the film is like a great act of magic, where only the end will reveal its own

"prestige" " Much of the perpetual suspense throughout the film corresponds to the work of nonlinear editing in

time. The director of this film (and also scriptwriter of the same with his brother Jonathan) is Christopher

Nolan, who previously had worked with the duo Christian Bale and Michael Caine, directing them in

Batman Begins (2005). However, The Big Trick reminds us of another very good film by Nolan:

Memento (2000) where the game of back-and-forth times is also fundamental. If you have not seen it,

see it, it's very good. After all, the real magician in the story seems to be Nolan.

" 1

" Disconcerting, extravagant, extra���aam���s not able, disheveled and what is worse ... quite tedious

film of court, at least presumably, fantastic.

"" In a small town, the new secondary school teacher arrives. Everyone knows the Bonomiya family,

falling in love with Miki, a woman of youthful appearance, although much older what ���l. They fall in love and start a

secret love relationship. But they will not have it easy, because, apparently, the Bonomiya family has asecret

family: for many generations, women have been affected by a kind of curse: they see a

series of spirits, of savage demons, that are deposited at the bottom of some jars. At night they must

count them to verify that none of them has escaped. If this were to happen, they would attackbeings

human. "" Disconcerting, extravagant, strange, unable to be, disheveled, and what's worse. Pretty tedious

cutting film, less presumably, fantastic. I have to accept that it is very interesting. The whole film

prepares us to assist in the last minutes to a trail of who knows what, but interesting, strong,

imaginative, spectacular, violent, exciting. But nothing of that happens. Everything is demonstrated in the end that is to

have lost the time, being a "" I touch mocho "" of film. We are promised a lot and we are preparing for

it, but in the end everything is it is in a pure and quite boring fire of artifice. Moreover, its director sins in

a somewhat embarrassing, pedantic way, suddenly, and without anything explaining it, removing the color in thepart

final, He knows for what the hell. It is supposed to highlight the fire that is suddenly lit in ascene

���vital?. But it is pretty sloppy am'n gratuitous. Someone could say that is that I have not understood the

philosophy and oriental keys of the film. And it may well be true, if I had, maybe I would have liked it

more, but the truth is that I consider "" Inugami "" like a little tease, whose vision does not lead to

anything. Also, it is very long for what counts (rather little). But not everything is negative. It has a good

picture, the landscapes are simply wonderful, and the actresses do it well, getting the

protagonist to give his character a halo of mystery really achieved.

" 0

" I just remembered why my love perp���tuo this genre with one of the masterpieces not only British

horror but the cinema in general .

Do you know? Sometimes you can lose the perspective of what is true horror movies, you go to the

cinematic premieres where they tell you the same ideas over and over again. The premieres direct to the DVD

are most of the times copies of recent successes where four boobs are shown something of GORE badly echoed and

we are classified as horror movies when it is not even cinema of I have just remembered the reason for mylove

perpetualfor this genre with one of the masterpieces not only of British horror but also of the cinema in

general. ROBIN HARDY is one of those cases extra� ��os of an author who performs a magnum opus to disappear without

leaving a trace except for a small telefilm as for example the fantasioso.A sensational cast helps at all

times to the plot counting on the dr�� �cula CHRISTOPHER LEE or the SEX SIMBOL BRITT EKLAND that at that time

lived the stardom in outstanding works in the genre with macabre refuge or Night without end. Without forgetting the

great protagonist actor who embroiders his role as religious man in the face of EDWARD WOODWARD seen in the young

WINSTON or in the current fatal weapon. This is one of those films that in its premiere did not have the deserved repercussion

being the passage of time that finally positioned it in the great jewel that is today. Unclassifiable at

times where intrigue, terror and even the musical mix with an elegance rarely seen.

It also masterfully reflected pagan beliefs and HIPPIES communities helped with a huge

soundtrack reminiscent of the discs of CORAL. Naked girls who adore sex, cruelty at all times

with a duel between superstitions and the Christian faith, his huge photograph is another claim in a feature film

that no doubt remains marked by fire in the retina of the spectator. The Remake of the same name starring

NICOLAS CAGE is a joke, the director ROBIN HARDY back��� to have CHRISTOPHER LEE in 2008

with COMBOYS FOR CHRIST.

" 1

" Do you bring something new? No. Do you have anything that makes her worthy of going to see her? No. I think the first movie of this genre was K���rate Kid. Yes, really. In that one, a boy arrives at

an unknown place for ���ly and falls in love with the wrong girl. Thethe chulito of the place, but

kid licksour boy perseveres in the endeavor until in a fair fight he gives him a beating (like a lesson about

life). Well, these cars are the same, with the proviso that the protagonist is not a timid character,

but the coolest of his neighborhood. The film is about a minor (of the hairs in the eggs that are

razor-sharp and that do not meet the 30) that is arrested for the first time in the United States for

illegal races. His mother, to avoid that the thing happens to majors sends him to Tokyo with his father, marine of

profession. There he meets a girl he likes, who happens to be the sister of a mobster who wins him in a

race but he perseveres until the stupid final in which everyone puts is his place. Another one of the genre.Buff,

what do you want me to tell you about a film whose translation would be To Petao and rabid, skidding in Tokyo?

Well, that's a film of cars that skid, that they play and that laugh at authority. Does it bring something new?

No. Do you have anything that makes her worthy of going to see her? No, with the exception of the driving scenes at the limit

(which as you see 100 skid the following become tiresome). So a little more I can tell you, thatleaves

Vin Dieselthe last two minutes to leave the faithful with honey on the lips. Resumiendo, a mess of

racing and tuned cars that go skidding through the streets of Tokyo. Many special effects, but neither

hooks nor interests the story. In addition, you know who stays with the girl and who is humiliated in

the last race.

" 0

" The realization of a Tim Burton capable of creating authentic visual delusions, as he has done

previously. Without detracting from the final result. The vivid image of my father ...

"" Big Fish "" reminds me a lot of my father, who was a great storyteller, that's why, when

I finished watching him, I was as excited as the first time I saw her, filling my eyes with tears at the end of it.

The film sometimes and in a way resembles the magic that Burton transmitted to us in "" Eduardo

Scissorhands "" in fact in the trailer of it we can listen to its main theme. It means the return of Tim

Burton to the fantastic world that he had relegated in his lackluster "" Planet of the Apes "". It is an ode to

freedom and imagination in which the free and creative spirit is seen as an authentic vital privilege

impregnated with optimism. The spectator assists with pleasure and fun a fairy tale in real image of two

hours. In this unique tragicomedy, Burton knows how to conjugate dramatic moments with others full of

romanticism, magical and surreal situations with other endearingly human ones that get you to

fully identify with what appears on the screen. . It manages to convey the lack of understanding that there may

be between two beings who nevertheless appreciate each other, as well as the need for imagination to permeate our

lives. To which is added the realization of a Tim Burton capable of creating authentic visual delusions, as he has

done previously. Without detracting from the final result. Now that you have it on DVD! Run to buy it! (you will not

be disappointed)

" 1

"I have come to witness the horrifying fourth part of Saw and I do not say it precisely because it provokes terror, in

any case it caused me boredom ... Poor David Cronemberg must be swearing in several dead languages."

Malitos Amigos! They come from watching the horrifying fourth part

of SAW and I do not say it precisely because it provokes terror, in any case it caused me boredom, evidently it was their

turn to choose the movie, so I went directly to the slaughterhouse to see the new bullshit that

occur to them in the new delivery. Such DARREN LYNN BOUSMAN returns to make a mess with hismovements

continuousof camera, again the film seems orchestrated by a fucking blind monkey to the rhythm of video- That

guy will take care of the direction of the SCANNERS Remake, poor DAVID CRONEMBERG must be swearing in several

dead languages. The very same actors in the saga who eat hot. I thank you and that no one else is going

to hire you out of SAW. In this occasion the despelote begins from the beginning, in full autopsy they

find a tape embedded in the stomach of the Psychopath. Take chestnut! But at every moment the thing

is worse. People who appear and disappear at free will, increasingly ridiculous tricks and again a

final surprise really insane that nobody believes it not drunk. The photography, music, direction of

actors is again kindergarten, leaving a single powerful moment that is in the commented autopsy, pure morbid

for gore lovers. What's more, the worst thing is that there are probably new parts to be rolled.

" 0

" The fact is that the Jungle, in its version Point Zero, is a modélic film that drinks from themodernity

televised and globalizedin which the h�� Deroe then and the heroes of now.

We showed suspicion, a few days ago, towards the last installment of the Jungle of Crystal saga, one of those

cinematographic series that we like so much and that are part of our sentimental education.education is

Sentimentalnot strictly philic, that is to say. We all know that John McClane was a kind and halftechnician

finished, carrier of that aesthetic of the loser that we like so much. Badly spoken, violent, politically

incorrect and, in addition to all this, smoker. A man's pain, come on. His first appearance on the screen dates from

1988, no less. The things that have happened in the world since then! From the fall of the Steel Phone to

planetary globalization, twenty years are a lifetime. And playing with this change of geopolitical,

cultural and cybernetic scenario, the producers of the saga of the crystalline jungle, after resting their protagonist

for thirteen long years, rescue him from ostracism and, thus, before its cinematographic rebirth, it is reasonable to

show a certain concern. What would have been McLane's in these years? Because the promotional imagesus

showquite full and compact, solid and in one piece. Will he have hamburger? Would it have been made

politically correct? Have you quit tobacco? The answer, in "" La jule 4.0, "" a title that is already

quite illustrative and that, from the beginning, puts his cards face up. Let's start with the bad guys. That they are of

those bad bad guys but, at the same time normal���simos. No crazy mutants or crazy disfigured. No. The

bad guys are a compact group of JASP, very handsome and smart. And its purpose: total chaos, of course. A

terrorist attack of a cybernetic nature that, in addition to making them rich, will subvert the world order

as we understand it. Perhaps a start like this I can hear them. M���sa tel���filos that to cin���filos. Does not it

have a certain aroma to that series that, supposedly, happens in real time? Quickly we pass to the hero, who

has problems with a daughter who denies ���ly, without solution of continuity, they present us ankid

anonymous, vulgar and ordinary, but with a special talent, in this case for computers and that from the

beginning is put in the spotlight of the bad guys. And the story is already mounted. Why are we in ascenario

recognizable? Attentive to what Willis says in an interview: "" That so many characters have been based on McClane

is normal. For example Jack Bauer. Kiefer Sutherland is doing a great job of inspiring himself in the jungle. "" It

does not matter what it was before, whether the egg or the chicken. The fact is that the Jungle, in its version Point Zero, is a

modélic film that drinks from the televised and globalized modernity in which the hero of then

and the heroes of now. Because the protagonism of the film is double. In the best tradition of

Buddy-movies, McClane helps and is helped by a spontaneous companion, a hacker for whom the character

played by Willis is a dinosaur who, in turn, look at the computer genius as if it were

a Martian. And in this dialectic between the analogical hero and the digital one, the whole film moves, halfway

between the parodic and the chaotic. In that sense, the Witch, played by one of the gurus of

modernity, Kevin Smith, is paradigmtica: its hub is the most modernthe world, but

ah ��� There is a radio transmitter, of all life, which will be the only thing that works when everything goes to

hell because of c���berterorrismo.And is the action ,N, in abundance. And violence, less explicit than other

times. And the humor, more acid and corrosive. And the beatings that fall on McClane. As usual. And, for all that,

we are facing a great movie. Modern and classic at the same time, in the best sense of both expressions. A little

long, maybe. And hyperbolic and excessive, of course. But it is that, even in its version Point Zero, we are

still in "" The Crystal Jungle "".

" 1

" Interesting exercise that raises, from a minimalist approach, the dilemma about what is most

important, love or be loved.

Interesting exercise that raises, from a minimalist approach, the dilemma about what is more

important, love or be loved. As the action progresses we feel a little lost and one, that already He has

experienced it, he recommends that they let themselves go. Slo you as enjoy the maximum of this curious and compelling

film shows intimista.Casi all puzzling: the beginning, on a secluded beachthe Basque Country,

peeps a possible end or a beginning, but far from appearing to be a predictable story, this German film is

presented as a peculiar composition for several reasons: not many German productions arrive, it has signs

of a sociological experiment by introducing a strange element (although not so much) into a routine "" peaceful "" and

gestures and urban landscapes prevail in a reality of few words. If you had to look for similarities with

other titles resort We went to the Italian The consequences of love and to the Uruguayan Whiskey, although more for the

atmosphere than for the sentimental pol���gonos that are formed. It has something that is sensed and transmits a

sensation that invites us to think of La buena estrella and Son de mar, undressed of the Iberian accent and cooler,

specifically "" 3 degrees less "", taking into account its translation into Spanish. One of its greatest riches -and it has

many that we will let it discover- we find it in the interpreters, able to hold glances that

translate into first planes: the camera seems to extract feelings from the deepest. The terrain where they

develop does not seem hostile but it is strange, where the unnecessary is dispensed with; look for example in the

city, which seems deserted and exclusive for the pupils profiled and manipulated by the still unknown

filmmaker in our country. Being honest and Seeing the devouring affinity of the billboard, the future of the film is

presented as cold as its title. A pity, since it is done with feeling, contention and correction,

qualities that are overlooked by too many filmmakers who take hold in the halls, of course, with thesupport

unconditionalof the Public.

" 1

" The plot is at all times weak and seems to circulate as a cheap vaudeville and devoid of emotion. It has served little for its director to have caressed this project for almost 4 decades and have a

budget of 15 million euros for its realization. Salvando Alatriste, this is one of the mostproductions

expensivein the history of Spanish cinema, and since we have mentioned the title of Agust���n D���az Yanes, it seems that

we will have to wait for its premiere to see a correct film set in the past with important characters

. After 24 films, Tirante the white is again an adaptation, this time of a classic of

cavalries published in Valencian in 1490 by Joanot Martorell. Vicente Aranda finds him ironic and sensual,

something that he has tried to translate through images and a poor script that focuses on the running of the court and

the virginity of a princess as life insurance of a town and its governors. Except for exceptions such as

Juana la loca, from Amantes, filmed in 1991, Catalan seems to be unsuccessful in its dramas, which always remain

lame (the case of Carmen), are unnecessarily prolonged (The Turkish passion) or end up solving withendings

acceleratedafter a coherent development (Libertarias). VERSION Aranda is only part of the novel, in which

ingredients of adventure, mystery and politics are given, and it is not to emphasize the strong erotic charge of its pages?do not

wespeak of sensuality precisely- but around it the whole argument of the film revolves. It is sad to

say it to such an intelligent filmmaker, but it is not surprising with his new proposal: sex withoutand, without

taboosappearing to be modest, little contextualized, a posture that is countered with a modern language,

even funny, and fun portrait of the mandate of the intriguing women at the time of maintaining the health

of the empire, contrary to the established masculine order. The ladies of the court are the ones who make the policy and it

is they, the actresses, who try to raise a plot that weak at all times, seeming to circulate as a

cheap vaudeville, and devoid of emotion. A lot more Leonor Watling and Ingrid Rubio (two sides of the same coin)

than Victoria Abril and the debutant Esther Nubiola? What is explained about her, what about April is not- they manage to capture the

attention of me. Professional rites This point is aggravated by the misguided male cast, led by

inexpressive Caspar Zafer and Rafael Amargo. The first as the knight who arrives in Constantinople to

fight against the invaders and the second giving life to the Great Turk. They attribute the result to the problems of

production and it is true that things were not arranged as they originally promised the veteran filmmaker:

changing Sicily for Istanbul at the last minute is just an example of the sweat that It must have cost him. But we must

judge by what we see on the screen and the result, much as it hurts to be one of the greats

of European cinema, is no big deal.

" 0

" Encounter I do not know if ten but I have five or six reasons to see this movie. It is a delight without

pretensions and with a lot of sense of humor that in these times is appreciated. It's up to Mr. Freeman to walk.

Of course I find I do not know if ten but I have five or six reasons to see this movie. It is a delight

without pretensions and with a lot of sense of humor that in these times is appreciated. A film -which was originally conceived

to be downloaded on the Internet in the USA- by Brad Silberling, accustomed to moreproductions

generous-City of angels, A series of catastrophic misfortunes by Lemony Snicket-.Morgan Freeman gives life to a

celebrity in low hours who is forced to accept a role in a low budget film. To prepare his

character he becomes a spectator of the daily activity of a supermarket in the outskirts of California.

There, contact the only employee who speaks your language, a Paz Vega with very bad fleas in charge of the box

? Ten articles or less? -the much more successful original title of the film -.Among them a forcedis established

relationshipthat gives rise to dialogs and reflections of the most fun, in which the one is learning from the other even

though they come from two opposite worlds: the star that lives with its back to reality and the "mildolarista"? who

wants to prosper but lacks desire and confidence. The film does not count much more and does not unleash the laughter but it

is a friendly, entertaining film that is seen with a smile. The best moments are starring Morgan Freeman

performing a laudable exercise of irony about his career and allowing jokes about productions such as The

collector of lovers. Paz Vega is adorable. Although in the skin of a Hispanic immigrant in Hollywood, she is

charming and far exceeds her intervention in the forgettable Spanglish that marked her debut incinema

American.

" 1

" The real joy of the film lies in enjoying the style of Tykwer behind the camera. Those

first planes, that superb recreation of the time, those images that almost even? Smell? ...

Years ago it did not know Nothing of one of my fetish directors, the German Tom Tykwer. For too long

this gentleman, responsible for "" Run, Lola, run "" and the fascinating "" The princess and the warrior "", presented his

films in various European festivals without any national distributor dare to acquire their

rights and release them in Spain. They should be too busy financing masterpieces such as "" Since the

morning dawns "" or "" GAL "". The fact is that this drought has ended (and I predict that forever) with "" The Perfume "",

brilliant adaptation of Patrick S���skind's bestseller and consecration final of Tykwer as ""Author

European Referential"". "" El Perfume "" tells the fascinating story of Jean Baptiste Grenouille, a man of

exceptional smell and obsessive goals in the middle of France in the 18th century. Of what were his miserable origins and

how, thanks to his nose, he gradually escaped from them, never ceasing to be amisfit

dangerous, a moving mutant to the eternal b� Look for love. The unknown Ben Whishaw embodies this

character with a disconcerting conviction. The entire film rests on his narrow shoulders and the t soportao

bears the weight without the slightest hint of exhaustion. Almost the same as the great Dustin Hoffman, who owns the

perfumer Baldini and dispatches the order with a naturalness that complexes. However, for me, the real

joy of the film lies in enjoying the styling of Tykwer behind the camera. Those first planes, that

superb recreation of the time, those images that almost "smell". I love this guy. What will I

do? That's why I even forgive that final politician, so criticized by all, where some planes fall

unambiguously in the absolute most ridiculous. The whole film is a sad and beautiful story. A story about

loneliness, rejection and unrequited love. A story that must end as such. I understand it like that. Although

it is true that his farce tone disconnects from the seriousness of the whole.

" 1

" Atonement literally means expiation, that is, it is the Catholic concept by which one purifies oneself,

cleanses one's sins. With the excuse of a confession we are told a very careful story in a film with

several touches of originality and an impeccable invoice.

There are things that I still do not understand in this of the distribution of the films. Ratatouille has beenmore than

in the United States forthree months and more than two in Spain, when here in England we hardly expect her

for this Friday. On the other hand, Atonement will be released in Spain already in January of the next year. I imagine that it is

presented as one of the favorites for the next oscars and you know that the closer to March is the

premiere, the more successful I will have Atonement literally means expiation, that is, it is the Catholic concept byoneself

which one purifies, cleanses one's sins. Psychologically it is also the liberation one feels when confessing

something that torments him. Well, that's what the movie is about, a confession that the narrator, a writer, makes us

about facts of disastrous consequences that occurred in her childhood and of which she is guilty.

Contrary to what may seem at first, the film is not at all classic, nor in the

way of narrating the facts (we see them first from the point of view of one of the characters and later

more omnisciently, with temporary jumps) or in the story itself. Apart from that it is a

tremendously careful film in many details and very well made (the music, the photography, the sets and the

interpretations are fabulous, especially of some of the secondary ones, as the red-haired girl and her two

twin brothers), these points of narrative originality and the treatment of some scenes, such as that of

destruction after the war, considerably improve the value of This movie. Keyra Knightley is looking for

the interpretation of his life here, but I think he has not just achieved it, I can not get it off his image

in Pirates of the Caribbean. James McAvoy is quite good, but the ones that are great are the three actresses that

give life to the character of the sister writer, Saoirse Ronan, Romola Garai and Vanessa Redgrave, and I already predicted the

Oscar for the cast for the small Saoirse.

" 1

" I was surprised to learn that in a film of the disastrous Darrell Roodt director among other pearls of

"" Dr���cula 3000 "" or "" Enemigo publico N��� 1 my father "", could tell in a series b of little budget with two

interpreters of certain prestige.

I was surprised to learn that in a film of the disastrous DARREL ROODT director among other pearls of dr���cula

3000 or public enemy No. 1 my father, could count in a series b of little budget with two interpreters of

certain prestige.BRIDGET MOYNAHAN I carry out authentic superproductions like for example I robot. For his

part PETER WELLER is the unforgettable protagonist of ROBOCOP. Just to see both protagonists decided to keep an

eye on him making a big mistake. Another film about murderous animals in this occasion lions, which seems a copy of

CUJO adapted to the fierceness of these felines. Family trapped in a car to withstand the onslaught of the

beasts all made without the m�� Very minimal narrative style, with very poor special effects, a caustic

guide, typical production that would not be out of tune in the time slot of Telefilmes in antenna 3. Their two

protagonists contribute something of office in the mess.

" 0

" After seeing that movie, the saying that I always say of? To fuck, to fuck, that the world is going to end? it makes

sense

After seeing that movie, the saying that I always say of "" to fuck, to fuck, that the world is going to end "" makes

sense. In this film of which he had to be president of the United States, they speak to you with a crudeness without

parallel, and more or less they say to us that we are going to take for ass. I saw the film in original version and it leaves me the

eyes of as much to read all the good talk of Al Gore. The movie is not a movie or a documentary, it's a guy giving

a class to his students. Sometimes you see photos and videoclips but the bulk of the movie is the guy giving an

eternal charlet. As the kid talks fast, he did not have time to read anything he said. Warning: anyone who

does not know geography, not a little economics, who does not see this movie who will not find out about anything. The girl with

whom I went to see the movie wanted to kill me because I did not understand anything. And you have to have them too big to make

a movie with a guy giving a class in plan rally. By the way, go piece slate that had the Gore, you

imagine the classes at the university with something similar? All the statistics and what you want so

great? It would be amazing, but that is to dream too much, we are in Spain and here the motorcycle has not arrived

yet. I'm already imagining some prank joke like putting the photo of goatse in gigantic size before

the teacher comes, hahaha, what we were going to laugh. Finally a scary movie of the verb to frighten. A

terrifying movie of good, because the argument is as follows. The place where we are living will

become unbreathable in a few years. This is like the movie SAW, where the mu seequito is descojonando andus

is telling, in a few years there will be a rutting heat, more tornadoes than ever and hurricanes, the waters will

cover the earth and there will be millions of displaced people. Living on earth as today will be a utopia and will become

a nightmare. Global warming of the planet is a reality and Al Gore is going everywhere to

tell us that he has data from scientists where they warn us that we are going to take for ass. The only ones

that it seems that they do not find out are the politicians, who go from doing nothing and are still locked in theirwars

stupidthat if I said this or that, believing that they are going to scratch a few votes to the foolish I have always

said that this system of politicians only serves so that some are nourished at the expense of others. We continue living as

before, where the kings and bourgeois looted the people. And when we have a real problem that affects

everyone, the world does not do anything. I do not even want to think about how we are going to organize before a possibleattack.

alienThe human race is a whim of nature, and I think what is happening to us is that we are

about to die of success. We are so many that it is difficult to agree. Anyway, I keep saying the same thing, to

fuck, to fuck, that the world is going to end.

" 1

" Terror series B, with a lot of humor, which makes it essential to watch. You have no excuse, it is short,

vibrant, hilarious and emotional. To see her with colleagues accompanied by psychotropic substances, if possible.

Is it just 92 this movie? I thought I was older, maybe for the number of times I've seen it.

I remember that the first time (I saw her, not the other, that you were obsessed with the defollar and the desavingsacar)

it left me completely hallucinated, and even outraged, because I did not understand what ended to see With the passing of

the years and the viewings, I realized that I have to see it every year to be able to reset the brain and

see that we do not need hyperproductions to have a great time. Tratacula is about a guy who works in

a giant hardware store, until by a series of vicissitudes of fate (not to lose his hand cranked) appears

in the past, specifically in the middle ages. It turns out that his arrival, accompanied by a car, a chainsaw and

a cut-out, coincides with a prophecy. So he has to retrieve the book of the dead (called

Necronomic���n) so that the wise man can send him back to his world. But it does not do the other good and awakens

the army of darkness. Mother, what a movie. If you see it with serious metality, you're going to see some shit that you

're going to want to cut your veins with a teaspoon of coffee, to suffer more. But if you see it knowing that this is

a mixture of cheap horror movies, chungos special effects and unbridled humor, you're going to have a good

time and you'll want to have this wonder in your deuvedeteca as a server has it. The special effects are

pretty crappy for the most part, except skeletons that are not bad. The situations are hilarious, and cause

more than a laugh. Although what I liked about the film is how fast it goes. That is, 82 minutes in

which more things happen than in the extended 12 hours of the orcs and hobbits (mother what I just

said). Resuming, terror of series B, with a lot of humor , which makes viewing essential. You have no

excuse, it is short, vibrant, hilarious and emotional. To see it with colleagues accompanied by psychotropic substances

, to be able to be.Grand���sima.Besitos.PD: There are very large scenes, such as the one with the craggy hand,

when the mirror breaks, when you look at your shoulder, the flying monster that competes withspecial effects

Ed Wood's, etc.

" 1

" A simple and seamless guide from the unknown Ben Elton who also surprises in the direction of his first episode

.

The romantic comedy belonged from the beginning to the Yankee cinema. Both in their own right and by doing them

very well, as if they had the precise timming and formula. When they are tried to imitate, they achieve mamotrets

without life or their own identity. This is not the case. One knows that in an English comedy he will find in advance a

style of his own: good performances, slow pace and even a certain stiffness saved only in a few moments

in recent years - Four weddings and a funeral, Full Monthy- to mention only two achieved. But to all the

statements we add a leading pair with weight, effective, more chemical situations without using the low blow

for the theme treated -infertility-, the use of gags "" to the American "" but without abusing allwith

fuseddramatic situations to the tone, we are before a film achieved that without being any Marvel, leave

the famous and contemporary My Great Greek Marriage as a children's game. A successful couple has everything but

what they crave: a child. From there a thousand and one attempts to solve the problem with a sudden sudden

creative blockade in Sam (Hugh Laurie of Stuart Little) a writer of television scripts of little success and the

platonic infatuation of his girlfriend Lucy (the sojourner Joely Richardson of The Patriot, 101 D��� lmatas) of a new

work partner, the handsome Carl (James Purefoy of Infidelity), all further complicating theproblem. The

originalsecondary surrounds achieved as Tom Hollander as Ewan, a filmmaker removed (almost a clone of Ben

Stiller) and Roman Atkinson (Mr. Bean) as a hilarious and freak gynecologist. There is also Emma Thompson as a

hypnotic friend of the couple keeping in a character without grace and insubstantial.A simple and seamless guide

of the unknown Ben Elton who also No surprise in the direction of his first episode. In the must, some loose gag that

does not contribute anything like the scene of the dandruff of the protagonist, and the English and pedantic idea to put recited and

prepo to Shakespeare anywhere. A collage of romance, melancholy, comedy and drama. Neither so much nor so little.

To finish the review, the detail of a horrible theme of Paul McCartney in the opening titles. RET

Lennon, we forgive.

" 1

" Expiation is an interesting film that removes sensitivity but above all leads to reflection

on art and on a way of telling stories that is already exhausted. Expiry metaliterature.

In recent years many directors have presented through their films a critical and / orpoint of view

doubtfulabout the capacity of cinema as a means of showing the reality / truth This debate, more typical of

documentary film, has reached fiction in a historical moment in which the policy of double truths of

governments is confused with trucages and montages of the media, a situation that is evident

with the Iraq issue and that has made many filmmakers exercise a reflection on the medium of cinema as a

system l�� Little or no expression of reality. But let's be clear: No, the cinema does not show THE reality, not even

when it tries. Any film, whether documentary or not, involves an intrinsic manipulation that begins

with the selection of the staging and continues with the delimitation of the frame. Accepted the impossibility of the

concept of objectivism in the cinema, it is necessary to be aware of the immense power that the manipulations (understood not

pejoratively but as selection and construction of a film) have on the p�� Public. Not in vain,

Eisenstein dedicated his career to making films with political or Hollywood campaign objectives, before the

growth of European presence in its ranks, decided to take out the famous witch hunt to annihilate the

possible anti-parochial subliminal (or pro-communist) messages in their scripts. Starting from this base and

seeking reflection, this year movies such as Zodiac, by David Fincher that raises the, appeared this

impossibility of finding the truth in his speech, or the filmyear. This is the topic that concerns us, Atonement, which with aexercise

meta-literaryraises something similar, although in a lighter and less honest way. Speaking of Atonement, we

could talk about the cleanliness of its staging, the correctness of its interpretations (among which

Saoirse Ronan stands out above all the adult cast), the striking of its sound work

(possibly the most interesting at a formal level) of the whole movie) or of the ���don? of Wright to convert

English novels into box office successes. But what is really interesting about Atonement is its reflection (something delayed

in the footage, perhaps) about two of the functions of art (literary or cinematographic) : of how he can

grasp and manipulate reality; and through it the author can find himself. During the

film, structured in three parts, we are introduced to Briony, a teenager with Much imagination that after

finding his sister in an embarrassing situation, enters a world of lies in which all suffer the

consequences. This first part in which the photographic ghost and escnico of Pride and Prejudice flies over

the work of Wright, is where we lie sits as strategic level to understand the rest of the

pel ���cula. From then on, everything is supposed to be truths that unravel one by one as a consequence

of the young lie of the young woman. Thus, we enter a second part of the city where war and the concept of

reality take center stage through an incredible plane on the beach where Wright seems to echo Bazin

and his theory of the realistic sequence plane. So we forget all lies to enter a world of the raw, the

real and the pessimistic that will leave us already in the third part in which a new turn of reality makes us want to

revisit everything seen until then. Expiation proposes to the spectator a responsibility taking over what

is exposed (be it literature, films or news) and at the same time takes the art as a means of

expiation for the author . It is this second function of art that completes the meta-literary power of this work,

which, although it has now been presented to us in its version in images, collects all that force from the original on

paper. Even so, if something fits to stand out about Joe Wright is his excellent literary taste and his successful staging

, something that helps him to continue living in the cinema with more than decent results. Atonement is an

interesting film that removes sensitivity (at the end of the day we are before a love story that is

interrupted by an injustice) but that above all leads to the reflection on the art and about a way of

telling stories that is already exhausted. Because I'm sorry to say, for all those who want to see astory

romanticto use, that Expiation has an end to those that leave you frozen because of its sobriety, its sincerity and its

little cinematographic magic . It was time for the cinema to put its batteries (even if it was adapting novels) and to start

showing skepticism about all those romantic stories that flood the screens.

" 1

" The horror something so clear that you can smell, feel, chew and breathe almost in the 180 minutes

of footage, in a clear way, that takes you from sigh to crying, from mosqueo to disgust and that you do not leave

with a clear conscience.

I must admit and I say it almost with real embarrassment, that I did not remember if I had seen this movie and that every

time someone told me about Spielberg's masterpiece I shrugged my shoulders and I was scratching my head

thoughtfully (it's that I do not remember if I've seen it) it was what he repeated over and over again, so as you have to

remedy things and you have to see the films that do not know, today that I had more than enough time

(at the end of three hours that lasts the same I have had to see almost 5) and, of course, logically I have

been pleasantly satisfied. The horror something in such a clear way that you can smell, feel, chew and

breathe almost in the 180 minutes of footage, in a clear way, that takes you from the sigh to the crying, from the

mosqueo to the disgust and that does not leave you with the quiet conscience, it is true that movies about theholocaust

Jewishhave become hundreds and that it is a very "chewed" topic "but this (made in 1993) leaves

the role of Oskar Schindler exemplary , a German businessman who decides to take the bull by the horns and treat

the Jews as what they are, human persons and not as "" animals "" (as the Nazis treated them). It is

difficult for me to talk, almost with tears in my eyes and with goosebumps, after how thishas left

filmme, coldly of what it has transmitted to me (go two days). ���as I have! Wow!) But without a doubt there are

many scenes in which Spielberg knows how to transmit "something" that goes from the screen to the heart of the

viewer and stays there sitting, quietly and clearly during the time of projection, the faces, the

gestures, the fleeting hope. Excellent interpretations of Liam Neeson, Ben Kingsley and Ralph Fiennes, in

addition to all those actors (without a name) that make a GREAT role (so, in CAPITAL) because they leave you with

your mouth open and goose bumps throughout the movie. Also noteworthy is the soundtrack of John

Williams, which excellently transmits all the moments of the film. It's the typical movie that when it

ends "" leaves poso "", we go as my father said, "" that something remains and that's what matters "" I know that Maybe it's

the last people on the face of the earth who have not seen this movie, so there are many

recommendations.

" 1

" A typical adventure film about the last Cesar of Rome, who leaves in search of a sword motivated by

the Goths. It's not a great movie, but it has a clear objective, it has entertained me, and a lot.

These pseudohistorical films give me a furious rage, since I do not know if I'm learning history or

I'm learning a story. Then he paints my hair, which I have lived thinking that those of the Congo er���n a few

difficult blacks, that Julio Cesar could not dominate all the Gauls, or that in Spain we had anagency

intelligencecalled the TIA. It should be like medicine, with a leaflet "" The association of historians

warns that the viewing of this film is going to make a mess "" or things like that. The film is about a

Roman emperor who is named when he is only a child. Shortly after the appointment, he has a Gothic problem

(the humor festival begins) and he is sent to the island of Capri, which is still not a great luxury, if not a

prison. Accompanying him, his mentor goes, a kind of Druid-like appearance of the Gauls, and in his rescue runs the chief

of the guard and a few select men. Can they rescue the one who is presumed to have the last Cesar? What nerves are moreHow

nervous.hard is the profession of film criticism. Luckily I am computer, so I can

say with all the pride of the world that this movie poop I liked a lot. You will tell me that the script is a

ful of Istanbul, that the end is predictable, that the action is predictable, that the amory is a co yazo and things

like that. But hey, I loved the movie. The action scenes are certainly not great things, the

inclusion of a woman has truffled the tape of silly things (some very funny) but it has very good things.

Entire tape develops quickly, has good points humor, simptica it all the time and the

final epilogue I found very grande.Resumiendo, film Ipic of adventures on the last Cesar of Rome,

who leaves in search of a sword motivated by the Goths. It is not a great film, but it has a clear objective,

it has entertained me, and a lot of it. And if the harangue would have been minimally motivating, I would like a 5, ale.Besitos.PD:

Adem�� ,S, he has strange things. A godo with dreadlocks and blonde dies three times in the same fight sequence. The rapper

who accompanies the head of the guard reminds me of the brother of the girl who liked Stive Urkel. PD2: Two

things have not been clear to me. On the one hand, is it high budget or something more modest? And the other, are you serious

or are you laughing?

" 1

" The ending becomes something innocent and ut���pico, but apart from good jokes, the songs andnumbers

musicalare already worthwhile alone. That's it, you have to go with the child's mind to enjoy it.

One of the Christmas premieres with more than likely success. Not in vain is the Australian George

Miller, creator and director of "" Babe, the brave piglet "". Although some of you already know of my weakness for the cinema

of infantile animation, being objective, it has history, music, humor. entertaining both children and adults.

And thanks to the focus of the dance (it's almost a musical) it brings something new and old at the same time, from the animation

classics. It's not a purely childish film in the style of Ice Age, but as I have said, dance is the

cornerstone of it, as an element of communication, and against the backdrop of Chaplin's famous phrase: I know

myself and try to be happy, but above all , yes, same. There are things in the story of the ugly duckling, from the movie

Billy Elliot, by Darty Dancing, in terms of dance, but then it derives to the heroicity of the

protagonists of these stories, all with some social criticism in as to the Hispanic communities and

the differentiating elements. The end becomes something innocent and ut���pico, but apart from good jokes, the

songs and musical numbers already deserve by themselves alone. That's it, you have to go with the mind of a child

to enjoy it, because if not, the almost two hours more than one will be long.

" 1

" Peter's friends are ours, that part of us that we are leaving behind, but to which

we can go when we want. The film is a critical, above all, friendship, the need to have

friends to make the sometimes insorpotable racking of life bearable. And Peter knows it perfectly.

In Peter's friends there are very favorable circumstances so that the impression of his viewing is

excellent and lasts long enough so that the film is remembered with a special affection. The first is a

dazzling cast: Kenneth Brannagh, who directs, Emma Thompson, his wife then and the ever-efficient

Stephen Fry, recently seen in Sons of Men, who are three of the best British actors of his

generation. .N Then there is the exquisite script of Martin Bergman, Rita Rudner and Brannagh himself, who swings between

the comedy Woody Allen (ten friends meet after ten years in the house of one of them , that Peter,

Stephen Fry) and the ���cida, sentimental, mocking, more pointed look at the Woody Allen drama as well (the ten

friends not only tell each other battles and they make jokes about the vaginitis of the president's daughter but they

put their fingers in his mouth and scratch there where the itch later mutates into harm). The film It benefits from the

state of grace of the distribution, but also from the implacable evidence that the feelings and confessions

that emerge in that meeting at Peter's house (and its fatal conclusion can not be postponed) are Affordable to any

sensitive heart, intimately twisted to their own life experience. Not accurate Peter's friends the

machine A variegated aria from other Brannagh films, a friend of the bizarre Shakespearean verb and of complex

narrative structures such as In the Harsh of Crude Winter or Mary Shelley's Frankenstein. The way in which

Love boat, here Vacations in the sea, opened its frivolous barrage of Caribbean cruise love, of small

orgies of chance, the film de Brannagh also discovers an appetizing, predictable, true, butsample

sincere,of archetypes, which configure the concatenation of revelations, confessions and disappointments that keep

Peter from confessing, in the end, what he truly grips his heart and everyone knows / we all know

where the function comes from.Brannagh renounces his commitment to the vitamin text of eptetellites and bombastic acts to

offer dignified entertainment. Sometimes, it might well be confused (and that's a loa) with a

BBC episode for television, but we are pleased to see it, deeply moved by the wealth of

disaffected characters and sane, sincere, clinging to life, close and close.

" 1

" A small wonder that shows that with good ideas it is possible to carry out interesting projects

substituting mastodontic budgets.

JERONE BIXBY was a fairly prominent author of science fiction in the 40s and 50s, writing numerous

short stories and television to be as well-known as STAR TRECK. In 1946 he pulled the argument from THE MAN FROM

EARTH, For decades, he tried to make the film without achieving his dream because he died in 1998, it was his

son also writer and screenwriter who finally this year he could to shoot the film for his father's memory. Asmall

veryproduction with which I contacted the director with the unknown RICHARD SCHENKMAN who previously

made documentaries for PLAYBOY and some Quen that another telefilme.Precisamente of the television comes the whole cast

where they meet a couple of faces known by all fans to horror, the charismatic protagonist of

CANDYMAN TONY TODD that leaves aside his interventions in the most visceral terror with this work accompanied or by

another illustrious veteran of the genre with WILLIAM KATT who starred in one of the gems of the genre of the 80s in HOUSE

an amazing house. A science fiction film made in a single space with the simple tools of one

of the most intelligent scripts of the last years. Obviously you can forget about special effects,

fast action or fast pace. Sit down to enjoy an accelerated course of film making in away

practically artisanalbut with interpreters in full state of grace that make cre���ble astory

simply incredible, where all kinds of questions are raised about the different steps of the centuries. A

small wonder that shows that with good ideas it is possible to make interesting projects by substituting

Mastodontic budgets. The promotion also comes out quite normal since it was initially distributed in

P2P exchange channels of the network. Its success in the United States can facilitate the release of this. �� rarity in

Spain even if it is direct to the DVD.

" 1

" I have always refused to accept the equation, universally accepted, according to which good cinema equals

the sum of the recitals of the protagonists.

I have always refused to accept the equation. �n, universally accepted, according to which the good cinema is equal to the

sum of the recitals of the protagonists. For more to insist, the performance of Johansson and Harnett

leave nothing to be desired. I also do not accept the excuse that they are not well chosen. It's about the narrative, it's

always the narrative. "" The black dahlia "" is indifferent because it is badly told. Two policemen share a

deep friendship. Both are good fighters and get an unforgettable feat for thecorps

policewith a fight. One of them is Kay Lake's boyfriend (Johansson), the other wants her, but he respects his friend. One of

them is obsessed with the murder of a second-rate actress (The case of the Black Dahlia is astory

real), the other has a money with a millionaire. The triangle does not it is solved because we do not know where it is

counted, nor for whom should we take sides. We do not understand the protagonist's dilemma between his heart and

his fidelity to his friend. Later, Josh Harnett has to choose between the good and the depraved woman. But today

nobody is willing to reject a character for having had homosexuals. The homophobia of James

Ellroy is a problem of Ellroy, not ours. To the surprise of the spectator, the action takes unexpected tints and

the turns make us consider everything we had created. The problem is that we did not expect anything, because

during the first hour we have no characters to connect with or a clear action to get hooked, wenot

dohave presumptions that can then fly in a thousand pieces.

" 0

" It is such my disappointment and my bewilderment after seeing Oliver Stone's World Trade Center last night, that I do not know

where to start narrating the multiple reasons ...

Actually, it is such a disappointment and my bewilderment after seeing Oliver Stone's World Trade Center last night, that Inot

doknow where to start narrating the multiple reasons. First of all, for those who do not. is still seen I would

recommend that you do not continue reading this post, firstly because some spoiler may fall

(although what happens in the story is known before you start) and Then because if seeing it without prejudice is already

unbearable, I do not want to think how it can be with some slight negative idea in mind. I have

to admit that the first half hour of World Trade Center (the same one that excited me �� in Cannes) is

spectacular, reflecting the widespread bewilderment, and the lack of information and resources available to law enforcement agencies

, who could never have imagined that such atrocity would occur in a city like New York.

Although an apparent progressive distancing from the facts is already beginning to appear, to focus on the

protagonist characters, who are buried under the rubble of the building. And when I say apparent

distancing, it is not by chance, since the film omits relevant data such as who carried out

the attack, under the pretext of narrating only what happened to the police, but there is no shortage

of Bush's television images proclaiming that no one can do with them, or other phrases played by a Marine (which will be

discussed more fully), They are of foreign shame. We already have the heroes buried, their families

suspecting that they will not see them again, and from here, the film is limited to showing a time to ones,

a time to others, just enough so that you do not fall asleep with any of the situations, so repetitive, and boring,

that one gets to feel guilty of ending up yawning before events that were really so

terrible. I do not doubt of the veracity of everything that Word Trade Center has, but can not be had during if

two hours to two guys buried under rubble, repeating incessantly "" Do not fall asleep "" while their families

spend the day eating, without making the most relevant comment, or giving their opinion about what is happening, or

speculate about the situation, as if they had donkey earmuffs, that prevented them from seeing

around them. To top it all off, the victims and their wives , that as is logical they think about each

other constantly, and vice versa, they share at the same time, the same memories, with a photograph bathed in a

kind of illumination whitish, worthy of the worst telefilm of a Sunday afternoon. But in case there was not

enough with the monoton���a, the film also includes some embarrassing and ridiculous moments, which they even

provoked laughter in the room, which, taking into account the subject that was being discussed, is

unfortunate. to the extreme of absurd parody that leads Oliver Stone. The first scene to forget,

is when Jesus Christ appears with a bottle of water, between lights of colors, in the most pure Super Star style, which

to top it off, repeat twice, in case someone was not ashamed yet. Surely, in the situation

he was, the policeman saw Christ, and what was needed, but was it necessary to show him that? Or rather, "

Was it necessary to show it?" Apparently, because what is clearer as the film progresses, is that God

is with the Americans, at all times, manifested Going even through a former Marine, who hears his

call in a church, under a huge cross (after seeing Bush on TV) and runs to the hairdresser ,

to shave his head, which surely is very useful for a rescue. This unfortunate character,

is the hero of World Trade Center, since it is he who manages to find the police (thanks to the warning of

God), skipping all the recommendations of the rescue teams. So that his position is clear, in his

first appearance on the screen we see him proclaiming "" Gentlemen, we are at war "" (or something similar) and in the last one

speaking for a m� ��vil (we assume that with other Marines guided also by God) to avenge what happened. Was it

necessary to put God in this? Because I understand that he is named for the questions of faith, that there are them at all

times, since in the face of despair most of the characters pray, but to talk about revenge? I

find it quite outrageous, especially considering that Oliver Stone has not tired of repeating thatnot

he haswanted to position himself politically. Less bad! Because if he gets to position himself, Bush would have gone out making

the final barbecue, where everyone appears happy, and in which Nicolas Cage releases a discourse onmen

bad, and good ones, which serves as the perfect icing for size desprop� ��sito.En the final credits, among

other things it appears that the marine in question went to the war in Iraq (which had already been quite

clear), and finally devotes the film to all the victims of the attack, but at that moment it is already too

late, because most people have left the room, after having seen a typical americanada, who

did not need to be placed in the attacks of 11 September. When I heard that this film was going to be made

so soon, I did not think it was �� very correct, due to the still latent trace that remains of what

happened, and if something is grateful to Stone, it is not to have fallen in the morbid, nor to have delved into the wounds, with

scabrous images, or shocking. For that we already had the reality. But to do what he has done, it does notme

seem toat all either, that it was worth it.

" 0

" that I can add to a tape that is a classic in a whole generation, is not it? Inot recommend, nor can I

dothink of it, we've all seen it a thousand times.

While in the morning I drank my coffee watching an excellent documentary by the Spanishcompany

special effectsDT (winners) of 1 Oscar for "" El Laberinto del Fauno "") and taking advantage of the fact that my other half

had bought (it is supposed that for me, although she is enjoying it almost more than me) the book "" Star Wars - The

Legacy "" we take advantage, thanks to the half kilo of editions that Lucas has been publishing to revise the

Saga. It is true that sitting in front of the TV to watch the films of Star Wars is like seeing again at Christmas

that cousin that you have not seen for a long time, and that you enjoy his presence, and that , with the film that

started the phenomenon, it's easy to feel identified, even if it's the last time you see it, and you know about pap��� ,

not only his di���logos, but also many of the secrets (or even additions of the remastered version.) of

shooting it. It is true that at a narrative level , history, (I always said that Lucas is apsimo.),

screenwriter it's pretty loose and even predictable, but hey, l wantedmake a kind of homage tocinema

of action ��n, and the novels and get it, apart, I've always liked the movies that revolve around

visiting places and doing things, and so on. And Star Wars is one of those films, in terms of its actors, it

is true that both Harrison Ford and Carrie Fisher are great, but Mark Hammil, who is seen,

quite lost in his role as Luke Skywalker. more I can add a tape that is a classic in a

whole generation, is not it? I do not recommend, nor does it occur to me, we have all seen it a thousand times.

" 1

" The fact that it shows the conflict of the diamonds with such clarity is what saves it from being a

simple film of ordinary and inconsequential action.

Diamante de Sangre is, in general, a fairly conventional film, especially in its form, in many

moments it is like a Hollywood action movie, what sets it apart from those films is that

He talks about an important issue that is never talked about in the media, the traffic in diamonds in Africa and

about the painful situation in which this continent is located. The fact that he shows the conflict of

the diamonds with such clarity is what saves him from being a simple film of ordinary and

inconsequential action. Leonardo DiCaprio continues to demonstrate that he is a good actor, I think he could It's going to be one of

Hollywood's greats and that being handsome does not have to be an inconvenience to be a good interpreter. In

Diamante de Sangre he shows that not only Scorsese knows how to get the best performances from him. His role is that of a

white African who is dedicated to trafficking in diamonds, he suffers an evolution throughout the film, which is

quite predictable, but this is the fault of the gui���n, not of its performance. The other protagonist is Djimon Hounsou, an

actor more and more known and who, like DiCaprio, has been nominated to the Oscar for this role, but as a

secondary. He also performs well, is a reserved character who does not express what he feels,

except when he can no longer exploit. He also has an impressive voice (in the original version, of course).

As for Jennifer Connelly, it does not catch my attention, I think it's correct and nothing more. ��s, as it usually is

always.

" 0

" When someone wants to leave what he usually does, he must first make sure it is a good

project.

The basis of a good film is found in the script. That is an obvious axiom for every director and

connoisseur of cinema. Everything else, actors, photographs, montage. they are additions that make the film

perfect and that the message that you want to transmit through the script is clear and spectacular. That is the

fault of Los cr ���menes of Oxford, by much good direction that ���lex of the Church employs, imitating his admired

Hitchcock in a brazen manner but that makes him a beautiful tribute, and for many good interpretations that he

has, part of the basis of a very loose novel, in which typical characters let go what could be a

good story and it is an overwhelming disappointment. Many writers consider that p�� Public can only be

won by presenting initial theories of some formulas to be solved, which are happening until the

final climax, where everything is solved and after being confused the spectator with twenty thousand suspects, in the end the

culprit was in front of your nose. And it may be true, but even so, that story must have a hook

and an attractive conclusion and above all a spectacular ending that does not leave you indifferent. The explanations of

why those cr ���menes seemed to me lazy, the typical characters such as the girl in love with the

protagonist who gets frustrated when not getting it or the disgusted student who was not looked after by the star teacher

and who drowns his sorrows in alcohol, they are mere insignificant absences that do not contribute anything and damage the history

in general, because you get distracted but without having a logical consequence, to solve whatraises

the film. That yes, technically it is a great movie, and the interpretations of each of them are from

book, but without a good material behind, this remains empty and vano.Espero that the Lord Of the Church, it returns

goes by its vein c���mica and ir���nica of the community or Crime ferpecto, that ah��� that it shines its true ones stories

and knows how to take them very well.

" 0

" Except in the script, the rest seems to be taken from a half-length telefilm "" Los 100 golpes "", that's what is called the controversial and successful book that he wrote autobiographically � Melissa Panarello,

a young Italian woman who is now around 19 years old. This book brought the scandal with the storysexual life

of this girl'swhen she was only 15 and 16 years old. And this is not a tale of sexual awakening to the

"" Summer of 42 "", is a mirror of today's society, in which sex has ceased to be a game of adults to

be a game of ni�� �os, with the psychic and physical risks that this can entail.This is what is tried to be

transmitted in the cinematographic version of "" Melissa P. "", where sex with all its variants are

discovered by the young Melissa, when her innocence and her naiveté is still a skin. For this

Lolita of the 21st century, the Italians have imported to the Spanish Lolita, Maria Valverde, the actress who made herself

known and won a Goya for that wonderful film by Manuel Mart���n Cuenca entitled "" The weakness of the

Bolshevik "", in which she knew how to give her character the sweetness and Brazenness needed. A real discovery in

that film, where she was barely 16 years old, Valverde has become one of the most promising actresses

of our cinema. Let's hope that her innocent and affectionate face is not the flower of a day and that with the years she knows how to

face roles other than that of a provocative girl. That can be coupled to adult roles. On this occasion, his

role again requires childish gestures with mature attitudes. Valverde convinces in his innocence, but not

so much in his contact with the adult characters. It was necessary to wait for Valverde to turn 18 so that he

could shoot the nude scenes and the truth is that they have not spared in sequences of this type,

necessary on the other hand, to tell a story, which is not , a sexual diary with all its

consequences. In addition, the dubbing of Maria Valverde herself, does her a disservice in her Spanish version. What's

really interesting about this "" Melissa P. "", although nothing new on the other hand , it is something that thealready contained

novel. That mirror, as we say, in which a large part of the youngest youth can be seen. Sex and its

consequences in a child who still wears backpacks and has just stopped playing with his toys. Thedisorder

psychicthat this may entail in the person. To reaffirm the fragility of the girl, the film introduces two

characters and one ghost, around Melissa. A mother who believes that she gives everything to her daughter, but in

fact hardly knows her, a grandmother who understands the girl, but who will not live in her house to advise her and

a non-existent father with whom Melissa, alone communicates by SMS.Therefore, a portrait where we see a

quinceañera, without a patenal or maternal help, without that basic family environment that is necessary for a

correct socialization of a being human. A house where solitude abounds. And as for the scope of the

Institute, good and bad influences are shown on the tape. The choice of one or the other by

Melissa, would lead her to a hell of uncontrolled sex or to the straight path that corresponds to her age. As for

the strictly cinematographic of "Melissa" P. "", little we can save or highlight. The interesting and previously

mentioned, was already the basis of the book, and, as it could not be otherwise, remains in the film. But the rest

seems to be taken from a mid-range telefilm, which even the most telefilm-prone chains would not select for their

grill. A direction without tact, without taste. A very good assembly and a very bad use of music. Luca

Guadagnino, the director of the show, is halfway between the poetic tone and the sordid tone.

Enter characters that are easily forgotten and then enter them again on screen without prior

notice. In addition, some sexual sequences are shot without the least talent. And most worrying, sometimes it

gives the feeling that we are in front of a compress advertisement. There is nothing with a minimal relevance in "" Melissa

P. "". A scandalous story, (maybe a few years ago if it was) sometimes gratuitous, with the pretension of a

transgressor, an unfortunate narrative, almost two boring hours of footage and a bad address. It is not

precisely the recommendation of the week, although there will be many who fell in love with Mar���a Valverde

in "" The weakness of the Bolshevik "" who want to see how this girl is doing with two more years.

" 0

" Impeccable in the aesthetic, but with too many gaps in development. It is long and lacks

sufficient action to engage.

The expected and desired adaptation to the cinema of the Miami Vice television series is already among us

with a final result that I doubt will satisfy the fans of the original. Michael Mann signs an

impeccable film in the aesthetic, but with too many gaps in development. A story of action should not let

the viewer get bored and blow his imagination far away from the room. This is the biggest mistake of Miami

Vice: action scenes with other vagrants that serve to unite one and the other. But not even the action is the most

common in this film of police. Except in the final scene, the shots are scarce as if there was a

tremendous crisis in blank weapons. The formula fails and gives the terrible sensation of a chapter too stretched.

The best thing is, without a doubt, Jamie Fox as Ricardo Tubbs, very much in his role as a faithful follower of everything from

Sonny Crockett, played by a scruffy Colin Farrell who has been chasing a Chinese girl (instead

of the bad guys) during most of the footage. In the end, Miami Vice has been in the pursuit oflove

Sonny, which is limited to follow the dictation of their hormones proving that is a rebel. A nonsense. As

for our Luis Tosar? What could we say? Let's say it is correct. He plays the bad guy, a drug

lord in Cuba who hires the two policemen (incognito) to do a little job. Tosar has a couple or

three appearances in which he is appreciated sober and content (he did not have to do much more either). On the

contrary, his academy English seems good, maybe too forced. But, what does that matter if they are already

dubbing it here with a Cuban accent. There is not much to mention about the film, which tells the typical police story in the style of Two

policemen rebels Tubbs and Crocketts must infiltrate a network of drug trafficking to kill the biggest

boss in the market, but someone crosses their path (a girl, of course) and everything gets complicated. The story is that

you expect a movie like that, but it is long and lacks sufficient action to engage. The good

esthetic result is the only positive, but not very valuable considering the high budgets that

Hollywood handles. Undoubtedly, we repeat that the best is Jamie Foxx, who shows once more that the same is true

for a serious film that for another not so much. Maybe Tosar will have more luck in his nextincursion

Hollywood, although his pocket sure does not complain.

" 0

" Fast-paced action, bad misfortunes and special effects everywhere. Entertaining and vibrant maybe the

words that best define it. But of course, that's a matter of taste.

Go ahead that I've always felt an odd fascination for James Bond. This twentieth first film

of the adventures of the most famous secret agent in the world corresponds to the first novel published in 1953

by Ian Flemming, so we already have here the first great work of the writers, which is to adapt the

action, the technological means and the language of more than fifty years ago to the current times. This installment

has the great incentive to see for the first time the new protagonist, Daniel Craig, who is the seventh actor to

play 007 and the first blonde, something that aroused the suspicions of many traditionalists, among the

that I include myself The sudden decision of Brosnan (former interpreter) to abandon the paper, put the producer

in a serious problem, since he had been fundamental in the resurgence of the character, in a dormant state since

Timothy Dalton interpreted it for the last time in 1989. And it is that it must be difficult in these times to

defend the role of a guy who lacks ���pulos at the time of killing, who drinks excessively, smokes and uses

women as mere objects. It is a brave bet, and it seems that with Craig have returned to hit and there is

someone who catalogs it as the best Bond since Connery. To me, honestly, I think it lacks mordant and

style, although at an interpretive level it is quite good. The new Bond girl, the French Eva Green, still

lacks a boil and Judi Dench is correct in her role as M, the strict boss. For the rest, in the

usual line: fast action, bad bad habits and special effects everywhere. Entertaining and vibrant maybe

the words that best define it. But of course, that's a matter of taste.

" 1

" Almod���var has achieved a resounding and accurate full: the heat of criticism, the heat of the public, a

blockbuster and a movie

"" Back "" we returns to an Almod���var wrapped in the clothes of the well-understood and better digested costumbrismo,

a tradition that, instead of colliding with modernity, links with it to complement, join and

even multiply. ���, the most detestable of the universe Almod���var were those extreme characters that,

sincerely, seemed to me a real co���azo. I never could with so much travelo-macho locked in the body of a

woman who, however, fell in love with a young girl who, finally, had implanted an artificial penis and

some silicone tits. That is why, when Almod�� �var started filming more classical court stories, talking about

universal themes such as loneliness, the loss of a loved one or love, his cinema won many whole. In that

line were "" All about my mother "" and "" Talk to her "" and, with "" Back "", Pedro has given birth to a masterpiece

that can not be put even It is but. At the start, the credit titles, removed by the inclement

wind of La Mancha, are an authentic declaration of principles. And, from there, Almod���var makes the

presentation of the scenarios and the characters, both main and secondary, in just fifteen minutes, with

a conciseness, a neatness and a synthesis capacity that will turn the "" Back ""intosubject

scriptcompulsoryof study in any cinematographic writing workshop worth its salt. , of course, the

story. A story that interweaves characters, legends, myths, superstitions and family secrets, that

mixes drama with comedy, the city with the town, the big family house with the tiny apartment,

the old-fashioned gossip and the that uses television as an amplifier to reach all

corners, etc ... Because "" Back "" is full of details, gui���os and gestures that unite and they link the two

Espa :as: the rural and the urban Spain, the Espa���a of the mid-twentieth century and the one that wakes up with the Millennium, the

Spain of traditional cuisine , the an���s and the cross stitch with the catering company, the mojitos and the lycra.

Two Espa enas in which, however, things are not so different, then and now, as well is responsible for

demonstrating an Almod���var in a state of grace. And it does so by using a rich, spectacular and Glorious coral cast

monopolized by women. There are barely two men in the whole movie and they do it in a tangential and almost

anecdotal way. The male genre, converted by Almod���var into mere narrative Mc Guffin, which shows that

parity by decree, when there is genius and talent, is not necessary. With "" Back "", Almod�� �var has achieved a resounding

and accurate full: the heat of criticism, the heat of the public, a blockbuster and a movie. Now onlyare missing

the prizes. Do not delay in arriving.

" 1

" Szabo pays tribute to his socialist culture, the legacy of the Russian school embodied in fixed, short shots,

in the austerity of the props and, above all, in a certain reconstitutive affection for the verbal over the iconic.cinema

Politicalof a lot of height.

From the start, a warning. Sweet Emma, ​​dear Bobe is not cinema with capitals as it may be Grapes of Wrath

or Psycho or Casablanca or The Tree of Life. It is not cinema that has marked one generation and then

marked another. And what comes. It is not a manifestly popular cinema that we can hear talking about at atable

baror in the improvised gathering in the tail of a cinema, but it is cinema in capitals and it deserves that the

sentimentality of this passionate and vocational prose be delivered for a while and the kind reader of the

title can dive in public libraries or private archives to watch it. You will not regret it the

least. Whoever knows her (I saw her in a pass of the glorious TVE 2 and now I have repescado informat

digital), same returns to its raw charm, but necessary. The splinters of the socialist regime float on the

pool and bore the raft in which the teachers of a school try to survive. The line of the fleet floats

and each future na���frago cackles what it knows to claim its share of life preserves. Emma, ​​apart

from the social revolution, is concerned about sexual unionism and wanders the corridors of the public school in

Budapest where she works lampando for brushing the director: a cowardly, elusive guy, stranded between the

conjugal fidelity and the clandestine vice of sinning outside of the program. She is an easy woman, who tries to overcome

a personal crisis surrounded by a state, economic, and political crisis. in dreams, Emma falls as if by a long

embankment, naked, with her face contracted and her mouth made a crooked, ugly gesture. Bobe has amood

western, materialistic, and lives his particular odyssey of escalating and applying the Latin carpe diem to hisbook

savingsand his vaginal solace: he becomes, then, a whore, and ends up throwing himself, at the end, from a third floor perhaps

because he failed to respond to the strict observance of the class rule of entrenched communism of his

government. Szabo is a Hungarian director (Budapest, 1938) fully westernized, but he knows how to recover

adolescent readings and write a film that is alien to the narrative mechanisms of European or American cinema that he has

tasted in his westernization. There is no physical correlate between this Dulce emma, dear Bobe and other films of

her like the well-known Appointment with Venus (Glenn Close) or Hanussen (with her compatriot and friend Klaus Maria

Brandauer, which we remember in Memoirs of Africa very especially). Szabo pays homage to his socialist culture,

the legacy of the Russian school embodied in fixed, short shots, in the austerity of the props and, above all, in a

certain reconstitutional affection for the verbal over the iconic. An advertisement from the time it was released

pointed to the idea that the film was Thelma and Louis from the Eastern block. It's false. There is nothing of that.Scott's

Ridley film moves the audience to identifygloriously with fugal women seeking to

escape their particular emotional buffeted handle your life. The country in which they live is going well, reasonably

well, of course. Hungary is not the United States of America. Nor Dulce Emma, ​​dear Bobe, is a film, like

this one, feminist or slightly inclined to a practicing feminism: it is a sentimental criticism of the

dsigregaci���n of a way of life and how that fragmentation ended up destroying lots of lives that did not know (

or did not try) to embrace the new capitalist, modern, pop militancy. The little Szabo (huge ) is

that it makes a film of internal consumption that is neatly understood abroad: more in Europe than in the

effervescent and sweetened Hollywood that does not see beyond � from your own garden. The Westernist borders of the film

(the squares crowded with tourists, the pass of naked women for an Arabist film, the liberal andtale

cosmopolitanof the tolerant Bobe) articulate a window through which to look to understand that reality pol� The ethics

of the Eastern countries are not the work of chance, but in that very complex plot, Western valuesplay a role

and behaviors also: the fair of the vanities in which we have turned, for good, for evil, this side of

History. Twenty years after (or almost) the reading of the film is identical that when the first ninety

yawned that awakening of Eastern countries to democracy and lifestyle modern European, but now

we know more and we understand that the trip was worth it.

" 1

" A tape that is not for everyone, but quite interesting, of those that, at the end, can be the subject of

a long discussion.

By 1865 slavery was abolished in the United States, thus freeing thousands, if not millions, of-

AfricanAmericans who lived on its soil. No doubt it was the right thing, the most human? But were they ready to

be free? Manderlay, the new film by Lars von Trier, starts with that question, and then makes

many more and so raise, once again, his criticism of the United States, for It's certainly not visited. The

film is part of a trilogy I started with Dogville, starring Nicole Kidman, whose character

Bryce Dallas Howard now takes up, with a fine and exact Acting by the way Trilog���aa the one that will end the

next year with the Wasington tape (so without h.). This new misfortune of Grace, the main character,

begins when on the road with her father and her gang of gangsters they arrive at aplantation

cottonin the middle of nowhere, where slavery continues. 70a 70 years after being abolished.In a matter of minutes

Grace, with the help of her cronies, frees the slaves, but when she is about to continue her journey, she

discovers that the new free men need something more. I am afraid of what will happen now. - He confesses

one of them. ? I do not know if we are ready for a new way of life. When we were slaves, we used to have dinner every

day at 7. How many hours do free men eat dinner? Grace decides to stay in Manderlay and help the

community learn to live in freedom, striving to install equality between men, healthy

coexistence and democracy, almost by decree. And so chapter by chapter, we see how von Trier passes through the

arms the American way of life, soon the slaves stop being slaves to sign contracts and be

workers, that they will have to work forcedly to cover their debts, suddenly Grace has the same

interventionist attitude of her country, trying to convince everyone that the best thing is to be like her and her country. But

soon his new society hits bottom and made use of other "American thanks" as justice and the death

penalty, which Grace will suffer firsthand. Again, Lars von Trier, made hand of the concept of Dogville, when

shooting the tape in a huge black studio, with some lines on the floor showing the division of the

different places and with only some scenographic elements, that is, as if ��� of a play by

Bertolt Brecht, which is not well received by many, but in my opinion, adds several degrees

to its already dense atmosphere. And although, as dictated by The Dogma initiated by the director himself, the

lighting is quite elementary, it is possible to create a beautiful and quite adequate photograph for the tape and that

helps to faithfully recreate the environment of a plantation of the thirties. This is a tape perhaps more

digestible than the first, At least not so bloody, although step by step, the tension grows until it

resembles the dramatic limits of Dogville, with a couple of surprising turns of the nut that like

Grace, they will leave us with their mouths open. A tape that is not for everyone, but quite interesting, of those that,

when finished, can be the subject of a long discussion.

" 1

" The pain is that with Mr Brooks they do not give you a remote control to be able to pass quickly what you do

not care about at all. And it is that this film is very slow, so much that it seems that Kevin Costner and Demi Moore have been

infected and their actions and actions are slowed down.

I do not like to leave the cinema thinking I've wasted my time. That's why I try to fix at least one good thing

of each film to justify its viewing but it will cost me with this one. The pity is that Mr Brooks does notyou

givea remote control to be able to pass quickly what you do not care at all. And it is that this

film is very slow, so much so that it seems that Kevin Costner and Demi Moore have become infected and their actions and actions

slow down. Mr. Brooks is a brilliant businessman with a family that seems perfect. But in his

spare time he has a rather peculiar hobby, he is addicted to murdering couples. Although there was a time when he

did it very often it seems that now he is willing to leave but events will force him to kill

on at least two occasions against his will There are two things that do not convince me. The first is the director

who bores with classic and unnecessary shots making the story boring and decides to go crazy in theshooting

finalbreaking the black and sober aesthetics that he had raised himself create, the other is Marshall, his own

Pepito Cricket as a rather unoriginal schizophrenic resource Marshall is much more fun and charismatic

than Brooks and in fact much more clever, maybe They should have chosen to change the real and the fictional character

and the experiment would be interesting.

" 0

" If second parts were never good, then third and I do not even tell youCuriosity made me come to see the new film by James Wong, who already directed the first part of

this saga, and that because I did not say that, I liked it. On this occasion I can not say the same thing, if second parties

were never good, because third parties do not even count. I could already guess that the film was not going to be a

masterpiece, but it is that from the beginning you could see the catastrophe and the torture that was going to be endured all

the footage. If something is characterized the saga is for its start, at which time the tragedy occurs that will

later be a foreboding of the protagonist who will vary the course of death. In "" Final Destination

3 "" takes place in an amusement park, specifically in a gigantic Russian mountain, but the truth is that

even using a medium so propitious Wong manages to get us between the vertigo, nor the fear or the tension of going in a

vehicle so fast and that so much anguish creates in many people. The whole script is predictable, with di���logos really

simple, falling is the most vulgar stereotypes and with some sequence that really gives shame. If

we start from that base it is difficult to do something worthy, so the acting plan you can imagine

how it will be. I must say that the protagonist Mary Elizabeth Winstead (Sky High, The Ring 2) is saved from burning,

which seen the seen is not little. The most fun are the deaths of the protagonists, which make the film

recover a little lost interest in these ramblings about who will be the next to die and in those

interpretations that make some pictures that were taken in the amusement park and that serve as a guide for

prevention. The most regrettable and worrisome is that it is having a good fundraising and that to achieve such aproduct

badthere is a large group of professionals behind. "" Final Destination 3 "" returns to low hours to

the fantastic and horror movies, in terms of quality because based on remakes and absurd movies, at the box office is

surviving. The truth is that recommending this film would be very bad, but if I have to do it, the

most acrimonious public will be those teenagers who enjoy lazy exercises of entertainment and who

look for predictable situations, children's dialogues, see a pair of tits and a bit of blood.

" 0

" Movie about a monster that is installed in the co���oa a little lady what forces him to go on balls

all the time and eat the lovers and others fuckers For seasoned viewers who are able to see

all the programs of the washing machine.

Director: Takao Nakano. Duration: The theme does not last for more than an hour. Year: 2004. I think there are

films that roll for that kind of spectators that gives them equal eight that eighty and that are swallowed

equal one of art and essay like a moj���n breaded. If not, I do not explain that these films have success. Well

looked, if we join title of porn movie (Nacho Vidal rod��� a few, but without surprise between the legs) to a

witty monster and gore scenes, we have fine cinnamon, which is usually said.The pel� "I do not know what it's about,

since the copies are in Japanese without subtitles. At the beginning there are some explorers and a magician who doesthings

strange, to go directly to the girl in porretas. It turns out that some kids get into a country house

to devote to what is being used to wear out mineral salts and in these they find a girl who used to go out with

the magician in an ice cube. Then it defrosts and a girl gets a worm in her mouth (like

the disgusting announcement of the cocaine that the older ones will remember where a worm came in through the napia

to one) and becomes strong in what that is being the whole co .o. And ale, to eat all var quen that arrives there to

smell. What do you want me to tell you after reading the summary? It reminded me of a chapter of "" The House of

Drawings "" where the princess had a curse and when she lifted her skirt a monster came out with a

tent� ��culos. That burst out laughing. In this is the same, but with fine casquer���a, hear, as I bring the casquer���a, that

moves me, that mueeeeeeeeeeee me. Of course I understand perfectly that it does not have translation to the

Castilian, although in the videoclub would be well, next to those of Disney one that was called "" Thecoo

assassin""". film about a monster that is installed in the co���oa a little lady what forces him to

go on balls all the time and eat lovers and other follarines. For seasoned spectators who are

able to see all the programs of the washing machine, even the one with delicate fabrics. This does not have any stars

or anything that looks like it.Besitos.PD: I'm dying of laughter thinking of "the co�" ��o murderer "" and remembering

the story told by a friend about a girl who flirted in a bar. They got into the car, pulled her

panties down and had to lower the windows of what came out of there. Hahahaha, what else is soez! PD2: The

scene in which the girl oozes "" flow "" is the most disgusting thing that has been seen in the movies. PD3: If this

cr� Ethics does not elevate me, I do not know how to do it anymore, given that nobody else has criticized it in Spanish.

" 0

" Personally I recommend it if what is intended is to spend an entertaining time with children of no less than

about 6 ��� 7 years, I calculate. Although the biggest laughter was heard from an adult who sat to my left.

Definitely not what was expected for my little critic. Maybe the plot and the conversationsnot

wereintelligible for a young intellect of barely 4 years. The fact is that it is a

story that does not come out of my usual adventure movie. Time, taken to the terrain of

3D cartoons, made by computer. A succession of events too frantic for the smallest to

be able to follow the thread of the film, in my opinion. Let the film tena a pace

too rpido.No But from the point of view a little more adult, I recognize that see this film,

maybe, a couple of years later, I would have had a better score for my young critic. The turns of "" Looking for

Nemo "", the slugs that recreated the ambient sounds of many of the scenes, even their soundtrack was

starred by them, are more than funny situations that adults collect r��� quickly, but in the

smallest they do not have the least effect. As if that were not enough, it was not the evil plans of the "" Toad "" that

landed � to my young critic, but the fact that the poor child, owner of the mouse, was going to run out of her

pet. - To understand this part of the criticism it is necessary to see the film and interpret it from the mind

of the critic who speaks through my lyrics. on this occasion he will score only with a regular, given

that, for him, this film is surpassed by "" Colleagues in the forest "", "" Ant Bully "" and "" El Corral"". Anyway, I

personally recommend it if what is intended is to spend an entertaining time with children of no less than about 6

��� 7 years, I calculate. Although the biggest laughter was heard from an adult who sat to my left.

" 0

" No actor stands out and our Pen���lope stands in terms of credibility embodying the role of a

luxury prostitute who is less affected by cancer.

The second film by Martha Fiennes as director does not convince the critics and we will have to wait until its

premiere, on May 18, to see if it convinces the Spanish public. In 2005 this film closed theFilm

CannesFestival and has had to wait, for reasons that even the director herself knows, until 2007 to be released

in cinemas. As a curious note, it will be released earlier in Spain than in the United Kingdom. Martha Fiennes

narrates the existential void in the refined and stilted English high society through the life of a successful lawyer

(Damian Lewis) and his wife (Kristin Scott Thomas), an art dealer. However, the entire

narrative approach is bombastic, excessively abusing a plan that is carried away by the

grandiosity of the environments and an excessively loud soundtrack. It does not highlight any actor and our

Pen� ��lope is a watershed in terms of credibility, embodying the role of a luxury prostitute who is not

suffering from cancer. It will please all those fans of "" Pe "" and "" The English Patient "" as the main couplerepeats

of that filmin this, from a filial relationship this time.

" 0

" The photo is cruel, and the script is not well intentioned, which makes this movie a true madness of

the macabre, with antol���gicas scenes, magnificent gratuitous violence and blood in spurts .

28 DAYS AFTER was to the cinema of "" zombies "" (although they were not) what Steven Spielberg's version of "" THE

WAR OF THE WORLDS "" to the cinema of extraterrestrial invasions. Realism prevailed, echo from apoint of view

physical and primary, the movie took the subject seriously and did not try to take the characters' hair (which

on the other hand does not have to be bad) If you imagine the months after the end of "" THE WAR OF THE WORLDS "" you would

also have an entertaining movie. Well, "" 28 WEEKS LATER "" how would London be 28 weeks

after the infection of the virus of anger. The approach is simple and the movie also , and that is something

that the cinema has to learn. the simple The movie is almost perfect if it is not already. I think that this will become

a classic just like its predecessor. I do not know if it's better or worse, and it does not bother me, I think they are pelisque should

exist, the perfect sequel and the perfect prequel. That is, it is not an unnecessary sequel to take advantage of the

pasta that I collected the first, no, this movie had to happen. I wanted to know what would happen after the first move.

Danny Boyle decided that he would not lead, he was too messed up with "" SUNSHINE "", And I looked for someone, I

saw the very correct "" INTACT "" and it peg��� the touch to our compatriot Juan Carlos Fresnadillo, who after several

encounters decided to access having as a condition retouching the script, Boyle agreed ... and the thing started.

Less bad. The movie has a hellish rhythm with a sickly performance, which is necessary, the camera is

infected, it is almost more from the point of view of the infection than of the non-infection. .N Influenced by the

first but not like that, "" 28 WEEKS AFTER "" is more brutal, more violent and more crazy. It has little to do with

horror movies now, because It's not done like a horror movie, it's more like ascience fiction

possible. like a version the beast of "" JURUSIC PARK. "" It's terror, but it does not look like it. It has a touch almost of

that cinema that was made in the 80s in Germany or Italy or the USA. MONDO cinema, extreme violence. The little

care with what is said, the little responsibility with what is seen. Despite what manysay,

smartiesthis has nothing to do with the war in Iraq. People see absurd parallels. It's a movie, period. A great

movie that people who make movies must learn. The sequence with which the film is opened is

masterful, to learn from it, study it, observe it. The rhythm is trepidante from the beginning, but it has

necessary moments of rest. rest is not exempt from tension, it's like a bacteriological movie, it's like aweapon

biochemicallike the ones you release in the movie. You feel great to have seen it, it is not one of those films that leave you

bad body. It's like part of the infection, the film is the infection. The picture is cruel, and the script is

unintentional, which makes this movie a real madness. the macabre, with antològic scenes,

magnificent gratuitous violence and bloody blood. In addition to a nihilistic point of view about man as a

waste of the earth. Actually, I think, we should all die, in reality diseases are necessary

to end part of humanity at once. That's what you think when you see the movie. A movie that is worth more

than we think, a great movie and a final shot that gives meaning to everything.

" 1

" If the public has not applauded is not the fault of the director, is that he was not warned that in addition to seeing

zombies carn? Boros would need a handkerchief.

"" 28 days after "" Danny Boyle was, confessed or not, a zombie movie. The terror, consisted in which the

same protagonists, that we so longed that they escaped became zombies and suddenly we wanted that they

were destroyed; it consisted in human feelings, compassion was a weakness, and the army, which

had to save the healthy, was a danger. The zombies of Boyle put They tested oursensibility

Christian. Only the insensitive ones survive in their world. Fresnadillo has not wanted to go any further, as, no doubt,

we were waiting. He has wanted to humanize his monsters, and has taken a step back. The protagonist falls prey to

rage and begins to hit the walls. He is no longer with us, he is already one of them, but curiously, the

camera follows him. It is a subjective camera. Does Fresnadillo want us to identify with the patient? Do not want to

leave? Boyle would not have made that mistake. The innocents in this version are as afraid of the zombies

as they are of the army. When the time comes, the soldiers are ordered to eliminate the humans. Fresnadillo

points to the dehumanization of a part of society, of the army, to which it is so easy to make guilty of

anything. But Boyle's message was much deeper because it pointed to the very essence of thebeing

human. The protagonist's family carries a genetic variant that makes the surprises atcompletely coherent

the end, both humanitarian and tragedy,. Fresnadillo has wanted to put into question themessage

bleakof survival over love of neighbor and wanted to cast a positive message, like a

choir of Angels in the middle of the Texas massacre. If the public has not applauded is not the fault of the director, is that

he was not warned that in addition to see zombies carn? Boros would need a handkerchief.

" 0

" Paul Greengrass chooses his own version here and moves for 91 minutes, shoulder-to-shoulder, agile and

ruthless like a hungry tiger in a henhouse, with no concessions to the viewer. A historical film,

terrifying and essential.

In the final credits, the film is dedicated to ALL the victims of September 11. Because what United

93 shows, is a detailed documentary recreation about the events that occurred on that fateful morning. And

although there are many and varied the different angles and perspectives of that creepy tragedy, they all

have a brutal dramatic power. In this case, Paul Greengrass, author of the interesting "" A

Bloody Sunday "" or the regular "" The Bourne Supremacy "" focuses on the fourth plane hijacked on11

September, that which, according to official sources, crashed in Pennsylvania when the passengers

mutinied against the hijackers and tried to regain control of the flight. Greengrass plays with all

the tricks that an event of these characteristics offers.your own talent and your ability

Perfectly measureto document data and to faithfully and almost accurately recreate historical events. In

this case, the film is sold as supposedly veridical. But only supposedly, because there are still many

unsolved questions about what happened with this flight and with this attack in general. Strangely

, the remains of United 93 appeared eight miles from the place where it allegedly crashed, and, moreover,were never

the two black boxes that usually resist all types of collisionsfound. But more

strange is the fact that official sources also claim that theplanes were never found

black boxes of the other three. On the other hand, despite the that the delay of 40 minutes that this flight

suffered could have facilitated that the passengers, as in the film, learned about the fate of

the other hijacked planes and this was the trigger that Motiv their mutiny is wonder that the rebellion

came exactly on the plane with less passage of the three hostages, 45. When the other aircraft had

64, 65 and 92 passengers respectively. There are patriotic and interested theories that take advantage of the

official version chosen by Greengrass to, in addition, extol the courage and heroicism of American civilians, fighting

and sacrificing their own lives to save the White House. Others, however, much less attractive to the

US government, try to prove that the plane was shot down by an American fighter with an order to

shoot at the plane to avoid "bad elders." Some even claim that suchdid not exist

communicationsand that the commercial aircraft was shot down by mistake in those moments of chaos and confusion

that, moreover, is so faithfully portrayed by United 93. Nothing it is known for sure yet, but Paul Greengrass here chooses his

own version and moves for 91 minutes, shoulder-to-shoulder, agile and ruthless like a hungry tiger in a

chicken coop It narrates the events in real time, without concessions to the spectator. Undressing of clichés and dramatic resources

his work, without any type of morality or indoctrination. Showing with great crudeness and sobriety,

on the one hand, a millimic recreation of what could have happened inside the plane and, on the other, the surprise,

the bewilderment and the anguish of the controllers of flight and its total lack of coordination with astate

vulnerable, slow and inoperative US defense. Greengrass does not enter into political positions,

telling with great pulse and sense of rhythm. Exciting, crushing the viewer in the chair and all this,

without getting to position from one side or the other. As I pointed out at the beginning, in the final credits, the film

is dedicated to ALL the victims of September 11th. For this reason, when the kidnappers understand the

real situation they have caused, and the kidnapped, prisoners of fear and despair, they begin to

act under the most pure and animal survival instinct. Some pray fearfully to Ala in the cockpit,

while the others pray to Jesus in the back of an airplane in free fall. A historical film,

terrifying and essential.

" 1

" A high-quality film, which denotes the wise signature behind it and reconciles Scott with his

most demanding audience

Ridley Scott's career wandered in the last few years �� Poros by irregular terrains that seemed to predict the

decline of their masters. Except for Gladiator, who received a lot of awards at the 2001 Oscars but was part

of the best film tradition, films such as Un buen a���o, Los impostores or El reino de los cielos barely

glimpsed the shadow of the filmmaker who acted myths of the 80s cinema like Alien or Blade Ranner. And for his

resurgence he has used subgroups in his latest work, such as gangster or police thriller, so

approached by other great directors with magnificent results. Without going any further, Martin Scorsese left his

debt to the Oscar thanks to a film located between both themes with his excellent but not masterful The

Departed.American Ganster assumes with respect the long tradition In tapes set in the mafia and baby also

in typical universes of James Ellroy as the political-police corruption. It also means for Scott the

professional reunion with Russel Crowe, the protagonist of his last great film. And his first collaboration

with Denzel Washington, an actor who continues to demonstrate his wide capabilities to play almost any

role. The script of the film, which starts from a real story, is structured as a narrative. Parallel to the

lives of the two protagonists, the mafioso Frank Lucas and the police Richie Roberts. The lives of both run

on similar paths but in opposite directions. While Richie must suffer at the beginning of his career the

contempt of his companions for not acclimating to the environment of entrenched police corruption, Lucas will take advantage of

the knowledge acquired from his boss, an important Leader of the Black Mafia, to pick up his baton at his

death and prosper to become the greatest trafficker in the New York of the 70s. Another key factor for

Lucas's rapid rise in the business of heroin trafficking was war. In Vietnam, many soldiers

became junkies who imported their addiction to their country. Heroin was the fashionable drug, the one that everyone

wanted and should try to be cool. Lucas, aware of this growing demand, went directly

to the production source of the coveted opi���ceo. He put on the streets a heroine of great quality at aprice

reasonablethanks to excellent conditions of importation obtained by rinsing with high

political and military officials, who facilitated his transport to the United States. UU directly from

Vietnam itself. Very different, and probably more arduous, was the way to Richie's success. His unbreakable status

earned him few friends and a bad reputation in a corrupt police corps, but, on the other

hand, he was able to lead a special anti-drug unit that was in charge of It was time to decapitate the wide

tentacles of a business in full swing. Needless to say, with Crowe and Washington in the leading roles,

the art section is covered with ample solvency, m ���sa���n if you add to them the great work of the

secondary ones that wrap them up. On the other hand, the seventies atmosphere in New York, in the words of Ridley

Scott, was not at all easy given how distant now is the current aesthetic of the city, clean and tidy

even in suburban neighborhoods, the most worn and dirty aspect that the film

manages to recreate splendidly. Factors like these, so like the eager and entertaining narrative, they make

American Ganster a high quality film, which denotes the wise signature behind it and reconciles Scott with

his most demanding audience .

" 1

" There is no where to take it Yesterday, while returning from my pseudo official breakfast, an old woman stopped me in the street asking me

if I wanted to go to the cinema free. Obviously I said yes, and there we were last night surrounded by people whoseage could

averageeasily exceed sixty years, watching Cargo, a strange movie. ���cula (strange because of the

incomprehensibility of its cast, type European co-productions in which there is an actor from each country, so that you can

see who has contributed the money and what Dineronto money has contributed) directed by Clive Gordon (author of documentaries

that goes to length and has not started his career very well) and written by Paul Laverty, former

collaborator of Ken Loach in the writing of some of his films (Happy Sixteen or Carla's song) and

that I suppose I wanted to get rid of so much social and committed cinema and go straight tosimple entertainment

pure and. The film tells the story of a man (Daniel Brh���l) who must escape from an African country

where he has been robbed or all the documentation and where you can not get out (Why is it there?) How is it possible to

escape so easily from the police? Who is so foolish as to steal a bracelet in an African country?

To do this, sneaks into a gigantic boat of smugglers heading to Marseille, where he will coexist with a

group of sailors (avoid the joke, please) that has as a hobby throw overboard all the stowaways

that they find on the boat during the journey (but incomprehensibly, he is adopted and protected: it will

only be thrown away if you are poliz��� and black) I do not know where to start to gut the film, because therereally no

iswhere to take it. To begin with, the characters are caricatured to an impossible extreme: the

sailors (I do not know if eight or ten, I lost the account) are gross but can not, and do not contribute anything

when they open their mouths to grumble. They do not say two words without letting go of a cue and shouting, and the scriptwriter puts in his

mouth di comologos like these: Capit���n: "" Go to register the warehouse and find it! "" Sailor 1: "" That , let there be no

goat alive "" Sailor 2: "" A for that bastard "" Sailor ���: "" Come on, we'll find that bastard "" The character of the

captain, played by Peter Mullan (what a disservice the screenwriter of Ken Loach has done him in

recommend it), is one of those who talk to metaphors all the time, and who has a dark past that must

have been horrible to do the things he does. This (the mystery of something that happened in the past) is what pretends to

advance the story; but I can say no, that is precisely what sinks it. For

an hour and a half trying to know what happened on the boat for. discover in the end that nothing happened. The characters

throw people overboard to avoid paying the fine they will impose on the port if they discover them. Look no further.

Luis Tosar, the most visible Spanish contribution, acts with the autopilot required in this type of

film. It seems that he was passing by and they asked him to act. Above, if they ask him to go for a pig and with a

beard like Fray Leopoldo, he's in his sauce. For more inri, he bends himself, although hey, he does not notice

much, because more than talking he seems to growl every time he opens his mouth. The only thing that is saved is Daniel

Br��� hl, who gets to look scared during the whole footage, it is not known whether by history or by seeing what

those around him were performing. In addition there are mistakes in photography, obvious blurring,

inconsistencies in the story, things that happen because of me, and a final scene like "La Piedad" that has no

waste (so sonrojante). The picture is the only thing that seems thought and worked on a tape in which it

was very easy to get the sensation of claustrophobia that would drown the viewer and make him identify himself with

the protagonist (a ship in the middle of the sea full of intricacies, corridors and rooms), but it seems that only

the director of photography posed this possibility, and the scriptwriter and the director They try to destroy the

sensations that this provokes. And all this for a film that shows, in its promotional poster, the phrase

"" Magnificently shot. excellent performances "" (Geoff Gilmore, director of the Sundance Film Festival)

and "" Disturbing. ���spera and febrile like a heartbeat "" (La Raz���n). If that is the level of quality, I do not even want to

imagine what will come if this infumable tape has success. Hopefully not.

" 0

" Anyway, if you want to be scared, look at your current accounts when Holy Week ends. I'm

sure that in the next few months will be released by the film that we say? Tonight I do not sleep ?, butnot

this is, I assure you.

This movie I had already seen. I had seen about the child who sees ghosts in? The Sixth Sense ?. I had seen

about the house owned in? Terror in Amityville ?. He had seen the gray ghost in the? El Grito? Morehands

gray, also in? El Grito ?. Family Massacre again in? Terror in Amityville ?. In short, everything is

very seen. Little, therefore, I can say of a film that should not go from a quick viewing on DVD and in a

house, and that really He promised what he has finally given. Its directors, Danny and Oxide Pang, who

came backed by the saga of? The Eye? They have deflated themselves in the mecca of dreams and offer us easy scares

, foreseeable guidance, ridiculous tension and an end of the most hackneyed. After so many remakes andremakes, it

orientalgives more and more the sensation that, or you introduce pure gore, or that climate of old in which you

had to grab the compi The next seat is history. The industry may have become accustomed to

releasing sub-b movies that have good commercial credits, but everything has an ending, and "The Messengers"? It is a

good example of the end approaching. We need good STORIES, not a catalog of cliché situations. A

family that moves to the countryside, after problems in the city, buys a house with adjacent land where

they will grow sunflowers. . From then on there will be disturbing visions for the youngest of the family, and

an authentic harassment and ghostly demolition of the adolescent on duty. Meanwhile, the parents will continue to be incredulousblown

until everything isup and the inheritance is discovered. which was included with the house. This has been the

best way to explain the plot without bursting the meager? Surprises? that has the film, and believe me it has been

difficult to be so neutral. Seeing The Messengers? gives the feeling that? The Eye? He made her an uncle who gave his

honors to these Pang brothers. Pang pang their heads for perpetrating one of the most disappointing jumps of an

Asian filmmaker in Hollywood, which is doubly a crime for being two directors. They have managed to get the

actors to embroider their worst interpretations, with a Penelope Ann Miller aa���os light of "Carlito���s Way ?. Dylan

McDermott has not lavished so much in the movies, but he's not a rookie. It does not cause me any feeling of anguish or

sensation of anything, although it really is the girl in the movie, Kristen Stewart (? The Room of the Panic? ) the one

that has on its shoulders the weight of making you scream, which you do only to be liquidated at once and

everything finished. I'm going to leave John Corbett aside, since the man I owe a respect for? Doctor in Alaska? In short

, if you want to be scared look at your accounts when the Holy Week ends. I'm sure that

in the next few months will be released by the film that we say? Tonight I do not sleep ?, but this is not,

I assure you.

" 0

" If you compress in twenty minutes the first hour and a quarter, remove the bullshit of insects, and subtract

drama, we would have a great movie.

A joke that they told me the other day related to the movie. This is a guy who has not been to the movies for

many years. Total, he says he's going to go see "" Tarz���n of the monkeys "" but he's wrong and he gets into "" King Kong "".

When he returns home he asks the woman "" how is the movie "". "Very rare, very rare, Tarz���n does not appear

anywhere, but you have to see the Chita monkeys that have stuck." Fuck, I almost fell off the sidewalk

when they told me. Now I understand how Chiquito devastated with bad jokes. The film is about an

unsuccessful film director who takes control of the plane of a lost island. It tries to convince the producers

to finance it to go there and thus recover their prestige, but they deny it, so they decide to flee

with all the material that is not theirs to the island. As he wants to record a movie, he takes a girl he

finds on the street (pretty pretty, by the way) and a group of cameras, writers, etc. When they search

the island, they discover something more than a lost landscape of the hand of God. And so far I can count. Well, then

a monkey comes out like a house, you know, and Tarz���n does not appear anywhere, heh, heh. Special effects on

all sides. During the first hour and a quarter, the truth is that there are not many, but as soon as the monkeyalready

comes out, the budget isunleashed. Direis, the first and fourth hours? How many are there? Well here comes the first problem,

which are three horas as three movie cathedrals. And there are times when nothing happens. The monkey scenes are

fine, but the rest is a tru���o. Peter Jackson has passed three villages, with special effects and

with the gui���n. I do not know how the book will be, but the scene of the insects is a sovereign bullshit that

disqualifies half of the film. Fuck, and the end is a hell of melodramatic (although with somepoint

funny). Resumiendo, that if they compress in twenty minutes the first hour and a quarter, they remove the bullshit of

insects, and subtract dramatism, we would have a great movie. As they have not done it, we have a pretty

long period, so I recommend taking it on DVD and skipping until King appears (booooooooooombaaaaaaaaa ;-) Only

great special effects, but very long and silly.Besitos .PD: As you can see Peter Jackson's style, I was

waiting for thousands of orcs to appear throughout the film.PD2: A real anecdote like life itself.

We saw the film and in bed, while brushing my teeth half my chandelier, I climb to bed to do the

King Kong. The part of the blows on the chest well, the perfect growls the bad the moner���as. In one of these

somersaults I miscalculated the exit of the acrobatics and ended up with the back on the cold park. That osti���nPD3:

Look, I can not shut up. Let's see Peter Jackson, if you shake a woman for five minutes running through the

field, what is being the neck split in two. That you know.

" 0

" Essential movie in your genre. By far, the best of the saga. Before starting with the criticism, rather the bath of praises, of the film, to say that with Harry Potter

I am not nor will I be objective in life. I have read and reread all the books. I have deleted the bytes of the DVDs from the

times I have seen it, and I have been expelled from forums for criticizing aspects that I have not liked or that have not

remained round. So, if you are looking for a sincere criticism, where they tell you the film critically, pass by

. I would tear out an arm before criticizing the film I just saw. 0: 24 on the night of July 19

, 2007. We return from the cinema with eyes still soaked with emotion. .N I doubt I can start

my birthday better. I sit in front of the computer with a glass (of pint) of whiskey that has leftshivering

the Glenrothes. I meditate two or three seconds what I am going to say. I remember the entrance to the cinema. As I have cried,

I have laughed, I have been moved, I have thrown popcorn to the screen, and the usher has not thrown me because in

modern cinemas that figure does not exist. That 20 euros more well used, that even the popcorn was

tasty at its right point of salt. The film is about a teenage boy who is a magician, not like the Tamariz, if

not m��� It's okay pulling Merlin. It's not enough to be an adolescent, which is quite problematic, it's also an

orphan, because his parents were killed by a darker magician who was worse than the killer. Overall, Harry and his cousin

are attacked by bad bugs like black ghosts called dementors. As our hero chases them away, he is

judged for magic and it seems that he will not be able to attend the magical school. Well, and then so manythings happen

interesting and vibrantthat before I cut a finger to reveal them. Today we have changed theformat

usualof the tonter���a critiques - synopsis - comments - summary, for a longer one. Let's see, the

film has excited me, and that the book seemed very loose, with some subplots (like Dolores

in apogee) that bored me and put of bad milk. Here nothing of that. A very solid script has been created,

without the usual gaps, and very consistent with the general history. The earthly problems take weight, while

the classes lose it, very unfortunately. But you have not lost that touch that was lost in the fourth

installment of splashing each frame with a magic touch, useful. Despite knowing the story perfectly,

and how I was going to conclude, I vibrated as if I did not know anything about the story. I may have had to see whatme

a loose movie awaited. I'm glad I went with that mentality. Let's see the characters (excuse

me for not getting up to look for the book to put the names right) Luna Lovegord. Fuck that languor of a girl, more

hits in movies of fear. He has been haunting between being afraid and giving a lot of grief. He could have made a

cheerful movie, which seemed like he owed the scriptwriter money. Dolores Umbridge. As I imagined it. To

kick him in the intestines until they come out of his mouth. That I would have it, for God's sake. I appreciate

that you have trimmed your tortures.Bellatrix. After having seen her in the movies of Tim Burton, the truth is that she

did not hit the bad bad paper very much. Even if I act well, I will not dare to deny it. Voldemort. Has

this guy's nose grown? More bad than bad. Longboton. Fuck that ni���om���s hateful. As the last

book does not change will be the most absurd character ever invented. Kracher (the house elf). As Ihim

imagined. A little more prominence would not have been bad. Aurors. I found it funny that one was

black, since in books they never mention race (which I think is great). It's been funny not because I'm

black, but because of the strange role that they have given him, totally filling. The girl who changes her hair hasme

madelaugh a lot the moment of glory that she has. Dumbledore. This man has less glamor and presence than the

mats for the crochet TV. Why do you have a seriletto in your beard? Removing that, a total crack and with

more style than the host. Ole by ���l.Hagrid. His scene with the giant reminded me of the cat in the movie that

animated a green ogre (I do not put names of other movies because I do not feel like it). Little paper. The giant. They

have changed, with much success in my way of seeing, the role he had in the book. I made him as much more

horrible, and in the end it's a good-natured care. Ron and his brothers. The final scene of the brothers is very good,

although it has varied with respect to the book (which makes me sad because I did not manage to imagine it when reading it). Ron is much

more mature as a person, always by Harry's side. Hermione. How big this girl is, how I like her. As

always, giving the point of sanity, although it has been seen as less important in history. Let's say, that very

well in its discreet background. Harry. Very well. Nothing more to say. To comment more, the scenes of the

patronus have been very good, with much magic. The combats have nothing to do with the books, with

good ones much more powerful. In addition, the fight scenes are bestial and very successful. The final apotheosis, and

very sentimental, with a Harry showing us how wonderful friendship and family is. Very curious the house

where the order meets, especially the scene in which they enter it. Resuming, essential film in its

genre. By far, the best of the saga. And because I do not have 6 stars.Besitos.PD: If I did not have to remove

Rome with Santiago to see her again, I would see her again tomorrow. I'll have to wait for the DVD and its

good extras (I hope). PD2: The beginning of the letter "" Dear song "" has made me cry with laughter. It seemed

that Harry Petas was going to leave the joints and said goodbye in that way. Very big name.PD3: I had never

devoted half an hour to a criticism.

" 1

" It has all the basic ingredients for a romantic comedy to use as a result. A

sincere film that does not promise more than what it gives and what works.

Without reservations, it has all the basic ingredients to obtain a romantic comedy toas a result

use. His argument, as in any film of this genre, is summarized with a certain simplicity. Girl knows boy (or

vice versa) and they fall in love after passing a series of inconveniences and altercations that put a little

pepper to the relationship. And all this cooked on a slow fire, that's why the protagonists are cooks and the

film runs almost completely between stoves. It has all the basic ingredients to obtain as a

result a romantic comedy to use. His argument, as in any film of this genre, is summarized with a certain

simplicity. Girl knows boy (or vice versa) and they fall in love after passing a series of inconveniences and

altercations that put a little pepper to the relationship. And all this cooked over a slow fire, that's why the

protagonists are cooks and the film takes place almost completely between hearths. Catherine Zeta-Jones

serves as the queen of the kitchen in a restaurant with a lot of success where the customers crowd to the doors in

search of a free table in which to taste their exquisite creations. A life full of professional successes,

but emptied personally. Which forces her to go regularly to visit a psychoanalyst who helps her

improve face to face. With a grid schedule and organized to the smallest detail, any

novelty can make your fragile emotional state fall apart. Hence, the irruption in his life of his

niece (of which he has to take charge after the death of his sister) and a fellowfryer

pastathat makes him change the course. Zeta-Jones, and only she, is the real protagonist.

Magnificent in her role as a young beautiful and control mani���tica load on his shoulders with the weight of the film,

in which the supposed handsome Aaron Eckhart (for tastes were made colors) He puts the histrionics to the

plot with his outputs of everything. The story does not give much of itself since it makes its own, as is usual in

romantic comedies, the principle that opposite poles attract each other. From there, all are topicazos that

the viewer has seen again and again and that will see again not much. Hard girl that a crazy

young man gets to soften. Little girl who arouses the tenderness of her responsible t���a. The stress of modern life. The

difficult task of reconciling work and professional life. Etc���tera And all dressed with an Italian tone that is

breathed in every plane (music and food mainly). The best advice that can be given to those who

come to the cinema to see Unreserved is that they go with the full stomach, since, otherwise, they will leave the

cinema room with an appetite insatiable. That and that they go with the security of which they will be with a

sincere film that does not promise more than what it gives and that it works.

" 1

" The prejudices to see the Italian cinema and the fact of being popular after the remake can hurt you a bit

, although it may be a good time to give you the chance as well.

We become older. Carlo does not want to assume it, and it's a shame because his girlfriend with whom he expects a child

is quite clear, also seems to see the light of his mother who finally decides to take the step of leaving her husband .

But Carlo still has not decided with his increasingly large Peter Pan complex. You just have to see his friends:

a married man who is very bitter about his wife and his son, a relationship addict espor� Doctors and the latter is

obsessed with his ex who detests his work and whose father is on his deathbed. In the wedding of another friend

they realize their problems and some events end up detonating their need for change in the form oflove

teenagewith a charming Lolita, choosing a trip to the unknown with the friends of a

lifetime or making decisions that can affect an entire family. Some discover that they want to continue being cr ,os,

others decide that they were not prepared to stop being it although they thought it and they will have to follow it

always. I would not know which of the characters that populate L'Ultimo Bacio is the one that has come to me the most. Perhaps

because of sharing the age and spirit of these friends there is a perfect connection with most of the

feelings and fears reflected in the tape. The script is simply brilliant conversations, even the

most dramatic, border on perfection. The normal thing in a film with such a choral pretension makes some of

the nuclei of the story more boring or just less interesting but that stone saves it

perfectly. When it seems that we overlap the visual impact of a scene (there are really dramatic) or

a decision of one character the next is waiting around the corner. The actors achieve a

state of absolute grace. The scenes with discussions (believe me there are a few) are worth seeing and

possibly would not work as effectively if it were not for them. The young Martina Stella and

Stefano Accorsi give off a chemistry that is appreciated on the screen. Do not be deceived, this is a dramatic

film with romantic touches, there is no rest for humor because we all know that in a certain way love

is a drama or it would not be realistic or interesting. Impressive the end, an outcome that will delight

any lover of good movies with magnificent reflections that, obviously, were not respected in theirremake

American��� that if you have seen this last one, forget everything and visualize this jewel of contemporary cinema without

prejudice and I assure you that it will be two hours well spent. DATA OF THE PEL� ��CULA: Released in Spain (so

you can easily find it in ESPA���OL) Premiere in Spain: 2 July 2004Remake of the American The

Last Kiss

" 1

" Plastified t� Good things that get some scourge beatings. Insufficiently bad and boring. Better

wait to see her on television.

There are certain types of movies directed, mostly, to teenagers, the only thing you canthem to do

askis make them have a fun time and, of course, they have no intention of To make astory

quality. But, of course, there are limits to everything even when you do not intend to make a good movie. Based on

a videogame saga, DOA does not introduce any personality points on this g� ��nero that has more than

one film and that could summarize in a very simple sentence: plasticized good tÃas that put a beating

escÃ © ndalo. Previously we had been made to suffer with the same genre but starred by men who

loved the anabolic on all things (I think it is not necessary to indicate examples because in our

mind it is sure that it peeks at us. Des of a title). Well, it is necessary to complement this base with some

elements if you want to have something curious: an acid humor, good scenes of action, an elaborate ending?

Finally, touch sb for a simpleton story can make you spend a pleasant time, as occurred with theversion

cinematicof the mythical series "" The Charlie's Angels. "" However, DOA does not have any of this, so it

is insufferably bad and boring. Paying to see it is a real robbery. Better wait to watch it on

television (this kind of movies abound very often in some national chains). And for the record,

I have not talked about how sexist this type of icons can be (the s���mmum in this sense would be the

untouchable Lara Croft starring in the film by Angelina Jolie, known, in addition, for being one of the best

marketing products not only in Hollywood but also Den of organizations of superbuena people and superpija

also denominated NGO? S).

" 0

" A film, in short, as well intentioned as soft, innocent, asyptical and peaceful. A film that does not

bore, that looks without displeasure and that is forgotten after two minutes of leaving the cinema.

Hugh Grant joked, in presenting this film to the media, about his role

in it: "I was a little drunk when I accepted it." "We do not know what is true and what is exaggerated in

such a claim, but the truth is that the good guy Hugh has thrown a couple at the time of interpreting that ex

poppie star of the eighties come to menos.Los hairstyles, outfits, dances and the cutrez of hislife

artisticin the XXI century are the most pathetic and at the same time ���able that we have been able to see on a movie screen

in recent years. The truth is that only because of that, because of Grant's character, it is worth seeing the

movie. ��cula. Because. and for little more. The crazy character of Drew Barrymore, in the line of the greatdestroyers

romanticof film history, beasts of my childhood and surroundings, does not bring anything new to a character type

m� It's handy and worn that the bust of Ava Gardner. The character of Drew's sister, however, is

the funniest thing, as a dominatrix woman as a crazy historical fan. The story and the plot, as well constructed

as they are light in their critic to the great divas of the current music, Cristinas Aguileras and Shakiras mostly,

are white glove: a musician without inspiration and any girl who passed by there � and helps him compose

a song for the great star of the moment: Cora, who will destroy it conveniently, looking for thesuccess

immediateand the recognition of some fans that, happening of m��� music, they only want to see the star dance. Andarises

the sparkbetween the musician and the girl, and they get enchanted, and fall in love and. Well, I think that any reader would be

able, without having seen the film, to anticipate practically everything that will happen until the titles

of cr�� arrive. �dito. Of course, if the reader usually travels by bus, you will know more than enough what awaits you

with this "" T��� the letter and I the m����� �sica "", a perfect example of cinema to watch on an airplane, or at home, on a Sunday

in winter in the afternoon. Soft cinema, cinema without edges that provokes laughter with some r���plicas � Àcidas of the

character of Hugh Grant and the smile with his light criticism towards the current model of culture of the show in

which we move, tele-reality-trash included. I've missed, that's it, some more exterior shots of

New York and its streets and cafés, Madison Square Garden and so on. ��� Too little budget? A

film, in short, as well-intentioned as soft, innocent, aseptic and peaceful. A film that does not bore,

that looks without displeasure and that is forgotten after two minutes of leaving the cinema.

" 0

" I confess openly that I was about to throw myself into the corridor of the room to beat me four wiggles.

It was a while since I had enjoyed so much in the movies, in musical matters, with a film.

Pure and hard musical. Rhythm, rhythm and more rhythm. With these two phrases I could basically summarize what you will

find in "Hairspray". I start this criticism synthesizing my impressions about the film because I want to

warn you previously that This is a completely different film from the ones you're used to seeing in the

movies. It's not an action movie with stratospheric explosions and shots in the face, nor is it a

drama of deranging dialogues, not even a light comedy of typical or witty jokes, according to the

Tastes.?Hairspray? It is a film 100% adrenal���ticamente musical, that to the profane or non-sympathetic of the genre

may be tiresome before so much succession of vocal songs and electrifying dances, chained with a

m Enlanimo linked of phrases of gui���n, but that to the megal���manos empedernidos surely will seem them a regalazo

for his eyes and for his o���dos. I openly confess that I was about to throw myself into the hallway to

bang four forbidden strikes at the frenetic pace of the songs performed by Nikky Blonsky, Elijah

Kelley or Queen Latifah, the best of the cast for my taste. We must recognize the outstanding

contribution of the rest of the actors (special mention also made by the handsome Zac Efron, the half-recognizable

John Travolta, the surprising James Marsden and even the incredibly elusive Christopher Walken), which

makes one want to jump up from the chair. The continuous movement of the feet under the

seat from the second song ("The Nicest Kids in Town?) Is not taken away from anyone. And it is that one can not

avoid getting so much positivity and fun that transmits the movie There is no rest for the

melic neurons of our head. Only one story, a childish film that takes place in acolored world

rose-(including the racial theme), whose importance lies only in that it serves as a link for the next

topic, interrupts the evocative magic of? Grease? It can not be denied that the soundtrack of "Hairspray" isreminiscent

slightlyof that musical tape of '78. This is due to the obvious setting at the beginning of the year.years

Americans 60of Adam Shankman's movie, with princess dresses, carded impossiblefilled with lacquer and

tUPsslicked. However, what did Randal Kleiser do with? Grease? It was a work of art on all four

sides, and its classical shadow is very long; In short, an insurmountable barrier. What a shame? Hairspray? It will not

have the same repercussion. The musical panorama of now is very different from the one that knew "Grease ?, but it

is to praise that Shankman has wanted to arrive with his film to the new generations; apart from that

many / many teenagers would only see it to get dizzy with the phenomenon Efron (I had a few backs

whose drooling felt on the cogote), the rest will enjoy a few themes with very ca arregeros arrangements, by the work of the

producer Marc Shaiman, in spite of his sixties style. Indeed, it has been a while since he did not enjoy so much in the

cinema, in musical question, with a film. Most of the soundtracks of today's films are

simple instrumental accompaniments, of suspicious similarity, which very rarely become

authentic protagonists in their films. career in the CD market; however, the soundtrack of? Hairspray? it is the

authentic motor of the film, with the added value that its performers are the same ones that put face and body (and

go bodies, in all sizes) to the peculiar characters of this cinematographic adaptation.any

There is no objection toof them, despite the choral distribution of time in the camera. The election of Nikki Blonsky has

been right; This aunt is a pure nerve and it seems incredible that with her physicist she can move in that way.

I do not put any buts on her voice. Amanda Bynes does a wonderful job with that dangerously suggestive rebel schoolgirl.

Pay attention to her extremely close final dance dress. From Michelle Pfeiffer I already said that he was incredible at

his age. And I'm not telling you how bad. Christopher Walken breaks radically with his serious and serious image, and

smiles frequently. The dance with John Travolta, priceless. Of this last it is not necessary to say that it has an

incredible little; to move so well inside that rubber bag is to praise, and to make credible her role as amother

complexedof Tracy is quite an achievement. James Marsden is unrecognizable in his musical side. I wassurprised

pleasantlyby its versatility. Zac Efron makes chulito no load, just what you need the thread of the

tape. Elijah Kelley is a machine; you only need to see him in action. And Queen Latifah plays ain luxury

great matriarch of color. Your interpretation of? I know where I? Ve been? puts the hairs of punta.In short,

that it was not necessary that the usher put us a dropper to put in vein the hypnotizing rhythm of

? Hairspray ?. Suffice it to say that since leaving the cinema yesterday I have not been able to getthe catchy

rid ofsong of the apothecaic grand finale of the film entitled? You can? T stop beat ? T���tan, so, so, so, so,

so, so? biiiiiiiiiiiit. Here I am rehearsing a few steps.

" 1

" Entertains, gets that the time and peak (I always complain about how long many films are made and this

short freckle) is almost flying and, although it is not round, it certainly manages to entertain.

Well, once I've seen it, I can only say that it's a very good idea, but very badly exploited, second attempt

of the same roll (The first was the jar of Juliane Moore in "" Mysterious obsession "") and without However,

after throwing a good part of the film by throwing meat on the spit we are left pretty bad, or tell us

why the death of Jodie's husband, or the pretensions and / or motivations of the bad guys, we do not know what

happens before, nor after what we have seen on the screen, and that is that we try to shorten (barely 1:30 min. of

projection) a film that, if stretched a pel���nm���s, would have given quietly for two

hours.Great Jodie, as always, also Sean Bean (although every time I see him I think instinctively in

Boromir), very well Peter Sarsgaard , giving to his role the depth that, at times, he needs, a

soundtrack that contributes justly in the film (James Horner excellent in the composition of the musical score), and

very elaborate plans on a plat created especially for the occasion, the plane "" lying "" m�� It's perfect

of the world world. It gets, it gets that the hour and peak (I always complain about how long manyare made

moviesand this short freckle) is almost flying (hehe) and, although it is not round , without a doubt it manages to

entertain, the pain is that if we try to deepen a little, we remain only scratching the top part, without

getting to the bottom, in short.

" 0

" Roll wrapped in a halo of absurd politics That is in the current cinema. The other day we see Magneto fighting there with Wolverine and company and it turns out that he

has left evil now to become a historian. And looking for the Holy Grail, nothing less. What about this man is

incredible, that you want to live that he has. At least the layer has been removed so shabby that luc���a, which is

appreciated. By the way, the subtle poster, plugging the mouth to the Mona Lisa (who say that more thanwas

cutecute). I like the poster. The film is about a guy who is murdered in the Louvre museum by anmonk

albino. As he not only dies, but decides to write with his own blood a message to discover the

murderer, Robert Langdon reaches the scene. A historian who likes to decipher secret andcodes

similar. So, helped by the historian's granddaughter and persecuted by the albino monk and thepolice

French, the search for the Holy Grail begins. It does not look bad. Well, first of all, reading the book before seeing

a film makes you say in all cases "" the book was better "". That you know. As a film, I did not like it

very much. It seems to me very run down, with very fast sequences and too long stoppages. It explains a lot about

history, but it does not quite fit. After all, we go to the movies to entertain ourselves, not to learn. The action scenes

are not many and they are not good. The plot is something incredible, given that the Holy Grail had beenfor centuries

hiddenand in the two and a half hours of film, the Lord discovers it, taking colors at the same time to Opus

and the French police. And all as wanting to tell us that this is feasible. It is not very credible, no. Besides,

Tom Hanks does not kill me, so I'm going to cheat you. Resuming, soft film for a silly afternoon that

the heat crushes you and you go to the cinema to take refuge. Good nap you can take, of course.

" 0

" I hope they are satisfied with the good box office results, because at the cinematographic level, the Spanish production

most expected of the year has remained in a kind of trailer for two and a half hours.

There are things that can not be, no matter how hard you try. You can not cover a trunk of sequoya with your

arms. You can not drink more beer than you can in your own stomach in one go. You can not adapt

five books in a single movie. This is the lesson that Agust���n D���az Yanes and his team should have extracted

from the final result of 'Alatriste'. I hope they will settle for the good box office result, because at thelevel

cinematographic, the Spanish production most expected of the year has been left in a kind of two-trailer

hourand media, in which concepts as elementary as the narrative rhythm, the development of characters or the

search for action / reaction are almost completely ignored, annoying the faithful followers of thework

literarywith axes of the type "" ten years after "" and confusing the ignorant of the saga of P���rez-Reverte

(myself, for example), by assuming that "This the public already knows." This negative impression is

accentuated because the director is halfway between the superproduction of adventures and the palace intrigue

of nothing spectacular appearance, with which the film irritates by equal to all kinds of public. On the

positive side of the scale, it highlights the powerful setting (especially the costumes) and thetreatment

photographicof Paco Femen���a, as ��� like the presence of Viggo Mortensen, who in spite of the h���ndicap of his accent more

than murky, defends his character with great dignity; and unlike Sergio Peris-Mencheta in 'Los Borgia', you

can with the weight of the film (or the trailer, at least). Enrico Lo Verso, Juan Echanove, Ariadna Gil,

Francesc Garrido, Javier C���mara, and above all, Eduard Fern���ndez, also take their papers forward with

solvency. And some isolated chapter (the site of Flanders, personally is the part that I liked) serves as an indication

of what this film could have been, be in other hands.Because in the negative part, apart from

some errors of bulk in the casting (Why Unax Ugalde does not know how to put another face, being in front of Elena

Anaya or the horsewoman French? ��� Why Pilar L���pez de Ayala, Pilar Bardem, Cristina Marcos or Paco

Tous so insignificant roles? Why Blanca Portillo acting as inquisitor? ��� Why, simply

why, Eduardo Noriega?), The palm is the absence of narration that makes you not know if you attend a

chronic of the decline of the Spanish empire ���ol, a follow-up of the main character, a choral drama or a collection of

highlights of the mustachioed protagonist. He talked about 'The Borgias' throwing in face the precipitation when it comes to

solving the story. But this is worse, this is not knowing what to tell. And the worst, not knowing how to

tell it, because D���az Yanes is limited to putting us in situation with a "" Madrid, ten years later "", and enters

fully into any of the "" happened "" that is showing more or less success, without giving to the profane in the

universe of Alatriste the opportunity to learn why everyone wants to betray him at the same time, for

example, or why Balboa is a contract killer and a prisoner of galleys the other, or Alatriste manages to

convince the same Count Duque de Olivares to do him a personal favor. D���az Yanes suppresses the much-

needed transition scenes to resit the spectators, and got what the 'Borgia' girlnot

could: piss me off. A 3, for the work of some actors and the setting.

" 0

" Sofia Coppola makes her last work an object of worship for certain snobs, with some virtues

(in addition to the aforementioned soundtrack, you also have to applaud the show a point of view different); but

with notable defects.

The fact that Sofia Coppola is the daughter of someone so important in the cinema of the last century, probably

helped her to gain a foothold in the world of cinema. But it is also true that much of the blame

is her own: her first film, 'The suicidal Virgins', was already something political, but gust���. However, it was

'Lost in translation' the film that made him take the leap to fame: good gui���n, great Bill Murray.But with

'Mar���a Antonieta' he wanted to give a very peculiar touch to his cinema. Characteristic, without a doubt. Different,

original. Breaker, politician.���o���o. Bold.But I suck. Coppola wanted to make his personal vision

of the queen's life, but with a 3-page script and an almost non-existent plot, little can be

done. Well, you can please his faithful followers. But a few. The last film by Sof���a Coppolaus

showsthe most personal side of the French sovereign: her arrival at the palace, her problems in the bed with her

husband, Louis XVI; his amorous escapades with foreign dukes. his fondness for the game. Everything in a way quite

different from what the cinema has accustomed us: original, yes, but sopor���fero am���s not able. I understand that he

wanted to give him his 'vision', but along the way a small attention has been left to the interest of the

spectator. The performances are of the m��� s justitas: a correct Kirsten Dunst brings beautiful face and little else. The

rest of the secondary ones are little known (it is appreciated) and they have a not very complex role. However, thepoint

most commentedsince the film was presented in Cannes, is the theme of its soundtrack. And to tell the truth, it's the

best. Modern music, shocking with the classicism of the time, but quite grateful. And it is that little more can

be said: Sofia Coppola makes of her last work an object of worship for certain snobs, with some

virtues (in addition to the aforementioned soundtrack, you also have to applaud the show apoint of view

different); but with notable shortcomings: I am still waiting to realize that they have actually told me something

more than what I saw.

" 0

" ���The movie? "Is anyone really interested in my opinion of such a dupe?" A very romantic comedy that I have to see / endure is that, for a while now, my wife ( fan of

this type of cinema) has given to put in an endless list all these films, that: 1) They seem cut

by the same patron.2) They do not contribute anything and bore.3) No Interested, not fun, not enthusiastic.4) Each month there are 4

or 5 of these on screen. Not long ago, I read one of my favorite critics in the press, ranting based on the

good of this cinema , I am left with the end of the criticism, know, suffering spectators, that the viewing of these

films by the public interferes only deserves a session of sex that disrupts the discomfort thatus

afflictsthe same, so there will follow vindolas, and sufrendolas (no doubt), but always change

"" good fuck "" of after. The film? Is anyone really interested in my opinion of such a dump?

" 0

" Plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas,

plas, plas and more applause.

Applause please. Plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas,

plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas,

plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas,

plas, plas, plas, plas and plas. Thank you very much. The film is about a child of those who do not exist, in an

imaginary world with an amazing gui���n. This child lives with his parents and four grandparents in a house where

no pillar or wall remains vertical. Willy Wonka is the owner of the largest chocolate empire in the world, where he

makes the best chocolates that exist. But it takes years without leaving the factory and apparently has

no worker in it. One day, some mysterious posters announce that they will open their factory for five children

who find a golden ticket inside a Wonka chocolate bar ... and some of them come out. Very

small ,ores, and rivers of chocolate, cocoa palaces, magical elevators, incredible events andcharacters

impossible; and more things that I have loved. Tim Burton has made a plagiarism. He has taken the dreams we all

had and put them on a film. I have no words, and see that it's weird, to describe what I

just saw. It may seem exaggerated, it probably is, but for many years I did not enjoy so

much with a movie. Everything has enchanted me, absolutely everything. I have laughed, I have cried, I have been moved,

I have suffered. I have lived and I have not been bored at any time. Incredible. Everything in this film is careful to

detail. The characters have faces full of expressiveness, clearly indicating what their role is. The

sets are incredible, mixing digital effects with the most pure stone carton. The scenes are

improbable and at the same time perfectly believable, surely we have dreamed them once. The color,

impressive, taken care of until the last point of light. The di ,logos, embroidered by hand, word by word, are

perfect. Every word is set where it needs to be. And the musical scenes, which look like I

hate them, are great. The scene of a technological child is completely out of the film and at the same time fits

perfectly. Pretty, my mother. I'm slow to go and buy the DVD with the collector's version, which my child

will tell me to take it away from the times I think it will be. Resuming, plas, plas, plas, plas , plas, plas

, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas, plas and more aplausos.Imprescindible.PD:

I was going to say that I want a squirrel, but almost not. PD2: And a Upa Lunga, Isure they did not even know about it. PD3: I

'm've eaten half a box of Belgian chocolates, that you have to see it with chocolate, not the shit of

popcorn that cracks the lips and gives acidity.

" 1

" Emotional, essential, human cinema ... It's a western, but it could have been a rural drama of our

Spain's honda or a mafia thriller with a courageous visitor and a sensitive child.

I saw Deep Rats (Shane) twenty years ago. Maybe more. The program solemn and sole Spanish television

in the afternoon and brazier. The same even rained. That's how I learned to watch movies: to love him. I remember huge afternoons

with Oliver Twist or Ben-Hur or David Coppefield. None of that is left for the girl and the youth of today

whose heroes are metal or Japanese manga, which I detest so much, but I'm not here to pontificate on my vices

because they are also so detestable - who am I to say the opposite - like those of anyone. One time (

follow the same string) what the programmer programmed (worth the loop). ���tico). My movie supplies

depended entirely on the others in the absence of video (vhs, beta, 2000, words already unknown

to these generations living from the blue ray and the hard disk) or not being able to go to the big screen cinema

whenever I wanted. These are other times. you see what you want, up to a point. It is rented or bought or

given by a cable or sattelite channel at affordable times and repeatedly. Serve all this sentimental tirade

to locate Shane in the context I want: Shane is the film of childhood or, at least, of mine. I was

the blond boy from the Alabama farm whose parents, honest and good-natured can not, can not with the tyranny

of a bearded and greasy cacique who wants to throw them so that their cows Paste more pl���cidamente. I was the child

fascinated by the language of the weapons that forges its identity with the typical of the retired and erroneous gunman who also

seeks his identity in the innocent look of the child. ��o. Rec���proco game, c���mplice, bell���simo.Entonces I did not

scrutinize the cinema: I did not look for hidden codes and languages, author's signs and three feet to the cat of the

photograph. None of that mattered: what prevailed was the story, which should be well counted (one hasbeen very

alwaysdemanding in that). I did not see William Manning in the character of Alan Ladd's gunslinger.

Yes, the Manning of Sin perd���n that, on the other hand, still did not exist. He did not recognize the infinite seed of John

Ford because he had simply not seen The Diligence or Centaurs of the desert, but he warned that the end was,

of necessity, a very high end: ah�� � there was the child and his hero, saying goodbye, after Wilson (

the mercenary hired so that the spilled blood scared the willing settlers to leave) had

been killed for Shane's quickest gun, which he would never see again. How nice is the cinema. How

pretty is Alabama. Emotional cinema, essential, human, eternal. It is a western, but it could have been adrama

ruralof our Spain or a mafia thriller with a brave visitor and a sensitive child.

" 1

" To the cinema of typical fantasy and of adventurous breath they are domesticating it in excess. They are doing with it what

they have done before with adventure or terror: bill mediocrities. That's it, this is a

commendable invoice. It lacks soul ..

So much fantasy saga overwhelms, at least; you feel cornered by golden compasses, power rings,

cosmopolitan cabinets and dragons more ready than a primary school child. The weight of responsibility in the

affairs of the infatil and adolescent imagination has fallen on the big producers of thebusiness

cinematographic. Where before flew Gianni Rodari, Perrault, the Grimm brothers, Michael Ende or now it seems

that forgotten Roald Dahl now plans the Disney and its voracity when it comes to making cash and, on the way, forming

customers to make cash: from the father to The son. Watching The Golden Compass in Film, I saw whole families

(including me) who showed disgust, enthusiasm, drowsiness or even incomprehension at what the screen was

attacking at the rate of zeppelins art-dec���, lavish colleges and bears with armor that look like gods of

Olympus. I myself, a believer in the religion of fantasy, I was caught in a cascade of impeccable images,

made no doubt that with passion and budget holgad���simo, but lacking in soul. And this is already the

norm in all these franchises with a good inclination, although they are humble with talent, too aware of

the box office and the merchandising of the characters. In fact, before entering the room I had the opportunity

to see how the throng of lusty infants of infographic were loaded in a hamburger to the side of the

room. Mu���equitos of the movie. All formidably orchestrated so that the experience was

multidisciplinary and beatific. The room, as we entered into what we can call context, was full

of a variety of genders: gangs of adolescents with acn��� and latest generation motives, large families,

Couples also varied sexual spectrum and even divisions far away, as if wanting to not be seen - a

couple of grandparents who, not only if lost or versed in the matter, waited with a face Satisfying the

turning off of the lights and the thunderous symphonism of the dolby surround. Then the visual feast comes:

impeccable Victorian architecture, impeccable costume design, impeccable cast choice. What hurts,

then, in the soul? It hurts that the fantastic or, in this case, fantastic-philosophical (and even

anticathetic, as read) is in the film It employs a shake well shaken and conveniently administered in

collectible fascicles (today the first) of elements already known, already assumed, already tasted by thegourmet

adolescentor preadolescent (the infant is not going to catch that from a powder metaphysical and a boarding school of infants to

which a retro machine steals a half and makes them adults, as if that did not happen only a few years

later). ���jula dorada reconciles us with the family act (entra���able) of going to the cinema as if it were aact

religious. Well stocked with advertising, tired of seeing on the shelves of the department stores

and in the usual bookstores Philip Pullman's volume tower (Dark Matter, three thick deliveries),

we went Let's see what they are going to give us now, what little pints of colors to liven up the leisure of a day of celebration. The

astonishment lasts just right: the credit titles and a voice-over that counts in a plis plas the sombre and

quasim���stico argument deliver a trip not always understood, tricky by moments, in which a child

marked by some spell or divine caprice or ancestral legend must save the world. The conglomerate of

elements of success contrasted in such enterprises (animals that speak, even some baby to the nose,landscapes

lavish, flying witches, colossal battles, evil bad guys and blessed armies.) give here with the key

of the illumination. The fantasy possesses its empire, its codes, its polar trips and even its golden compass other

than ��� sta: everything exposed here is formidable matter to encourage imagination. I am clear that thisworth more

report isgazpacho (I am Andalusian, what do you want) of domesticated magic than pu���etazos a mansalva in the underworld of

any finely digitized urban environment. The saga is already shipwrecked on its first voyage. It is theof the wise

earsproducer and his team of well-trained (I do not doubt) workers how it is possible that they leave

the ever-present public so in albis, so abruptly lifted off the chair. There are more parts, of course.

I do not know if the second installment will open new illusions. The mine, except imponderables, as they say, will not

go. He will stay at home watching something on DVD. Or reading. I have not recommended, in the abstract, the

reading Reading without commitment The happy reading The reading in the light of a flexo while outside the world

is delivered to their vices. Some, we know, ancestral. Today I have at hand The invisible cities of Italo

Calvino. He read it a long time ago and has returned today. Maybe something from the movie that I saw last night (and now I'mmyself

explaining to) is to blame. Mysteries of cinema.

" 0

" To pass the time maybe it's fine, but nothing more. Recommended to fans ofromantic comedies

American, who are not against gay marriage.

I will not extend more than what is needed. The film by Dennis Dugan is another bad example of

American comedy. I'm sorry guys, but every time I'm getting more tired of the matter. Yes, perhaps

there is some original touch (if you can call it that) or perhaps a trial, which,, stands out for its

unnoticedrazo. Not even the two protagonists (this time man and man) get to be credible, although they doeither

not do itbadly, they simply do what the public asks: pallasadas, the occasional dramatic face Ethics so

that the lagrimilla and the rest escape us, simply bland facets. But at least we have my (our)

dear Jessica Biel, who not only plays a very funny and well interpreted role, but is more beautiful than

ever. The gui���n, a bad experience, full of scenes that do not come to mind and characters that remain

enormously. Maybe there's some funny secondary, like Biel's homosexual brother, the priest,

the wedding beggar or Ving Rhames, but I assure you that Steve Buscemi's antics (by the way, �� What are you doing

here?) Are incredibly pathetic. The reason for making a film about homosexuals? I do not know The

intention is good, but it is done in a disastrous way (job accident, forced request,characters

gaybadly drawn.). To pass the time maybe it's fine, but nothing more. Recommended to fans ofcomedies

American romantic, who are not against gay marriage.

" 0

" A great resurgence for the saga, with a new Bond very charismatic and that augurs a new series of

movies, let's hope with the same style.

After twenty films of the mythical British spy, the producers of the series, after the low one that

had They had the last James Bond films starring Pierce Brosnan, they were trying to find a

new direction in the saga, more modern and in line with our times and that would attract people to the cinema again as they used to

when the premiere of a Bond film was surrounded by an unprecedented expectation. Well,

what better way to start again from the beginning? So they took the first novel from its creator Ian

Fleming, Casino Royale, to start working with this new Bond. The novel had already been adapted someago

time, but anyone who has seen it will know that the spirit of the classic Bond had little, counting on a

Woody script Allen and played the spy by David Niven. Now the difficult thing came from the election of the new

Bond, after Pierce Brosnan dissociated himself from the project because he was too much pigeonholed with his

spy role, funny thing, but that nothing because in its next film will do, well yes, esp? AfterGoth

a list larger than that of theKings, the chosen one was Daniel Craig, a very discreet actor until

then, although with good interpretations, and who broke with the typical Bond style of the twentyfilms

previous. I recognize that when I was elected as the new Bond I did not like it either, but I waited patiently

to see it on the big screen and it did not pull me directly to its jugular, as they did everywhere in the world,

and now they have to hide the little head, because once the film is seen, Daniel Craig makes the best Bond since

Sean Connery. Not that it can be comparable, because the style of Sean Connery is that of the typicalgentleman

English, conqueror and elegant, while Daniel Craig pulls down the middle path and is more like

any other person. He's seen in a chapter of Mission Impossible, hard, implacable, without any remorse at the time

of killing, and quite disobedient with direct orders, although that also had Losan previous Bonds.At

the beginning of the film, after teaching us how to get his famous license to kill (���sea, the 00 in

front of his n��� Spy mere, the 7) and continues with one of the best persecutions, on foot that if, I've seen

in the cinema. During the rest of the film the level continues to be very high, although not everything could be so

good, and in the final section the film loses dangerously, centr� Going in love affairs, when

normal and what I honestly expected was more action still. Even so it is not too bad to give a certain

human entity to the character, but more dosed throughout the film would not have been so bad. As

for the protagonists, Daniel Craig impeccable as a James Bond in its beginnings, too rough and with easy trigger

, and that gives an important example to the character, after Pierce Brosnan, for my actor withoutcharisma

enoughto embody Bond and that puts He would be tortured on the same side or be with one of thegirls

Bondfrolicking. Judi Dench in his role of M, very good, as before since he is in the saga and the

evil guy on duty, Mads Mikkelsen, quite correct, is not a Scaramanga, but not bad at all, yes, the

little detail of that cry blood is totally anecdotal, and a question that came to me when I saw it is because

lately the bad guys always have to have a scar, defect or something like that? Fixed that in the

world there are bad of the most normal. Yes, it would have been a delight to meet a bad guy like Philip

Seymour Hoffman in Mission Impossible 3. Eva Green, and I left her consciously for the end, it seemed

like the weakest part of the movie �cula, firstly because physically I do not look like the typical Bond girl to use, something that

goes into the normal watching the turn of the franchise, but I do not know, has something that does not convince me still,

both in their interpretation, and in the final turn they give to their character. In any case, she is not a bad actress,

I believe in the bottom that is her problem, that she is too good an actress to play this role, and despite everything she comes out

quite graceful with her performance.With regard to the gui���n , well enough, with that game of Poker as a

background and bringing the story quite close to reality, in this case the bad guy is not the typical one that tries to

conquer the world, whatever it may be, simply a banker of the terrorists, too fond of Poker and

trying, causing certain "accidents" to happen, to raise their investments. In short, a great

resurgence for the saga, with a new Bond very charismatic and that augurs a new series of films,

let's hope with the same style, something that the producers during the premiere already pronounced affirmatively

with the word damn, trilog���a, for the rebirth of this Bond to which all we know

" 1

" Its critical repercussion may be somewhat exaggerated but it can not be denied that Frears gets the most

out of a story that, in principle, did not seem It offers so many possibilities.

"" The Queen "" is a film that, a priori and because of its theme, did not particularly attract me. As it is

directed by someone as competent and reliable as Stephen Frears, it has a more interesting cast and

is endorsed by a certain critical and finally public success I decided to see her. The film tells how

were the days before and after the death of Lady Di and how they affected the Queen and the government of her

country As some of my friends remember, I had the "luck" of living those days in England itself (what

memories!) And I assure you that the reaction The people were incredible. These moments of exaggerated reaction are very

well reflected in the film, always seen from the point of view of the rulers and especially, of

the sovereign who, coming from a culture of Stoic suffering, could not understand what was

happening around her. To add realism, the archive images are perfectly integrated into the

action and used with restraint, always with a narrative purpose. Stephen Frears is a director of the good ones,

that nobody doubts it. But, in addition, he is a very intelligent director who, not only usually getsfrom his actors

good performances, but also knows how to rely on them when he has to do it. This is one of those cases. It is

true that the script is good, it focuses on the fundamentals without neglecting the details and brilliantly studies the

psychology and inner world of the main characters, centr� Going more, as expected, in the Queen.

But, if the choice of the actors and their interpretation had been mistaken, the project would have been

shipwrecked in a big way. Everyone, from James Cromwell (Prince Phillip, husband from the queen) to Alex Jennings

(Prince Carlos), going through Michael Sheen (Tony Blair) they perform great performances and fit

their characters in a perfect way (the way of moving some actors,tracing

impressivelytheir originals). But above all of them stands out the imposing figure of Helen Mirren,

who is not to interpret Queen Elizabeth II, is that it becomes her. His look and gestures

transmit all the inner struggle of that woman and make her the center of the film and the most memorable

of it. Attention, for example, to the scene of the deer. Despite that and the elegant direction of Frears, the

tape is a certain coldness and intranscendence (someone cares about the real Brit family. Unique?). I am nothing

friend of the coldness because the pirates and smugglers of Moonfleet are passionate people but I have to

admit that, in this case, it is justified by the subject. Perhaps its repercussion cr�� Ethics is somewhat exaggerated but

it can not be denied that Frears manages to get the most out of a story that, in principle, did not seem to

offer so many possibilities.Valuation of moonfleet.es: 7 out of 10.

" 1

" The worst I've seen in a while. He offers us phrases for posterity like: "Be careful, the

night is dark" "... seriously?

I do not usually see this genre of movies, and I reaffirm myself after seeing this desecration of the cinema. It consists of a

curse that consists in making him pass the child cold (he removes the blanket every two times) and in hitting him

slapped! Let's go mad with poor Betsy. Some believe it's an entity, others do not, some say "" But younot

haveseen it? "" The others "" Nothing was seen " "," "they were slapping her" "," "it was with a cane" "��� ?. you already imagine.you still

Buthave time to think about marrying poor Betsy with the teacher 20 years older. The film, to

call it in some way, offers us phrases for posterity like ���stas: "" Be careful, the night is dark "",

seriously, now it communicates with noises "" Is that a yes or a no? "" I'm leaving. "" When a witch smears blood

on someone's clothes, it means that it's going to. "" "" So what? You have to tell me. "" We are short eh! And scenes of the

most crappy as the typical religious ritual, reading the bible, with the camera turning in both

directions. When the girl is playing with the girl. ���a spirit and that I throw water, hehe, I miss you at���,

hehe, ahhhhhhhhh you're a bad bug! Doors and windows that close, dizzying cameras, the fire thatis

The scene in the bedenlivened, like the child of the exorcist, her eyes blank. At least the spirit sees in

black and white, good once in a while. Ah! and it has a flying scene, like Javier Bardem on Mar Adentro. This

obviating the "" plagiarism "" is the best there is, if you can get something good. In short, that in the end, we like to

tell it so as not to tell (worth the redundancy), the case is that what hit him was., madrem���a that tontuna,

but best of all is that history repeats itself, but good what kind of depraved parents are in this

world! Conclusion: The worst I've seen in a while.

" 0

" If it's not your best movie, it's undoubtedly the riskiest just for embarking on a production - with

all of the United States in an ambiguous abstention - during the moment of greater German domination and influence,

making it all the more valuable for all of this. Undoubtedly, a classic film by a classical artist.

The Great Dictator is born as a joke for Hitler's appropriation of the mask of Charlot and his universal and

famous mustache. Then he becomes angry because of the growth and popularity of this nefarious character, almost a

revenge made by an artist who at that time declares not to have the honor of being a true Jew. The

remembered scene of the terrifying globe , with its infinite poetry and determination when portraying theobsessive patience

dictator Hinkel (Hitler)'sand his desire for power; It is both a forceful weapon and anwitness

unforgettable, both for its lyricism and for its permanence in the memory. It is still growing, being united

to the rhythm of the scene in the hairdresser, in charge of the barber Charlot and to the sound of the Hungarian march of Brahms and his

dance-fantas���a, when shaving a client and demonstrating his unparalleled dexterity. Also Chaplin does not getin the soundtrack

rid of the vagabond, several moments played by the hairdresser testifythese two

to it. Onlymoments and their scant ten minutes, would suffice to justify the name of this artist inletters

block. An unhappy scene played by the limited Paulette Goddart -to declaim at the door of the ghetto-, thethe odd

final speech that for some sounds pedantic, andscene unconnected; they do not overshadow the greatness and

bravery of a great film. If it is not your best film, it is undoubtedly the riskiest just for embarking on-without

a productionUnited States in an ambiguous abstention- during the time of greater German domination and

influence, making it all the more valuable. Undoubtedly, a classic film by a classical artist.

Pure history. Summary: Chaplin does two roles here. As Hynkel, dictator of Tomania, orders to harass the

Jewish population and plans the invasion of the neighboring country of Austerlich. As a Jewish barber Charlot sees hissuffer

ghetto companions. The physical similarity of both characters leads to confusion, where the barberusurps

casuallythe post of Hynkel, and finally delivers a speech in favor of peace, equality,

democracy and brotherhood among the men. This final speech went around the world.

" 1

" It does not convince lovers of the genre, which does not fulfill the fundamental objective ofcomedies

romantic-which is to fall in love and fall in love-, reaching a fun ending that would be perfect if you had

managed to create something coherent before the credit titles.

At���pica romantic comedy free of narrative rhythm, of anodyne script and scarce pretensions, culminating in

a story in which two great stars of the genre act under his own criteria, evidencing thenegligence

director'sand torturing his detractors. Fortunately, when leaving the cinema, the spectator will only remember the

music of a catchy song by Adam Schlesinger (The Wonders). The lyrics, like the film itself, are better

forgotten. The premise that grounds this film is, commercially, perfect. It isother than the reunion in

nonethe cinema of two generations through music. For this, Pop !, an attractive group that, if it had

existed, would have caused a furore in the lists of successes of "" Popular���simo "", that métist, is used. program of Radio Popular

de Albacete. While, for the claim of pre-adolescent girls, Cora Corman is created, a crossing of Britney

Spears with Christina Aguilera, which could well belong to the contemporary Top 40. The strategy works, and

eighties nostalgists succumb to the video clip of "" Pop Goes My Heart "" that, cleverly, combines thesteps

danceof George Michael with the unmistakable style of Simon Le Bon (m ���s "" Bon "" by Duran Duran), the dress of

the new romantics of Human League with the shirts of parallel buttons that popularized the Soft Cell, and the

close-ups that showed the exotic empty look of the singer of Spandau Ballet with the chess board

that appeared in the best album of Yazoo. Motives, all of them, more than enough to supportfor two

Hugh Granthours. But, as nothing is forever, the powerful beginning ends, the musical magic of the 80s is

reduced to brief allusions to poetry. �a of Stevie Wonder and the portentous tours of Tears For Fears; and the harsh

reality confronts us with "the worst film of this year and of any other". And it is that to T���, the Letter and Me, the

Music, fails him the formula of the best romantic comedies, and he has the main theme of the soundtrack

of The Endless Story played by Limal.The secret for the constant to flourish? Chico meetsin

Chica- S���bitolove- Terrible event that causes an inevitable rupture- Moments of sadness that are

recreated with a beautiful song- Reconciliation - Happy End - depends on the ability of those responsible for the

footage to elevate ���o���er���a to romanticism, making the absurd credible. We just have to remember how a

glove promotes the approach between the characters of Serend���pity, the elaborate process of falling in love that

is forged in You have an E-Mail, the betrayal of a bet that leads to the breakup of Someone Like You, the

melancholy that surrounds loneliness in How to Lose a Boy in Ten Days, the spectacular reconciliation of

Secret Admirer. Or, which is the same, all those titles in which, as banal as thebase is

plot, the scripts have been worked on. It is not the case of the story that we are discussing today, in which all

situations are unlikely and forced. The truth is that it is hard to believe that even the screenwriter of Miss

Special Agent, has been able to conceive a few days. Such lamentable words, that contrast with theload

depththat, fleetingly, is glimpsed in the story, and that they could owe their failure to the tasks of translation.

Actually, we can only enjoy the blurred profile of a great woman who, because of acriticism

destructive, becomes a hypochondrian and insecure being, and the interesting comparison Quen that unites a

person with a song, in which the music would be the first impression, the physical wrapping, the sex; and the

letter, the spiritual content, the soul, love. It is an authentic pity that a message as beautiful as it is direct

is diluted in a development as sloppy as it is tedious, framed in painful couplets of fifthnotebooks.

gradeParadoxically, the salvation table ,N, Grant, they become stone that is tied to the neck. A fact

that usually happens when consecrated actors dedicate themselves to "" go of stars "" in the shooting, ignoring the

instructions of the director. It happened to Brando himself in the disastrous Rebeli���na Bordo del 62, to Val Kilmer on

so many occasions, and he could not resist in a role that? will bring you closer to Ewan McGregor

in Moulin Rouge. A nonsense almost as big as the one that is committed by making him share history with Drew

Barrymore. Those of us who believed that there could not be a couple with less chemistry on the screen than the one formed by

George Clooney and Zeta Jones in Intolerable Cruelty, we were wrong. We have seen that it is easier to

imagine an "" affair "" between Fern���ndez de La Vega and Mariano Rajoy than one starring the Four Weddings and

One Funeral and the Angel of Charlie.The result is a product that does not convince even lovers of the genre, which does not

fulfill the fundamental objective of romantic comedies -which is to fall in love and fall in love-, reaching a

fun ending that It would be perfect if you had succeeded in creating something coherent before the creditof

titles. In frontCin���filo's distaste, Relax, what would he say? Frankie Goes To Hollywood-, Relax.

" 0

" It manages to be entertaining and surprising. If someone had doubts that he happens to see it, he will like it.

Yesterday afternoon we were encouraged to see El Illusionista (2006), a film directed by Neil Burger and based on a

short story by Steven Millhauser, an American writer who won a Pulitzer Prize for bestwork

fictionin 1997 and whose work usually reflects those temporal phases where the evolution of a system marks a point

of inflexion in history. The work "" Eisenheim the Illusionist "" offers this detail by demonstrating the change

from the old illusionism full of paraphernalia to the current, a world where the mechanics is of vital importance to be

able to create the tricks m��� s unbelievable and where the theater, in actor mode that tricks, and minimalism make

the illusion even more amazing. Starring an underutilized Edward Norton, see that he

is a good actor and does not stand out for great films or starring roles, a growing Paul Giamatti, Rufus

Sewell and the very interesting Jessica Biel, situates us in Austria at the end of the 19th century. Eisenheim (Norton)

is a young magician who, after falling in love with Sof���a (Biel), a young woman of a social status far beyond

his possibilities, disappears for many years to return and, using his illusionist tricks, free

the young woman from her social obligations to Prince Leopoldo de Austria (Sewell) without caring about the

consequences that this entails for him, her and the future of the country. The film has no pretensions and therefore

manages to surprise and offer a result far superior to many of the films that have been seen in the last

few weeks. Both De Palma and Scorsese so that in the end the adaptation of a short story of fiction is the

best that can be seen in movie theaters. With a curious picture like an old film with a certain

gradient on the edge, a pretty curved script, a musical composition, by Philip Glass, the sea of

interesting and an ambientaci��� Sincere, it manages to be entertaining and surprising. If someone had doubts

that he happens to see it, he will like it.

" 1

" Quite a mediocre film of, it is supposed, a social denunciation that, it is also supposed, was created to

contribute to peace in the institutes where there was mixed races and existed. No problems for that reason.

"" A professor of black literature must return to the town where he grew up to take charge of the classrooms of

a conflictive institute where there have always been only pupils of the same race. However, now, for

reasons of transfers and records, a group of white people should study there. This, of course, is believed to

create various conflicts, which require, so that they do not go away, from someone with experience and who has

worked with all kinds of students. Despite their efforts, the atmosphere will be darkened, with

verbal and finally physical disputes. "" Quite a mediocre movie of, it is supposed, social denunciation that, also, n it

is supposed, it was created to contribute to peace in the institutes where there were mixed races and there were

problems for that reason. Then, after seeing it, I firmly believe that I did not achieve it. �� his purposes, since it is a

soft movie, something exasperating in its inanity, almost nothing deep and that, although it is full (I think) of good

feelings, the certain thing is that it only looks for the �� Economic success, which I do not know if it's achieved. Everything is full of typical,

supposedly intelligent, silly dialogue, with irre gular interpretations (well Jeff Bridges in one of his

first important roles) and a use of music, which is the best of the tape. The rest is somewhat bobbley

because this type of products must be take seriously and not stay in media that only impoverish the

final set, as is the case. A poor final result, moderately entertaining, rather tedious and with

good photography, that's so. But it's a shame to see the "deep" pedagogical value of the film, all in the episode

of the boy "" of color "" who, although he is already in the last year of the institute, hardly knows how to read. The

teacher, knowing that the boy likes the magazines "" green "" gives him the reading of a good novel

with a marked sexual and erotic accent. The boy, in front of what he reads (rather he babbles) takes interest and, I do not know,

but in practically one or two days at the most, he reads quickly and understands everything . Thismethod will have to be implemented

subtlein all the schools of the world world. And whatsays toat a certain moment is also nice

the black chief of the institutionhis friends: "" - When I was a black child, I had white friends. Now that I am ""

colored "", I no longer have any "" ... In short, intelligence in the script.

" 0

" Delicious s���tira full of feelings but nothing lacrimgenic (backwards, totally perverse), with an

action that deserves more than an Oscar: the one that reigns Helen Mirren. Essential.

Stephen Frears is a director that I admire. Either for his refined and at the same time critical talent or for his

exquisite taste when it comes to choosing and telling the stories. After giving us splendid films like The

Dangerous Liaisons, Caf��� irland���s���o the most recent Hidden Business, the director of English originpremieres

This year the Queen. This clever account tells the terrible political events that occurred after the death

of Princess Diana, located in the talks between Queen Elizabeth and Prime Minister Tony Blair, to

carry out both political and political stability. social, since at that moment the population was amazed

at the absence of the queen (she did not present herself or give any message until Blair's

to be shown in public). The film is not told either in a documentary way or as a biography, but is

narrated, precisely, as if it was a normal movie story, where the facts are

happening and the characters are transformed. Although, as always, Frears addresses a stylistic drama

of exquisite taste and introduces us to the feelings (if any) of the British Royal Family. But

here what stands out mainly is the performance of that queen called Helen Mirren (Volpi Cup for Best

Actress 2006 in Venice). Her prodigious representation of Queen Elizabeth is truly moving, satirical,

brilliant, and she has a very clear idea of ​​how she is In reality, Queen Isabel: a distant, cold woman who does not know how to

show her feelings. At a key moment in the film, she tells Blair that this is how they

taught her to be, so it's even more clear to us leave the idea of ​​what the Queen of England really is like. Michael

Sheen (seen in Underworld and soon in Blood Diamond) correctly interprets Tony Blair, a character

that Frears uses to criticize his political interests. In my opinion, knowing that the director is not

exactly a right-wing person, I think that this criticism of the Prime Minister, which is not exactly-

rightwing, is due to the unrecognizable participation. of the politician in the Iraq war. So The Queen

experiences personalities with social and political interests that are not a sign of openness or good

morals. On the other hand, to say that the guide of Peter Morgan is an authentic marvel structured like aguide

cinematographicand not like that of a documentary or biography, although it is interspersing real images that

appeared on television during the events. This magistral proposal by the team of the film

admire her for several reasons, but above all for the good sense and courage to show one of the monarchies��� most

powerful in Europe and one of the richest women in the world. So in short, The Queen is a

delicious s���tira full of feelings��� but nothing lacrimgenic (backwards, totally perverse), with a performance n

that deserves more than an Oscar: the one that reigns Helen Mirren. Essential.

" 1

" It will please all those who have peeled their thumbs, giving them command at home, playing the game on

which the film is based.

The videogame's big screen is very adapted and it is that Hollywood, a dream factory, has

become a sort of sponge or funnel where pass any topic to be taken to the big screen,

at this step we will see adaptations of "" Tetris "" or "" Pac-man "" to cinematographic format, but, time to time. This,

which brings us, is the adaptation of a fighting game, where the pictures are those that "" share the cod "" and in a

certain way this is what happens on the screen, where all the narrative power it is carried by 4 pictures, and the only

potential is to admire (and also to drool) its more than desirable good physicist, as it is difficult to transmit to theformat

literarythe chabasic expression "" are better than bread with pat��� the herd. "" Corey Yuen, author of action films

such as "" Transporter 2 "", "" the monk "" or the oriental "" So Close "" (which I highly recommend), sign the

film, to the delight of the game fans, and movie lovers of action and fight. Where that roster of faces,

from Devon Aoki (seen in "" Full Gas 2 ""), Jaime Pressly, seen in "" The dirty story of Joe Guarro "", Sarah

Carter (to which many will remember the series " "Smallville" "like Alphida Alice), and Eric Roberts in

such extremely low hours, that to see him fight in the few fight scenes where he intervenes provokes the

biggest of the laughter, not because the man struggles badly, which he tries to put, but because he is already older for

such barbarities. In short, the film will please all those that they have peeled their

thumbs, giving him command at home, playing the game on which the film is based at home (I

understand that the movements of the actresses are n pretty well inspired in those of their virtual models on the

screen), the rest, they would like to see meat (fresh) and little else, forgettable, if it were not by f���minas. (\*)

Peel, giving and house in the same paragraph uy uy uy.

" 0

" Does not leave indifierente: cove in any kind of public, even in that which does not connect with the mind (others

twisted) of a stimulating director like few.

Solondz has an exquisite sense of risk, a self-responsibility that hasinjourney

satisfieda narrative foundationa child's. It is not a physical journey, although the film is dismembered in arange

fantasticof scenarios: what is evident is a well-stamped and staged denunciation of the world of

childhood. V���ctor, the protagonist, wants to be a mother. The corseted family life censures his desires so

he is forced to search the street for the realization of his dreams. It will not be easy. Actually, it will not be

possible. Solondoz pulls a character that many actresses play. Try (imagine) that we can all be

accomplices of their vital expertise. Try (I insist) to create a empathy, a natural state of

things, a sophisticated exercise, but minimalist, deep down, reconcilable with all the vices that the

viewer takes to the room so that the movie Nocula does not leave indifierente: cove in any kind of public,

even in that which does not connect with the (twisted) mind of a stimulating director like few, who investigates

the human soul and extracts from it the material m� It is sensitive, the least contaminated by social,conditions.

political or sentimentalUsing the figure of the palindrome as the title of this quasi-circus pirouette also has

its crumb. The palindrome is the phrase that reads equal from the right to the reverse. "" Ana brings to bear hazelnut

"" .es the metaphor that we are all equal: that thereno travel, no cambio.Querr thespectator

cmodomade give him the food mascadita. Here a supply of good intentions is required, a

certain ethical and aesthetic complicity. So this is a championship film, which will not triumph in the box,

nor will it They made Happiness or Welcome to the box of dolls, the other creations of thisauthor

unclassifiable. There is, however, an indolence in the portrayal of the most dramatic situations, if not

scabrous, of the plot. You see everything, sometimes, excessively distant, cold, almost hieratic. There is no heat:

the most important component of human emotions, which is naturalness, is obviated. All very well

compartmentalized, stabled: everything prepared so that we do not know if we are witnessing a modern fairy tale or an

urban legend. What I am very clear about is that when one has finished watching the film, the runr��� n of its

history colea in the memory, hammering our plube bourgeois life of citizens pleased with the

meekness of this (false) Welfare State, cackled by democratic governments as Seal of the House.

" 1

" When the only highlight of a movie are its special effects, the tits and ass of an actress and

one (only one) of its characters, is that something is really wrong .

This is how a crazy license is broken by rolling a brickwork starring the brick man: Nicolas

Cage. Because 'Ghost Rider' is a real brick of considerable dimensions. And is that when the only

highlight of a film are its special effects, the tits and ass of an actress and one (ONLY ONE) of its

characters, is that something is going really wrong The script seems to have been written by a thirteen-old

year-pajillero child: the argument has neither a head nor a head, it is so foolish and foreseeable that only with seeing the poster youalready

canimagine the whole movie. The characters and, above all, LOS VILLANOS (if you can call them

that, because they seem taken from 'Mystery Men'), are authentic talking and walking jokes; the actors do not

help since all of them seem to be reluctant, trying to put some face to convince that they are

taking seriously the character they are trying to interpret. And those crappy flashes when they make

appearances. Losn bad bad guys, pffff.By being, it's even boring. And in addition, the absolute leader is Nicolas Cage, a

guarantee of sudden attacks of shame on others, at least on my part. As I said before, the only

rescuing of this mediocrity- more-mediocre-than-'DareDevil 'are its special effects, the body of Eva

Mendes, and the same phantom motorist, who is the mondo lironda, but comes out very poor, becoming ��� in one

of the most sadly and awkwardly untapped characters in the history of the adaptations of the film toAnd

the cinema.those that will come.

" 0

" Although it represents a good step for the formation of a genre industry in the country, as a film it

is quite poor and easily forgettable.

Few things are left to say about The Orphanage (2007), except perhaps the surprise that has caused me the

tremendous silk glove with which the critics have treated a film that in the pr�� �ctica does not go beyond being a

more or less potable proposal. For the record, I am not talking about the typical tariff crises with which the

distributors usually support their products; the praises to the opera prima of Juan Antonio Bayona have reached

even several of the strata of "independent" "criticism". And it is that if something is clear to me after the viewing

of this film is that, in its specific case, there seem to be two different appreciations: those who see the

film as a contribution to the "" industry "" cinematogr Spanish (fica (specifically that one who lives

in the cinema of genre and not in repetitive dramatic of the Civil War or vulgar social proselytizing) and those

who judge it ��� only as a film. The opinions are unequal, but that is because

Bayonne's work is also different. And, on a purely narrative level, the failures of The Orphanage are more

than obvious: Obviously we are dealing with a film of scraps whose mostsequences

interestingare because they are taken from classics such as Suspense (1961), At the end of the stairs (1980) and

Poltergeist (1982), or even more recent works such as Los otros (2001) and Fr���giles (2005), all of them (it must

be said) far superior to the Bayonne film, that in the end it is nothing more than another exponent of the already

worn out formula of old houses, chungos children and secrets of the past, all of it revolving around the already

well-worn archetype of " "Mother Courage" "confronting the supernatural forces to recover theson

missing. Mr. Bayona has difficulty in achieving something interesting from a premise that

is not given any new input, and putting all the weight in an actress as limited as Bel���n

Rueda, who jumps from hunger to hysteria in an inexplicable way. Another problem is that the beginning, in

which the character of Bel���n Rueda arrives with his family old Asturian farmhouse where the orphanage

of his childhood was erected, it becomes too long and uninteresting. It is only when theelement finally appears

supernaturalthat the film of Bayonne begins to gather strength, a virtue that is revealed in what

for me is one of its best sequences: the one that It involves paranormal investigators, among whom

is a Geraldine Chaplin doing Zelda Rubinstein. Unfortunately, this interesting moment (which gives

way to a frantic and effective supernatural showdown between the protagonist and the inhabitants of the house) is

truncated by the arrival of a disastrous ending; not only the final twist that encloses the story is

predictable enough to say enough, but behind it hides an excessively sweetened and cheesy ending,

which tries to be sublime and poetic but fails miserably. This is not only the faultobvious

of Bel���n Rueda'slimitations as an actress, but also a gui���n full of plot holes, inconsistencies and

loose ends that in the end have nothing better to do than To cheat the spectator. Still, not everything is bad, since

the Bayonne film gets really good moments when it tries to recreate itself in its atmosphere and flee from

melodramatic sentimentality. Ethics It is only when he escapes his potential as a horror film when he

breaks free. In addition, the mere fact that attention is paid to the genre film made in this country (and in Spanish)

is already an advance, although the benefited is this film and not much better ones that have been done

previously, such as El espinazo del diablo (2000), by Guillermo del Toro, who here acts as

an executive producer turning the film in a thematic couple of his own work El laberinto del Fauno

(2006). Beyond that, the amount of positive criticism that this film hasis made more inexplicable to me. The

receivedOrphanage, therefore, can be appreciated in two ways: well represents a good step for the

formation of a gender industry in the country, as a film is quite poor and easily forgettable. As

happened with 28 weeks after (2007), we are facing a medium tape that has received ahype

disproportionateonly because its director is Spanish. There is no one who takes it from my head.

" 0

" The movie starts with all the actors sunk in a pond, and what a clearer premonition of what I was going to

see ...

Yes, I went to see the movie in the movies, which I almost never do unless go to see winning horse,is

that, some movie of general interest or that many people have said to you that is sublime. Yes, I read the firstthe Alartiste

book ofof the curmudgeon Perez Reverte, a writer who did not quite catch me at all but that

is a jarto and that's why it's cool. The book was not bad, adventures and such. Jure read the second but the pornete and

the crazy life that I have not allowed me to return to the pages of this captain who lived an era with a great

attraction for me, I am passionate about that cycle of the Americas. And suddenly I find out that they're going to make a movie

about Alatriste. And it will be directed by Diaz Yanes, a director I met in a Sevillian Holy Week a

lot of years ago and I stayed with him talking. A very nice and accessible guy, so I wished him all the luck of the

world with his movie. Then, I see the movie at last, accompanied by a Romanian pussy and the writer David Barba and

two things happen to me the sea of ​​curious. In the entrance, buying the fucking entry I want to strain a fat

infamous. He tells me that he has been given 2 tickets and that they are 3. His movie started at 10:30 and mine at 10. And it

was 10 am .. I tell him that if he does not care if he waits for me to take my tickets because this It starts now, and the aunt

gets on the edge saying no, that she has given her tickets badly and that she blah blah. Before her idiocy, strength. I

tell him it's not going to happen in front of me. Sure enough, the one in front of her comes out and she tries to get the

head, but I'm a goose, I stand as the referee who gets between two furgolistas who are going to have a

bowel movement, and I take my tickets, the aunt calls me impolite and I I say a blunt "" you forget me "", for not

reading the primer or riding a chicken, as the movie started. The Alatriste experience started right, live

God! The movie begins with all the actors sunk in a pond, and What a clear premonition of what I was going to

see! Ostia, what a disappointment, how I got bored! Diossss And that the first hour is not wrong, but in the middle,

when Ariadna Gil appears, the whole movie gets into the most absolute boredom. I have nothing against

this great actress, beautiful by the way, but is that? Diossss that sovereign co���azo.Io when I get bored in a

movie theater and I have a pussy next to me, I start to get kissed and heavy. I happened at the premiere of the movie Pret a

Porter, that one of the Altman. I had an acquaintance next to me and I gave it to the movie, because it made me super-heavy

trying to get my hands on it. Later I saw her presenting a newscast and I could not stop forgetting that night.

Pobretica.En the middle of the projection I decide to buy drink and shit the Romanian pussy because the poor thing was

saying that I wanted to kill, that I had taken to see such a movie. Luck was Professor

Barba because he could at least comment on the play with him. I go out to the stand of the cinema's goodies and I

meet Manolo Escobar !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! DiooooooSSSSS !!!! JajajajajaLe greeting and I say: - man Manolo, do

you remember me? That we saw each other at the Calderon Hotel in Barcelona (it turns out that months ago I saw Manolo

in a hotel and I said hello saying that he was a living myth and about my car and all that) - man, yes, haha

, such, man? (I recognized myself!) - How incredible that I see you here, I saw you yesterday on TV, a while ago in Barcelona

and now in a cinema stand. This is a sign, Manolo.- (the good man laughs and says something like that to me)

who knows if there is something there, who knows. "" Who knows if there is something there, who knows"". Great words of a great

Spanish. Subliminal message that is related to the movie I'm watching. "Who knows if there is something there,

who knows?" I think there was little in Alatriste. The departure of spikenard with the Echanove de Quevedo, which is very

accomplished with those hairs of jevy and those gafillas that made the Chinese eyes, the gold scene of the ship and of course

, the final battle. And of course the costumes and sets, which is where the pela has been spent. And I

wonder, is not this an adventure movie? So why not get more rhythm? Some gag, co���o, that in all the

movie there is no joke or gracieta. I hate the movies that could put chistecillos and they do not put them. What's up

? That not to put humor the movie is better? The Romanian made a hateful comparison, told me that days before he

had seen Pirates of the Caribbean and that he had liked, and this film instead. The pirates have

humor, rhythm, things happen and it is not as unpleasant as Alatriste's, that they do not stop killing in a veryway

unpleasantall gods. And the role that aunts have in the movie? Have you noticed? All whores

or chungas. Who hates women? Reverte or Diaz Yanes? Because often seven that they have done to thegenre

femalewith this movie. And no feminist has said anything. And to conclude, a special mention for Vigo

Mortenssen! If it looked Swedish! Do not fuck me! If the only Spanish is the name, Vigo! Co���o, if you want the

movie to look Spanish at 100%, put a Spaniard on top !. Ernesto Alterio or Antonio Resines, among others. But

look if there are actors out there. Anyway, we live in the country here is worth everything, soooeeee? to give

everything to ass!

" 0

" Film about a guy named Riddick who falls on a planet where darkness brings bugs to

snack. Tremendously original, it leaves many doors open for sequels and prequels, which makes it a

semi-cult film. Very recommended.

The Vin Diesel this has fried me. Look at my half courgette does not like these movies of hunks, but it

turns out that this guy's yes. That if it is very good, that if patat���n, that if patat���n. As I continue making

movies, I take a plane and spit in his eyes (you will not intend to hit two hosts to the east,

which makes me a knot). Heh, heh, I certainly love the movies in this bag of muscles. The film is about a

future more than a distant future, in which a shipment of settlers heading towards by sack on the left hand

falls on a planet fiercer than monegros. Among the "" travelers "" is also a murderer named Riddick,

and a bounty hunter who takes him on the way to prison. Overall, once they reach the planet they see that the previous

settlers - geologists came out too hasty, that the two suns give light make it never be at night and that

there is a kind of giant anthills that give some resquemor.Lo What is more surprising about this film is its

originality, with its little touches of fear, its humor, its good dose of action and the trick that can be

established at the beginning of "" � Who will come out alive? " Vin Diesel is among these actors, who work best

, with very similar roles, in which they fit perfectly. I like that he invents a world and

shapes it, leaving things in the air in order to make other stories related to this sinister place. It has some

failure of these gui���n, as for example that bugs that spend years without eating suddenly die of starvation,

but more serious things we have swallowed. Resuming, movie about a guy named Riddick who falls on a planet

where the darkness gives a slight fear since some bugs come out to snack. Tremendously original, it leavesopen

many unknownsto face sequels and prequels, which makes it a semi-cult film. Highly

recommended.Besitos.PD: Mola mal tron, which was said years ago.PD2: I do not understand how he had so few

spectators.

" 1

" It was the biggest economic failure of any of his films, due to the negative criticisms he provoked

at the time. Misunderstood at the time like almost all of the director, who after ten years,

automatically become classics.

After his eternal inconclusive project - the life of Napoleon -, he decides on a film of the same style and

time. That was the germ and inspired by pictorial works of the same period became the great Barry Lyndon.

Made in England, Ireland and Germany, it was the biggest economic failure of any of its films,

due to the negative criticisms it provoked at the time. Misunderstood at the time as almost all of the director

, who after ten years, automatically become clÃsicos.AquÃ began the famous

talk about the filming methods of SK. A strenuous filming of 300 days over two years.

Shot on Christmas Eve with no holidays for the technical team, a way to face work bordering on

slavery. Excess of a director - such as making 25 or more shots of each scene - that were already common. Filming

indoors with candlelight -made especially like the ones from the time of the film-, problems

with the locations because everything should be only a few kilometers away. from his own house, lavish sets and

clothing, demands and bad reputation of the film before its commercial premiere. After the piercing La Naranja

Mec���nica - made four years before -, it was expected This with another one. Barry Lyndon takes us to the films

of the time, with the lavish sets and clothes, being anodyne at times compared to his predecessor,

but without any more frames resulting in an adaptation Full of the book. The beauty of his images is

neither decorative nor precious as they criticize him, and the rhythm is quite difficult to achieve in a realistic film and at

Stanley's level of thoroughness, without limits as regards to the duration of a scene. The beginning with the duel is a

photogram of a beauty rarely seen. As much as its soundtrack, where the main theme Sarabande by

Handel, gives chills for its depth. As in 2001, there are long scenes without dialogues -such as the exquisite

meeting on a balcony- so that one can print their thoughts and emotions. One of the virtues of SK is to

use the soundtrack so that it is an integral part and not a simple accessory.of four Oscars only

Winnerin minor categories, Kubrick is reproached for not having correctly chosen the leading role. time in the

hands of a remarkably over-demanded Ryan O'Neal. Forced action when averaging the film, being well in

its first part being this, more relaxed and relaxed. Maybe I lack character toward the end, of a more

serious and dramatic tone, although his work in perspective is correct and does not affect the m��� rites of the film. SK among other

things is a great director of actors and managed to take Ryan, to a point of demand with naturalness and decorum.

Airy with the right thing, Kubrick would take note of the Oscar winner of that year, Jack Nicholson, for his upcoming film

The Shining. Barry Lyndon: another masterpiece by Stanley Kubrick and van. "" The actors are, basically,

instruments that generate emotions. Some are always willing and well-tuned, while others

reach a high level of quality in a shot and no matter how hard they try, they are unable to repeat it. "" Stanley

Kubrick

" 1

" A very hard movie bad that can end up causing ulcers of how horrible it is. He also plays with the

spectator as if he were subnormal, moving from comedy to drama in an inexplicable way.

Mmmmmmm.���click! eeeeeee buff, yuck, argh, buff, ������clik !! !.Ay !. buff, ���andaaaaaa !, re-buff. I think it's the most

coherent thing that I can say about 'Click', the last spawn starring the actor's feint - it's called Adam

Sandler, which I know, has many followers throughout of the wide world. To those precisely I would say to them that they did not continue

reading the phrases that comes next, we go the rest of the post. I do not want to hurt deep sensibilities,

but after all, Sandler's fans do not care what I or anyone else with a

head on their shoulders, we can say against the famous chemist (hahahahahahahahahahahahahaha ,O, it is true,

makes you laugh). And how they do not care what is said against Sandler because they can read everything that comes to

continuation But then I do not want problems or questions like "" Hey, and what did you mean when you say

it's a plagiarism? "" The argument of the thing is quite simple : we have a happily married family man

who does not have time for his family because, of course, he is expecting a significant promotion in the company where

he works (he is an architect). Therefore, he is not happily married. One day being desperate is helped, as if

by magic, by a hidden dependent in a department store, which gives him a universal command

with which he can organize absolutely everything that is in your personal universe. You can lower the volume to

all those you point to with the remote, you can make everything go slow, and you can skip

chapters of your life and go to what really matters. interesting Before learning the lesson of his life, he will have a great time

with his nose. Sandler must have some problem with Frank Capra's cinema,

because he has already resorted to � He's on more than one occasion, putting up to date (it's a saying) some other classic of the

great director. But of course, there is a huge chasm between the two. Sandler did not understand Capra's movies and

probably never saw him, and let's not fool ourselves, Sandler is neither James Stewart nor Gary Cooper,

authentic solitary heroes in a type of cinema that today says for more than you want, and except on very few occasions, you do not

know how to do it. In 'Click' it is not that I plan the shadow of 'What Beautiful is to Live!', It is that it is practically the same

story, adorned with the foolishness of the command and some details plot The impudence with which the

authors of this monster have plagiarized the mythical title that all the Christmas emitted to us by the televisions

is of Court of Guard. Attentive to the final part of the film (well, if you see it), a shameful strip for

backing clearly invites to leave the room throwing pests. Capra is stirring in the grave, I do not have

the slightest doubt. And you can ask me amazed, or not, but what were you waiting for? was it good? and I

can answer that no, I did not expect it, but I kept some hope with the detail of the mandito,

original detail, everything has to be said, but very seized and developed. Once dissipated the doubt

that the original idea is going to ruin shortly after starting the projection, I could not expect anything good

from a film directed by Frank Coraci, who already he had addressed Sandler twice, and the last one, 'The Water Bearer',

was a very forgettable title. The script goes through all the topics of this type of productions, and of

course it does it without any grace and without claw. The characters are all photocopies of the photocopies of the

clones of the imitation of so many movie characters ���o���a family where they crush us again and again

that the family is the m It's great, which obviously is very good to teach the neighbor, but in the

film does not have the minimum consistency because everything is put into shoehorn and there is no such thing as

dramatic progression, which looks at where it is what was in the t� Titles of Capra, in whichwere

the same moral valuesproclaimed. But of course, things have changed a lot. Now to spread a good

message the protagonist has to throw huge farts in the face of his boss, observe how his dog

always fucks the same stuffed animal (by the way, a totally verdicic custom), etc. , etc. The humor of these

kind comedies, so to speak, is poorer and less intelligent, more evident and less worked, more

eschatological and less subtle. Honoring the film: shit, man. In his cast we find the

only salvageable movie. No, I am not referring to Adam Sandler who continues with the same face as always

playing the same role he has played all his life and that does not change the least. Until it is

probable that the phrases of their personage can be perfectly interchangeable in their films (it is worth, I do not

name 'Punch Drunk Love', that ah��� the thing is different, although am��� it seems to me a film failed). Kate Beckinsale

walks around here as I walk every day of my house to work and I even have a better time. What about this

actress has no name, but her presence is totally dispensable in this film, since her role could

have been played by anyone. Moreover, there are actresses of Beckinsale's age with many more resources than those of

this very limited actress. It is a good thing that we have Don Christopher Walken having a great time in the as much

as he can, lending us his peculiar sense of humor with a character that could have been muchremoved

more, but of course, Sandler did not have to make him shade Although this is almost achieved by David Hasselhoff,

yes, yes, see him to believe it. The mythical Michael Knight is splendid as head of the protagonist, laughing at

himself at all times, although in the final part they forget completely ��� l. The appearances of the two

actors, especially the second, are the best of the film. Of course, that does not come. A very bad movie that

can cause ulcers of how horrible it is. He also plays with the spectator as if he were

subnormal, moving from comedy to drama in an inexplicable and totally incoherent way so that many throw away

the tissues and get excited with a story full of nonsense. . Buff.

" 0

" Expresses his philosophy by resorting to a caricature of the characters and situations of antruism

alarming. Too naive, even to be a story.

The pool in which La joven del Agua submerges, is transformed by minutes, from its original prologue to

its final moral, in an ocean full of findings and successes that make the new film M. Night

Shyamalan's film in a whimsical fantasy. Because with his last work Shyamalan, who is above all a great narrator,

has risked more than ever; The young woman from Agua is a story that is known to be inconclusive; and that reminds us of the

old oral stories, those that were invented on the flyThe young woman of Water, improvised andhistory

long, is a fiction about the fear that we all have inside to assume our responsibilities, for

which Shyamalan proposes as an antidote, as it did with El Bosque, the unity of the Community. But, on

this occasion, the result is rather unsuccessful, not only because it allows some of his best ideas to be

diluted in the plot, perhaps by disconnected; but above all because it expresses its philosophy by resorting to a

caricature of the characters and situations of an alarming obviousness. Too naive, even to be a

story.

" 0

" The problem of the film, in my opinion, is that it has to condense too manyin a very limited time.

vicissitudes

I just, as one says, see Alatriste, a film that I liked it and, at the same time, itme

disappointed. I am not an expert in the art of "" watching movies "", but, rather, a cinematic look and,

therefore, even if this is, inevitably, a criticism, it is necessary to take it, preferably, as mere opinion and I think

it would be desirable to see reflected other opinions, probably more expert in this matter. In fact, I

find it difficult to conceptualize a production of this type, especially when one has read the literary work that

serves as the foundation, which is compressed into 147 minutes of narration. �nf���lmica that, in the fundamental, tries to

stay faithful to that one. Naturally, the result is complex and debatable. As I see it (and as I see

the literary work), Alatriste is a subterfuge to present the Spain of the seventeenth century from the optics of Diego

Alatriste, away from the bubble of power but at the same time , linked to that bubble for a thousand reasons, which

gives it a special interest because it delves into the socio-cultural-religious reality of the time,

trying to approach it from the position of the plebe of the moment, although, inevitably, the

judgment of someone today in that marem���gnum leaks. It seems to me that Diego Alatriste, who is made of flesh and blood in

Viggo Mortensen, is a transcript of Arturo P���rez-Reverte, father of the literary creature and, therefore, "grandfather"

of the film. ��cula, whose face cut reminds me of Mortensen's (evidently, this is absolutely subjective).

On the other hand, from my point of view, a cinematographic adaptation always poses an important problem

to the spectator who has read the literary work that has served as his base, because ���sta tries to influence the

reader, through the text, to recreate, imagining them, characters, scenes, situations and places, while

the narrative eliminates that step of the imagination. n the viewer and, in return, intends to introduce

this in the same action through the images. That problem is also the one of the director of the film and,

logically, that of all those who intervene in it. But we go in parts. To start, the atmosphere. I found it

simply impressive. We must bear in mind that it is a film of many different actions

whose nexus of union is the main character and that this not only does not remain in a single place, but changes

places, times and situations. Well, each place, each time and each situation has its

own setting, in my opinion, very accurate. See, if not, these samples: The photograph, by Paco Femen���a,

may be the most prominent element of the film. I do not think it's any nonsense to say that it endows the film with

an impressive wealth of different atmospheres, according to the times, situations and places. Extraordinary

the innumerable games with the light, that introduce the spectator in situations as varied as the handcuffs

in Flanders, the Madrid intrigues or the din of the battles. As for music, Roque Ba���os, I get

the feeling that it is perfectly integrated into the work, which, in my opinion, is a success. For his part,

Agust���n D���az Yanes, as a screenwriter, has chosen to offer a panoramic view of Alatriste's life,

for a few years, in order to , perhaps, to present the character in its multiple facets, without leaving at

any time to be who he is and who he has been, which summarizes in his presentation P�� �rez-Reverte: he was not theman

most honestor the most pious, but he was a brave man. His name was Diego Alatriste and Tenorio, and he had

fought as a soldier of the old thirds in the Flanders wars. To my way of seeing, being in principle a

little, there lies the fundamental problem of the film. In his role as director, D���az Yanes embroiders his

work: long shots, appropriate to the situations he presents and with the tone he wants to print to his story;

measured camera movements, breathtaking landscapes, hyperrealistic sequences, a set that transmits to

the perfection the hardness of the life of the soldier and the people, its ���nfimo price, the existence of the powerful,

the tensions between them for their struggle for power, street life, the tavern, the gossip, the

Inquisition, the fear, the tension of the cavalry charges, the life of the infantryman (not so far

from today) .. Even duels, which may be short when we think of other films, are easy to

answer more to reality. What to say about the actors? Obviously, we must talk about Viggo Mortensen: his

performance is impeccable, because I believe that he transmits Alatriste's "" being "" to perfection. At first, you can

"" mislead "" your diction a bit (perhaps by the effect of the exponent's imagination.), But you do not get to disfigure

the character. I would also highlight the performance of Blanca Portillo (fray Emilio Bocanegra, inquisitor general),

whose diction also "me" "despist" "and , nevertheless, manages to transmit, I believe that to the perfection, the sinister

character that represents. Antonio P���rez Dechent (partner of Alatriste), Nachovery good performances

P���rez (������igo de Balboa young), Unax Ugalde (������) areigo de Balboa), Juan Echanove (Quevedo), Ariadna Gil (Mar���a de

Castro), Elena Anaya (Ang���lica de Alqu���zar), Javier C���mara (Count-Duke of Olivares), Enrico Lo Verso

(Malatesta). Eduardo Noriega (Conde de Guadalmedina) is somewhat blurred, although perhaps it is due to

paper. Maybe I forget some characters, but these are the ones I remember best. So, with so many

virtues, why have you disappointed me? I have already pointed out that the problem of the film, in my opinion, is that it

has to condense too many vicissitudes in a very limited time. The changes of situation that that excess

imposes break the rhythm and, in certain cases, I understand that they can bore (not am, certainly) and, of course, they

can leave suspense to the spectator in a vacuum. or (ah��� s���). And it is a pity, because the effort made is

worthy of applause, but the final result has not been, in my opinion, what I would have liked. I have read some

"very critical" criticism and it will not be me who says that its author is not right. However, I can only say

what I leave here. At the end of the day, each viewer makes his opinion and, as a whole, it is the viewers

who have the last word.

" 0

" It can be nice if you look at it from afar. Or, if you take it with gloves. As an experiment on the

way cinema can manipulate us.

If the sophists raised their heads, they would go to the cinema going to the movies to see movies like "Thanks for

smoking" or "The Lord of War." Selling weapons to Batiste is not bad, and making a product that gives cancer

either. The public can be convinced of anything if one knows how to handle the rhetoric. Anything can

be said, or done, if that helps us pay our mortgage. "" Thanks for smoking "" can be nice if

you look at it from afar. Or, if you take it with gloves. As an experiment on how the cinema can

manipulate us, it serves to enter a perverse game and then go back to review where the trap was. In the

end the spectator sympathizes with the cigar salesman and takes hold of the anti-tobacco senator. The trapnot

isparticularly subtle, the cigar maker, although it defends the bad, it is tolerant; the senator defends a good cause

with intransigencia.Como as a spectator I do not put a dent in the speech but there is little emotion. He could have imitated

"" Knight without a sword "", but he loses all the magic in the attempt. It could have been like "" Campe���n "" in the

relationship father to son, but with such a transgressive protagonist there is no way to digest that coctail.

" 0

" Film by Fritz Lang who feels some of the principles of Film Noir. A teacher (Edward G. Robinson) makes contact with the attractive model (Joan Bennett) of a painting that is

displayed behind a window. From that moment, he gets carried away by the taste of the forbidden and ends up in

the girl's apartment, being involved in a murder when he must defend himself against the attack of alover

furious(Arthur Loft) and his later investigation. , by a shrewd district attorney who is a friend of the

protagonist (Raymond Massey). The appearance of a hamp���n (Dan Duryea) that tries to blackmail the woman,

complicates the panorama more, and the protagonist must think like a man of science, in a cold way. and meticulous, the

resolution of the incident without prejudice to his reputation and his family. The plot is complicated, as

if it were a nightmare, and both protagonists are forced to trust one another to save the skin.

As the thermometer of the intrigue goes up, an exceptional collection of

tasty dialogues, moments of tension and situations that will later be They are common in the film-noir. Above (or

below) this plot firmly subject to the conventions of the genre, you can perceive an attempt to

combine elements of psychoanalysis and give a deep meaning to the relationships between the characters . The

resolution of the film, with a resource not very appreciated at the time, may operate as a "happy ending", but

also gives the opportunity to add an interesting new dimension. ��na the plot. As if all this were not enough,

the performances of Robinson and Bennett are impeccable, as well as the lighting, photography and most of

the secondary ones, which, in short, leaves us one of the best films of Fritz Lang in his American stage.

" 1

" Film really ���o���o, unlikely, and with situations really ... absurd. An insightful comedy in which it is

hard to laugh.

When you go on a plane, you can do few things. People mainly, try to sleep. Others read. And the

rest, see movies. I opted for this last yesterday, taking advantage of the company that I was flying with (step of

advertising, that they pay me if that xD), put me "" The Jewel of the Family "". And what did you find me with? Well with a

film really ���o���o, unbelievable, and with really.absurd situations. The plot is typical: boy presents girl

to his family. Well from here they have taken enough for a footage that is based on silly situations, without

grace, and really unbelievable. The characters seem to have an inner and outer reluctance throughout

the film . As if they were really sorry to appear in it. Is it really dull. And where are you going to

believe those sudden feelings? Whoever saw it I think he knows what I mean. From here I ask

Diane Keaton, who never in her life will read this blog, but I do not care, why? He chose to appear in thiscomedy

predictable. And like her, the rest of the cast, although maybe someone wanted to appear incomedies

commercialwithout any kind of depth. Because look what could have been, � But not! Do not believe

that you were going to go there.

" 0

" Silicone, steroids, demonic pacts and other habitual wastes are the basis that support this

aberration. Shame

A party full of excesses, stunning blondes, muscle everywhere, some dead. nothing new.

The evil alliance is the name of this supernatural Thriller that narrates the adventures of some young people who, tospeed,

live at fullcan not think of anything else to make a pact with the devil or any of his acolytes. I really

do not know what happens to Hollywood writers, why they despise theagain and again

viewerand offer him byproducts riddled with topics, without the Very minimal originality and that more movies than odas

look like silicone and steroids. And the worst thing is that the answer to the question I have just

asked is implicit in it: these clunkers are still being made because people keep going to see them. It is acircle

vicious, similar to that of the programs of the heart, where paritas without office or benefit fill their

pockets at the cost of selling garbage. The alliance of evil has nowhere to catch it: its argument is practically

non-existent and disconnected between its parts; of the interpreters I have said enough, since any resemblance to

an actor is mere coincidence. Special mention deserves the director Renny Harlin, a person who has directed

titles of a certain size that has been made to make a fool of insulting the viewer with this mess

that seems rolled yes what for those who suffer from idiocy. And they do not even bother to createeffects

decent special, which was the justification that was used to justify these bullies. I was going to say

it's a typical movie of class b, but it would be an insult to the toxic avenger and similar ones, which

at least made you To smile. Because the only reality is that the alliance of evil is awaste

cinematographic, an insufferable succession of images whose only virtue is not to last too long. Of

shame.

" 0

" Entertainment is often rejoiced with cinematographic perfection. This is what happens with this new

notch in the career of Luna, a filmmaker as atypical as criticized.

Disparate. This is the work of Mar���a Lid���n, more known in the industry for its spatial nickname that gives an idea of

orbit in other parts of the world. His daring look at today's movies makes him worthy of praise and ridicule. To the latter

we will arrive very soon, just let me remember Luna's filmography: she started with N���ufragos, an incredible

adventure on Mars and worse, to follow with Yo, whore, where he combined the documentary tone

with the farce, counting on Daryl Hannah and Denise Richards.�� Where do you get the financing for your projects?

What are your contacts in the world? They should be interesting to have famous interpreters like Val

Kilmer and others quoted for their value, in the case of Joaquim de Almeida, who is not proud of it here. Since it

gets so much money, the question that arises is why its carelessness in the gui��� and the incoherent

interpretations of its star-actors, that rub the pathos. �as de Mosc��� can generate one and

dozens of worthy stories to get to the movies is something that does not catch us on the spur of the moment. Why do not we get caught

this descent into hell taking as input the Moscow metropolitan transport? Theenvironment

claustrophobic and darkis infected by a formal apathy that translates into repetitive planes, recurrent music

and a crude guide that drinks from two references already cl��� sicos: El espinazo del diablo, by Guillermo del Toro, and the

resounding short film 7337, about a group of children who 'hide' in a school during the Spanish Civil War

and. So far we can count. Given even the benefit of the doubt - Luna may not see many Spanish

productions -, Moscow zero must overcome the pre-criticism that this director. This

costs so much more than believing that the depths of Moscow are controlled by urban tribes that appear

and disappear by magic and perplexed the delusions of a guy obsessed with legends that go

back to 1920. When narrated, this story is unpalatable, much more so if it is adorned with absurd guises: a

priest who kisses with a peculiar guide to that underworld, the eternal struggle between alive and the dead for the

same place in the world (of the living, of course) and the rapid movements of the camera following the wakes and shadows,

the same ones of every film of bad terror. By the way, friends movie directors, some of the best

stories of the genre happen in broad daylight, in case of Who can kill a child? Ah��� there is no darkness that

camouflages the imperfections.

" 0

" Lacks cinematographic passion, to be at the height of these heroes. Despite some jokes that are in the

film, kind and exciting moments, the film is bland.

There are many concepts of heroes in the cinema. There are the supermen in disguises and royal heroes in

uniforms, without masks or super names. This is the case of firefighters.dedication and dedication is commendable, since

Theirtheir job is to risk their lives to save others and perform tasks, sometimes, of extreme danger.

That is why it is always to be grateful for films "" guilds "" like these, in which they reflect everyday ah���roes with a

certain closeness. Brigada 49 is a film tribute ; much more "" deep "" than Flares. Although both are

fiction, Jay Russell's film is much more "biographical" and realistic than Ron Howard's, which is based on the

firemen's guild but introduces a plot of investigation somewhat forced but no less

interesting. This film, tells the story of a novice firefighter (Joaquin Phoenix) in the brigade commanded

by John Travolta. Beside him, companions like Robert Patrick, etc? a whole gang of dedicated firefighters who

risk their lives in fires and other catastrophic situations. The film focuses on an accident suffered by

the character of Phoenix during a fire and tells us his professional and personal progress as a

flashback. Despite some jokes that are in the film, kind and exciting moments, the film is bland.

It complies with the quota of homage and professional vindication of people who, with their work, run more risks

than those of being fired, but they lack cinematographic passion, being at the height of these h���roes.Por that the

film does not stop being a decently but very bland entertainment.

" 0

" Film about a guy who hates his work and when he wants to lose it he is promoted and overvalued. Comedieta

simptica, but little more.

Trash work will not go to the annals (ass, butt, ass) of the cinematographic history, but I was very

funny to see that there are freaks everywhere. In addition to the evolution of computer science, which seems to

have the film at least one hundred million years. Going back to the geeks, where do those guys who are

scared but no one get them come from? ��� They entered a building one day, killed one and sat in their place? Because

I believe that more than one does not pass a psychic technician, but there they are, giving it to the key.see if the normal ones are

Let'sthem and I'm just psychic meat. The film is about a guy who works in a boring

office, in which the boss will fuck him up limits by all known. Overall, the boy in the middle of a

psychiatric therapy is hypnotized and his life changes. Decide that life is to be happy and theis put on

worldmontera. He goes to work, joins the waitress that he liked, he gets promoted in the curro, the

world backwards that is usually said. It is rare if it is, but it can be seen. On the one hand, the chosen characters

have their points, especially those who fired 5 years ago but who continue to pay for aerror

bureaucratic. Of those in my company there are more than one, that the day they rise up will be the rebellion of the geeks and

laugh you of the zombie comecerebros. The argument is more or less easily followed, but if you wanted to make

a comedy you could have left behind some scenes that fit a lot. Oh, when are you no longer

hypnotized? By the way, the neighbor mola.Resumiendo, film about a guy who hates his job and when he wants to

lose it is promoted and overvalued. Sympathetic comedieta, but little more. You can see, but without much

laughter.Besitos.

" 0

" Action comedy without great special effects, but with a high quality script that reminds us that not

everything is based on money

My friend The toxic avenger recommends this � movie on his blog, and since I know how to taste subtle

frames before lumpy movies, we told him to watch it. In addition, these Argentine comedies usually

like us, I do not know if by what they say, or as they say it. But the fact is that we usually get stuck with them. So

, with these magnificent premises we could not help but give it a chance. The film is about an

Argentine psychologist (who would say Sabina) which is condemned by the judge (also Argentine, it is an

Argentine film) to do social tasks for the community due to a traffic accident that he suffered. So it's up to him to

assist a federal police officer who is depressed because his wife is cheating on him. So a

very strange couple is formed that has to solve a case of a disappearance of two types that complicates to

expose the shame of Argentine justice. What a good panz ��� to laugh that we got between chest and back

with this production. For starters, I really like the solidity of the script, given that without bigyou get

bangsvery fast in the movie, it subtly envelops you and you end up very involved in it. The things that happen have their point

of credibility and, although they are quite sad and harsh (the harsh reality) are carried away with thatlittle point

funnyso necessary. It is also very interesting to change the roles suffered by the two protagonists, who

transmute their identities. And the final outcome, with that little bit of tonter���ae impossibility that it has,

I also liked it. It is not very credible, but it does not detract from the rest of the film. To emphasize, the scene is that they smoke

marijuana in the car, which is totally surrealist, and the dinner in the psychologist's house. Very big both.

Resumiendo, action comedy without great special effects, but with a high quality script thatus

remindsthat not everything is based on money and that they can be made magnificent movies with not too much.

" 1

" The day we know how to make films of this quality and bill but without many? Queens? and? Princesses? There will have

to be a double celebration, because people will go to see more Spanish cinema and at the same time less propaganda.

This is the first time that I have written down things during the showing of a film: I did not want to forget any

details to comment on here. with great misgivings to see the new film of the Spanish Ken Loach.

I feel the comparison, but he himself tries to become that, it is not a nickname that we put him out of hatred. In

fact, the director is the one who seems to hate the world in which he lives and the one who lives to make hisdenunciations

social. And it seems that he uses marginals as allies to be able to explain his ideological frustrations in his films.

To begin with, the script continues to crucify and condemn the m���. Absolute hell to

his "" heroines "". And Hell is responsible for reflecting it very well, in some situations veridically

(for example, sequences in the Casa de Campo with hidden car matrices under a pixelated one). And Don Fernando

is responsible for not giving its protagonists possibility of escape. And it perfectly exemplifies it with the definition

of "" princess "" that the character of Candela Peña gives. All the prostitutes, apart from irredentists, are victims. The

character of Candela Pe���a has the noble purpose of enlarging her tits. But it implies that it is temporary.

That must be his lie, because a character who has a clear goal but has to do something horrible would

want to leave it with the utmost urgency. And it is not the case. The character of Micaela Nev���rez is the most credible asundocumented

that of anDominican woman who has no other choice but to prostitute herself. But that also acts as

"" praying mantis. "" The downside of the panfletary film is that there is no one who creates them. And apart they do no

favor to who portrays. And in this case, as De Aranoa wants to dignify them and turn them into heroines (makes a

parallel about Superman better used than in Kill Bill 2), not only write them philosophical phrases of those that you

release at the time of coffee after dinner on God and life, but also puts them as teachers of

sexuality (Lorena Berd���n trembles) or introduces some character enviable within the profession, as the

mistress of some minister who gives them a ride in limousine.No undeveloped stories (such asare missing

Candela and Micaela with their "" boyfriends "")They could defenestrate the ideological discourse of the director. But it is necessary to

emphasize the good thing of the film, that they are a pair of things: the actresses and the staging. This time Fernando

Le���n has dared to take the camera on his shoulder and makes a staging less stiff. The actresses

are of award, and it is worth noting the discoveries of Antonio Dur���n Morris and Llum Barrera as excellent

secondaries. The film can also count on the privilege of Manu Chao I composed a song for

the movie "" They call me street "", a game of words almost worthy of M���dem.Resumiendo, that the day we know how to make

films of this quality and bill but without so many "" Queens "" and "" Princesses "" will have to do a double celebration,

because people will go to see more Spanish cinema. at the same time less propaganda.

" 0

" The great difference that a history of history falls in an expert hands or reaches those of

the producers of 28 days after, resides fundamentally in that, in the first case, it could We should be

talking about a masterpiece; while, in the case at hand, we only hear about the interpretation of

Forest Whitaker.

That of which History judges to each and every one of the dictators of the world, is well; but it would be much

better if, in addition, it was indicated to each and every one of the almighty people who, at some point, smiled at them. The

butcher of Kampala gains access to the power of Uganda after a coup that is supported by Israel, while

the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs defines him as "a splendid type and a great player of "Tbol "".

Some aspects that, like many others, do not transcend in a film of "" historical genre. "" The great difference

that a history of history falls into an expert hands (is I think of Mr. Spielberg's) or

of those of the producers of 28 Days Later, it resides fundamentally in the fact that, in the first case, we

could be talking about a masterpiece; while, in this case, we only hear about the

interpretation of Forest Whitaker. It is not strange. We are facing a film that lacks too many

essential elements, such as historical depth and rigor, a gui���ns���lido, an effective montage, and an

intensive course on what what is meant by "" measuring times "" in the narrative of a film. And to that, on the

other hand, there are plenty of dizzying camera movements, scenes that do not fit and are inserted artificially

(due to deficiencies in the script, in the editing, or in both) and , above all, the pretension that places it within the

historical genre. The director of the film expresses his desire to take the viewer to a remote place, as is

Uganda, for? We suppose- to bring him closer to the socio-political reality of this country in the era of Idi Am ���n, "" Given "".

(I say well, we assume). We continue supposing that, being an Oscar-winning documentary maker, success is assured; and

we were wrong. The only thing that is offered is a film of adventures, "" Doctor in Uganda "", and apanoramic

superfluousof an imaginary country, governed by a quirky tyrant who coexists with English characters that do not

explain their presence, in which there are episodes of hijacked flights withoutpositions being clarified

anyone's, and where the brutal repression against adversaries of unknown origin is sensed. In other

words, the filmmaker becomes one of those travel agencies that provide idyllic destinations in

paradis���acos closed circuits, away from the harshness of the place visited.Which is an aut�� ���ntica

làstima, because there are valuable ingredients that have not been known to exploit, such as the attractive story

by Giles Foden; the presence of a fictitious advisor, personal physician of the dictator, who represents the

civilian population, seduced by him to later suffer the revelation of his true personality; and the

possibility of shooting in the heart of Africa, which is only used to show the different types of

mosquitoes, under the control of a tortuous soundtrack. A clear example of what it happens when

the "" approach "" fails with which an argument is approached, which leads us to wonder how differentbeen

this film would haveif the novel had been used to delve into the historical episode. ��rico, as did Steven

Zallian in Schindler's List or Tony Kushner in M���nich. It is not even possible to capture the essence of the

slaughterer, which is overflowing with affability (which, surely, he had), but thatare notattributed to him

those other aspects that manifested his schizophreniaexplicitly, those that led him to appear in

La Reina's court unannounced, to telephone the president of the same USA at five o'clock.the

early inmorning, or to reprimand his admired Hitler "" for not have killed enough Jews. " A few details that

make that, when leaving the cinema, there are 1,500 doubts that assail the spectator, having attended to the exposition

of an incredible story and, at any moment, forced. In a product destined to the satisfaction In an audience that is

not demanding, it is pleasantly surprised by the extraordinary direction of the actors developed by the documentalist. Not

only praises the work of Whitaker (deservedly awarded), physical resurrection of the "" King of

Scotland "" filmed in 1974 by Barbet Schroeder; but also the interpretations of James McAvoy,

Gillian Anderson and David Oyelowo. As well as the accurate photograph of Anthony Dod, sober and solid inside the British

Empire, with intense colors in Ugand���s territory. Which leads us to the conviction that the

next time a filmmaker decides to enter the African continent, he will have to flee (as if he were atiger

hungry) from the unique message that they give off. products such as Blood Diamond, as well as the historical

indefinition created by MacDonald. I am sure that the famous acronym EEA (this is Africa) is

still to be explained.

" 0

" A spiral of psychic turbulence endowed with a hypnotic effect that traps the spectator and makes him

part of the bitterness.

Images Sounds Music Words. Making art is creating a structure through imagination, the "double

vision" of the artist, the poetic visions that emerge in the interaction between the world and the gaze intuitive

of the creator. A r���quiem is a composition, Darren Aronofsky composes with images and words to express a

whirlwind of ideas and sensations, a trembling reflection on social problems or, better yet, a ��� ,N, about thebeing

humanalienated from himself and lost in an empty world that is filling with the virtual realities of

enso���aci���n. Dream what you want, everything works: drugs, television, sex, food, are the ways

to an artificial paradise that immerses us in what we are not. The story is heartbreaking, not for original,

but for the perfect balance between form and background. The parallel montage and the visual tricks configure a

musicality in the succession of images that keeps more than the intention of leaving "" cao "" to the spectator. It is not

gimmicky, but effective. Aronofsky's camera creates a penetrating vision of each psychological moment in each

of the characters, using images of an unhealthy sensuality, through the use of elements such as

drugs and sex to emphasize the addictive pulse that oppresses them. In this film, the spectacularartifice

visual, the bombastic psychedelia, becomes the ideal technique for the representation of a conglomerate of

individual hells articulated in an expression of Den of collective tragedy, a drowned heartbeat that advances towards the

final dream, the desperate flight forward. The death of the dream in the dream itself. According to the title,

then, the basic idea is the lament before the underground of society, human frailty, how little we are

and how much evil It hurts us not to be more than we are. But it is not only the pain, the look of Aronofsky

composes diverse tones: the pathos (represented mainly in the character interpreted by Ellen Burstyn,

simply unforgettable), the melancholy (the loss of the past with the consequent loneliness) and the s���tira

around institutions, uses and North American customs. In synthesis, an overwhelming composition that encompasses

both sensations and concepts, impeccable balance between the emotional effect and the expression of an

idea, a spiral of psychic turbulence endowed of a hypnotic effect that traps the spectator and makes him

part of the bitterness. We do not write anymore because there is no time, and also because there are no words that do it

justice.

" 1

" If at the end you see it, whether you like it or not, do not say that I have not warned you. The movie is one of those that you

love or hate. I, like hating, I do not carry it in my blood and I love it, I leave it for other things, because neither fu

nor fa.

Curious comedy of Wes Anderson, who rejoins Adrian Brody, Owen Wilson and Jason Schwartzman (health!), In a

film in which it seems that the trip is nowhere, because it hardly lacks meaning and. Come on, that's

weird. It premieres on January 4, so it would be the first comedy that opens in 2008, although I would

recommend that to laugh, and if it is still on the line, go to see Hot Fuzz (whose cr�� Ethics I still have

pending). Because in this, neither laughter, nor grace nor n��� of n���. Maybe it's me who likes the uncouth humor and Inot

dounderstand Anderson's chemical vein, but it seems he's made the movie for himself and hisbuddies

gafapast. I'll tell you a little bit about what's going on and you're deciding, although I do not think I'll draw any

conclusions. Before the movie started, we were given a short film starring Jason's character ( I refuse

to write his last name again) and Natalie Portman, in case the producer at the end did not decide to broadcast the

short film before you can find it on youtube or similar. You can also see Natalie Portman

naked. Those who still read me after saying this last, tell you that the film is about on a trip

organized by three brothers (of blood) to India, in search of spirituality in their lives, although then the

trip takes another meaning that will not be revealed ... so as not to spoil the grace. than for one that has. Although I'm not going to

be bad, we're at Christmas, the film itself is very entertaining, plus, Owen Wilson gets out, he's the

best in the movie, most points, and blows, fall on him. Adrian Brody is also correct, but still

not get rid his character in The Pianist head, sois difficultaccept an me his facet

c ���mica.Entonces. Where are we? I spend my time watching this movie or I ask for a pizza better and I see the

repeat of the New Year's Eve special on a Sunday afternoon? Well, I do not know what's worse. With the

Christmas Day, the Kings and others, going to take refuge in the cinema to see this movie is not a bad option. in

fact it is the only good choice of the first set of premieres of 2008. If at the end you see it, whether you like it

or not, do not say that I have not warned you. The movie is one of those that you love or hate. I, like hating, I do

not carry it in my blood and I love it, I leave it for other things, because neither fu nor fa. Fua.

" 0

" Exit Pitando is a comedy without grace or spark that masquerades as a tribute to one of thesituations

m���sc���micthat soccer has given in the last few days. cadas

The cinema has always looked for stories to tell in the sport, successes, failures, or simply and simply extract

a series of potentially chemical situations. The sports most portrayed on the big screen are coincidentally

the ones with the largest number of fans in the United States. On the other hand, football has remained with the

dubious honor of being a sport that can not be made a good film. And maybe that's the case, but you can

make good films of everything that surrounds the world of football, and if it is not enough to be attentive tonews

football. One of the most memorable moments is the famous phrase "" Do not Fuck Me, Rafa "", a phrase that has gone down in

history as "" Rafa do not fuck with me "". With the idea of ​​emulating this scene, Salir Pitando was born, a comedy that

aims to exploit the comicity of one of the most despised collectives in sports: the arbitration body. The

big question that remains for one after seeing Salir Pitando is how Alvaro Fern���ndez Armero has been able to

waste such a humorous potential to end up telling an anodyne and vulgar story. The claim

of soccer and arbitration has been the main commercial feature of the film, but it is no more than a mere excuse for the

development of a bad comedy of entanglement in which the main protagonist is a loving triangle. The

scenario no whereget it, and instead of the blanket to the head have been tied up and thrown in the way of

the absurd and surreal, ste going through a sinfn of platitudes and trite situations. The few

situations that could have given something more than they are are badly taken and worse resolved. The actors fulfill

their work, which already has a lot of emotion due to the infamous characters and dialogues that have fallen into their

lot. Pitar is a comedy without grace or spark that is masked as a tribute to one of thesituations

physicalthat soccer has given in recent decades. But the king sport is not more than a mere excuse, and

that is that the film would have been the same with any other profession.

" 0

" Known in Spain with the title of aggression in the house of terror, this film was the first to be recorded in

digital video as well as to mean also the first assignment of a work done for the live video.

Some films become cult for a specific fact, much less for the quality they can offer that

in this case is null. Known in Spain with the title of aggression in the house of terror, this film was the

first to be recorded in digital video, in addition to mean the first order of a work done for

the live to video.This precedent gives a minimum thread of popularity in the debut of director and actors who did not

return to work in any other product. Typical story of houses possessed where adolescents of little

brain are massacred in special nursery effects, practically amateur performances, a

mise en scene very a by-product that can make some grace in the face of such a bunch of

disproportions. More than nothing has its value for collectors.

" 0

" It shows the contradiction that prevails in the labor market based on the idea of ​​how to even ask for

work you need money.

"" There is no person more unfortunate than the one who does not know how to see what he has "" reflects Isabelita (Isabel Ampudia),

a middle-aged woman who leaves the prison and is in the dif� Easy situation of having to look for

life as best you can. Through the character of Isabelita, the 15-day director with you reflects on thelife

affluentenjoyed by most of society and how little we value what we have. The filmmaker Jes� Ponce

debuts on the big screen with the direction and the gui���n of a film that emerged from a photographic report

that the director made in 1992 to people who lived on the street. The idea DESARROLL until theGuin,

current where Isabel and Rufo embody "" those beggars we see every day on the street "." The filmus

teachesRelaaa relativize the problems, because no matter how difficult our situation, there will always be someone who

is in worse circumstances. But the fundamental issue of 15 days with you is the reinsertion of the

prisoners: those people invisible to society. History shows how people whonotare despised

havehad the luck or opportunity to integrate into societyand become marginalized.

Unfortunately, there are three habitual behaviors against this type of people: indifference,

fear (to the unknown) or contempt and abuse. It is time for us to leave hypocrisy aside because:

���Qui� Has not he ever changed the street in the street when he saw a person looking like a drug addict? This

film helps us to put aside prejudices and get closer to those people who for various reasons

live on the margins of society, the outsiders. History reveals that they are people like others,

with feelings and dreams, they are not so different from us, from "normal" people. " Like everyone, they suffer from loneliness, they

elsehave dreams, dreams (more modest dreams about going out to dinner) The film shows the contradiction that

prevails in the labor market based on the idea of ​​how to even ask for work you need money.

Isabelita, after trying to find a job without success, decides to stay out of the system: she lives on the

street and manages to survive as she can: she cleans the windowpanes in exchange for the

will. A will that does not tend to be very generous in the matter of money. But Isabelita is not alone

but has a companion with whom she shares her life. Rufo (Sebasti���n Haro) is a drug addict and earns some money

to survive by helping to park cars. The life of that peculiar couple also has chemical moments but of

those that leave a bitter aftertaste in the palate of the spectator. It is the tender and at the same time hard fifteenhistory

daywith a couple of friends, Isabelita and Rufus. The history of their daily experiences, problems and joys.

"The bad thing about getting out of jail is to see how everything changes and you stay behind. And when you stay behind is

forever, "reflects Isabelita. But at the end of the story there is always a gap for hope, for

the bitterness to soften and some dreams come true. Will Isabelita and Rufus get back to life?

" 1

" Definitely, I loved it, although I still prefer The Curse of the Black Pearl. Definitely,

I loved it, although I still prefer The Curse of the Black Pearl.

The Pirates of the Caribbean saga had already dazzled me since the premiere of the first installment, The Curse of

the Black Pearl, which I consider one of the best adventure films. more exciting, entertaining and

fun of the current decade.The second installment, The chest of the dead man, did not disappoint me, but could not

overcome the list of the very Enjoyable first part. The charm was no longer the same, and it was not what I expected and

wanted for this saga: autoconclusive chapters to Indiana Jones. The third installment, At the end of the world,

which was released all over the world last Thursday, it means a dignified continuation of the adventures of Jack

Sparrow and the troupe that surrounds him, and the consecration of the Pirates of the Caribbean saga as one of the best (and

most profitable) that the film industry has given birth to. Curl the curl until the exhaustion, but what the hell, what

good does it. And it does not deceive anyone. It's a fantastic adventure movie like a

pine tree. On this occasion, unlike its predecessors, more fantastic than adventure. This breaks a bit with

the general tone that the saga was taking up to this third part, but the pure spectacle that means all of

it justifies everything. Pirates of the Caribbean: At the end of the world is long. It lasts almost three hours, but nevertheless,

it has not been long nor heavy. I did not think it was a movie of almost three hours. It has kept me

dazzled, stuck in the seat from the beginning to the end. And how I value that! It has made me laugh with

most of the gags, which are not few (��� great the cameo of Keith Richards!); it has made me enjoy with the action

scenes, and of all the perfect technical invoice that the film has (wonderful soundtrack and

prodigious artistic design, accompanied by the best and most spectacular special effects that have been

seen on the big screen during all this decade); In addition to being moved by the sequences that pretend toit. Not

doa moment of shame of others. not a single yawn. He has not left me for a moment

respiro.Definitivamente, I loved it, although I still prefer The Curse of the Black Pearl. They defer their burdens

: the total waste of some characters and situations, and its excessive duration, totally

unnecessary, taking He tells me that the plot is so small, although it has seemed more complex than it

can come to pretend. It turns out to be the least sympathetic, most serious and darkest film of the saga, but that

nevertheless has the most number of gags and situations extremely hilarious and surreal ("The multiple Jacks

!" The wedding in full battle!) of the whole trilog Ena.In short, people, entertainment and spectacle

in its purest form. It is true that the script is nothing special (in my opinion it is not very well written: in the

middle of the film the multiple frames are so much that one can get to mess up), but when one

has been kept so dazzled in this way for almost three hours, what the hell, to take the gui���and

other messes that ass We always take into account. If the cinema is entertainment, the cinema was created by movies

(sagas) like this one.

" 1

" The last tango in Paris is authentic cinema, although I do not know exactly what this means: maybe it's

authentic because it's not offers answers but opens questions. This is life, in any way.

What has happened to El Ultimo Tango in Paris has no reasonable paragon in any otherfilm

quality: some images have prevailed in our memory collective and the rest have been erased. The elevator has been left

where the lovers put on a vitamin lube. The very black and shaggy pubis of

Jeanne (Mar���a Schneider), her small body, her short legs, her baby face and her big tits are all gone.has

The humiliation of butterremained. The apartment has been left sunny, its loneliness sweated and its emptiness

emaciated. What has been lost is a symbolism, the spirit of utopia, its literature. Thehas been lost

background of his characters: the madness of his existence, the sad beauty of the stories that, following the

meeting of the lovers, are composing the portrait of a world in decadence, ridiculed by Bertolucci in

the figure of the amateur director , Jeanne's pedantic-boyfriend filmmaker, who represents whathimself

Bertoluccihated: the sluggish, pedantic and realistic cinema of the time. ��� Somebody has thought of Goddard

Bernardo Bertolucci's political commitment is dressed in the echo of the French May, of his student revolts, of

the educated innocence and solidarity of his young liberated . These were times in which culture was managed, perhaps

for the first time in the twentieth century, as a weapon and words were thrown off like bullets. What Paul (an

amazing Marlon Brando) does is to talk: his inner torment is verbalized, unashamedly communicated to the child-lover

who has found and shares with him the loneliness, the anonymity, as if They were ghosts. The last tango in

Paris is authentic film, although I do not know exactly what this means: maybe it's authentic because it's not offers

answers but opens questions. This is life, in any way. Paul is tormented, a man

torn apart (he has envied, his wife has committed suicide, and he does not want to build a new world) and a soul inpain

continuous, who does not need to redeem himself, but who laps to find someone to let himself die with, who to

trust his letan���am���s intimate. And then it is when sex appears and it is in his grammar of sweat and silence

where Paul and Jeanne get a full communication. Eros and Thanatos, life and death embroidered in

sex, as Serrat said in the copla of his Curro el Palmo, the eternal story of good and evil, light and

its reverse, not necessarily tenebrous : this is what is hidden under the clothes of the lovers, on the floor

of the Parisian apartment, with sunlight invading the screen. It is a shame that the years have not subtracted a touch

of force from this film: it has overlapped its message, although it has all the poets to get lost

because it is, very fundamentally, a precise film of a precise time and it is understood that the spectators who

saw it at its premiere will have a greater astonishment, a deeper reverence, a more visceral love for the

expereince that his viewing entails. "" God fucking, "says Paul under a bridge as a train passes by. Paul does not

want to know anything about his casual lover's past. There are no names. There is no history There are epidermis. There is a

revolution that has given enough headaches to the repressed and the prevailing censorship to have

this film as the head of sin, with the voluptuous image of Jeanne in the bathtub, soaped by the hier� Ethical

Paul, burned by a sad and beautiful winter afternoon. He does not scandalize like then, thanks to that God from

under the bridge that Paul insulted, but leaves a residue of anguish, of burning in the soul, which is where more

all things sting. Major words of table philosophers such as nihilism or existentialism for a

simple remembrance of a film of dramatic eroticism or erotic drama. Ethical, but sex is the vehicle for

these characters to touch the sky or touch bottom and end in glory or hell. It matters little. Par���s,

nevertheless, having many films, has to this as a firm flag of his aura ofromantiscism

decadent. Chapter necessarily separate is the arc of social influence that the film produced in its time:

I am still fascinated by the garrulous and provincial poignancy of those Spaniards in perpetual erection (

Franco had thrown inhibitors of the slime in the swamps that was inaugurating) that went to the south of France

to see a co��� and some tits, with perd�� Porn by the sem rebantico recess, by others, util���simo. And on top of that they spoke in French.

These are now different times and others are the pathos, provincial or not, that populate us,

but here it was paradigmatic of a situation. A shameful, obscurantist poll���tica. It seems, in any case, that the

delay is already a souvenir of our History and everything is in these days of openness in the social and

moral bonanza awards for the liberal talente of our Government. Time was. Time will be in the future

probably not far from evaluating if we ran a lot or if in the race we lost something valuable. Then it is very

difficult to go back, resume the road and sharpen our eyes to see what we lost. This is a simplecriticism

film, a note about the past, not a editorial furious about the progress and its vices in the editorial of

a newspaper with a lot of circulation.

" 1

" In such a deplorable framework, magic will be the vehicle of salvation towards a fantastic world where

truth does not only have a path.

Not all Spanish cinema has to be the same and films like this show it. To begin with, it iscinema

fantasticof the good, with a solid argument and excellent special effects. To continue, the

structure of the guide is developed according to the story and, therefore, we do not have the sensation that we

lack data or, on the contrary, that we have too many. Both the photography and the sound are exquisitely

elaborated, nothing has been left to chance and, moreover, the work of the actors gives off the same quality as the

film. cula, highlighting the work of Sergi L���pez.Al as he did in "" El espinazo del diablo "", Guillermo del Toro

transports us to the cruel and dark world of the Spanish civil war (in this case , of the postwar period) to

show us a bleak scenario, where the powerful will systematically abuse the most vulnerable

individuals. In such a deplorable framework, magic will be the vehicle of salvation to a fantastic world where the

truth not only has a way and is exempt of prejudices. And precisely, of prejudices the director has sinned

since the final result would have been much better if he had not insisted so much on the subject of the cruel Falangist

and would have delighted us more with Ophelia and her incredible world. I think this is the biggest mistake of the film since

it will confuse the public, who for the most part, will have been manipulated by a campaign of promotion that is

quite far from the final product. Guillermo del Toro said at the press conference that he made a day after

the presentation of his film in Madrid, that still today in Spain there was a deep division in two and I

would have liked to ask him if he does not consider that this type of arguments stimulate ���sa���n the wound and,

therefore, the division.Finally, warn of the extreme violence of some scenes, which made me take my

eyes off the screen, although I recognize that I am quite sensitive and prefer not to get used to tolerating

torture, even if it is the product of incredible special effects (unusual in national productions).

" 1

" The best, the snore of someone from the back seat that seemed to be part of the sound effects of

the space suits. Dolby Digital Human, hehehe.

There are two cinematographic genres that tend to entertain me with ease. Children's animated films

and science fiction. The last of the director of Trainspotting, The Beach or 28 Days Later is the story of

a space mission in the not too distant future where the sun dies and they have to explode a bomb to create a

new star from the Great Astro. Many times an absurd argument can result in a great

movie. But it is not the case. To see it, I made the mistake of trusting the comment of the critic of theprogram

cinemaof the SER chain, Te���filo el Necr���filo: Est��� closer to "" 2001 "" than of "" Star Wars "" and also has

elements of "" Alien "". It raises much more than special effects. If it looks like 2001 is that there is a

central computer that also speak with the voice, pass, but otherwise, it does not even reach the sole of the

shoes. The dialogues are simple. So they explain everything they do as if you were stupid, but

then (due to a very bad editing) you do not find out if they have already reached a place where they can be found. n at

every moment. Up to 4 times they are deciding the lives of the crew members with things like there is only one

suit and the others must die, or there is no oxygen for so many and there are Even the last room, with

the introduction of a more or less surprising element, hardly goes back the flight of a movie that did not keep me

interested except for some attempt ��tico with the sun as protagonist. Best, the snore of someone from the back

seat that seemed to be part of the sound effects of space suits. Dolby Digital Human,

hehehe.

" 0

" A second part what would get to lose all the little freshness that could have the first part,

to be much more commercial ... and so � has been.

The other day was released on the Spanish Disney Channel the sequel to the hit High School Musical, atelefilm

young musicalthat I already mini defended in his day. My little sister saw it yesterday and I recorded it on the DVD, and today I was

able to watch it. Expectations? None at all, so then do not revenge me with those of "" ���Pf! What did you expect? "

The first was grid, and that's enough. It also closed the story well. A second part what would get to

lose all the little freshness that could have the first part, being much more commercial. In addition, given

the talent of the Disney Channel for making series and telefilms, it was expected that the story would be

more of the same, and would not offer at all. nothing new with respect to its predecessor. I only sell records and DVDs.

And so it has been. High School Musical 2 is a pretty considerable bullshit. The plot (that tells the

"" adventures "" of the wildcats in summer) is a joke (when the movie ends, go to a mirror and look at

the faces that you have left), and multiply the defects that, Within what fits, had the first

part: twice as predictable, twice as typical, and double as cheesy. The musical treatment of history

also it makes water with respect to the first part, and it is so so commercial that it frightens. Onlysaved

minimallyWhat time is it? and I do not dance (although the origin of this last one is also another gilipollez), that

at least they are a little marchosas.El rest, trash. Only for fans of these buds, for disneychannellers,

and for the more youngsters. Not recommended for people over 17 years old. Unless you call yourself Andy Stitzer.

" 0

" What starts as a descojones ends up leaving mother and touching the "" Land "" but what were you waiting for,

���Hamlet?

Roddy Piper is Sam Hell in this post-apocalyptic comedy in which the mutants, frogmen who do not quite

understand what they are called, (the copy of ve muya very well, but the audio sucked), are the main

threat of man.The case is that the first fifteen minutes are anthology of comedy and theclose-ups

protaare great, is a kind of Plissken the snake but cowardly and fat.Hell is the �� Only man

of the earth that has not remained sterile and the main hope of humanity. Of course, the women uncover and

want to grab him, but he has a shell in his parts that can fly in a thousand pieces that he reserves for

fertile women g���ays. What begins as a descojones ends up leaving mother and touching the

"" Land "" but you expected, ���Hamlet? From the middle on rubs the unbearable and the laughter are forgotten.

Painfully bad.

" 0

" Another action / juvenile cut tape, which again stays in one of many. The best thing about the tape is

undoubtedly its beautiful London exteriors ...

Again notepad shot and before commenting on the tape that brings us, I would like to make a small

reminder of a film This film was released in 1991 and directed by Willian Dear, under the title of ""Agent

Youth"" was a comedy for the absolute brilliance of a rising star (Richard Grieco �� Who knows where to

go now?), And that in a way reminds me a little of the film that I'm going to talk about now. I've been

a long time reading the net things about this film, the first one that was going to be made about the

character created by Anthony Horowitz (it will be the first and the last, since the film has been a boxfailure

office), a kind of JK Rowling's youth literature (this time set in action and not inmagic

Potter's), and where, after an unusual opening of créditos, which relates Alex Rider in a certain way with a

sort of young James Bond; impossible otherwise not to compare them, it throws us to a simple argument where

Ewan Mcgregor makes a small (but intense) role, and Alicia Silverstone returns by her fueros; this girl since

she was "" Fatgirl "" (I say) "" Batgirl "" never heard of her again in the movies, also Billy Nighy

(here without makeup) and Andy "" Gollum "" Serkis, this one carries the makeup that the other does not carry. Its durationimportant,

is veryand that is, if the tape lasted more than the hour and a half of rigor, the kids (do not forget that it can not be destined

to another sector of the population), they would end up hating the film, and that is that some scenes of action are so

extremely silly and childish that one can not help but laugh with astonishment at this disproportion, and I understand that

when you see a tape of these characteristics you have to leave your brain at home, but some things grate the

absurd .When I've been documenting, they said on some websites, that they had to scratch something else on the

surface of the tape to see beyond the original premise , s We can not contradict this, if we scratch more,not

we dosee anything (sad, but real). The best thing about the film is undoubtedly its beautiful London exteriors,

and since I was in September, I fell in love of London and everything that your city represents.

" 0

" Fascinating descent into the hells of the drug. A fantastic vehicle to put into operation all

the visual resources of a formidable director.

This is going to age only in a disgusting room when the children have left and only have one

television and one refrigerator. It's also about dreams: because nobody wants to die in an old building in

Coney Island and there are methods to deceive reality and that our fantasy acquires flight and blind us R���quiem

por un sue���o is the hardest portrait of loneliness cinema can give except the confinement of Edmundo Dant���s on

the island of If. In this story, Daronofsky does not look for patterns in the ridiculous turns of the stock market and he goes from making a

mustache with the phonetic of the names of God to find happiness in the symphony arcana of the

mathematics of the world. That he did in Pi, that pearl in black and white that left us on horseback between

disbelief and fascination. In this case, the author returns to the holy grail of the human soul, to the

incensing search for happiness. It does not matter if it comes from a heroin shot or a television show. The

characters of the film fatigue the shadows in search of the light, but they do not reach it. Neither is happy and we know

that he will not find that happiness in the film. Everyone is addicted to something: drugs orprogramming

television, but both elements are evidence of their loneliness, of their helplessness. Aronofsky conceives the film

as a fragmented compendium of images that marry perfectly with the tortured and also

compartmentalized brain of all the protagonists. Some lose their sanity for excess drug. The mother (an

absolutely perfect Ellen Burstyn) is placed with television contests and with the pilgrim idea of

recovering the figure she had as a young woman so that she could fit into a red dress that represents the life wasted,

the time sacrificed. The music of the genius of electronics Clint Mansell, attached to the asphyxiating strings

of the Kronos Quartet, is one more component of the film. It was a long time ago (Oldboy, very recently) that I did not

notice the physical presence of the soundtrack in a movie. The final climax can not be conceived without the

disturbed melody that brushes the abrupt end. It's not easy cinema: you do not want it. It is digested with difficulty and

leaves in memory a few overwhelming images. The frenetic movement of the camera, theaccelerations

abruptof the tempo of the images and, above all, the vertiginous visual tics to which Arofonofsky turns withFascinating

excessive and reckless frequency.descent into the underworld of the drug. A fantastic vehicle to

put into operation all the visual resources of a formidable director.

" 1

" Very estimable work of Scorsese. It was not easy to capture, not already all, but not even a part of the life of the tycoon turned into inventor and

film producer Howard Hughes. His life was, until his voluntary retirement from the madding crowd, a continuous challenge

to social and business conventions. Along the way, as often happens when a rich man,

and therefore with a lot of power, becomes stubborn in a certain social recognition, he left a trail of

friendships and broken feelings. the hagiography but it is undeniable that, although I do not judge him, he

does have some sympathy with his protagonist. Perhaps because it reminds him of himself in the struggle he has or had

in the past with the film industry, who postponed him in glory on numerous occasions

. n is fluent, with remarkable moments of humor (the prologue or dinner with the family of Hepburn) and

prodigious di���logos, fast and incisive. Different social and businessare the object of ridicule,

stratajoke or simply criticism, showing exemplary to the spectator what certain kind of people were like in

those fascinating times of the, maybe better or at least ���s pure, Hollywood. The interpretations are

great, easily highlighting its protagonist Leonardo di Caprio, always a good actor although sometimes

comfortable in the easy way. Here it shows an immense variety of nuances that strip the soul of such a complex

character. Anyway, I would highlight, even above him, Cate Blanchett, as Katharine Hepburn.

It is curious that, not physically looking anything like it, thanks to its stylized gestural composition,

sometimes its resemblance is not already big but even resemble like two drops of water.

" 1

" It's a shame. Perhaps he hoped that with the reference of 1956 and the excellent filmography of Hirschbiegel The

invasion was a superior product to the one found.

Until the nineteenth century Western culture attributes emotions a negative and dangerous role in

shaping the nature of the adult man. And I say man because it is attributed exclusively and exclusively to thegenre

masculinethe noble enterprise of bringing Humanity through its rational capacity towards Progress and

perfection. n moral. For its part, the woman was a paradigm of moral weakness and intellectual disability; that is

why the exclusion of the female genre of public life was seen with naturalness, and it was assigned -almost

with paternal benevolence- the roles of loving mother and wife sol�� �cita, more adjusted to its

unstable, superficial and sickly nature.It will already be under the ashes of the Enlightenment where it will emerge from the hand of

the romantic movement a ���oranza of the origins of Humanity (Greek culture) and with it also a

reaffirmation of human passions as a necessary substrate for life. It is not the Razn that makesbetter

human beings, but the natural and noble feelings that come from within. Moreover, the exaltation of

the Razn, so characteristic of the so-called modern world, has only degraded and alienatedbeings

humanfrom its nature. , altering his capacity to act with wisdom and kindness. Oliver Hirschbiegel has never been

throughout his short filmography so far from this romantic thesis about the causes of

human violence. In fact, the excellent The Experiment and The Sinking are perfect examples of

this Hamburg's interest in making us think about the springs that move human beings to be

trapped by the subjugating inertia of power . In the experiment will be a woman (Maren Eggert) who serves as a

counterpoint to the perverse universe recreated in that experimental prison moved under the binomial jailer-prisoner (or

if you want the Hegelian master-slave), and the Unique in charge of returning the character played by the

always wonderful Moritz Bleibtreu (The elementary particles) to reality. Equally in the sinking is

a woman who recounts - and thus serves as conscience - the events that she herself lived in the bunker of the F���hrer,

hours before ending her life. In The invasion ( pending release in Spain there by October) the

psychiatrist Carol (her profession makes her aware of human emotions) interpreted with no little

histrionics by Nicole Kidman will be responsible for fighting for keeping his son awake against thedream

masculineof the Raz���n. Not in vain the relationship of the character with her ex-husband must have been as flat before

being infected with emotions, thus underlining the rejection of the patriarchal model represented by the

infected . That is why Carol will only accept Dr. Ben (Daniel Craig), for whom she feels something that she represses even if she

wishes, when she recognizes in this the basic emotions of cari���oy respect that it adds after itsfailure. The

maritalsexual roles that Western culture defined in the past with f? rereo determinism reappear in

The Invasion in a pilgrim and superficial way , not reaching the intensity and depth that gives us The

experiment. Ben is a doctor, scientist, rational, protector of Carol; Carol, psychiatrist, expert in reading

emotions, wolf mother who protects her challenge. Even the ending becomes a postmodern game with that cinifile

gui���o of the final sentence that Dr. Ben says when reading the press. And, of course,science

Americanrelieves the depressed bystander in the face of the ill-fated suspicion that the virus will end up turning

human beings into an improved spice of tobacco dispenser. Otherwise, the happy end ends by cutting off the

polyhedral capacity that Siegel's proposal had to generate infinite readings. The invasion is light, it

only shoots with blank bullets, without letting us down. The sociopolitical metaphor of its antecedent andmyth

reference, Invasion of the Body Snatchers (Don Diegel, 1956), which is applicable with decency even to the remake

that Kaufman made in 1978, opts from the beginning for not contributing more than a suffocating story (not to be

confused with disturbing) of despair. Den of a mother to find her son, worthy of atelefilm

three-thirty(like the series Rex, a different policeman who directed Hirschbiegel in Germany when they still it was not

known internationally). We do not even find in The Invasion an anthropological reading that points as

high as they did the previous works of Hirschbiegel. And if what is desired is one of fear, without

intellectual pretensions or double reading, neither does The invasion contribute much to the panorama ofmovies

scareand persecutions. Its potential, centered on the family drama of the loss of the child at the hands of anhusband

inadvisable, is bland and without grip, despite the fact that the action scenes try to hide the underlying

defects. Recall that a similar story in the hands of Kubrick (The Shining) gave us a work

visually powerful and disturbing. It's a shame. Perhaps he hoped that with the reference of 1956 and the excellent

filmography of Hirschbiegel The invasion was a superior product to the one found. Hopefully, at least one

decent fundraiser will help its director find new and more suggestive stories to tell us. I wish���

" 0

" Moderately fulfills its objectives, including smiles, it even leaves us with a flavor similar to

those that were made in the decade of the 80s.

If someone expects a food m� ���ssllido or committed, this is not your film either. It is ancomedy

American, with many visual effects, starring Ben Stiller, and aimed at the family.

No more surprises than to verify what is the level of special effects, if Ben Stiller, accompanied

by his inseparable Owen Wilson, suffers the disease of the comic with grimaces "" burdensome " "or see if he manages to start, at

least, some smile. Try to give what he offers, in generous doses and perhaps with too much attention on

the children. But it contains the added attraction of encountering a particular trio of rascals formed by

none other than Dick Van Dyke ("" Mary Poppins ""), with ���80 a�� �os! behind his back, and made a kid, even

marking some dance passes; Billy Cobbs (luxury secondary in titles like "" Cotton club "" or "" The color of

money ""), 70, and the little big Mickey Rooney, nothing less than ���85 years !, and made a gruÃ������n of the most

simpÃtico.No are the only actors "" resurrected "" for the occasion. We also have a Robin Williams

(overcome his problems with alcohol), as a colleague entrajeable, which embodies, and never better said, the

figure of Theodore Roosevelt. Adventures in the great museum. invention allows us to parade before our eyes all

kinds of historical characters, including a Crist���bal Col���n who speaks in genov���s, pharaohs and hordes of barbarians ,

Romans, cowboys, Mayans and Neanderthal men. And other animal species of the most sympathetic or

dangerous, from a hooligan monkey capuccino, to tiranosauros-rex, lions, mammoths or reptiles. Such is the fauna

that populates the immense Natural History Museum of New York, with what is allowed to set in motion that

premise, or sensation, that spending a night there must be disturbing, especially if one of the objects

begins to come alive. The staging by Shawn Levy ("" The Pink Panther "") is as functional as it is effective in

trying to make both the guillotine and the Ben Stiller star shine without squeaking and the accumulation of

so many effects does not tire , too. Meet moderately with your goals, smiles included, and

even leave us a taste, but not the same greatness, adventures and fantasies similar to those that

were made in the decade of the 80s. Not in vain Chris Columbus, screenwriter of "" Gremlins "", "" The secret of the

pyramid ���mide "" or "" The goonies "", and director of "" Adventures in the big city "" or "" Alone at home "" (1991), is after the

production. others take Ben Stiller turned into a family man, and a man, unsuccessful, withoutwork

stable, divorced and with a child who yearns to be able to admire his father. And that, like Federico Luppi, will

end up finding his "" place in the world "", in the most incredible way and step, so that everything is round,

also Unana guide of the museum of very good to see (Carla Gugino).

" 0

" A new Bond, a more realistic one that will help the saga to stay alive for a long time. From the beginning Casino Royale, the new adventure of 007, knows differently, the traditional shot towards the

camera that is appreciated in all the previous films in the first few seconds is conspicuous by its absence, only to

surprise, minutes later, when they tell us the genesis of that shot that today is themark

personalof the legendary spy. Of that kind of surprises is the number 21 James Bond tape. Of course,

when you make a move, you end up losing something or finding things that you thought were lost and

maybe you is what happens with the move made by the producers and director of the film, whous

givea new Bond, after closing a cycle with Another day to die, now they go back to the

beginning , based on the first novel that Ian Fleming wrote about the super agent and introducing us to

a younger, novice, impulsive Bond and, therefore, a more human one, one that is wrong and that bleeds, like

any mortal. The tape starts when Bond completes the requirements to become an agent 00, that is,

to have a license to kill and his first mission is delivered, to capture a terrorist who roams around n

instead of Africa, which will give the track to a banker terrorists that has become a millionaire thanks to

the most cruel acts of terrorism of recent times, but to stop it, Bond will have to defeat him, not

using force, but his skills for poker. this time, it is not surprising, that some of

the most climatic scenes of the film are made on the table of a casino, based on the work of

the actors to create a tension that will keep the viewer at the edge of his seat, as well as the well-

achieved and intelligent action sequences, which inject adrenaline to the tape. But perhaps s theingredient

mainthat triggers the exciting adventure is the performance of Daniel Craig, who does not concentrate only on

posing and modeling the esmoking, but in giving each scene the right measure, which transforms it from a persecutor and

soulless assassin to a seducer, a rival technician, or a man who He debates between good and evil and

finally loses himself in the love of a woman, so much that he threatens to leave his life of martinis and weapons

aside. Judi Dench as M, is back, printing his style as the boss of Bond, willing to keep it at

bay as it happens. Eva Green is the Bond girl, who, far from being a spy, is a common accountant

with the mission of preventing Bond from squandering government money, but with the charm necessary

to lead his wife to death. Although the director Martin Campbell tries to get serious towards the

end, extending and redoing the third act and thus weakening the closure, he manages to create a Realistic tape, that

far from the technological fantasy and the cheap action, gives a new air to the saga, that without a doubt, it will help to

keep it alive for 20 new films. ��culas om���s. I only have one question for the filmmakers: Where did

the silhouettes of the nude women remain in the initial sequence of titles?

" 1

" Death Proof is the new film born from the imagination of one of the most delirious minds ofcinema

contemporary, and is a real l� It's a pity that his vision and that of Robert Rodr���guez have been distorted

in order to get more money.

Less than a month ago Planet Terror arrived on our screens, the first of the two films that make up

the Grindhouse project. Project that in Europe we have seen cut by the bad results of box office that

cosech��� in the United States. If the intention was to double the profits, the shot has backfired, since

in Spain Planet Terror has obtained a rather discreet result. If the Robert Rodr���guez film was a

visual org dea of ​​blood and vespers seasoned by a very black sense of humor, Death Proof is a more

contained film. Well, contained if that word can be applied to a work by Quentin Tarantino. On this

occasion, the story is also the least, a pisc���pata who uses his car as a weapon of destruction against

a group of attractive girls. Death Proof has an atypical beginning for what is usual in Tarantino, it

presents the characters little by little and lets the uncertainty grow in the viewer. From the

first minute, the delirious but masterful dialogues of the filmmaker are present, being the protagonist

of several of them. Since theof the character of Kurt Russell the tape is gaining

appearanceintensity and tension, to finally explode in an explosion of violence really frenetic. Only a genius

is able to perform a shameless self-homage like the one of the character of Rosario Dawson's character and that

it fits on top. The last half hour of the film is simply stunning, with the bestchase

carseen in the cinema in many years. Death Proof is the new movie emerged from the imagination of one of the

most delirious minds of contemporary cinema, and it is a real pity that his vision and that of Robert Rodr���guez

have been distorted in order to get more revenue.

" 1

" When leaving the room, after seeing this movie, the sensation was very clear, what a disappointment. The third part of

this film series, which everyone defines as a meeting of friends.

When leaving the room, after seeing this movie, the feeling was very clear, what a disappointment. The third part of

this saga of films, which everyone defines as a meeting of friends that also happen to

be filmed, is the same as the previous ones in the form, but not the background. I explain, like the other two

deliveries, the story is very simple, the argument barely exists, and the theft of turn is increasingly exaggerated.

Okay, we've all assumed that, and it's not a surprise. But both the first film, and especially

the second, had a few scenes of dialogue simply unrepeatable. Fun, spontaneous and that made you

laugh, you repeated some phrases and scenes to everyone who asked you about the film, thanks especially to

the It was between Clooney and Pitt, to which Damon was sometimes added in his role as the linnet in front of the

two veterans. Well, all that does not exist in this third part. It's as if they had forgotten to hire the

screenwriter. There are no funny phrases, there are no scenes to remember, the characters are passing by with little time

to say anything, and above all, the feeling that they are without desire, without the ���mpetu and the fun of the second

part. What is left then? Well, hardly anything. There is no story, there is no rhythm, there is no fun plan for

theft, because it makes little sense and the secondary ones are as if they were not. In the end, you can laugh a

bit, but disappoint those who liked the previous ones, and the rest surely would not like it either, because

it continues to maintain the style of trying to make a comedy. But a comedy without jokes and good di estalogos

is clear that it will not be a great success.

" 0

" Not only girls have big breasts in Supervixens, men have "" Superpenes "", of more than half a

meter !.

Today I'm going to talk to you about Supervixens, a small b-series film critic, who may not bewell known

asas he should be, but who undoubtedly broke all the molds at that time. Supervixens has everything,

humor, love, violence, action, sex. everything that could be asked of a film is here, united with arhythm that

frenetichas seldom been seen in a production of this style. Des of one will consider this filmbore

as a, it is not a conventional film, the humor that it has is very ycido and macabre at times,

feminists could find it macho , by the way it has to teach the female sex, always with the

breasts in the air and ready to open their legs at all times. But nothing is further from reality, theway

absurdit shows all this makes you take it with humor and do not give importance, Russ Meyer just wants

us to laugh overreaching to the limit all the actions of the girls that appear during the footage. Well,

first of all we should comment a bit on what Supervixens is going on. We already know that there are girls, many girls, and very

unloaded, but what more is there of girls? Supervixens is not an erotic film, although it contains

several scenes of sex and as I said before women as God brought them into the world. The plot revolves around

Clint, a gasoholic who is married to Superangel, an exuberant woman with enormous breasts. The couple does not get

along quite well and they have numerous discussions. After one of those discussions, Harry, the policeman,

brilliantly interpreted by Charles Napier, visits his house to investigate what is happening,

Superangel seduces him and takes him to bed. But Harry does not perform at the expected level, Superangel laughs at him, and

he feels very angry, so much so that he does not hesitate to electrocute Superangel when he is taking a bath. Clint

is accused of the crime and must flee. Harry pursues him, and here the adventure begins, with a host of

persecutions. It is best to discover it yourself. Supervixens has an exemplary setting for a film of

this type, giving it a frenetic rhythm that does not give the viewer any respite, the truth is that it is a very

Entertaining The laughter is assured, as Clint will be harassed by a lot of girls during his escape,

all with huge breasts, and anxious for Clint to make them his own. The problem is that some of these girls

have husbands, and upon learning that Clint has been with his women they are not going to shake hands precisely. Not

only do girls have big breasts in Supervixens, men have "Superpenes", � ��of more than half a meter !.

It is the way in which sexual scenes are taught rather they look like cartoons, the stallion lowers his

fly with a snap and pulls out his virile member, which we see reflected in a shadow in a kind of

sexual parody, with music little seen in this type of scenes, better to see it to understand what I mean. Russ

Meyer conceived and created this film, we could almost say � He alone. He did everything from the script, which he wrote

for six days in a Hawaiian hotel, to the address, to the photograph, with some interesting

Rolling landscapes in the Arizona desert, production and assembly. So here we have a product

that reflects exactly what kind of cinema this director wanted, nobody put obstacles in the way of a film 100% Russ

Meyer. We are in front of an author's film , with its virtues and its defects, may or may not like it, but

no one can deny its originality in the staging and the personal and unique style that the director gives

Supervixens. It really is worth seeing. As it is not edited in Spain on dvd, and finding the tapes in

vhs is somewhat complicated you can download a montage I made with the original dvd and the sound of my vhs tape. Here

is the result. It was my first montage of this type, so I may have some failure to

synchronize, I hope it does not show much. Later following this style, Russ Meyer directed Up! (1976)

, titled in Spain Megavixens and Beneath the Valley of the Ultra-Vixens (1979), here "" Beyond the valley of

ultravixens "". I suppose some will comment on these two films, which are also quite

interesting, especially Up !.

" 1

" Back means fleeing from his own histrionics and clichés and from the formula that found him at the top

of Hollywood.

Very rarely does such a concise title summarize so many things. Almod���var is very big. He knows how to remake himself, to reform himself, to

transform himself, to improve and to dare to return to the path to which, he himself, is predestined to go; the path

of a great film director, that of a round, intuitive, precise and consistent screenwriter. The great men

only flee from their own ghosts giving a new recital and re-demonstrating mastery and genius.

"" Volver "", means, among many other things, to recover its Spanish public, and not to continue focusing its

stories, above all, to the taste of American and foreign criticism. "" Back "" means to flee in part from his

own histrionics and clichés and from the formula that found him at the top of Hollywood. It is risky

knowing that he is able to come up with the right formula. And it is that, "" Volver "", mixes the drama with the comedy, something

very complicated to carry out with guarantees of success. He plays diverse themes, complicated scenes, and dares to

navigate today and even to treat social criticism in exact doses. Almod���var, in this, his

last film, does not forget anyone and manages not to saturate, not exaggerate. We can taste his visual style, his

control of the dramatic turns, his great direction. He manages to be present, to insinuate, to leave his scent, to

move like a ghost without pointing too hard or to force his personal and artistic intentions. Almod���var

returns to work from humility and honesty. Spins a round story, a powerful and wellscript

lubricated. It magnifies a magnificent cast of actresses and directs them as well knows. I do not understand those who

try to criticize Pen���lope Cruz, who here carries almost all the leading role and returns, to show

the world that she is, not just a bell-shaped actress It's a very strong presence and an overwhelming presence, but an actress capable

of embroidering important roles. Carmen Maura also returns, without complexes, to find herself again.

Carmen gets excited, is real and magnificent, as always. And the rest of the actresses, all of them, join

the chariot of brilliant performances. Lola Due���as, Chus Lampreave, Blanca Portillo, Yohana Cobo and all the

others. The men, they are all bad, bad, and of insignificant presence, this I know that also As always,

in each of the feminist tales of Almod���var.The director from La Mancha, also portrays the people of his

origins and that coming and going to the capital that saw him grow. There is a lot of autobiographical, tribute and

melancholy. And since cinema is romanticism, in La Mancha there are windmills, wind, superstition, traditions and the

madness that Don Quixote knew how to promote to the world. Almod���var, knows that the cinema is telling simple things, portraying

austere places, people from the real world, but with stories and universal dramas, with poetry in all

languages. Almod���var narrates the world and immerses him, once again, in his own universe, a universe full of

intentions, details, subtexts and messages. Almod���var returns, to show that he is one of the best

directors today, a true lover of cinema and, quite possibly, one of the most sober andauthors

intelligentthat our country has known.

" 1

" You will not receive any important prizes and, surely, you will not pass to the anthologies of the history of cinema,

but the five euros invested in the box office is Well, but very well spent.

A film that includes in its footage boats, sea, adventures, pirates and the famous "" Ron, rum, rum rum bottle

"", in addition to the fifteen men on The dead man's chest will always count, of course, with my most

sincere and enthusiastic sympathy. That is to say that, on entering to see the new adventures of Captain Sparrow and his

boys, Sacai and I were happy, optimistic and funny. The paraphernalia prior to this type of cinema

advises to equip itself, as the critics do. ���os, popcorn, potatoes and soft drinks, that not every day you have

the opportunity to rejuvenate for two and a half hours, just as it happens during the time that the film's length

lasts. A genre that, however, breaks with many of the typical topics of adventure movies. The

characters, for example. Everything is par���dicic in these pirates of the Caribbean. Each imposing pose of one of the

protagonists is immediately followed by a small humiliation for his ego: a blow, a fall, a

blow. The sword fights are anything but heroic, the escapes are bizarre and, at times, it gives the

feeling that the Marx Brothers are going to leave one of the cabins of the Black Pearl. And it is what

these "Pirates of the Caribbean II" have, that they are a cartoon, with its accelerated rhythm, its gesticulate comedy, its

persecutions, its gags and all its rigging. It's like a cartoon movie. but in a big way. A

beast. Because the producers have not repaired expenses to get some lavish sets, a perfect

atmosphere and, above all, spectacular special effects. Thus, the appearance of the Holand���s Errante and,

above all, the appearance of the Kraken and its sinister tentacles are absolutely spectacular. I recognize that,

having forgotten the first part, I had At times when I was argumentatively lost, without knowing who

was who and why, suddenly, there were laughs that held jokes for initiates. And is that thisfranchise

Sparrowhas surrendered fans who have seen the first part more than three and four times, fans who will return to the

cinema in the next days to to delight in the waste of imagination of this second part and that, when

The end appeared on the screen, they began to (de) count the days that are still missing for the premiere of the third

film of the saga, already filmed and announced for the spring of the next year. We are before a film without

any pretension of transcendence that, nevertheless, It is refreshing and stimulating, easy and fun. One

of those summer movies that reconcile you with the sea, the wind, the adventures and childhood memories;

that is seen with joy, it is enjoyed with pleasure and makes you spend a delicious time. To the "" Pirates of the Caribbean II "" will not give

you any important prize and, surely, it will not happen to the anthologies of the history of cinema.

Surely,amassing a fortune atbox office and, perhaps, discover har kid sb Robert Louis Stevenson, but

in any case, five euros is invested atbox office Bienn well, but very well spent.PD.- It is convenient

not to stop looking at that singular witch lover of voodoo. A wonderful secondary character to which, hopefully, in

the third part give more prominence. He deserves it.

" 1

" Tremendous animation film that will not leave anyone indifferent. We can get excited, happy,

laugh, cheer, sing and dance without any flush. An���mense, they will have a good time.

Christmas arrives and the producers take their best clothes to fill the cinemas with our little

challenges. The bad, in many cases, that focus on lightweight movies, which do not encourage the adult public to

accompany their children. With this film you have achieved a mixture that I do not have anything clear that conveys

older children. For children, I think it's a bit scary and the elders are not receptive to receiving blows.

In the end, the film is about an emperor penguin who, even being an egg, falls to his father. For this

reason he is born with a peculiarity, he does not know how to sing like the rest of his kind, but he has a gift for dancing.

In the society in which he lives, he is not well seen, and he is marginalized and discriminated against. One day, by chance

, he meets another type of penguin, who communicate in a different way. I loved this recording, and

for several reasons. On the one hand, the graphic quality is impressive, bordering on perfection. In many moments,

you can doubt if we see an animated film or a curious documentary. The soundtrack, aspect thatnever

Imention, has been very suitable for me, of those that force your seatmate to call your attention so

that you stop following the comp���s with your foot . The plot is not at all lazy, going from a Billystyle movie

Elliotto ending with the Lord of the Rings' epic. To finish, I would like to highlight two aspects

that make it a very special film, the useful (good, no, subtle) criticism that makes religions

organized and hierarchized, and on the other hand the review that gives human beings in terms of the maintenance of

natural resources and care for nature. Very big. Uy, do not forget the "Cuban" friends

you find, who have some dialogues to listen to part of. Resuming, tremendous animation movie that will not

leave you. indifferent to anyone. We can get excited, happy, laugh, cheer, sing and dance without any

flush. An���mense, they will have a good time.

" 1

" Great movie of intrigue in the streets of a Vienna destroyed by the Second World War. One of

the best films in the history of cinema, which continues to surprise with its intelligent and well-storyline

spun. Highly recommended.

I think I'm getting older at an unstoppable pace. Nothing of a physical deterioration, given that each day I am

more visible in that plane, or trifles of those. What tells me that I'm getting older is that I'm starting to make

collections of Sunday papers. Yes, I confess, I'm doing the classic film collection that every

Sunday the newspaper that staples its pages. And at a good price, hear. By the way, in the synopsis puts

up the last frame, so do not read it. The film is about an American who travels to Vienna

after the Second World War, when that city It was divided into 5 parts, one for eachpower

occupyingand the last international. He travels to see an old friend of his, but when he arrives there he discovers that he has

died in strange circumstances. Total, that as he is a writer of novels from the west, considers that he is

qualified to investigate on his own the alleged murder, so he faces the army in doing so. I

loved this movie. �cula, and that films of such fame then do not come to kill me. The setting is

simply great, with that Vienna that was quite demolished. The very good actors, those

that I like am���, with very marked gestures (especially the duke or count, I do not remember well). The script very

outstanding, starts soft, with a kind of begging that looks for his dead friend, but it grows until the

final climax that enlarges the cinema. In addition, it gives a small lesson in history, which always comes in handy. By the

way, leaves Orson Welles in a very good role. Resumiendo, great film of intrigue in the streets of a

Vienna destroyed by the Second World War. One of the best films in the history of cinema, which continues to

surprise with its intelligent and well-spun storyline. Highly recommended.

" 1

" When we see her, we have the feeling of being in front of a picture from another time, a very sweet tape that

seems to come from an arc to which we will soon return.

A debutante in the direction can choose to risk the staging or relax and play with a

host of cultural and, above all, cinematographic references. The Madrid native, Gustavo Ron, opts for the first.

His story about love and all its stages (the first contact, the seduction, the surrender) gets us to

draw a permanent smile, but Lacking strength to tear off any other grimace. It is not surprising what

he tells or how he does it, and that in these times, may be more than sufficient reason for his

tape tiptoe through the billboard. The magic touch , supernatural, is not able to sustain the footage of

this work for dreaming minds that feel a predilection for small details. And in that thecan fall

spectator, in losing himself for other worlds instead of being attentive to the amorous entanglements between the characters

of Ver���nica S���nchez, in his first weight protagonist, and Daniel Guzm��� n, in a more friendly and less slum tone

? said this with fondness- than in previous works. From agoraphobia to love there is a step and

whoever sees the film will know Why do I say it? We are not here to uncover the few surprises that this production

filmed in Galicia has - the periphery also exists, fortunately - where Fernando Fern���nG���mez appears every

time it lavishes less. Ron relies on the complicit relationship that established the veteran interpreter with the already

adolescent Manuel Lozano, who was a child in the language of the butterflies. Another one of the charms, this one can be

revealed, resides in seeing in action Phyllida Law, mother of Emma Thompson, in the epìlogo of this story. Under the

designs of a illustrious paragon with the name of Amlie and multiple wishes, such as inculcating the love of

books and the desire to overcome. Thus, two interwoven stories are developed, passional stories each with

drama and comedy in its proper measure and separated by chemical expressions contributed by the character of Diana

Palaz���n (Central Hospital) , an actress who should have more opportunities in the cinema.

" 0

" An Invisible Woman denounces a reality to which many of us turn our backs, but as aproposal

cinematographic, the truth is that it leaves a lot to be desired.

There are few filmmakers as prolific in the current scene, both nationally and internationally, as Gerardo

Herrero. For several years, the Madrid-born filmmaker has taken the rhythm of making a film per

season, like Woody Allen, and also, through Tornasol Films works as a producer in almost a dozen

titles per year. He is a true lover of cinema in the whole dimension of the word, although

paradoxically, his cinema is not the most loved by those who subscribe to these lines. An Invisible Woman is

considered the successor of The Reasons of my Friends and The Beginning of Archimedes. For this, Herrero has

Bel���n Gopegui, screenwriter of The Principle of Arqu���medes, to tell us the story of a woman who feels

invisible. Luisa (Mar���a Bouzas) is 44 years old, and she feels invisible both in her work and for men.

To recover his self-esteem, he decides to seduce Jorge (Adolfo Fern���ndez), a work companion, who maintains a

relationship with a young girl, Marina (Nuria Gago). With an Invisible Woman, Gerardo Herrero explores theuniverse

femininewith a sensitive look, which does not intend to judge its characters nor justify its actions:

only the sample as they are, so that the value judgments remain in the hands of every viewer The

main virtue of Bel���n Gopegui's script is the great sensation of verisimilitude that it transmits, with

characters that any spectator can recognize and identify with them. However, despite this

remarkable virtue, the text also has flaws, such as its lack of originality in many aspects, as well

as its foreseeable end. Herrero does not finish finding the right rhythm for the film, sometimes

too slow, and in others too fast. A point in favor of Herrero is how well it fits everything

related to the character of Cuca Escribano (who embroiders it), as well as the dialogues of TheFriendships

Dangerous. The best of the film are its interpretations, highlighting its protagonist Mar���a Bouzas, who

creates a fine work full of subtleties. Adolfo Fernández also signs a good performance in which it

can be his year, as well as that of Nuria Gago. An Invisible Woman is a film that denounces a reality to

which many of us turn our backs, the problems that many women suffer from 40 years of age to be recognized in

our society. As a cinematographic proposal, the truth is that it leaves a lot to be desired, and it is not the best

work of Gerrado Herrero.

" 0

" A true genius, a true kind of how to make good movies. A marvel, a film that

deserves to be remembered.

Of course, more and more, and especially after seeing "" Memento "", my appreciation towards Christopher Nolan has

grown. From enjoying "" Batman Begins "", to having a pipe with "" The Final Trick. "" Then I bought "" Memento ""

and. Well, a real wonder. Let's start with Nolan's address. Simply brilliant. From the first

moment, to the last, Nolan shows off a genius that accompanies us throughout the film until the

surprising ending. The script is the work and grace of his brother and Christopher himself. The script is the big

"" guilty "" that the film is what it is. And the best thing about the film is the way it is

told. Backwards. Therefore, you know the end, but you do not know the beginning. It is very morbid, like

Episode III of Star Wars. As for the actors, they all make some very credible roles and they look

incredible. From Guy Pearce, through Carrie-Anne Moss to Joe Pantoliano. The best thing about the film is the

montage, a great show full of intelligence that delights the spectator. In general a

true genius, a true kind of how to make good movies . A marvel, a film that deserves to be

remembered. Ve���nla, it has no waste.

" 1

" If we keep the moments of fast action, it is a film that could even be described

as entertaining. If we value the whole, it is not just another transatlantic pufo.

You can already imagine what it must be like to celebrate a night at the end of a luxurious transatlantic board.

Well, the passengers of the Poseidon walk when a huge wave sweeps the boat and literally puts

legs (or keel) up. The few that manage to survive, decide at first to follow the captain's advice

to wait for a rescue, but later they join Jofn Dylan, who has started a solitary search in pursuit of

survival through the mass of iron in which the ship has been converted. Directed by Wolfgang

Petersen (Troy, The Perfect Storm) and starring a large cast in which they stand out (not forquality

artisticbut for screen time) Josh Lucas (Road to Glory, A Life Ahead) and Kurt Russell (Sky

High, Vanilla Sky), Poseid���n is one of those new versions (I prefer this definition to the bombastic Anglicism

remake) so fashionable now in Hollywood and that basically consists in taking a film thirty years ago and

do it again, without contributing anything new, and even distorting the original a bit. Regarding "" TheAdventure

Poseidon"", which in 1972 Ronald Neame directed and interpreted the always magnificent Gene Hackman, this version

is much poorer in the development of the gui���ny and in the assembly of the characters, empty most of them and

sparsely worked. Undeniably, that is, the richness and quality of the special effects, the only reason for

being in the film. It is fair to recognize the intensity and spectacularity of some scenes, accompanied ���adas by a

good soundtrack that increases the sensations that the film tries to transmit. If we are left with

moments of fast-paced action, Poseid���n is a film that could even be described as enjoyable. That yes, if

we value the whole, it is not more than another "transatlantic" "pufo".

" 0

" A gui���n at no time obvious, with some interesting twist towards the end, well taken by

Robert Connolly in his first film, demonstrating a good use of lighting and its shadows in a cold environment,

with predominance of steel and computers everywhere.

Film for other timely to premiere in our country, to deal with an expensive issue at this time of

financial crisis and playpen, bringing a little justice -even if it is political- , against the feared banks and

their shady dealings (apparently for the film, universal) .Narra the story of Jim Doyle (David Wenham,

right) a mathematical genius that together with his Japanese partner, achieve create attractive software for thebank

Centabank. Led by an ambitious and unscrupulous manager, wanting to use the system not only for the

benefit of the bank, but to have the pleasure of ruining all the competition and satiate their enormous greed. Everything

is intertwined with another sub-frame, the of the marriage of Wayne and Diane Davis, affected by the shadyof the

dealingsbank and harmed by a loan; being the emotive -and at the same time tragic- part of the film (with some

low blow too) everything to get us more in tune with the desire for revenge towards the bank in question. A gui���n

at no time obvious, with some interesting twist towards the end, well taken by Robert

Connolly in his first film, demonstrating a good use of the lighting and its shadows in a cold environment, with

predominance of steel and computers everywhere.An interesting thriller, with all the condiments and even performances

, standing out "" the bad "": Anthony LaPaglia (Sweet and melancholy), without excesses but with thecharisma

rightand also with the best speeches: "" People who take care of themselves "", "" I am like God , but with a

better suit "". The girlfriend of the protagonist (Sybilla Budd) brings naturalness and self-control, being thecharacter

richestof all. Released in Argentina in the month of April at the independent film festival, another curious fact

is that the cl���max (the banking collapse) occurs in the film on October 25, the day after its premiere

here. How to get out and quickly make the endless queue of the bank.

" 1

" Another film for Tom Cruise to appear, in which, ironically, the one who shines the most is Philip Seymour

Hoffman

At this point, almost nobody remembers that a television program called Misi ���n:

Impossible, had a great impact of audiences to show a group of characters solve as a team a series

of operations, which as the name indicated were practically impossible. And we owe this to Tom Cruise,

who had the whimsy to buy the rights and turn it into a tape, which sent the devil to theconcept

originaland that only served to show off its Hollywood star qualities. The first two films

had a good success, commercial clear, doubling the already fat bank accounts of Tom andhim

allowedto make the third tape, which supposedly closes the trilogy. Impossible MISSION 3, is presented in

a different world from the one that existed when the previous film of the series appeared, a world in whichno longer

the Twin Towersexist, so the sense of Thematic changes drastically and is seen with new eyes.

But that is not the only change, from Mision Impossible II to date the audiovisual language of the genre has been

modified and advanced, especially thanks to some television series such as 24 and Lost. So it is

smarter to send JJ Abrams, to apply to the tape the vertigo of a good chapter of

lost and although in the first instance we can say that he achieved it. ��� and I create an entertaining film, also it must be

said that at times it also seems that you are seeing some chapter of a marshmallow melcochera novel.

Since it occurred to Abrams to humanize the main character and add a romantic part, so

now Ethan in addition to trying to save the world, must keep his job secret to his partner and try to

lead a normal life. So on top of being a secret agent who travels the world fighting evil, he

has to take out the trash every night. And although in general the tape runs well, it recovers a bit

of teamwork that is supposed to be the essence of the original concept and presents an extraordinarilyscene

memorablewithin the genre, that of the bridge, this is one of those films that does not worry about appearing credible

and on the contrary one has to accede to the concessions that he asks for, so that one can swallow the story that

the characters can die and relive at will, learn self-defense in seconds since a team can

enter and invade. The Vatican! Scene is curious, as the Vatican, one of the subjects of another

summer movie The Da Vinci Code, whichcertainly not did very well in Cannes.En end to another tape

Tom Cruise looks, in which ironically, the one who shines the most is Philip Seymour Hoffman, as avillain

luxury, proving once again that he is an excellent actor, by credibly giving life to a arms dealer, who

seems to only speak in monos���labos.

" 0

" A great idea materialized in a gray and sad film. Interesting, but not at all exciting

or captivating.

The starting point of "" Children of men "" is absolutely fascinating. Instead of aiming at the end of the world

in the traditional way, by the melting of the polar ice caps, a nuclear war or a devastating plague

that threatens to brush the human genre, part of a much more premise simple and, precisely for that reason,

more disturbing, more unsettling: women simply stop having children. They begin to have abortions and

not to get pregnant and, suddenly, humanity is forced into an inevitable end because of its expiration. In

fact, the film starts with the death of the youngest person in the world , a boy of 18 years. The funny thing is

that, faithful to its millenary trajectory and when the end of the world approaches, humans are especially

prone to violence, blood, confrontation and war. England is immersed in chaos, with the

immigrants caged, in the purest style of Guant���namo. Everything is gray and presents a neglected, dirty and

abandoned look. And in that world, a girl of color, a Fugi (tiva), gets pregnant. And the different factions that

vie for power in England want to make the child's flag, which finds its best champion and protector in

an enigmatic and individualist loser who makes the mission of putting mother and child safe, taking them to

a boat that would lead them to an unknown place where a project between utopian andhas been launched

hopeful: the Human Project. The bad thing is that with such good wicks and with an exceptional cast of actors?

Clive Owen, Michael Caine, Julianne Moore? the film is not as interesting as it should have been.

Although the approach is very well and formally is shot with the precise dryness, there is too much salad

of shots, too much precipitate flight, too much supposed action in a film that, m�� Well, I should have

aspired and appealed to the reflection. Because, above all, the action is not that it is a prodigy of rhythm, precisely. I

like the last battle, shot almost like a video game, with the documentary documentary ofnews

the TV. I like that kind of miracle that, like everything that has to do with men, hardly lasts a few

minutes. I like the ending, without excessive forced dramatisms. However, the whole central part of the

film, the command of the fish and others, was boring and soulless, without claw, as if fulfilling a mere

tr���mite between the approach of the story and its outcome. By the way, the infamous dubings of theactors

mainis not that they contribute to make this part of the narrative more attractive. In summary, a great

idea materialized in a gray film��� cea and tristona. Interesting, but not at all exciting or

captivating.

" 0

" You can tell that this film is a very personal project by Antonio Banderas and that's why it seems like an experiment that

takes place with the freedom of someone who has nothing to lose.

The Camino de los Ingleses tells about the summer of some young boys in the Malaga of the 70's, focusing onundergone

a protagonist who has justsurgery and in the hospital has known to a man who has marked him in such a

way that he decides to become a poet, obsessing over Dante's Divine Comedy. The second film

directed by Antonio Banderas is one of those films that love each other or they hate, since it's done with a tone that

can get quite tired, if you do not keep an open attitude to it, since the poetry impregnates every

moment of this film and every image giving rise to a set of images between on���ricas and po���ticas that

can be very beautiful but also somewhat exhausting. It is noted that this film is a very personal project of Antonio

Banderas and therefore seems an experiment that is done with the freedom of someone who has nothing to lose.

Most of the actors are known for their television work, such as Fran Perea, who here makes the

best role of his career, since until now he had not stood out for being a good interpret, and comparing the

work you do in 13 Roses with this one, you can see a big difference, maybe Antonio Banderas knew how to get his

best performance, or maybe he is a good actor who has not had the opportunity to prove it. We'll have to

wait to find out.

" 0

" Entertaining without more, in part thanks to its short duration, but disappointing and far below the

previous two of the saga

"" X-Men 3: The Final Decisi���n "" (X-Men 3: The Last Stand) proposes an interesting premise: acompany

pharmaceuticalhas managed to create a serum that, injected into the blood of a mutant, is able to turn him into

a normal human. This will unleash a doubt among mutants around the world: live a normal life or

accept as they are. As I say, it is an interesting premise; The problem is that it is just one of the

plot lines of the film. They have also decided to tackle one of the most complex and mysterious sagas in the

history of the X-Men: the saga of F���nix Oscura. All this without forgetting the treatment of a series ofstories such

parallelas the birth of El Angel (Ben Foster), the relationship Man of Ice-P���cara, the relation

F� ��nix-Cyclope-Wolverine, the return of The Beast (Kelsey Grammer) or the increasing leadership of Storm in the

team. Too many open fronts would need a bright script to be able to solve them all. And

unfortunately the script is far from brilliant. Because of that excess of pretensions we have characters

that do not paint anything and who get to disappear from the action, as if by magic, maybe to avoid the

problem of not knowing what to do with them in the final scenes (even then the problem becomes evident). In fact

I think that purists will take their hands to their heads when they see how important characters in the comic are

so blurred that their appearance has no other function. What to do for thedepartment to shine

visual effectsand to be able to say that they come out in the film. It's curious that my great fear during the process of

developing the film consisted of to where the director was Brett Ratner. Once I've seen the film, I have to

admit that maybe the fault of the final result is not yours but the gui���n. Of course I'm sure that

a director with more personality would have forced to polish the script until it was much better. On the other hand,

the staging of Ratner is purely functional; correct, yes, but lacking in brilliance although in some

scenes its lack of expertise is made up by the excellent work of the visual effects team thatus

allowto see Storm (Halle Berry), Fenix ​​(Famke Janssen) or Magneto deploy all his power (especially

the last two). On the positive side to see the charisma of Hugh Jackman as Wolverine, who screams for a

movie for him alone (hopefully directed by someone better Ratner), Patrick Stewart as Professor X and

Ian McKellen as Magneto. Nor do I want to mention the great soundtrack of John Powell; author who

raises points d���aad���a.In short, a movie entertaining without more, partly thanks to its short duration,

but disappointing and well below the previous two of the saga. As a curiosity and notice to potential

viewers, I will comment that the film ends after the credit titles (although thatcould have been saved

scene).

" 0

" On many occasions, the second parts were never good, but sometimes you have to try to see how it

goes ...

On this occasion, the opportunity is worth it, especially for those of us who enjoy good times of adventures

that the first part of The Search left us. And that has all the typical ingredients of a film of

this genre: ironic protagonist with hero skills, half-foolish wished woman to whom the ironic precise precise of its

help, secondary funny with ingenious phrases, and bad that seems bad until in the end it makes a foolishness

that stops it from being bad. In any case, this new product of the factory Bruckheimer, does not lose the hook

he had in the first, you embark from the beginning with Nicolas Cage in each of the tracks and you are

impatient for the next one to arrive. He keeps retaining the good humor and the good relations between the

different characters, which is joined by a brilliant Helen Mirren. And I am still surprised by the great

ability to unite stories that have really happened with the search of amazing treasures, without it seems

an unlikely thing, which denotes a great work of documentation, which comes from pearls to

history. Let's pretend that if you reach a third search , do not lose your tone and good humor and keep

entertaining people who like to avoid the worldly noise with movies that entertain us andus

makehave a good time.

" 1

" James Bond abandons his charming and elegant ways to become a more slum, chunky

and rude, but an as��� continues to be impressive whether it's pushing a gun or wearing a tuxedo .

���Give yourself strong! The new Bond has a replica, screaming and brilliant, which is already History of cinema,

at least for me. He will not disclose anything else, but it takes place in a sequence that will also be very painfully

remembered, above all, by men, because it hits precisely there, where It hurts! And now I must quote another

phrase that is not mine. Belongs to the critic Paul Arendt, of the British BBC: "" First things first: Craignot

isa good Bond. It's a great Bond !. Specifically, it is a 007 as conceived by Ian Fleming "". I love this

critic! (Well, do not get me wrong) And, third praise, I do not know what the writers have taken, whether it's agitated or

churned, but it's not just one of the best titles of action never seen on a screen without it being also filled

with brilliant and ingenious dialogues. And the plot is not that it is especially complicated, but it has

enough puzzling twists. The direction of Martin Campbell, a filmmaker already seasoned in the necessities of 007,

is effective, and the last thing you want is a Bond product is that it is the director, and not the character, who imposes

his universe and personality. But whoever expects the same Bond, the same characters, the same archetypes, the

same characteristics or the same? Gadgets? always, will stay half. To begin with, one of the

brands of the factor���a Bond, the "teaser", eludes the typical spectacular moment to engage us and in exchangeus

offersthe moment in which the most famous secret agent obtains the "" two zeros in front "", the license to kill.

The images, black and white, very hard; the forceful editing and the di���logos, brief. They are a foretaste of what

will come. No perd���n. It announced a change in the evolution of the saga, and these are specified in atreatment

darkerof the characters, but above all in the fact that James Bond abandons his charming andways

elegantto become a more slum, chunky and coarse, but an ace continues to be

impressive by pushing a weapon or wearing tuxedo.S���, his face is animal, primary and wild. Do not

miss the answer you give to a waiter when you ask him how he prefers Martini, and that is a

huge bad milk. During many years it has been commented that Bond, and so on It was like the ide��� Ian Fleming, he was not

a hero without a cold-blooded assassin. And so it is the composition of Daniel Craig, a brute, but with class and

taste, and who does not trust his shadow. Why kill like he does? He must be like that in all his films,

a devil without regard, with no place in his heart for feelings, no place in his soul for

remorse, as he demonstrated. � William Bill? Munny ?, ossease, in Clint Eastwood's Masterpiece that is "" Without

loss "" (1992). And one of the writers is precisely Paul Higgis ("" Crash ""), signer of the

"" Million dollar baby "" o "" Flags of our parents "", also Eastwood.Whatever more realistic is already another

song. Bond is able to go through walls or perform a "defibrillation" "(!), In another of thesequences

most tenseof the film. But Bond was always the opposite of the spies of John Le Carr���. As a reflection of its time, it is

no longer about the Cold War or saving the world without the background being terrorism, one of the

most worrying and enraged, the current world. And the villain of the function, although several appear, is also

vulnerable. His name is Le Chiffre (Mads Mikkelsen), a banker who plays cards for the money of his

clients, the terrorists. Every penny! And among the Bond girls there are two pieces of pictures: Solange ( Caterina

Murino), who looks what she can in the few scenes they give her; and Vesper Lynd (Eva Green), in total chemistry of

hatred and attraction with Daniel Craig. In addition, Bond comes to discover what the letter "M" means (interpreted

again by the charismatic Judi Dench, skipping the chronological order of the superiors of the British agent

). She never reveals it on the screen, but I would swear it means "" Mother "" (that is, "" Mother "") and I

mentioned at the beginning a memorable phrase, but there are other great moments as I persecuted her. Entren between a building

under construction in Madagascar and a saltimbanker (Sebastian Foucam, one of the characters-finding of the film), which

are pure vertigo; or the last looks (of defeat and victory, and vice versa) between Bond and theterrorist. There is

airportanother extraordinary dialogue during the presentation, in an airplane, between Bond and Vesper. She

is a Treasurer of the State that must give her a very high sum of money so that the spy can face, before and

behind a poker table, with Le Chiffre. "" Here's the money! "", She bursts in. And Bond, more than answer,

exclaims, referring to her: "" Every penny! "". How is this new Bond worth it? Is it perfect? Of course not.

It is extraordinarily imperfect!

" 1

" Tape that at this point of the year seems to me almost perfect. An authentic jewel among so much garbage

millionaire and that is capable with its images that you feel the emotion and the pain of the main protagonist.

Well who was going to tell me: Angelina Jolie's first movie that I like, in years? Daniel Pearl,

journalist for The Wall Street Journal? disappeared on January 23, 2002 when investigating theIslamic groups

radicaland their connection with the terrorist network Al Qaeda in Pakistan. In February 2002 the Pakistani

police received the video of the execution of the journalist, which is still circulating on the internet, and it was not until May 16

when They found the body slaughtered on the outskirts of Karachi. Impressive story, and similarly has been

reflected on the screen. Michael Winterbottom (? 24 hour party people?) Has done a great job to

print the feeling that history deserves, and (finally) this drama is no longer the typical product of

Hollywood to deal with the drama of the Pearl as if a documentary was edited, and with that I do not say that we are going to

flood data, dates or political issues, not much less, an invincible heart? is a film that

tells a story of unconditional love truncated by stupid fanaticisms without bored explaining how many

terrorist groups are in Pakistan or who are the good and bad. I must say that without doubt the use of

flashbacks to tell in parallel the last trip of Daniel Pearl and the intense search of Mariane

prints to the tape a rhythm that would have easily been null in case of first counting the abduction of the

journalist and then the two months of investigations and interrogations until the fatigued outcome. With how easy

it was to fall into the melodrama of a pregnant woman who collapses when her husband is going to die safely, the

result is the opposite: a woman who struggles without hardly spilling a tear to pull the thread and reach

the captors of her husband, maintaining an integrity in���dita. Thank you. Everything goes to Angelina

Jolie. Menudos bodrios has been marked by the actress so that now, under the production of Brad Pitt, sign her best

role since "Interrupted Innocence ?, there is nothing. Imitating the French accent is usually a real jod \*\* nda

for who gets into a role that requires it, but Jolie makes it so natural that you barely notice. The

reaction of the protagonist when she receives the news of the death of her husband is a scene so round that it will be

recorded Jolie in the back to remind him that there are roles that are worthwhile. It's brilliant, and Iyou

promiseI never thought I could use brilliant and Jolie in the same sentence. Now, you know if you're looking for

the truth about why ��� Daniel Pearl was killed, you will not find him in the film. In the film, it is

implied that it was because of Pearl's Jewish condition and even because he was mistaken for a CIA agent,

however the investigations that the journalist followed Two months after the 9/11 attacks are the cause oftold

his story is now, but of course, one thing is to make a film with few tax claims and

another is to condemn it to the rooms eliminate it to the first of change. In short, leaving the inaccuracies of the

guide that are imperceptible for us who do not live the media flood that was mounted in the USA, we have

a tape that at this point of the year it seems almost perfect to me. A real gem among so muchgarbage

millionaireand told through the eyes of a director, who marks a before and after in his filmography, and who

is capable with his images that you feel the emotion and the pain of the main character.O has caught me at

a very low moment, or possibly it is the best thing that has been released IN MONTHS on the Spanish billboards waves.

" 1

" Despite its failures, Letters From Iwo Jima is still a very good film, in which Clint Eastwood

returns to demonstrate that he knows how to shoot like few filmmakers today.

While preparing Flags of Our Fathers, an American vision of the battle of Iwo Jima, Clint Eastwood

learned of the existence of a book that collected the letters that the Japanese soldiers of the garrison of Iwo Jima

wrote to their families. Then, Eastwood decided to shoot a second film that counted the Japanese vision

of one of the most bloody confrontations of the Second World War. Tell the same historical fact , more

a battle, from two different perspectives is not something new in the cinema, for example it was already done in that great

film that is ���Tora, Tora, Tora !. Letters From Iwo Jima promised to complete the gaps of Flags of

Our Fathers, and without doubt, fill them for those viewers not very experienced in historical matters. The

story focuses on General Kuribayashi (Ken Watanabe), commander in charge of the troops in Iwo Jima, and

a private soldier, Saigo (Kazunari Ninomiya), who only wants to survive and return home. The first part

of the film focuses on the preparations before the battle, the feelings of the characters, and the

discrepancies between the controls. These first minutes do not have the strength one would expect from antape

Eastwood, but as soon as the battle begins, the story gains intensity and drama. The atmosphere

created by the tunnels is oppressive and rarefied, transmitting even more the suffering of the characters. However

, there are several details that chirr���an, that do not end up fitting very well in the story. One of them is the

whole sequence with the American soldier captured. In addition, the flashbacks do not finish working either,

since instead of giving more packaging to the set, they have the opposite effect. In the blic scenes the tape

suffers slightly, since these scenes are wedged between the scenes of Flags of Our

Fathers. Tom Stern's almost black-and-white photograph is once again absolutely masterful. On the other hand,

the interpretations are good, highlighting especially Kazunari Ninomiya's. In spite of its failures, Letters

From Iwo Jima is still a very good film, in which Clint Eastwood shows again that he knows how to shootothers.

like fewfilmmakers today. And any excuse is good to get into a movie theater and enjoy the work

of the last great Hollywood classic

" 1

" One of the most failed proposals of the season, which starts from a material more than interesting to be

left in the middle of a mix of supernatural thriller and Danielle Steel's novel.

The producers of Hollywood are the milk: instead of making the films in original plan, they choose to copy the

neighbor, lest they line up and they remain ridiculous. That's why we usually have several examples

of "repes" movies (Robin Hoodes, natural disasters, Wyatt Earps.), One of which is often the

"poor relative". This year the magicians have played, and 'The Illusionist' starts off as the pair's Cinderella. 'The Illusionist'

, directed by Neil Burger, tells the story, almost the story, of Eisenheim (Edward Norton in

pilot automÃtico), a magician who in the Vienna of the early twentieth century leaves no one indifferent: not Sophie

(stunning and somewhat bland Jessica Biel), his love of youth; nor to Inspector Uhl (Paul Giamatti in another of

those secondary roles that end up being the center of the function), admirer and rival; not even Prince

Leopold (credible Rufus Sewell until the final scene), evil aspiring emperor andbusting

professional. What starts as a challenge between raz���ny and superstition becomes a struggle to get

Sophie's love, with unsuspected consequences. Well, this would be, more or less, the official synopsis What we

really have in hand is one of the most unsuccessful proposals of the season, which starts frommaterial

more interesting(the magic world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries) to abandon half of

footage to a mixture of supernatural thriller and Danielle Steel's novel that ends up being boring for predictable. And it

is that, in a movie called 'The Illusionist' in which the protagonist is an illusionist, because theviewer

averagelet's say you do not get too surprised when what happens happens in the end. But hey, better not to make much

blood. Let's leave it boring and predictable. And why not make a lot of blood? Well, because as I said before, the

film starts off spectacularly (great work in photography by Dick Pope, in music by

Philip Glass and in art by Ondrej Nekvasil) , with a treatment of the perception of magic by the

profane very stimulating (all, sometime, we have wished to be the clever people who guess the secret of a

trick). But the main plot comes into play and the charm disappears, leaving only a staging

that, to top it off, devoid of history ends up looking pompous and burdensome. A pity, really, that did not

count, simply , the adventures of a magician in love with a princess. I think it would have gone much

better.

" 0

" If anyone thought that this is a good movie, all the blame is on the hormones. Visioning it now has the

same value and meaning as Proust's cupcake: a powerful evocation of what we felt and what we were in the

eighties, sitting on the sofa and rewinding ribbons with the VHS.

A while ago some reader of this notebook made us the suggestion that we talk about this movie, a

small sample of the family cinema of the eighties, of the which many people (who are now twenty-five years old

and up) keep a very good memory, surely because we saw it in the most tender childhood or preadolescence and

because few things are so evocative (and deceiving). ��osas) like the memory and its imaginative potential.Directed by

Randal Kleiser, it is a product son of its moment, and its dies die beyond it. It was released in

1986, and it is a rehash and remix - very fond of the tastes of the time - of classics like "" Back to the

future "" and "" ET "". Tells us the "" dream "" of a child, in which he travels through outer space aboard anship

alien. When he returns to the earth - due to the slowing effect of the speed of light - eight years have passed

and he does not remember anything of what happened. The film, at least, respects the basics of the narrative

based on "the hero's journey", and the transformation that this induces in the life of the protagonist. On alevel

metaphorical, David's "dream" fulfills the purpose of reconciling him with his family, especially his

hated younger brother. The story is told through resources too simple, often ���o���os and

stupid, with a treatment of the elements in play more typical of a telefilm than a product that had

broadcast in movie theaters. A pleasant viewing telefilm, undoubtedly, a sympathetic approach to the modern myth of

UFOs and abductions, some touch of good humor, eighties "tin" music and electrodes and little

more. The special effects are of a crappy one that they sing even in the time of its filming, although the design of

the spaceship is quite successful, with those changes of form seg���n the direction and flight rhythms. If one

believed that this is a good movie, all the blame is on the hormones. Visioning it now has the same value and

meaning as Proust's cupcake: a powerful evocation of what we felt and what we were in the eighties,

sitting on the sofa and rewinding ribbons with the VHS. As for its cinematographic function, the film is an

absolute nonsense, not for the story, which as we have already pointed out, starts off of an interesting proposal, but for

the banal and plémbeo of the scenography and the characterizations. At the time he had his grace, but he has aged

very badly.

" 0

" Treasures the best virtues of the Bond saga, the classic substratum of the cinema of scams, cards and,

tonguesthe biting replies of any good war of sexes and that geography. �a spatial and technological thatus

showsthat we live in a totally globalized world.

It's true that I'm not a big fan of 007 either, but it's even more true that I (almost) always see his films and

his arrival on the screens, when Christmas is around us , I celebrate it with more illusion than the disembarkation of the lotera

advertising or that of the almond-shaped nougat. The Bond franchise, with its collection ofgirls

spectacular, its refinement, the locations of The mode of cataloging luxury travel to the Cond���

Nast and its globalized sophistication offer a solid and well-finished product that, if not thrilled,

always It is interesting, fun, entertaining and relaxing. So, when the premiere of this "Casino

Royale" was announced, "I already knew that, even without excessive anxious rushes, a great da let me drop by the cinema to see it, with

popcorn, CocaCola and dems gadgets suitable for tasting a pel cula of these caractersticas.El

prologue in black, and white technician and gaunt, and began to call the atencinms what infilms

Bond, it is usual. And the credit titles, animated, ingenious, imaginative. to continue with a

first hair chase, a free and wild race for a building under construction that manages to transmit

all the sensation of vertiginous speed to which the two contenders apply and which is resolved ��� with a

crude murder, perpetrated in cold blood. they tell us that we are dealing with another type of Bond, somewhat different.

Craig has been called the Bond worker, popular and other things like that. I do not want to enter now to open the

debate about the different types of Bond that have been in the cinema and, above all, to insist on what

Sean Connery was the best 007 in history when, viewed with the passing of In the meantime, those films have

become more traditional than sheep's cheese. This is: that I liked, and much, this Craig and that scenes like ���sa

in that, emulating the John Wayne of "" The quiet man "", gets under the shower and the water soaks hisshirt

white, are magnificently resolved. And the bad one, of course, another of the inescapable topics when talking about a

Bond. The arch-villain, this time, is as cool and unique as he is perfectly credible and adapted to the times they

are in: a banker, money launderer from all the money and trafficker goes around the world, bleeding

its victims. A guy who cries blood and who will sweat his to our 007, which will come to torture in

a way as simple as cruel and ruthless. I liked that, instead of leaning on the path of the

franchise of Mission Impossible, of an increasingly difficult and outlandish action, "" Casino Royale "" has opted

for the spectacularity in the sets? that Montenegro, that Venice and its Palazzo Hundiente. - but based

on a more credible direct action. always keeping in mind that we are talking about Bond, a James Bond who, by the

way, hardly uses gadgets or ingenious toys in this story. Agitated, not mixed and stirred, "" Casino

Royale "" is a very good movie that a very good film that treasures the best virtues of thesaga

Bond, the classic substrate of the cinema of scams, cards and tongues, the biting replies of any good war of

sexes that be proud and that spatial and technological geography that shows us that we live in a totallyworld

globalized. And that's why, when the classic theme of the saga ends, after Craig saysfor the first

Bondtime, James Bond, at the end of the movie, gives you a aftertaste of the most friendly and satisfying.

" 1

" It begins with a strong expectation, continues with a central phase that intersperses scares and sense of

humor, to impact with one of the most tense and tachynictric final crescendos of cinema terror of the

last years.

Except for the award for Best Film, which deservedly took away the particular poetic odyssey of

Tarsem Singh The fall, the great winner of the Sitges Festival 2007 was [REC], winner of thePrize

BestDirector, Award for Best Actress, Public Prize and Critics Award. And it is that Paco Plaza and Jaume

Balaguer��� have signed a truly commendable film, shot of mockumentary, so much in vogue in

these last times, in which the tension reaches unsustainable levels -everything in its second half- that afor a

server had not experiencedlong time. [REC] tells the story of langela, a young reporter from a

local television station, who one night continues with her camera to the firemen of the Ciudad Condal, with the secret hope

of being able to live live a Shocking fire But the night progresses extremely quiet. And when they

finally receive the call of an old woman who has been locked in their house, they have no choice but to

follow a group of firefighters during their rescue mission. In the building where the old woman lives, the neighbors

are very scared. Too. The woman, locked in her apartment, throws heartbreaking screams. The firemen

smash the door and, followed by Angela and the camera, find the elderly semi-conscious, surrounded by

dozens of cats. Suddenly, the woman throws herself on a firefighter, biting him wildly, in front of the

fellow inmates and the target of the camera. It is only the beginning of a long nightmare and a unique dramatic

report in the world: when the other firemen take the wounded man, they discover that the only exit from the

building is �� blocked by the authorities. The building has been put to quarantine. It seems that a strange

virus has spread in the interior. Certainly, [REC] collects many topics of horror cinema, starting with

the inevitable referring to Blair's witch project, as well as There are certain similarities with 28 days later and

clear tributes to films such as Infernal Possession. It is also true that the film of Plaza y Balaguer��� does not

really give fear, if at all in certain specific passages, and that its formula works more on the basis of scares

[REC] is to take off his hat. With astyle

hyperrealistic, [REC] wanders between a strong expectation in its initial, truly unsettling, stretch.

central phase in which a community of neighbors hilariously feasible entertains the plot with a relaxed

sense of humor that seems to lead to the film in unexpected ways, to impact with acrescendo

final-with resolution- Easy, it has to be said, which is, without a doubt, one of the most tense and

tachydictrian horror movies of the last years. As I said �a, [REC] does not offer any novelty in itself,

but it is to admire the capacity of Plaza and Balaguer��� for to combine existing elements

, thus creating a novel product, in order to make all the attendees of the projection jump out of their seats. And it is

that Paco Plaza and Jaume Balaguer��� have signed, conscious or not, a true milestone, an extreme experience that

installs the national horror cinema at a level never dreamed up to now and diff Easily surmountable.

On the other hand, and this already as a personal note, I do not understand how the Best Actress Award went to Manuela

Velasco who, although she fully meets the proposal of its paper, it is not at the height of the excellent

interpretations of Catherine Keener in An American crime, Rain in I'm a cyborg, but that's Ok, or even Jess

Weixler in Teeth. But the real question is. Why is not [REC] at the Oscars, instead of The orphanage? I

give it an 8'5 on 10.

" 1

" Ambiguous, faded, sad and honest, at the time, portrait of an obsession, yes, but filmed with a warm

documentary breath, unattractive as cinematographic entertainment.

Progressively detached from the initial charm, Portrait of an obsession is positioned in that very slippery

limbo of unclassifiable films that do not deserve applause, but neither laziness, disinterest. Being

a more than free biopic about the photographer Diane Arbus, there are licenses that do not conform to the

linearity of the forms (the whole movie is a stomagant flashback) as well � as disproportionate allegories

about freedom of expression, decision-making and the will to change the course of our lives

for more than a super-terrestrial or invisible destiny seems stubbornly give in to give us. In this, the

film is exemplary, in what it has of subversive, of transgressor. You have to understand this strange love between

the beautiful Kidman and the ugly Robert Downey Jr. as the true subject of the film, although later it shies away in

occasional demonstrations of what gui���n not sufficiently worked can cause to theimpression

generalthat a film causes us. The Cocteau of Beauty and the Beast would not have cared to sign the relationship

of these characters. The pertinent label of novelty biography that opens the title of the film suggests that the

director, Steven Shainberg, perpetrator of the eccentric Secretary too, is going to give us an over-detailed

account of human relations. And indeed, this happens, but Shainberg prefers to dive in the fantastic,

in the ethereal part of the soul, in that in which the abnormal attracts and beauty, convulsive or not, as I said. �a Breton,plane.The

happens to occupy a necessarily secondaryprogressive process of diva Kidman in his role

as a photographer suddenly lit by the freak is worthy to appear in the collection deprived of any

kitsch aficionado. Special mention for the unsettling, amoral neighbor, immersed in his suit of solitude and

compassion, which introduces her into the world of the farindula without any village circus put atrezzo to that

crucial transformation. Sadly weighed down by its unjustly unconscious title in Spanish, Fur (skin)

is a curious work, a point and apart in the inventory of movies that we see daily. This is not going to swell

our particular altar of jewelry, it will not be highly recommended to our friends when we talk about cinema (

yes, it's still great to talk about movies around some ca���as in a bar ), but it is not possible, in aact

sincere, to crush it, to impose the dubious epithet of "capricious". "This tale about the fascination of the strange is

forced as the kind, gentle and always correct Diane Arbus does not marry with the spirit

ind���mito, complicit with the deviated from the norm, that the film wants to show us and that already his photographs

reals were in charge of doing. You can see some in this great link. This curious example of mind

disturbed by the infinite beauty of ugliness he committed suicide in 1971 and the urban legend that circulates in thethethe

gossip ofgossip ofgossip of the culture is that it was photographed while it was losing in the m��� It's

there. We are not here to deny this rumor.

" 0

" A sensational film that leaves no one indifferent and with one of the best performances of the year.

Very interesting and necessary film of denunciation, about the bloody "" war "" that faced Hutus and Tutsis in

Rwanda, Africa, in the year 1994.All��� almost one million died n of people, in their immense majority Tutsis, at the hands

of the machetes of the Hutus. The seriousness of the matter was that no nation of the civilized world took over

the protection of innocent civilians, leaving them to their fate. This film denounces these facts in an

honest and entertaining way, with historical rigor and a way of narrating using suspense, with a verytension

achievedand praiseworthy interpretations. It is worth seeing the great Don Cheadle in his difficult

role. A good movie ���cula that perhaps in the hands of another director more experienced would have been better, but

that is necessary for Western countries to become aware and not give again the back to

millions of innocent people. In short, a sensational film that leaves no one indifferent and with one of the

best performances of the year, Don Cheadle.

" 1

" The problem goes through a guide too bland -and that there are fourthat starts well

writers-during the stay of the animals in the zoo and then stagnates when the protagonists perform the

disembarking on the dream island.

Something is happening in the DreamWorks studios. From the great Shrek, they continue to lower the level every

year. Starting with Finding Nemo (which is quite good), going through El Espanta Sharks (forgettable),

Shrek 2 (loose) to reach this Madagascar, the lowest point and pronouncing a��� the fall of the study.

Pixar is relame.Los characters are as engaging as in any of the latest animated movies, the

voices are nice (this is Sacha Baron Cohen !) and even the legend bears a resemblance to the features of the great

comedian Ben Stiller. The problem goes through a guide too bland - and that there are four writers - which

starts well during the stay of the animals in the zoo and then stagnates when the protagonistszoo.

make the landing in thedream island. And we are less than half of the film. The characteristics are

some good isolated gags that make it a film at times disjointed, a closer animation by the

movements to the characters of the Warner and destined almost exclusively to the children (that badly that we were

accustomed with Shrek!) But in the end we do not become so critical with a movie without intentions

- Apparently - to transcend. The best are the anguish penguins led by a certain Joe, almost deserving

a film of protagonists. With pleasure to very little. The final moral is that if the lion can not eat

meat, we give him fish and he is ready (as long as they do not eat Nemo everything is fine).

" 0

" What twelve years ago called mighty attention for his impudence, his freshness, his self-confidence, no longer

surprising now, especially when that language of unusual sexual frankness today it is managed even in television.

It seems that the career of Kevin Smith, who drew attention mightily twelve years ago with "" Clerks "" (see

critics in CRITICALIA), does not quite find its way . After this dozen years, thefilmmaker

neo-Persiangoes back to where he started, the small universe, certainly nice, of a couple of gray guys who

attended the event. dismal supermarket of the first part. After some interest ("" Chasing Amy ""),

Smith made some incursions into stories by throwing delusions ("" Dogma ""; see critics in CRITICALIA ), which did not

work too well, so he returned to his former characters ("" Jay and Bob the silent

counter-attack ""), and now, definitely, to the same previous landscape, although for the occasion he had been defenestrated

by fire and the protagonists went to work in a neighborhood hamburger. But the truth is that,

what twelve years ago, he drew a lot of attention for his Brazenness, its freshness, its self-confidence, no longer

surprising now, especially when that language of unusual sexual frankness today is handled even in television.

In this way, time has not only been spent by the then twenty-somethings who are dependent on the supermarket, now they are

thirty-somethings long and without much idea of ​​what to do with their lives. also by the very concept of

"" Clerks "": before it was a joy to listen to these languages ​​and see how Smith, no idea where to put a camera

and how to decently film a movie ���cula, he was capable of making us laugh. Now Kevin knows how to shoot with

ease, but the subject catches us something talluditos and the characters sound too familiar: the reasonable

Dante; Randal, as loud as ever; Jay, like a goat; Bob the Silent, who does not speak because he does not bother?

It is also true that some scenes are fun and even memorable: see the diatribe about thesagas

"Lord of the Rings" and "Star Wars", or the disdainful of Randal and his "" normalization "" of ainsult

supposedly racist; It is also true that in other occasions three towns are passed, as in the scene of the

zo���filo shtick of the bachelor party, a scene too (literally?) donkey. But often the

verbiage of the characters bores the staff: it is difficult to be talking for an hour and a half and not tire, and

the dialogues are not precisely written by Shakespeare. Anyway, hopefully Smith will not fall into making

a "" Clerks III "" (although I would not be surprised, because in the USA his collection has multiplied by five his

budget?) , because then it will be clear that his work is going to turn on a single theme, and this one is already

sufficiently squeezed.

" 0

" The best animated film for the whole family. ��� What is a lot? No. It's the truth. And it should be

scheduled regularly in schools. I have done it on my own several times.

The spirit of classical animation, the one outlined by Disney and now exploited judiciously by Dreamworks or

Pixar, often falls into clichés that encourage the imagination of the public infant, but that they mislead theadult

willful(of the other, we do not speak) and force him to reconsider his natural vocation as a spectator of

cartoons. The iron giant flees from these commercial stunts, lacks musical numbers, obvious the maudlin side

, does not include talking animals. He does not even have Sting or Elton John in the central theme that will

occupy a few minutes at the next Hollywood Oscars. For all that, for not looking like cartoon movies,

I saw the Iron Giant. And I discovered a much more intelligent script than adult works of recognized signature and

apparently contrasted dramatic pulse. The story that is told is the story of all the children of the

world: that of the dreams that come true, that of the fantasy that occupies a piece of reality, without denying it,

without supplanting your evidence. The story of the boy who discovers in the forest near his house thegiant

iron(a MAS mastod���ntico) was not originally written for the times in which the film

takes place (the war cold, the fear of the Russian invasion, the terror of the paranormal, the belief that beings from

another world can at any time sit down with us and eat our lunch). It is based on a

children's text written by Ted Hugues at the end of the sixties to console his children for the death of his

mother, narrates the friendship between that child and the robot in the pl���cida campi English, but Brad Bird (later

famous for The Incredibles) changes into a hallucination produced by the unprovable imminence of thearmiessediment.

redand the B-series pulpsummer cinema that illustrated the porous imagination of all those children

who are now 50 years old.Cogid directly from the c���mic, drawn with care, mirror of the sci-fi of the � Epoch, oblivious

to the cliches of Walt Disney's formal art, The Iron Giant is a story for children that explains to the

elders how wrong the weapons are. It is also a beautiful and playful metaphor, beautifully beautiful,

about the anti-communist psychosis of a whole people, the American, who was educated to hold back theal

compIt is touching the national anthem in front of the flag of the bars and the stars. People who took several

decades to understand that the enemy is at home, but now the thing is messed up and the ceremony of terror is not

written by the Soviet enemy but the Arab fundamentalisms. Also that will produce some film of minor tone

like this one in the not too distant future. The story is written much better to past battle. It is not advisable that his

story be too impregnated with the hatred that is always fostered by the news, the daily routine, the trepidating rhythm of

television news and the insane complicity of television cameras, which record the infamy of a soldier

devastated by a bomb while they keep in their bovines the morbid and emphatic carnality of a miss on an

empty throne. And in the end, it is not something to gut the most laudable feelings that direct the plot, everything is

resolved into a meek, tiny happiness, necessary after the debacle. And cinema, I imagine, stands up to

give applause because the language of tenderness is universal and here it is superbly explicit. A

masterpiece of animation.

" 1

" A true return to the seventies where the ill photo and the atmosphere created around the

characters make this debut one of the greatest achievements of the horror of the last times.

GREG MCLEAN that shortly ROGUE premiere another horror film starring a giant crocodile debuted

big with this work that arrives with huge delay to our screens. Do not expect anything new, what is said

we saw earlier in works of great significance to the fans of the genre. The killing of Texas or the

hills have eyes among many others. The interpreters are young assiduous TV soap operas from their country

that practically debuted on the big screen. The merits of the debut should not be sought in interpretations or in

the gui���n.Sus real merits reside in the great management demonstrated by MCLEAN to create anguish. The slowness

of the film is another of its strengths, placing the action of less amÃ © s reaching moments certainly

shocking. A true return to the seventies where the photograph sick and the atmosphere. Sfera created around

the characters make this debut one of the greatest achievements of the horror of the last times. Let's wait for

the new works of the director to evaluate if we are facing a new legend of the genre. An 8.

" 1

" It could have been a very interesting film, with two parallel stories, one dramatic and another comedy,

but the problem is that comedy does not re���ry the drama is not so dramatic.

Melinda and Melinda is not one of the best movies of Woody Allen, although the approach is very good, itnot

doesreach its goal. It could have been a very interesting film, with two parallel stories, one

dramatic and another comedy, but the problem is that comedy does not re���ry the drama is not so dramatic,

so in the end what there are are two stories rather vapid and predictable, without any interest. In some

moments the difference between the two plots is not appreciated , since there is not enough humor in the comedy, in spite

of having the humorist Will Ferrel, who is the only one who does some grace. The drama is not tragic, because

the spectator does not get involved with the protagonist and therefore we do not care what happens to him. This

film promised a lot but it is a disappointment To realize that there are times when Woody Allen does not know how to do

comedy, better to keep the memory of Match Point, a jewel.

" 0

" A story that makes us think about coincidences, about bad luck, about howcan

lifechange in a single night and how many people's lives can change. z of a single

circumstance or at the root of the act of one person.

The night of the sunflowers is an original story of rural suspense set in a quiet town in

which it seems that nothing ever happens. It is the story of a night in which the lives of some characters change

completely after experiencing a situation that marks them all in one way or another. A film of intrigue, of

police suspense due to a murder in which, due to a series of coincidences, a groupare implicated

of unknown personsamong them. Pedro (Mariano Alameda) and Esteban (Carmelo) G���mez) are two speleologists who

arrive in a village in a mountain area to explore a cave. Esteban's girlfriend, Gabi, accompanies them there

but does not go with them and decides to wait for them in a nearby spot at the foot of the mountain. But when the

specialists return, they find Gabi in the grip of an anxiety attack. As soon as they have the opportunity, the

boys decide to take revenge on the person who has scared Gabi but mistakenly assassinate another individual who

has the bad fortune of appearing at the wrong time. The story is structured as a puzzle in the

that the pieces are fitting little by little throughout history. Each chapter of the story is headed by

a title that can give us clues about its protagonists (the motel man, the speleologists, the man on the

road) and does not follow a linear order but that the director plays to explain the story through jumps in

time or flashbacks so that the story is told from all points of view of the different

characters. However, despite knowing the end of some sequences, the interest of the viewer to know

how the story unfolds remains intact. The plot is perfectly explained but leaves some

loose. The director knows how to dose the tension throughout the story although it is from the inflection point

that assassination takes place when the spectator does not stop being surprised and does not stop talking about what it is

happening. The scarcity of light helps to foster this intriguing atmosphere, so that an environment is achieved

in which everything seems possible. Apart from a suspense film, it is a drama ofdevelopment

characterand even of a manners story that reflects the concern in the villages for their

almost inevitable abandonment. The first performance of the Spanish Jorge S���nchez-Cabezudo counts as protagonists with

Carmelo G���mez, Judith Diakhate, Celso Bugallo, Manuel Mor���n, Mariano Alameda and Vicente Romero. The

interpretations are remarkable in their entirety but perhaps the most disturbing role is embodied by thechief

police(Celso Bugallo). The character of the chief of police is in the dilemma of choosing between acting according to

what dictates his professional ethics or according to their own interests. The filmmaker explained. in an interview thathim a

interestedlot in deepening the psychological development of the characters: "they are ordinary characters

confronted with extreme situations, and perhaps one of the great objectives of the film is precisely the to

consider how these ordinary people can provoke such a complicated and dramatic situation; what are

the circumstances, and the psychological, personal and emotional mechanisms that lead them to do what they do

and above all to justify themselves in their actions to continue living. It is not a film of good and bad, it is a

film of very human characters. "" A story that makes us think about coincidences, about bad

luck, about how you can change life in a single night and how many people's lives can change

because of a single circumstance or because of the actions of just one person. A drama that leaves a halo of

sadness, of fatality, because what is narrated from fiction can come very close to our reality.

" 1

" The film only works as a vivid testimony of the adventures of Rodrigo Borgia and his sons during

the time they landed in the Vatican as an elephant in a cacharrer� ��a.

Apparently, we do not seem called in the national cinema to make good historical films. Without so many

previous expectations as with Alatriste, the disappointment that the Borgias produced for me has not been so great, even though

the poor result of one and the other is more or less even. To this film directed by Antonio Hern���ndezhappens to him

something very similarthat to the one of El���as Y���nez: it bores sovereignly during its extensive and unjustified footage of

two and a half hours. The film is of the flattest in the development of a story that could almost be described as a

protocolary. It starts from one of the last events that occurred to the once powerful and fearedfamily

Borgia, already in the path of absolute decadence. After being arrested C���sar, the firstborn of the late Pope

Borgia, the film goes back to us several years ago, until the coronation of Rodrigo Borgia as the Pont ���fice

Alejandro VI. We already know, because they have just made it clear to us and it is an historical story, that the glory

recently acquired by this family of Levantine origin was going to be squandered by the hatreds and jealousies sown

by its members. . But what leaves the film in the media is its unoriginal way of narrating

events. One can suppose that there will be betrayals without scruples, incestuous bed scenes, andevents

bizarre, but what turns out to be desalodador is the cyclic succession of sequences of this type The

ascension and subsequent sinking of a family willing to settle accounts with the princes of the neighboring territories

can give a lot, m���sa���n when The protagonists of the action are the members of one of the

families of nobles that has generated more ink between essays and fictionalized histories. But the cinema,

to be good, requires the good management of some springs to transmit emotion to the viewer. Dialogues

must have strength, images and how they are mounted, also, interpreters have to put themselves in the shoes of a

character that takes on true life thanks to your work. Things of the most obvious, but that, if they fail as a

whole, turn the viewing of a film into an insipid one. And this happens to Los Borgia, another national film

released with the bells of having been expensive? 10 million euros? and to have outstanding actors of

our cinema. By the way, I am struck by the media have highlighted both Alatriste

and The Borgia the many millions of euros that have cost both productions; as if thedisbursements

millionaireassured the quality and artistic successes. It is noted that the money has been spent in costumes, in the

filming in exteriors and interiors that set the time, in the few minutes of footage of blic scenes,

and the result is convincing in this regard. The luxury and pomp of the Vatican installations is very well

portrayed, although the sequences of battles are a wish and I can not. With very closed shots and without great

luxuries in the camera movements, these scenes could well have been eliminated; total, if the film goes

beyond the barbarities perpetrated by the Borgia family from the powerful papal armchair that something else.

Some of what they give good tell the continuous intrigues and talk of the bedroom, used withrepetition

relentlessin the tape. In short, the film only works as a vivid testimony of the adventures of

Rodrigo Borgia and his sons during the time they landed in the Vatican as an elephant in a

cacharrer� ��a.

" 0

" You will like it: If you are a "" snob "" with pasta glasses that go through life as "" over "", you will not like it if the

stories that have to do with the life of a stupid whipper you care less than you imagine.

The film tries to be an odd mixture of comedy (I have not said a single minute) and intense DRAMA

(I have not cried or felt badly), a film that intersperses the world of the vi���etas with the actors

that interpret the characters and also the real characters, forming an odd "" Batiburrillo -

Underground "" that surely all those who like them that they feel identified with that other kind of

comic that does not narrate the exploits of superheroes. The film has been delayed in Spain, in the USA it was at the

beginning of 2004 and the truth is that, as I already mentioned when I saw "" Between Cups "", the actor Paul

Giamatti is the center of the function, and also ��s of the conduct nexus of the story !! Co���e that is the protagonist !!

this sensational, showing that cruel and ruthless face that Harvey Peckard has, the direction is sober, the

photo taken care of and that soundtrack that wraps the film of a certain smell of Jazz makes it look Curious,

yes. ! The experiments at home and with raincoat! (I think during the projection I've yawned out of sheer

boredom like a dozen occasions.) You'll like it: If you're a "" snob "" with pasta glasses you go through life

as "" over " "(you see what a stick I'm going to take to put this), you will not like it if the stories that have to do

with the life of a stupid whipper you care less than you imagine. Curious, but so boring that you will

look again and again at the clock waiting for the time and 37 min. of tape pass as fast as possible.

" 0

" The film is not worth much, but at least it is not ashamed, as the pikker of disproportions that Stallone

launched after the overwhelming success of the original.

The cinema is the home of legends. In the celluloid they are born, they grow, they multiply with unnecessary sequels and

prequels, and if they ever die, they never deserved such consideration. We see characters with

whom we would like to have a drink, whom we would like to get to know, and for whom we probably

feel a special affection. For a generation, Rocky Balboa is a legend. Belatedly, for me too. And

yes, it influences my particular passion for boxing and the cinematographic subgenre that this sport has created. I am

thrilled with Paul Newman in "" Marked by hatred "", by Robert de Niro in "" Wild Bull "", and even by

Russell Crowe in "" Cinderella Man "". Special guide for the Robert Ryan of "" The Set-Up "", by the master Robert

Wise. "" Rocky "" (1976) we (me) moved for being the typical story of a normal type, of the pile pulling to little

thing. He was a character who was offered a handful of dollars for a boxing champion to win three times more and to

add to his pride. It was difficult to spin four sentences in a row. He was shy, but with an ingenious point,

more for his innocence than anything else. But above all, he climbed into a ring knowing he was going to get

beat up. He did not care. Because in that wonderful film by John G. Avildsen, Rocky taught us that thething

importantis not winning in this life, but standing up and holding the stakes when it

hits hard, Let him know that you are not afraid and that he will have to pass over you before you throw in the

towel. Victory is not a title, but an emotional state. "" Rocky Balboa "" is a shadow of thatwonder

1976. It's been 30 years. And the film has the same pattern as the four continuations that tried to

exploit the story of the unfortunate who conquers glory without succeeding. They were trash, conceived to

make money with a myth, mistakenly thinking that they fattened the legend. It's a pleasure to remember Rocky

in his calzonas with the colors of the USA sticking with that naughty Russian from Ivan Drago. Now, there's an old,guy

decadentwho lives off telling stories in his restaurant, a widower, and who just needs to feel alive once

more. The film is not worth much, but at least not embarrassed, as the p���ker of disproportions that Stallone

launched after the overwhelming success of the original. This does not make you cry. It just takes you to remember when

Rocky listened, in the last moments of the first film, and with the unmistakable melody of Bill Conti

in the background, that the "" ring announcer "" gave victor to Apollo Creed, but his only concern was to embrace

the frail Adrian, that presence that roams "" Rocky Balboa "" and is nowhere to be found. Stallone

pays homage to himself, or perhaps simply seeks that, keeping a legend alive by not seeing his present, but

giving reasons to remember the past. You may seek to transport the emotions that your film no

longer arouses. Nevertheless, it remains within the formally decent. That is the spirit of Rocky, of the ""Foal

Italian"", although it may not of his films. Long live the legend, champion.

" 0

" A light comedieta for those foolish daysPena that has not made this film Pajares, that of course we would face a rejoicing andfolleteo and

aa debauchery from the first frame. And of course, it is that you see the poster and a little lady with her back to the

air comes out and you think "" I tell the relative that we are going to see this and everyone is happy "". And it ends and you keep thinking

"" where are the ladies in topless!?!?! "". And, apparently, love and nudes are like oil and water

for the American filmmakers. The film is about Casanova, the greatest flirt of all time (after

Pajares, I insist). It starts with the old man telling us a little about his life. Na, the normal thing, that if you beat a

duel with one, if you save in-extremis from the gallows, that if a little nun is trajina, that you will be trajina to another,

that if to another, that if to another. Poor man, the formula would dry up. Then the film twists and goes

towards a love that he has and that rejects him. And that, even the most handsome, can not resist. Well, let's

see. As I expected little, I liked the film. The setting seems to me very good, with itscostumes

impossible(especially the Duke's) and select and outdated dialogues. It has been given an air of

modernity, otherwise it would be unbearable. But the film itself does not hook. To begin with, they show

Casanova the old man, with what you know he does not die. Then, as we move forward, we clearly see how they will

all end up paired, which detracts points. But of course, it can be seen much better than others on the

card. In short, a light comedieta for those foolish days.

" 0

" Entertaining Peli, which will not go down in the story of the animation, but which will make you smile at ease without

shrillness.

To the rhythm of today's animated film productions, and taking into account that it is increasingly

difficult to surprise, Bee Movie entertains and makes you pass a good time, that's it, without being anything special. The

worst is the story itself, loose and based on facts that collide a little, as almost always intended to

save communication between bugs (bees or mice) and humans. The part of jokes referring to the world

of bees, work pretty well, with witty wordplay and quite funny phrases,

which are joined by some cameos, like Ray Liotta or Sting, who have their grace. Visually, spectacular, although

technically, it is assumed that always goes well, the action sequences are well shot, with

magnificent flights through beautiful landscapes of Central Park, as well as the activity inside the hive. As for

character s, a little poor, but enough to sustain. I would squeak, (as in many Northfilms

American) that ego centrism in which spokesmen and protagonists are erected, even to wither the

flowers of all the world and that repopulating Central Park, save the planet. In short. Ingenious at times,

with a smile with more than a laugh, for children and adults, but not just for one or the other, which makes her

stay a little in no-man's land.

" 1

" A pretty light script with phrases like 'the problem of happiness is that it's boring'. As far as I know it's the first time that a fiction movie recreates the Rolling Stones, with this we already have reason

enough to want to see her, ���no ?. "" Stoned "" (2005) by Stephen Woolley attempts to tell the "" true "" story of

the death of Brian Jones, the founder of the band that was found dead at the bottom of his pool. At

first everyone thought it was a blunder by Jones, who spent the whole day drugged, but Frank

Thorogood, a guy who worked at home, confessed "" in his bed of death "" to have killed him. This is the version

that the film takes. The thing sounded interesting but it is a difficult challenge. To start we have stars as

well known as the Stones, as characters, and an important episode of the mythology of rock: the death of

Jones. That is to say, the expectations of the public are high and I think that many will feel that they have wanted to sell them

cat hares. What do we have here? A movie about rock stars. They are so similar to each other!

First we ask ourselves who will be sufficiently like so-and-so to interpret it? After: the

difficult beginnings, the great opportunity, the fans, the drugs (indispensable and almost protagonists), the

loss of control, the decadence, salvation and death. The End. If "Stoned" is not a film about the

Rolling Stones, but about Jones, some facts are recreated with the other members of the band. So we can see

the actors who play Mick Jagger and Keith Richards, both with low profile and very few lines, but

you can not ask for more either (it would have been worse, I think). The action is concentrated in the months before

Jones's death, his dismissal from the band and the rapid sinking in drugs and in the pool. To animate the

story the director spreads his movie with beautiful people, nudes in bulk, musical sequences, flashy

LSD trips, that is, all the paraphernalia of the 60, to at least entertain the eye and the ear. Ascript

pretty lightwith phrases like "" the problem of happiness is that it's boring "", with which they try to summarize

Jones' philosophy, and some documentary touches (peri�� cuts). �dico, filming of the time) so

that you will be informed of something and then do not come to surprise and you can answer with certainty to the

question: ���qui���n mat�� � to Brian Jones?

" 0

" With good German, Soderbergh worships black cinema par excellence, theHollywood

classicstudios.

Steven Soderbergh is a type of filmmaker who seems to have come out of classical Hollywood for awarp

time, not because of his directing style, or because of the stories he tells, not even for his movies in itself. But

for its ability to jump into the void with different and risky projects, improvisation. Nofilmmaker

currentis capable of making a film like Traffic, then Ocean? S Eleven, then moving to anfilm

independentlike Full Frontal, then a futuristic thriller like Solaris? and thus an increasingly longer

list. Only for that reason, all his works, even the most unfortunate ones, have that attractive aroma, and

unfortunately so rare, to classical cinema, to real cinema. With El Buen Alem ,N, Soderbergh pays homage

to black cinema par excellence, that of classic Hollywood studios, where some of thehave emerged

greatest masterpieces in the history of cinema. Jacob Geismar (George Clooney), war correspondent,

travels to Berlin to cover the momentous summit of Potsdam in which the future of Europe and the worldbe decided

for the next half century will. Back in the city where he lived before the war, he will meet again with his

old girlfriend, Lena Brandt (Cate Blanchett), to discover that he hides an important secret, and that his ch���fer ,

Tully (Tobey Maguire), is helping her. Based on the homonymous novel by Joseph Kanon, Steven Soderbergh

recreates with great verisimilitude and realism the atmosphere that was lived in the post-war Berlin. A city marked

by an increasingly tense and unstable balance of power, in which each power seeks its ownbotan

war, while the entire country faces the judgment of the victors and humanity. With that backdrop,

Paul Attanasio signs a solid script in which intrigue, political situation, andare mixed with skill.

even romance. The script is a tribute to the black cinema, with good characters that seem to be taken from

any classic of the 1950s: a hero, hard and lonely, to whom a resounding but content George

Clooney gives great uncertainty, in addition to bringing a variety of emotions, and the femme fatale, a role

that makes a splendid and disturbing Cate Blanchett, the purer Marlene Dietrich style. Of thework

technical, highlights that fantastic black and white photography, as well as the assembly, both of Soderbergh himself,

and the music of Thomas Newman. All these elements give the film a greater aroma of classic cinema, which is

worthy and worthy of applause. El Buen Alem���n has numerous guides to films like El Tercer Hombre, and

especially to Casablanca, from the poster to the final scene, gui���os that can be seen as tributes or

as brazen copies, we leave that issue to the viewer's judgment. Good Alem���n, in addition to being one of the

most attractive proposals on the billboard, serves to reconcile with the commercial cinema of

Hollywood. In addition, it is a magnificent excuse to return to enjoy the great titles of black cinema.

" 1

" Jim, is little credible in this film, although it shows the effort made by the actor to play a

role outside their usual records. Conclusion, do not waste your time and your money with this firecracker and rent

Gilda in the video store.

Many expectations I had created with this film, many of which fell apart when Jim Carrey

was consolidated in the leading role. The myth of the number 23 is something that any geek in the computer science

knows, something so widespread by the network that it becomes almost a religion. Much has been said about

this, it has been written and directed, that is, this is not the first film or the last one about the emblematic

number but Surely it is the worst. If what you expect is to shed light on the myth, do not go to see the film because

what you will find is a pseudo-psycho movie, with denfulas to discover something you do not get , staying

in a mere history of series B in which the prota plays the double personality borderline. Although the assembly

(nothing innovative) but with a style that I like, it is acceptable, sometimes the excess of This type of

assembly causes a slight "" dizziness "". We return to those of enso���aci���na plans that the director (Joel S)us

has accustomed. Inside the mental straws of Joel. Maybe this is the least intense (Thank God, pq

after the ghost of the opera believed to rave exasperated by the drowsiness) but still wants this boy It seems like

something that is not, that does not know how to do and over does it wrong. Joel, Joel Joel, when you're going to realize that

simplicity is also beautiful and that your films look like a meringue with double ration of jam

strawberry? for me talk about the number 23 is not talking about an encounter with a person and this number is what

narrates the film. Therefore film failed. 23 should be much more, I can not think of a thousand ways to approach it,

but good. Let's talk about friend Jim. God but even when I'm going to have to put up with this? to see Jimy, read

carefully. You have spent years consecrating yourself as the cosmic actor of this era which has led you logically to

a hard, hard, steel-like typecasting. You have become enriched, you have been comfortable in your routine, and now after

creating in our mind an image of absolute asshole that makes us laugh, do you pretend to be very serious and

convincing? No, no, no, I'll tell you that it's going to cost you a lot of time and a lot of clunkers like 23 settle down as something

more than an excellent actor for comedy, almost as much as the one that has cost you to become what What are you.

Patience, I support you! Jim, is little credible in this film, although it shows the effort made by the actor to

play a role outside of his usual records, but we still lack some passion enturage or

factor X to finish believing us.Conclusion do not waste your time and your money with this firecracker and rent

Gilda in the video store.

" 0

" The tape does not gomere entertainment of a rainy afternoon on DVD, of those tapes where one can

beyondget up several times from the couch, that upon re-engaging in it, there will be no thread lost, no sagging, It will nothim to

botherhave missed 10 or 20 minutes.

Among my circle of friends, where I have a couple of gay and lesbian friends, I found it strange that nobody told me

about this movie, as if they did it from "" Cachorro "" "" Red Roses "" "or" "Los l���os de Gray" ", however, from

" "Chuecatown" "as if the earth had swallowed it, that means a lot of the type of tape we are

facing, is not it? Today, after the new incursion of the Christmas premieres with Will Smith and his "" I am Legend ""did

Inot like much to break my head and wanted a consumption comedieta fast that did not give me much to think,

or to attend, and the choice could not be more successful, since this film combines, not only all the

typical possible gays (ms Bear type) but above seems shot with the greatesthomophobias,

possible even heterosexual someone can see and feel sadly cabreado.Juan Flahn in the

direction n, after many short, debuting in this, his second with a script where the shadow of Felixnoticeable,

Sabroso and Dunia Ayaso and that "" droll "" made in Madrid, cinema can only come of the head of the two of them,

but, with a snag, while in "" Descogelate "" one starts laughing with the situations experienced by, also

Pep���n Nieto, here, the two main characters seem very misplaced in the neighborhood of Chueca. It is curious

how the characters of Pep���n Nieto and Carlos Fuentes play two "" Geeks "" or "" Frikis "" (surely that is how it

is best understood) gays, lovers of comics, science fiction movies, and jealous of their relationship, who lead

as normal and without any caution in the Madrid neighborhood of Chueca, a place excellent of Madrid

where you can walk with total and absolute tranquility, not with that fear of "" cool "" that seems to call this

stupid comedieta.Por other part, it shows that Concha Velasco is in a cape, and that, after her excellent

role in "" Bienvenido a casa "" by David Trueba, here she plays a role for which she does not seem to be made, that

cranky mother from one of the protagonists, let's also join Rosa Mar���a Sarda, one of the greats of Spanish cinema

, in another stupid role and we added Eduard Soto (a actor that I really like) but here

seems to repeat many of the clichés we have seen him walk after passing through the television show

"" Buenafuente "" The film is nothing but entertainment on a rainy afternoon on DVD, of those tapes where you

can get up several times from the sofa, both to go to the WC, and to enter the kitchen for chips,

that when you re-hook yourself to it, you will not have lost any thread, It will not bother you, nor will it bother you to have lost 10 or 20 minutes.

of it, if the law of cinema forces us to "swallow" "things like this, we're going badly.

" 0

" Film with few pretensions (I suppose) of a minotaur fed by maidens and virginal, of

maidensmuscled and tattooed beauties. For a silly day of those who do not know whether to cut your veins or leave them

long.

The world of the DVD is a bottomless bag for films of which you doubt that they have really recorded it or that

they are simply pieces of others stuck with more or less mastery. Today's work is, without a doubt, one of

those. By the way, the title of the DVD promises promises until it gets it. this, which seems more than what it is

then, that my mind is going to other paths. The film is about an imaginary empire that loves the

bull. As the town is becoming incrimid, instead of creating the football to dominate the beasts, they

make their bull god copule with their queen to take out a semi tangible god for the plebs. Of these they

leave a minotaur with very bad milk that feeds on blood and demósv���sceras. So they lock him up in a

labyrinth and they throw in virgins from time to time so that the boy can escape. Until a

boy decides to save his girlfriend and offers to be sacrificed.Mother, who filmed meat video club

(I think it came directly in DVD format) that we have swallowed so silly. The beginning is very

promising, with a very interesting story and a woman in porretas. But as the thing progresses, it loses

its grip, the action disappears and we have a deformed minotaur who is giving horns to everyone who catches. The

ending is very absurd, but the film leaves a sympathetic aftertaste. Resumiendo, film with few pretensions

(I suppose) of a minotaur fed by maidens and virginal maidens, muscled and tattooed beauties . For

a silly day of those who do not know if you cut your veins or leave them long. With this morlaco I would like to see

more than a bullfighter.

" 0

" A too complacent ending - one always expects a little more risk or madness in Tim Burton - does not

ruin 76 few minutes of total enjoyment. If the saying is true that a great director always films the

same movie; we can be totally satisfied ...

The imaginary of Tim Burton is as surprising with animation as it is with human beings. Already in

Beetlejuice he displayed all his imagery, both praised and charming, that continued in thatmasterpiece

darkie / romanticcalled The young hands of scissors. Classics teacher, his thing goes through pure fantasy Sina without

falling -generally- into the false moralistic message, so present in the genre that he transits. The corpse bride

is another example of her touch and good taste, her rhythm for comedy, the pleasure of simple stories and

an amazing animation (almost two hours for a second of film!). With each TB, one returns to being a

tabletchild, ecstatic by his stories as he did the character of The Big Fish with his father. F���bulas are not

exempt from that electric touch, as characteristic as necessary and inoffensive. Its genre is

fun and pure pleasure, almost childish, with that dark and melancholy touch that is so evident even in hisworks

failed, that he has them, and that lately they are less and less spaced out. When he got a little serious -The

big fish, The Planet of the Apes- his look was diluted by lack of depth or too much seriousness. With

this the comparisons with the world of Jack Skeleton (of which he was co-writer and producer, not director) are

inevitable. The similarities already start from the characteristics of the characters, as if TB had been left

with the desire to direct that already become a total classic. The music continues to be a valid vehicle topresent

quicklythe story. That is, where Disney bores TB is didactic. THE PLEASURE OF DEATH All his

films are full of life although his vital reason is to admire death. Already at the beginning of The young man.

with the death of his father, with Jack and his microworld, Beetlejuice returning from her; death flies

triumphantly and without fears all the great moments of his filmography. With a great presence also in The Headless Horseman

and in this, the death - even more than the love that also stands out of course in his films - is the

true engine of your vision. Not for nothing the world of the dead is painted with joy and color while the

real world is in gray, almost lugubrious, and even with the most amore characters of this story. As a

deficit, the shy and clumsy Vincent does not awaken the empathy that Jack instantly woke up, just asare

the songs of Danny Elfman - another director's fetish -insurmountable. of that movie (in which it

was also Jack's voice). With the voice of the repeated Johnny Deep - he was in 80% of the films of TB!) This Vincent

seems the antithesis of the explosive Jack. On the other hand his corpse bride is a mirror - perhaps more sexy - of the also

removable Sally. This repetition or similarity leads us to think that TB this comes out of taquito, autopilot type

. Then we ask ourselves: Would not we have to ask for a little more risk? Did he do it in one of his

films and that's why they are the most failed of his work? Is it necessary or with these clones is it enough just for the

happy final result? Perhaps the degree of admiration / enjoyment of his work of the answer. The imagination of TB is

one of its most praised virtues, we said above, but there are those who also distrust it as I commented. �

Renoir quoting his father and that comes to mind: "" You paint a tree leaf without starting from a model and you run the

risk of monotony, because the imagination does not add anything to you more than some models of tree leaves.

Nature provides millions on the same tree. No two leaves are the same. The artist who paints himself

soon becomes repeating himself. "" An overly complacent ending - one always expects a little more risk or insanity in

TB - does not ruin 76 few minutes of total enjoyment. If the saying is true that a great director always

films the same movie; we can stay totally satisfied.

" 1

" Jason Reitman has outdone his father (of course, it was not too difficult) with just a comedy,

with an amoral and provocative face. Comedy of the year and would be a candidate for the film title of the year.

'Thank you for smoking' (2005), opera prima by Jason Reitman (son of Ivan Reitman), begins with some magnificent

credit titles, a country song that does not they are behind and with a first 15 minutes simply

antolÃgicos, halfway between the great outbursts of 'One of ours' and 'Magnolia'. "" Exaggerated "", you will

say. Do not wait to check it on DVD, I tell you. There is m���ss���tira and poison in these fifteen minutes that in all

the rest of the world-wide cinematographic production of which it goes of year. And there are even more. Taking thebookas a basis

homonymousby Christopher Buckley, Jason Reitman tells the story of Nick Naylor (overwhelming Aaron Eckhart),

vice president of the Academy of Tobacco Studies (financed by the tobacco industry, of course) and

official spokesman for that industry in the United States. He knows he is one of the most hated men in America

(North), but he does not care, because he is the best in his job: to convince the great public of that the

detractors of the tobacco are wrong. Naylor and his friends Polly and Bobby Jay (funny Mar���a Bello and David

Koechner), colleagues in defense of the alcohol and armament industries, often meet to show off

who causes Muertess deaths per year. His twelve-year-old son (Cameron Bright finally doing "normal boy") seems

interested in following in his footsteps. His ambitious plan to take tobacco back to the cinema has been approved.life

Nick'sis perfect, leaving aside the lack of values ​​or the amorality of some of his actions. But the

downside of being the most hated guy in the country is that there are a lot of people wanting it to fall. In just 100 minutes, Reitman

gets a dazzling film in the formal and impeccable in his speech , which is none other than supporting

freedom of thought and choice. No longer of the smokers, but of each and every one of us, exposed to

continuous media manipulations and pressures of every sign. 'Thank you for smoking' satirizes and questions all

those involved in one of those "big debates" of public opinion, and manages to make the viewer understand the

twisted logic of the protagonist, if it does not get to adopt it: no position is intrinsically good or

bad, so it's just that you think and then choose what you want to defend, because everything It is

defensible in this manipulated world. Arguably, also this last extreme. But that's what it's about. And

going back to the film: brilliant secondary actors in characters with just a couple of sequences (the

already named friends and partners of the "Merchants" squad of the Death "", the steepest critique of theHollywood

currentby Rob Lowe and Adam Brody, the imposing Robert Duvall as tobacco boss and Sam Elliot as the

cancerous Man of Marlboro, or the hilarious William H Macy as the cheating Senator Finistirre),planning

elegantand photography, production design as poisonous as the text itself (that bar sign where

refer to the Merchants of Death). All at a great height. Jason Reitman has outdone his father (of course,

it was not too difficult) with just a comedy, with an amoral and provocative face. Comedy of the year and would be

a candidate for the film title of the year. A 9'5

" 1

" The memory as a trip to posterity. Ingmar Bergman on Andrei Tarkovsky: "" My first discovery of Tarkovsky was like a miracle. Suddenly

I was standing next to the access door to an enclosure in which I had always wanted to enter, but whose key

had never been given to me, and in which Tarkovsky moved. He was free and confident. I felt encouraged, encouraged:

someone had expressed what I always wanted to say, without knowing how. Tarkovski is for me the most

important. It has created a new language, which corresponds to the essence of cinema, because it presents life

as reflection, life as a dream. "In effect, of the aforementioned" Zerkalo " . Dream, poetic reflection, beloved,

evoked, of a past that belongs to the director himself, but also is ours. The yesterday that merges with the

coet�� �neo, to build the morning, the future more universal.It is "" The Mirror "" the work with greater autobiographical charge

of Tarkovsky, but not for that reason can be considered herm� Ethics, waterproof. Very personal, with exclusive elements

of their memories, which are formed as bubbles transported by the air, fire and water consumed in the evolution

of their awakening, it is still a portrait that we ourselves can recognize. "" Zerkalo "", as its title

indicates, is the mirror in which we all look at each other. It is about the narration of a past that merges with a

future present and will become the essence of nature, of our human condition. It is thepath

necessaryto self-recognize, to transcribe our entity , reach the point where we become

crystal clear water and we are able to open up to our reflection. Recurring theme in the entire

work of Tarkovsky.En "" Zerkalo "" there is no narrative based on a classic plot thread. There is noorder

chronologicalnor, therefore, logical. Neither does it matter (nor does it matter) when exploring the true value and meaning

of the film. The story itself is broken to form a cycle full of on���ricos elements, memories,

dissociations, remnants of a reality lived by one and represented for all. Tarkovsky gives the meaning m�� He is

metaphysical, exalted, grandiloquent in his filmography and his recurring phrase of "" Sculpting in Time "". Create

shapes, figures, sometimes transparent, sometimes murky (like the water that flows from our life), to

decorate them inside us. "" The Mirror "" is not a complex film. We make it complex.As���

is evident in an introduction to many incoherent, diffuse and whose explanation has nothing to do with

the whole film. But, as the director himself affirms, if we look inside, the answer is

much simpler than it seems. This scene, absolutely follows the final path of the work, that path

in search of our sincerity, our deepest truth, which will make us find lost freedom,

hidden in our pain. Follow the reflection , excavated and finally found in the form of healing hypnosis of

a young stutterer. The recovery of spontaneous speech as a faithful analogy of the encounter of ourselves, of

our condition cut off by a draconian regime that does not allow us to act as, in essentially and naturally,

from our birth, we should act. The fourth feature by the Russian director was about to take him

to prison, for the inclusion of ambiguous images that serve ���an as a form and refuge to a harsh criticism that

ended up confronting him with the authorities. All this in a communist dictatorship of the USSR at that

time impossible to refute, unless you wanted your life run serious danger. The film, obviously

censored, had an initial premiere very delayed and complicated, and was only projected in

minority and very reserved places. Before damn, today work of worship. Much more than that: work of art,heritage

culturalof a Russia that is sketched all over the world. In those difficult times, therefore, it was necessary to look for

ways, through met� ��foras, subtle images, escapist intelligence, to flee from the obvious, not show it,

make it unaffordable for obtuse minds. Only open minds, in search of continuous growth, could

understand their magnitude and adapt it to their lives and their cultural environment. That gave the cinema a supreme,sense

universal, which was precisely Tarkovsky's maximum. Censorship, as we all know, enhances

imagination. Without it, as many claim with an ironic and rebuffed spirit, cinema will never be the

same again. And the reason does not fail, analyzing the thesis from the creative point of view. And, also being aware

of the situation, in the case that concerns us of the work, the disease is always point of inflection (or

beginning) to begin to rethink transcendental, vital issues that escape us throughout

our previous existence for various reasons. At the end of our lives, on the brink of death (common theme

with Bergman, but treated in both very unequally) we begin to understand, or at least, we

try. ��, Alexei (alter ego of Andrei), in the course of his illness, becomes someone very

tending to reflection. He does not stop looking at his past, his mistakes, his way traveled, the way to

identify with him to, at the same time, identify us. We are part of those memories, to

constitute our own. It is as if the phantom traveled through time, observing, learning, taking

for itself, inserting itself in other people's lives to feel the suffering that takes hold of them, his thoughts and

feelings (which are also, on many occasions, his own, those of his childhood) before a future that

seems painful, either because of a coming war, because of the recovery of the lost love, or for

redemption in the face of the cause of harm to which you do not know how to pardon. Alexei, the character, is everyone. We

are all ���l. Belongs (us) to your memory. It is an inseparable whole if we want to meet and understand. Great

part of the memories (dreams) concern their childhood, re-live them in the way they can invoke them,

sometimes they are active characters of them , sometimes he remains hidden, only his word appears (hence the

predominance of the spiritual over the physical for Tarkovsky), not his person. Some may bememories

relatively foreign, visionary� Only other difficult, brittle, tenebrous, but many are his

past, wound pending cover, forgiveness waiting to manifest. No doubt, reminiscences attached to his

innocence and, at the same time, to his bosom maternal (there remains for the historical cinematographic memory the

impressive onionic sequence of levitation). Therefore, in "" Zerkalo "", the cycles and spaces merge in a

crazy to verify that, simply, the time "" does not exist "". There are universal feelings, the "few" of

them are unnecessary. A perfect example of this would be the bird that Alexei holds in his hand, transferring his

cultural past to a future that breathes hope, longs for history Surely there are moments in

which it is impossible to discern past, present or future, since they are exclusive of the director, only he

associates them. But we should not care, the message is global, universal. We can insertexperience

any, our own, of our habitat. The movie transits by stops that go from the lyrical and the beautiful,

to the dark and terrifying (by past not complete or apprehended, which is like an abyss that generates fear,

but not terror of use, easy, but real fear), going through the mysterious, exciting or subjugating. Do not

let yourself be guided by the surface, which in Appearance is purely cryptic, incomprehensible. Otherwise,

we will only see unconnected sequences in time and space, not knowing how to distinguish without being present,

past or future, or if we are the ones that are there, if they are the same characters or if they have or cease to

have continuity . Nothing will make sense. But of that, nothing matters. Indeed, it can be complex

insofar as the memory, the poured images, are not ours (they are of Tarkovsky's own, are his

experiences). If we do not like to take them as our own, apply them to our life, there will be no mirror in which to look at ourselves.

There will be no way to travel. Still, here memory does not act simply as a generator of memories, as

a damaged component (as it is altered and mistreated in the majority). ��a of films), but as a method to recompose ourselves, to

take from it skills and apply them to our learning, to our spiritual growth. That same memory,

trace of the path to take, will disappear��� when we can place ourselves on the path, which should already be covered

only by us. From there emanates the historical final sequence plane, forming a very long traveling

(Tarkovsky house mark). ) that travels through nature, the vision towards it as a union with the human being,

making it immortal, achieving an infinity full of beauty and splendor. The memory cited as a generator of

unity. Den of all ages, children, mother, grandmother (interpreted by the prop the mother of the director). All

in unison in the freedom that nature has given us, free of splits, contemplating its brilliance to the

rhythm of the uplifting, masterly, sublime, spiritual music of Bach. An antològic end, immediate to theIngen Naive hope

divine, to which nothing of what is named makes true justice.? Eternal doubt whether

happiness lies in the memory or in the forgetfulness of it. That is already a matter of self-reflection and

non-transferable. Memory leads, but then it will occupy a second plane to glimpse the union of

generations that have been a reflection of the others. (a divorce that is repeated, a loss that is not known how to

offer: more sacrifice in the work of genius). Now we are alone in front of our path. That

nature is our true mother, according to Tarkovsky, is reflected perfectly with everything cited. It

leads us, unites the totality of times and, in part, we also make it channeled. Antheme

essential and recurringin his filmography: "We are part of that force that goes from stone to water".

Undoubtedly, everything dies and comes to an end, but, through the mother and her essence, thanks to her, if you look

inside, you will remain alive forever to our eyes. For when you want to realize what is

trying, arrives the colossal end of "" The Mirror "", arrives the c���nit of the journey to retake it again. And, even without

understanding it completely, the tears sprout down the cheeks. It is not urgent to dry them. It is also not necessary to guess it

completely. The truly important thing is that our person, our porf���sica, has not cried. The

spirit is the one that has shed the tears. Because, for the first time in his biography, he has been touched with his

fingers. Because, in order to provide an inexplicable lyricism to the footage, Arseni Tarkovsky, Andrei's father-poet, recites

some of his own verses, some poems full of preciosity, rhythm of enso���aci���n, passion and essence.Because the last

step is not only one of the best in history that the cinema knows. It extends beyond

celluloid, culture, everything we know in life. We have no other reason to thank Andrei Tarkovsky for

doing an unbeatable work, of a magnitude and style never achieved. A work for all times.not

Because we areonly before a Masterpiece: we are before an imperishable, superb andArtwork

exciting. An ode to existence, a poem to life. As those stories in which the mere voyeur,spectator

asyptical, becomes an essential part of them: from birth to death, from the

g� ��nesis until consummation. Like a sonata that sings in the autumn the twilight of the leaves, and the watchful trees

come out of the ���tero pushing. As in a crystal, it is perceived the pulse of the rivers, bloods of sap and amazement

before the di���fano hollow of the tempest. As the whisper that escapes by the stairs, dressed of ���xtasis that

fuses with the h�� Luscious medas, and takes us far, to their domains, on the other side of the mirror.

" 1

" The Footprint is a stimulating remake, very different from the original work and, nevertheless, complementary,

with a daring direction, some performances to remember and a surprising reinterpretation of thetext

original.

The current remake fever has no end, usually focus on movies of action and / or science fiction,

but neither do they disgust comedies or dramas. I can understand the remakes when the material of the game is

not much less a classic film, as for example The Case of Thomas Crown, whose new version The Secret of

Thomas Crown is even superior to the original. What I do not understand is the rethinking of classicor

worksmasterpieces such as Psycho or The Indiscreet Window. This type of operations have always seemed to mesuicides

insuredbecause the comparisons are always odious. And yet they continue to be done because theyundoubtedly

arevery profitable. All this comes with the release of the remake of La Huella, a film from 1972, a

work by Joseph L. Mankiewicz based on the work of Anthony Schaffer (Amadeus) adapted by thehimself

authorand interpreted by Michael Caine and Laurence Olivier. The new version has an equallytechnical record

enviable: the address is provided by Kenneth Branagh and the adaptation has been written by Nobel laureate

Harold Pinter while the The interpreters are Jude Law and Michael Caine. The plot begins when a young actor

is invited to the home of a prestigious writer of mystery novels. Once they have met, a long dialogue begins

in which the replies and counter replies follow each other in a more acute way. The best that can be said about the

film of Branagh is that it supposes a whole reinterpretation of the original material, both aesthetic and content.

In Mankiewicz's film, everything revolves around the idea of ​​play, of appearances, of the great pantomime,

in a lighter tone and with very accurate chemical details. However this new version has a

much more serious and dark tone present both in its staging and in the characters. The game is still present,

but the reinterpretation that makes the text Pinter, perhaps gives more importance to other factors such as

a homosexual approach between the characters. The direction of Branagh is also opposite to what

Mankiewicz proposed. The second one got something really difficult, namely, that a work with only two

characters would be fully cinematic and would stand the tension and interest during about two hours and

twenty minutes. Kenneth Branagh has always stood out for knowing how to adapt the theatrical mediumone in an excellent way

to the cinematographic, that's why his choice is surprising. The English director, in a very risky decision, plays to

make theater inside the cinema, that is to say to make a cinematographic film but with elements of thelanguage

theatrical. The stage, a character more without a doubt, is a minimalist house, with the minimum of elements to

focus attention on the characters. It also has a continuous set of planes "" strange "" and even allows

the characters to play with the lighting environment, so that each scene has its own light, chosen in

"" direct "" by the protagonists. It is a difficult decision, which does not work in all the scenes, but in general it

is surprising and refreshing as well as being a very creative way of combining both codes (the one of theater and

cinema) from the point of view of the direction. As director of actors, Branagh is excellent as always

. In the commentary of The Orphanage he commented that Bel���n Rueda was the film, in this casecan be said

the sameof Michael Caine. Jude Law is also very good, but what Caine has achieved is really

extraordinary. A complex character, full of nuances, with an aplomb and a serenity impressive and whose

silences and looks say more than many di���logos. In addition he gets an approach to his character radically

different from the one made by Olivier in the original, and yet at the height of that prodigious

interpretation. The photography and artistic direction are appropriate and discreet, surprising the design of

the house in which the action takes place and that ends up being a character m��� s. On the other hand, Patrick Doyle

gets his best score in many years, away from excesses like Eragon, achieves an extraordinary result

based only on a theme that receives various variations as the film progresses. A great job at the

height of the author's best. In short, La Huella is a stimulating remake, very different from thework

originaland, nevertheless, complementary, with a daring direction, some performances to remember and a

surprising reinterpretation of the original text, which takes away about an hour of duration, without noticeably affecting

the result. But above all, La Huella is the confirmation that Michael Caine, when he

is left as nonsense as Miss Special Agent, is one of the greatest geniuses of the interpretation we have

today. Only for him should the film be seen, fortunately the rest of the elements are also worthwhile.

PS: It is essential to see The Mankiewicz Footprint, a masterpiece of the truth. PS2: Do not miss the

curious cameo that Pinter and Branagh perform in the film (a clue, watch the television screen)

" 1

" Many things happen but you do not know well Why? The actors are quite lazy, which

dramatizes. And follow the plot is very complicated, by the continuous swings (and because you can not understand why

the acts of El Pera).

Flying I go, flying I come, by the way I am entertained. (Kiko Veneno 1979). The film deals with the life of

a child, nicknamed the Pear, from nine years to eleven. Only brother among five sisters, from a very

young age he is dedicated to stealing cars and driving them. His continuous robberies and persecutions, together with the friends of

misdeeds he has, make him the meat of the prison. The parents are totally helpless as their son

becomes a myth among juvenile delinquents in the south of Madrid. Everything seems to be based on the

real life of Juan Carlos Delgado "" el pera "". Look, it will be true that all this happened to him, but I do not

believe it. It may be that the chosen actors are not the most appropriate, but I thinkis very

the plotunbelievable. I suppose it will be a case where reality trumps fiction. I did not really know if it was

a comedy or a drama, since the father of the pear (the pear, juas, juas) has no dramatic record. And it is that

when you are bad actor and you remain typecast in the role of serial porter of humor, you can badly get out

of it. This film would have needed a dramatic actor of truth, and not this man. You could have made

a very good movie with good actors and transitions between the clearer scenes, but so the

result is loose. Resuming, many things happen but you do not whole well of why. The actors are quite

lazy, which dramatizes. And follow the plot is very complicated, by the continuous swings (and because you can not

understand why the acts of El Pera). More than anything for what could have been and not Fu���.Besitos.PD:

���Kiko Veneno will have to see something with "" the Poison "" (the one of the shark)? PD2: There are very violent scenes badly

solved.PD3: The Only one who is saved is the director of the CEMU (Student City MUchachos) that I

think is very credible. And what is incredible, but true, is that there are people like this in the world.

From here I give my most heartfelt congratulations. PD4: Once I went with a tarao through the streets of Toledo imitating

the Pear and I almost defecated on top.

" 0

" The curse of 23. It's been a while since I heard anything so stupid. Because of course, if you take yourdate

birth, you divide it by 23, you add 23 multiplied by x and you subtract 23,000 and you add 4 more to it to fit

... you get 23! T���o, it's to shit.

It is a strange movie, this one of the shtick, since it is marked by the presence of the well-known and histri���nic

actor, Jim Carrey. This guy has earned a living (and well earned, of course, because he has made a fortune)

doing all kinds of grimaces and antics, with more or less grace. He is one of these actors who makes humor out of

exhaustion. Like those kids that do not stop making faces and caranto���as until exhausted you dedicate a

smile to be left in peace of a fucking time. The same thing happens with this type. All the while putting faces,

until you get that out of pure weakness you escape a smile. It has never occurred to me to see his

films again. Well, the tiresome Carrey, as it is already lined, now insists that he wants to be an actor. There are those

who have compared him to Jerry Lewis, who also made deplorable comedies in his beginnings but thenus

gavesome masterful interpretation. Similar only in its beginnings: lamentable and a shame for the

history of cinema. Later Carrey insists on dramatic roles, with more pity than gloria.Aqu��� we have a

psychological thriller, or so it seems at the beginning. The story goes of a guy who reads a novel that seems to narrate his

own life, that's it, from a fantastic and action-packed point of view in which he looks like adetective

privateof great success (in reality is dedicated to hunting loose animals in the city, go fuck work

pardiez!). In the book he is caught by a curse related to the number 23 that begins to affect him in

his real life. Up to now I painted well, and I was already thinking. Is it possible that the clown has done something

interesting? Well, no. The story continues. The story goes on. but the ideas ran out. Immediately you see that the

book or his wife has written to try to drive him crazy or he wrote it because he was already crazy. It all comes

down to the author's research, which in fact is the same, on the part of the whole family (the

adolescent child included). That's it, all well watered with a delirious subrealism: the curse of the numbers

that you do not have even lying down, the woman hiding corpses in the park, the protagonist that turns out to be

amnesiac and nobody knows his past. Awesome guy. This reminds me of the novels by Agata Christie, in which at the

end there was a distant relative who had not appeared before and was the murderer. A shit worth

living with the rest of this web. The thing is that the guy charged a girl in college and was

amnesic of fright. As his father was an accountant, he was marked by numbers, specifically number 23, you see.

Then he remakes his life and marries the first girl he finds, who is also like a goat by the

looks of it. The thing has its grace, let's see it in parts: 1) The curse of the 23. For some time he did not hear anything so

stupid. Because of course, if you take your birth date, you divide it by 23, you add 23 multiplied by 2 and you

subtract 23,000 and you add 4 more to it. you get 23! T���o, it's to shit !!! 2) The mysterious amnesia.

But how can you be married to a 17-year-old uncle without knowing he's a homicidal madman? Fuck, and with a son and

everything. Above to protect him (sends eggs) he starts digging up the victim's husband so they can not

find her. I guess that being unfamiliar with American culture did not know these ancestral costrumbres.3)

The search. They meet an old psychologist who treated him and seeing him. he cracks his neck not to talk

to him. ? ��� I hallucinate I can not think of anything to comment, I was super-stunned. It should be in the

dictionary, section of explanation of 'without feet or head'. 4) The end: the guy gives himself and goes to jail. I

'm telling you in case you still thought to go see her. Do not do it, it's very bad. Joel Schumacher has done, among others:

Last call, Hidden youth, One day of fury, a couple of Batman, anyway. above all action and quite

mediocre. But this one now takes the prize to a whole career of tru :os: the mega-tru���o. After a career

full of movies, at least now we have clear which is the worst of all that has rolled. About the actors,

the thing is funny. The son of the chalao practically does not even focus, he goes out all the time in the background, and the

woman is taken out mostly when they are telling the story of the detective. and the truth is that he earns a lot in

picardias or camis���n. But nothing, everything revolves around the Carrey, who does not just do it right or wrong. Having

the pasta that the uncle has, the first thing that he would have to do is to select a good story and you would not get crap

like this. The truth is that even being the most optimistic that I allow myself, I can save this movie shit.

Total, another tru���o, another zero.

" 0

" Who has been the luminaries of the New York Post that affirms that it is one of the best films of the

year?

Bored, pompous, misunderstood? full-fledged disappointment the a priori interesting The illusionist.Deception

of the fat because there is only something worse than a bad movie: a bad and pretentious movie.This ���history? from a

magician what? good? goes from? there's a? ���flashback? There is no argument nor the actors seem to be enjoying their

work: Eduard Norton was never so bad (well, in The Score may be) and, yes, as a noveltyus

givesan interpretation of Steven Seagal's school, what a way to frown; Paul Giamatti must

have a hole in his schedule, Sewell has a ridiculous mustache and the Biel? The photograph is not as

prodigious as one might expect, and the soundtrack of Philip Glass's turras tries to resemble those of Mr. M

(add a red cap to it as well). if you want?), causing an embarrassment of proporpicas proportions in the

spectator. There is no emotion, nor a more or less solid plot, and it shows horrors that unlike The

Prestige, which was based on a consistent novel, this one is based on a short story and yes, what I want to

say is that this story would give for a simple chapter of The Twilight Zone instead of to have presented an

arrogant and bland, very dull films of those that mothers like. Like El Zorro, but without action or

humor, this is a serious and prestigious movie. Who has been the luminaries of the New York Post that affirms that it

is one of the best films of the year? And by the way, of the moral that is intuited, better Not to mention, but I

suspect that the guinista is a kind of dubious moral? It's so sad that it's not worth comparing it with

Christopher Notan's. I was not so bored in a movie theater since Lobo, that gem of terror that Mike Nichols

perpetrated a few years ago. One of the absolute suspense of the season, why that has come before the other?

" 0

" Bored, long and heavy cinematographic proposal about the attacks of September 11, 2001.

'World Trade Center' has seemed to me, and will say it without hairs in the language and independently of the subject that deals

the film, a tostonazo unbearably boring, long and heavy. Its rhythm drops precipitously from the

collapse of the South Tower (a quarter of an hour after starting, go). Do not believe at all or a glimpse of

interest in almost all of his footage. Now, intense and emotional is a while (and I have not seemed much

less an "American" "). Highlight the collapses of the twin towers, which are a pu agetera agon���a. And itme

seems toan authentic homage (regardless of what the movie has bored me) to all the

victims, and to all those policemen, firemen, soldiers. In short, all those authentic H���ROES

who gave all their strength in the rescue tasks. The cast is simply correct, although I would like to

highlight Michael Pe��� to (Will Jimeno), Maggie Gyllenhaal (Allison Jimeno) and the always resplendent Maria

Bello (Donna McLoughlin), which I would love to have one of them win an Oscar nomination for the year. or

that is coming

" 0

" Disturbia is a teenage thriller where intrigue, suspense, testosterone and easy

fright are mixed in equal parts.

The great masterpieces of the history of art are considered authentic jewels, a patrimony of

humanity. No one would imagine that a painter would make a new version of Goya or Rembrandt paintings, or that a

sculptor would update the Venus de Milo or Mir���n's Disc���bolo, or that a musician composed a new piece

based on the Four Seasons of Vivaldi. But when it comes to the seventh art, it seems that there are no

problems in which true masterpieces are distorted and destroyed. There is no doubt thatLa Ventana Indiscreta

Alfred Hitchocock'sis one of the cinematographic summits. �ficas of all time. Therefore, what is the point

now to make a remake? Well, not even Disturbia is a proper remake, but it is concealed in the

logical definition of inspired by. For some filmmakers it must be very rewarding to believe that they are capable of

improving a film like La Ventana Indiscreta and surpassing a maestro like Alfred Hitchcock. Disturbia is a

teenage thriller where intrigue, suspense, testosterone and easy fright are mixed inparts

equal. The tape takes horrors to start, being its director very concerned in showing the viewer the

inner and outer world of the protagonist. And by the way, let the camera delight in the figure of Sarah

Roemer, the new muse of American teen cinema. DJ Caruso tries by all means to distance himself

as much as possible from the long shadow of Hitchcock, and in that search is when the film isandshipwrecked

completelycompletely. The only moments of true intrigue are due to the appearances of the character of David Morse

and his disturbing interpretation, far superior to that of a pamphlet Shia LaBeouf.Disturbia is a covert remake

of one of the best films of intrigue of all time, The Indiscreta Window. If someone was so deluded as

to think that the film by DJ Caruso could even make the grade in such an unequal comparison, in the cinema he will

find the sad truth.

" 0

" Film about a hyper-muscular ex-marine who has to recover his wife kidnapped byrobbers

murderous. For lovers of action cinema, it stands out for its candidness and simple development. It is bad, but it fulfills

what is asked of it.

Director: John Bonito (I'm going to resist making the joke about tuna, muahahaha) Duration: I can not

think of more than an hour and a half. : March 16, 2007. When I saw this movie, I remembered

Rafa as a politician (husband of my aunt Carmen, who is quite a pachucha, see if it improves). Well, my uncle is a

great cin���filo, not of great movie classics, but of every movie he has in his cast with hard knocks +

shots + explosions. I think you have been able to see all of the genre, in addition to being able to talk about them in the

same way that others fill the mouths of directors who among all their films do not reach the spectators

of one of Ozores. Great guy my uncle, great guy. The film is about a Marine who is thrown out of the body by

jumping to the bullfighter's orders and destroying a whole camp of the bad guys. When he returns to be a

civilian, he has to accept a security job (this was only done to fill in and the movie did not last an

hour). As they throw to him to the two seconds, one goes away trip with his wife, but with so bad luck (it is not for

qui? N) that they encounter with types that kidnap to his wife in his flight with diamonds. So the bag of

muscles has to go to gnaw a few taps to retrieve the girl. Let's see, what suggests the name of

the film and the Did you fuck this one? For a very easy movie to see, of explosions, easy jokes, stereotyped

characters, hard and demystical types of action movies. As a film it is very bad, but

it is just what the viewer of this genre wants, so we can not criticize it there. The goal of

kill kill is more than achieved. It seemed curious to me (besides that a human being can have abiceps

biggerthan the head) that the waiter after having spent thousands of hardships ends up without me. s scratches that a tap on the

cheek. That's men and not the shit that is now in the street (I'm home, hehe). Resumiendo, film

about a hyper-ex-ex-marine who has to recover his wife kidnapped by murderous thieves. For

lovers of action cinema, it stands out for its candidness and simple development. It's bad, but it fulfills what is

asked.Besitos.PD: It has a touch Terminator of the most significant.PD2: Between the director who is called

Bonito and the actor that is Cena, this looks like an announcement of Bald, hahaha, the festival of humor continues.

" 0

" Complies, there is no better word with which one can define the argument, the note, and the opinion of the

tape, it fulfills what it claims, which is nothing other than entertaining.

It complies, there is no better word with which one can define the plot, the note, and the opinion of the

tape, it fulfills what it claims, which is nothing other than entertaining, fulfills the simplicity of the characters (

some of them are see coming from the first minute of footage), meet the argument (simple, perhaps debtor of tapes such

as "" Street Dogs "" and "" Perras Callejeras "", all the films of the Torete and the Heifer even that cinema

of taste that we saw in the 80s). Both Natalia Verbeke and Daniel Guzman fulfill their respective

roles and that is 1:45 min. (credits included) we can not ask for more than what the tape gives us, Comply, and

little more. By the way, in a couple of scenes, streets from my neighborhood, Aluche, come out.

" 0

" From the best that has gone through the theaters this year It is not new that the products made in the USA are in low hours. There's only a handful of

titles that get us out of the boredom that remakes, clichéd salads andusually produce

the most commercial cinema. These titles usually come from less novel directors, since there are fewgods

moviecapable of doing something different. This is the case of Crash and its director, Paul Haggis, who comes from the

world of television and has debuted with this film that he shot during 2003 (after having written thescript

Million Dollar Baby). Crash is located in Los Angeles, one of the most racially mixed cities in the Unitedmaybe

States (andthe world). This mixture provokes daily conflicts between whites, poor blacks,blacks

rich, Arabs, Hispanics, Orientals. These are communities with many differences that are forced to

share the same living space and survive in the face of adversity. The protagonists of Crash

are walking stereotypes: the black brothers, dedicated to crime; the white police couple, one of them

racist and the other not; the Arab, who is not willing to integrate into Western culture; the rich black, who

can be more racist than a white; the white politician, who sees only the black community as a sack of votes.

All of them will live different stories that at some point will cross at some point in the streets of Los

Angeles. Depending on the situation, each one of them will give the worst or the best that they have inside, with what the director

seems to mean that between different people there are so many things that unite them like that separate them.

Statically, Crash remembers Traffic a lot, with which he also shares the rhythm and development of the

different stories. Although some interpretations are remarkable, especially those of Matt Dilon in the

role of police and Don Cheadle in that of detective, the strong point of this film is the gui���n (not in vain

Higgis you have more tables as a scriptwriter than as a director). If you have to put one but this, is that it starts

with a crude realism and is transformed into a story of almost more happy end sweetened, losing some of

the credibility along the way. Crash is one of the best that has gone through theaters this year and touches on an issue that is increasingly

relevant in our societies: the racial and cultural mix. Paul Haggis shows with

skill that there are many differences that separate us, but at a certain level there are also many things

that we share and that should be the starting point to move in the right direction. In short, a film

with a subtle morality that perhaps could have maintained the level of realism with which it starts, but in

any case maintains interest until the end with enough solvency, which is not little.

" 1

" May, do you want to be my friend? "" May, do you want to be my friend? "" It's one of those movies that remind us that terror does not always haveclaws

steelin a hand or a mask on the face. Terror and madness are much closer to us,

to reality, to our peaceful and even sometimes boring monotony. May works under the method: the beast

sleeps inside us. In each of us there is a possible psychopath and our neighbor the second

can hide a dark past or a double life. For this, Lucky McKee, tells us a story

presumably daily (which nevertheless, hooked from the beginning) about a young girl very similar to thoseothers

manythat swarm around us. The rarita of the class, the ni���at���mida of the grocery store, that

strange sister of our friend, our cousin of the town. That is why we ride in a local train

and not in a high-speed train with scenes seen more than the "" The Prince of Bell

Air "" replacements and adolescents with unbearable Hormone surplus and neuron deficit. In this train we

find characters well traced and flesh and blood. Characters worked, attractive and even very

daring. (May's company at the veterinarian where she works is not wasted) All of them revolve

around May's character, played with a lot of care and talent by Angela Bettis who manages to create a

character that Irresistible and original sample. The plot is as I say very interesting and it surprises us by

carrying a rhythm that breaks our expectations but that never disappoints us. The transformation that May undergoes and

the irremediable unleashing of an overwhelming destiny, happens because of a whole series of

well-explained and calculably recognizable features and events that forge and mature the

true face of terror.This is a film that takes a run to start before where almost

all the others of its genre begin, and then finish quite a bit more. That's where no one else would dare.

In his day Todd Solondz, known for also getting very far with his jumps and for shying away from thegenres

usualto invent his own, he gave us a gift "" Welcome to the house of dolls "" (1996), (film

before his ���cida and genial "" Happyness "" (1998) that has a lot to do with this. Solorz,

addressed the drama of an ugly and traumatized child, confronted with the crudest realityin a crude and courageous way, the

biggest difference between them being, of course, that It was a horror movie, well, and to the point,

that you did not expect conventional scenes, or cats that are getting lost, neither gimmicky substitutes, nor

special effects because they do not need This is a low budget production but it is not noticed, and

it is not noticeable, because it has a lot more than correct photography, an atmosphere Fera distressing and intoxicating, an

intelligent assembly and a very true ending, and for this very reason, terrifyingly real.This is a movie that is

worthwhile, (of notable high for who now writes you) and is that, friends, yes "" Amelie "" would have been a

horror film instead of a magical tale, that sweet French would have been called without doubt "" May "". And the magic?

Black magic, of course, very black.

" 1

" Dialogs are a mod- ular example of organization, character construction andsense

narrative, irony, sarcasm, melancholy, humor , replies and counter-replies that leave us breathless in the face of the

overwhelming dramatic force.

All about eve is a furious look at the world of movie stars and theater. Idolatry and ambition

occupy the center of gravity around which the feelings revolve, the need to see therecognized

meritsand to compensate for the weakness with the love of the public. . And this is worth emphasizing, because the set of

relationships described points to the need - so common and elemental - of being loved, despite being part of a

game with no other rule than to manipulate the other with the purpose of achieving stardom or staying

in an influential position. On the one hand we have Margo Channing (Bette Davis), a human expression of the idol, a

contradictory personality full of edges that they affect the lives of their neighbors and, at the same time, affect the

whole development of the argument. She is the epithet of Eva, removes consciences and develops the

conflicts of a plot that becomes entangled in a choral drama in which the actions of each character expand the

themes, interact and direct the development until its conclusion. Margo renounces her status and, in a certain way,

represents the antithetical position to Eva's, since Margo's attitudes underlie the desire to break

the chains of success, flee from fame to win love, leaving behind a feigned youth. Eva, on the other hand, is not

afraid of old age and will do everything possible to resemble her idol. He does not hesitate to sell his feelings to win

fame. Margo's well-known phrase, you've been very good, Eva, but I would not worry so much about the heart:

you can always put that trophy in its place, express the substitution of humanity for the vanity of those who

put personal success above the true appreciation of their peers.Joseph L. Mankiewizc developed a

fierce criticism about how a passionate loser in the world art�� �stico ascends through manipulation and

dirty play, until you achieve your goal. He manages to synthesize in the character of Eva (Anne Baxter) twodimensions

psychological; sincere bonhom���ay and falsehood, a complex character that moves between these two areas

until, in the end, confronted with Addison (George Sanders), discovers all his letters and reveals his fragility

on the eve of a act that will make her worthy of winning the trophy. Mankiewizc's gaze oscillates between

s���tira and pessimism, linking the interpretive set through an intelligent game of complicity and

distrust, dissecting with enormous versatility various registers that make up the humanity of each

character. Dialogs are a mod- ular example of organization, construction of characters andsense

narrative, irony, sarcasm, melancholy, humor, r� �� replies and counter-replies that leave us breathless in the face of the

overwhelming dramatic force. The final shot is antològica; Multiple image expressed through a set of mirrors

that synthesizes the fight of egos developed throughout the film. Perfect image, in short, of

the sickly idolatry that has inspired Eva in her climb to success.

" 1

" Could you rate? Closer? (blinded by desire in some Spanish-speaking countries) like a

wonderful wonder. Closer, in a certain way real as life itself.

Well, I'm watching a movie and I have plenty of ideas on how to approach my criticism /

opinion, and the feeling that one has after the projection is good. To stand up and as in a play

begin to applaud, in if you could qualify "" Closer "" (blinded by desire in some Spanish-speaking countries)

as a pu���etera wonder, neither suffering is something to play with, nor bliss is something that we can

contemplate with ease on the screen, where we have been accustomed from our earliest childhood as

spectators with something so f� Easy and banal like "" Chico meets a girl, they chat and fall in love "", however in

Mike Nichols' last film (famous among others for "" Weapons of Woman "") all the schemas that we have requested

memorized thanks to the cinema are broken. For those who have suffered some love rupture once or twice

"" Closer "" represents everything that has happened to us, unstable loves that leave like foam in the sea,

strange situations that end up becoming something real, more real than you think, and maybe the

film is a little "" bit of reality "" put on screen, excellent interpretations of Natalie

Portman and Clive Owen, in my opinion, almost the best, maybe because Jude Law begins to bore me on the

screen and Julia Roberts, despite the fact that I love her, is already "in years" ... "Awesome! Someone told me

that "" Closer "" had a certain similarity with "" Lost in translation "" and yet, I do not find such parallelism,

maybe only because of how unfortunate the protagonists are and that not everything is always such Easy as the cinemaus

has madebelieve. One of my fears was how a play would be represented as theatrical as it is on

screen, since everything happens in a dozen scenarios, (created especially for the occasion thanks to the

bulky budget), where premium m� It's the dialogue that the sets, maybe that dialogue sometimes suffers

from expressions that, of course, do not stop being peculiarly beautiful, since they show in some

other time the brutality of some another character (the Larry played by the "" King Arthur "" Clive Owen).

We can travel in the film between very peculiar personalities, between the already commented brutality of Owen (maybe

the least I liked about him was his way of changing the answers, so quickly) , theinsecurity

youthfulof Alice / Jane (Natalie Portman) that reminds me of a certain person with whom I shared one year of my

life, the instability of Jude Law (neither with you nor without you have my ills remedy ) and the adult affirmation of

Julia Roberts, knowing full well that she wants at every moment, even if she ends up recovering from her sad

mistakes. One of those films that are not too strong and that currently has two gold balloons, one

for Portman and one for Owen, although perhaps, as a negative note is that brutal change of emotions in the

characters in some moments of footage. Closer, in a certain way real as life itself.

" 1

" In the end you have a film that is a good cinematographic adaptation of what was the television

series, technically impeccable, but that does not count anything, or at least nothing new, and that is

tremendously irregular in his narrative getting more than a yawn to the staff.

He recently read a story in which an American website had made a ranking with the best

films based on television series, among the top posts could be We can see The Untouchables of Eliot

Ness, El Fugitivo or Blues Brother, these days the adaptation of thebased seriesarrived on our screens

Miami-Miami Vice hasin the hands of one of its producers Michael Mann, who had already delighted us on

previous occasions with great action thrillers like Heat or the most recent Collateral. I do not know if this

movie could be on that list, I suppose so, seeing that in it we also find films like South

Park, or Ag�� Take it as you can, but the feeling that one has after seeing this Miami Vice, is somewhat

bittersweet. That is, the film is not bad, but at times it becomes heavy and boring, especially because of a

script that leaves a lot to be desired. Technically the film is impeccable, Mann's direction almost touching the

perfection, large general planes that look like postcards and where the viewer can not look away from

a boat crossing the sea or a car at full speed at night through the streets of Miami. In thesection

interpretivewe have everything, a great Colin Farrell who is benefited by a guide that focuses on his

character and the love story he has with the character of Gong Li, who would say who is 40

years old, the opposite happens with the blurred character played by a correct Jamie Foxx, the worst, and at the

risk of being accused of alleged phobias to the Spanish actors, is the ���actuation ���n? Luis Tosar, although I

must be honest I do not know if it was Luis Tosar or a wax figure of it, since his inexpressiveness reachesheights

unsuspected, he is supposed to speak but we can not see his mouth because of his abundant beard and his eyes seem do not

blink while it appears on the screen. And in general the whole film is very well done, the BSO is also

luxurious, I would say that even the best of the film, photography, and as we said the direction and the

interpretations, saving some exceptions are remarkable, but that's nothing more, the film has nothing, a

very well wrapped gift shit, the scenes of action are very few, few, a couple of them or three, that

if very well shot and very spectacular, but it is not enough. The film comes to bore greatly to the

viewer. In the end you get a movie that is a good cinematographic adaptation of what was

the television series, technically impeccable, but that does not count anything, or at least nothing new, and that is

tremendously irregular in his narrative getting more than a yawn to the staff.

" 0

" Artically is one of the best I've seen this year? but for the rest, the disappointment has been

tremendous.

Robert De Niro returns to the address after 13 years since the excellent "A History of the Bronx". With such a

remarkable predecessor, and the undoubted love and respect that I have for the actor, I can not lie if I say that I

felt to see? The Good Shepherd? I've tried to immerse myself in a spy story with the De Niro stamp. Much to my regret,

and after half an hour of film, I realize that artistically is one of the best I've seen this year? But for

the rest, the disappointment has been tremendous . I hope not to be the only one who thinks that this film follows the trail of

the biographical-historical works of Oliver Stone in? Nixon? or? JFK ?, or the type of? 13 days ?, and although the

supposed founder is not so famous, there is nothing more American than the CIA. The above, and others, are

tremendously visual works, and also tremendously political. For that reason, the narrative ballast, heavy,

cumbersome, and for the most part boring, is to be expected in other filmmakers, to whom I can forgive him more

than to Mr. De Niro. The director spends the first 50 minutes trying to explain the origin of the protagonist

and then not show a single action scene in the two hours remaining to finish. Therefore, I must

say that a 3-hour footage, without action, with excessive political information of the time, and a somewhatmontage

chaotic, I crave A CO���AZO. The story tells the foundation of the CIA, or so it seemed when I saw the

trailer. It is actually the story of Edward Wilson (Damon), a man who step by step, from aposition

lowerto the highest, helped to found the American Intelligence Center, but there is not a glimmer of emotion

in anything that this man does. De Niro has built a cold and calculating man that at times

leaves you in a state of mild drowsiness due to his repeated lack of "blood". His first years at Yale, which

I have plenty of, his first years as a spy, without a shot to take you to his mouth, and his subsequent ascension

Towards the dome, with that roll of bureaucratic plot, they show me that if this character existed, he mustdie

finallyof his own boredom. Apart from this is the parade of secondary ones that populate the film. Impress that

names like De Niro himself, William Hurt, Joe Pesci, Alec Baldwim, Michael Gambon or Billy Cudrup are

characters that barely manage to say more than ten sentences. Everything is focused on Damon, and that produces an overload

of the protagonist who does everything he can to fill the screen, and that if he had chosen another actor,

I do not really know if he had finished seeing it. If Angelina Jolie was another of the reasons for her viewing,

I am disappointed, since her presence is merely transitory, apart from the fact that the chemistry with Damon is null, null and

void. If this woman thought about retiring, for m��� she can do it already. Divided in two temporary sections, the film

confuses in many moments and ends up not contributing anything to the genre of espionage. A lot of conversation, a lot of

theory, a lot of politics, but little resolution. The life of the founder can be seen from the office, or from the house, or by

picking up telephones with a 1961 firewall, and I do not know if under the optics of an American the story will be

interesting, as if they would explain to us how the PSC was founded, but understand me if I tell you, I can not

stop thinking about Bourne, and how good it would have been to mix so much chatter with something m� ��s of tension,

which shines throughout the film by its absolute absence. Good performances, good artistic direction,

but horrible montage and horrible development. If De Niro had reduced the footage, he might have gone through

an interesting film, but with such slowness and parsimony, and with only three flashes of restlessness, he has only boring

me to swear that I I think twice about going back to see a film that told the glory and honor

of a public administration, no matter how tite Bobby directs it. It's going to be a great movie for the lovers of the

infinite footage political thriller, and I can not deny that as such it is the best for years and years, but

for me it has ended up being a tost���n, with an impeccable visual invoice, but at the end of the day tost���n.

" 0

" Nothing of boasting. Nothing gratuitous. We are seeing real men, fighting against themselves and the world.

Until February 15 we will have to wait to see in the Spanish cinemas the last film of Paul Thomas

Anderson, who already brought us that wonder called Magnolia, as well as the interesting ones. Extreme Punch Drunk Love

and Boogie Nights. On this occasion he has had Daniel Day-Lewis as the undisputed protagonist to speak to us,

once again, about human misery, a role that has won him the award of the Broadcast Film Critics

Association Awards.There will be blood tells us how Daniel Plainview is possessed by the idea of

competition, of being the best, the richest, not being able to stand that others shade him . Gold and silver

seeker converted into a petroleum tycoon, Plainview will go lower and lower to achieve his goals without

caring who he has to trample. more or less linear plot development, without great

excesses or extremely portentous turns, the story unfolds, as in the rest of Paulfilms

Thomas Anderson's, using the characters as foundations, as the main base and motor of the whole movie The

weight falls on them and they know how to take it very well. Daniel Day-Lewis is a true American of the nineteenth and

early twentieth centuries, hardened by force of pick and shovel. It exudes rudeness and cold blood. His accent and movements

are perfectly worked. In short, the one we see on the screen is not Day-Lewis, but Plainview. Very

consistent with his name (plainview, in English, it would signify direct vision), he advances without artifice through history,

making clear what he wants and that nothing will stop him until he achieves it . But there is always some obstacle, and in this

case the obstacle is none other than a young man who is a prophet of his own sect, The Third Revelation, incarnated

by Paul Dano. . Dano, whose best-known role to date was that of big brother in Little Miss Sunshine, isripeness

surprised by theof his performance, knowing how to stand up to Day-Lewis without any A problem,

balancing the interpretive balance perfectly. Maybe Paul Thomas Anderson has discovered a new

Edward Norton with this movie. The realization of the film is, without packaging, the one that asks for the story.-

Longterm plans, for the most part, nothing of syncopated editing, violence, when it appears, told withcoldness

exquisite, close and distant at the same time, without recreating but without forgetting it, as a necessary element m��� s.

Very studied frames and games with the internal counter-field in the moments of more intimacy or in the light of a

bonfire. No bragging. Nothing free. Here we are not seeing Giant, with the wonderful James Dean suffering

before our eyes because of misunderstanding. We are seeing real men, who could well be their grandparents, fighting

against themselves and the world. The rest of the elements perfectly support the development of the film, and they

magnify it. The photography of Robert Elswit, his usual collaborator from Sydney (1996), still without being too

spectacular, has great moments, especially when playing with high contrasts and low light. As for

the music of Johny Greenwood, he manages to create an atmosphere of almost hypnotic tension, playing withmovements

minimalistat times, with very present strings that almost suffocate the percussion they have base. There

was only one moment in the footage in which I thought it was not very accurate; the rest of the time, a real find. There

will be blood is a must for those who enjoy watching movies with more than shots and

explosions, films that have something to tell, a film in which Each element, each character, works with the

accuracy of a watchmaking machinery.

" 1

" His great triumph is to have raised the film as a plea without forgetting to make quality films

Dear Sir Edward Zwick: You do not know who I am and I surely do not get to know it never. I am just

a poor cynic who addresses you with the firm intention of offering you my sincere apologies.

Apologies that I think are necessary because, for months, I have maintained that you were not the right director to

carry out a project with such an attractive theme and actors. A few days ago, thanks to the kindness of

Warner Bros Espa� Laay the mediation of muchocine.net, I had occasion to see "" Blood Diamond "" (Blood Diamond).

My initial expectations, of finding myself with a correct film, lacking in strength, could not have been

more erroneous. I have always attributed to his films a lack of passion that, in my opinion, was necessary for

the stories he shows us: "" Legends of passion "" was halfway to the great work that should be Haberto have

been and the same, to a lesser extent because its script seems inferior to me, it could be said of "" The last samurai "".

Do not get me wrong, they are good movies, but they are not great movies. Instead, "" Blood Diamond ""? that's true

cinema. Ah��� I know you have shown all the passion that the film required. Perhaps his style is not

as striking and recognizable as that of Spielberg or Scorsese; you are more invisible to the viewer, but

this time he has given the best of himself and has been able to extract the best from the others (something very important in a

director). It is true that a great guide by Charles Leavitt helps him, who enters fully into the essence of the

matter to be dealt with, without wasting time on useless explanations. A guide that explains the characters to

perfection. A script without phrases of less or less. An almost perfect script to which, perhaps, only you have two

or three final pages (although I do not find it annoying). But let's not detrieve anything, you never know who

can be reading us. I congratulate you too, Mr. Zwick, because I think your actors have never been so good. The

three main actors are great actors and it is not difficult that they are well, it is true, but the meritorious thingnot

isthat they are good but how good they are. Djimon Hounsou and Leonardo DiCaprio are incredible, they live their roles

and they make us live, they fill the screen in an interpretive duel of height in which they stamped on our faces

how far a human being can reach, even if very different reasons. I would not like to leave out a

Jennifer Connelly, forgotten in this year's awards, who is as good as her companions and has a greater

role what I expected To make matters worse, his scenes with DiCaprio are pure chemistry, something very difficult to see

today in the cinema because it is usually forgotten that chemistry is something that comes from the brain, is the result of

intelligence and is not achieved simply by putting two bodies together and showing some skin. And you know it, your

screenwriter knows it, his actors know it; that is why DiCaprio and Connelly are sparking in that confrontation that they

maintain between the most radical pragmatism and the most combative idealism. I know I repeat myself but I can not find another

way of saying it: the actors of his film eat the screen. I could tell you about the wonderful picture

of Eduardo Serra, of the band sound of James Newton Howard, the striking sound or the montage of a Steven

Rosenblum that the third may win the Oscar; They are all very important in the creation of some

of the most memorable action scenes of the last few years. What would be very important to me? It's hard to explain to him, Mr. Zwick, it

's how exciting his film was, how heartbreaking and emotional some of his scenes are or to

what extent he enjoyed it. � and suffered at the same time, seeing this portrait of what we have done to Africa. All

this without having, at any time, the feeling that they were selling me a pamphlet. Because that success in

the initial approach is its great triumph: to have raised the film as an allegation without forgetting to

do what he has to do; Quality cinema. For all that, thanks Mr. Zwick and sorry again for my lack of

confidence. Sincerely: Jeremy Fox. PS: If you ask me for my opinion, I will give you your movie. He calculates 9.5 on 10.PD 2: I

know, he has not asked me for my opinion, but we are so presumptuous. 3 moonfleet.es can see the film's Spanish

script in case it is of interest.

" 1

" With this cast it was difficult to make a mess, but Walker gets it and introduces us to an Orson Welles who

looks like a bullous blower mainly and although he presents himself as a thriller, more It seems like a comedy

because the plot and the situations, if they are serious, are a tease.

One of the best scenes of Ed Wood is the dialogue between Vincent D? Onofrio and Jonny Depp. They recreated a

conversation between Orson Welles and Ed Wood in which Welles gave him this advice: Ed, it is worthwhile to realize

one's dreams. Why spend your life dreaming? Other people? If Welles had appeared in

some of his ways to Oliver Parker would have also dissuaded him from making this film and reading the script would

have killed him surely .Because Fused to black, he staged Mr. Welles who arrives in Rome recently

divorced from Rita Hayworth to shoot at the Cinecitt��� a B series movie at las Orders of a director of

series C. One of the actors dies in the shooting and Welles, turned into Jessica Fletcher of sal���no player

seasoned of Cluedo, is put to investigate the event. Adorn the plot a romance with the worst Paz Vega I've ever

seen playing an Italian actress who speaks English as I send. As a backdrop, a

subplot of political corruption with Christopher Walken, Diego Luna and even the hairdresser of the dreams of

many: Anna Galiena. Unexplained and that can be misleading. With this cast it was difficult to makemess

a, but Walker gets it and introduces us to an Orson Welles who looks like a bully blower

mainly and although he presents as a thriller, more like a comedy because the plot and situations,

if they are serious, are a tease. Perhaps exaggerated but I do not see where to take it, I thought a

sacrilege, I got angry and bored me more than I guess I got bored Melanie Griffith watching The Road of the

English. And for Welles movies: Citizen Kane and Thirst for evil. Anathema!

" 0

" The misconception is fat, but correctable in future movies. He leaves behind style, love for

details, and a firm pulse that speak of a good storyteller.

"" The night of the sunflowers "" is a film made of twists. The good turns are a veryreticent element

stimulating, because they involve the participation of the spectator. Each spectator constantly anticipates the

paths that can be followed of the plot, it does so because, without knowing it, each spectator is an expert in cinema, and

an authority in the matter of genres. When a turn is achieved the viewer has to recapitulate and realize

that their assumptions were wrong, the author has changed, without noticing it, the genre, the

theme, the focus, the protagonist or another element. Someone should write an essay about the turns, because, whether we

like it or not, the turns have their rules, and I suspect that S���nchez-Cabezudo has missed a very fat one. You

can not start a movie with an Anibal Lecter banquet and then turn our attention to atheme

studentlike that of a teenager who wants to pretend what he is not. There are themes too strong that

impress too much, and subjects that require too much inner peace to mix them in an omelette.

S���nchez-Cabezudo starts his movie with a heartless rapist, but it's a distraction, aelement

decorative, in fact, what he wanted was to talk about the prevarication .N The error is of conception, fat,

but correctable in future movies, behind leaves style, love for details, and a firm pulse that speak of

a good storyteller.

" 0

" Affordable cinema, denial of the cinema almost because it worries minimally about the usual conventions

of cinematography as art and lets itself be carried away by the spirit , by the word, by the theatrical .....

Ordet is not a film for those who do not have a certain commitment to the cinema as a vehicle ofsatisfaction

spiritual. I am not referring to the cinema as a transmitter of values ​​or to the cinema as a mere spectacle of the masses

moving in search of a purpose or the cinema as a caramelito to sweeten the Sunday mornings with the

familia.Ordet is evidence that miracles exist: that human behavior is adjusted to

spiritual standards and that there are directors who have sufficient sensitivity (and adequate mastery) to make

explicit minimal elements a philosophy, a metaphysics. The Borgen, a lovinglypeasant family

and politically correct, dedicates their life of bucolic retirement to fatality for a son obsessed with

religion. There is a resurrection that we do not know if he sticks to the effective reading of the word of God or to a

way out of dan���s Dreyer, who was a believer of tome and loin and wrote He scripts like someone who does a

pastoral or elevates his cntico so that God gives him a quarter and hears his reply. The father is thereligious reference

familyand in some way transmits to his older son those concerns: Johannes reads Kieerkegaard as a

handyman and believes, at times, Jesus Christ. Ordet (The Word) tells what we all feel

regardless of our moral affiliation. Mine, for others scant, if not, null, she let herself be carried by

Johannes's soft voice and allowed the flush of faith even for two short hours. . Having faith,

understand, does not obey strictly religious mandate or devotion. Nor does this review intend to make

an essay on the depths of the human soul. It is not the place and there is neither effort nor knowledge in the subject

to bring any thesis to any port. The faith that the Borgens profess, in general, is a utilitarian faith:

agreed to face the enemies. of the day, the hardness of the field, the pilgrimage that another world isbetter

probablyable to exist. The only one who really believes is the crazy, the enlightened, the voracious reader whoeverything

transmutesin blind obedience to the word. Dreyer films as if it were a theatrical representation: on

very few occasions, as far as I remember, a camera is a spectator sitting comfortably. It is theatrical cinema with no other

obstacle than the fluid dialogue of all the characters. This camera is the one that, nevertheless, also wanders through

the strict limits of a room when what in that room passes is relevant for the development of

the, on the other hand, very scanty (argumentatively) plot. There is a scene in which the doctor and Johannes are

enslaved in a heated theological discussion. One says that faith is the salvation of the world and the doctor,

burdened by his militant secularism, scientist, argues that the world will be saved by political action. ethics and

critical materialism. All that well stitched by the movement of the camera, which makes us get involved in an

absolute way in the thinking of each prag in this combat m���stico.El viewer of this film Cula is

aware that this cinema is out of all hierarchy: that more than cinematographic function is assisting

a moral revelation arranged as if it were a film, a reasoned and logical concatenation of frames. Who

has placed the cinema as a way of life must see Ordet at least once in life. This chronicler does not claim

that each spectator is invaded by the subtlety of his purpose. There will be who sees the numen and there will be who,

having it in front, does not perceive it. After all, I reason, faith is that. Either believe or do not believe. The cinema is

that: either you are inside or it just entertains you. The word, the verb, became llicious flesh, vortex of

ideas. Another aspect to consider is the beauty of the scenes that take place outside the walls: the wind shaking the

corn, the modest The very choreography of the clouds. These details confront the mental nature of the film (

religion, redemption, flesh, salvation, the miracle that we know that it will arrive at any moment) and

the secret order of the universe, which does not require morals, prayers or digressions to thrill. It is necessary to

insist on the halo of pure feeling that exhales the whole film. Dreyer is drunk with life. Ordet is an

absolute monument to cinema with capitals, a milestone, a true tribute to the moral nature of man

over his deviations, his sins and his erratic permanence in the world. Addenda: Ordet is an

extreme film in many ways. Or is considered a work of art, such is my opinion, or a co���azo, ajoke

heavy, an unbearable excess. If you do not see, as always happens, you can not comment, so say, b���squenla, give yourself

the pleasure of having candle in this funeral.

" 1

" To me, the truth, it has caused me a pleasant surprise to know that this saga still has something to

offer us.

Little could be expected from this franchise whose only (and shameless) objective was to squeeze the maximum out of the fever

for the adolescent magician. Little did he give us the first part, childish as few and, my opinion, rather

bland. The second, although darker, did not give us a great movie. And the third. Let's say that the third was a

"" inflection point "" for the saga. Suddenly appeared a man (known by all Alfonso Cuar���n) who took

many liberties with respect to the plot and meti��� (sometimes with shoehorn) a few scenes that,

although good, out of tune a bit. All the films of the young magician have good and bad things, but the

third had very good things (Alfonso Cuar���n showed us (and we returned it) ��� to demonstrate with the magnificent "" Children

of Men "") that he was a director like a pine tree and he gave us a magnificent scene, the one of the trip to the

past) and things tremendously bad (the production design left a lot to be desired, as well as the

script). The fourth, although it took liberties with respect to the original plot of the book, it was a

pleasant and entertaining film, alone, uniquely and exclusively that. Entertaining. That's why you could expect very little from

this fifth installment of Harry Potter. Imagine my surprise when today, in a press release in Madrid, the film

offered me � more (in fact a lot more) than I expected. Only the appearance of the Warner logo

already makes it clear that the film is going to be much darker than the others. The logo, like the title, appears in a

whitish mist, and in the background, what seems to be the prophecy. The movie starts with Harry in the park and the

discussion n with Dudley. This scene serves more to remind us of the end of the fourth than for something else. And then the movie

starts. Since the attack of the Dementors the film takes a frenetic pace without pause. Although a

lot of details have been omitted (and some really important, such as the fact that Petunia remembered

the Dementors) the film ���cula offers us the best scenes of the book with complete coherence (something that was missing in

an alarming way in the third and fourth). The arrival at Grimauld Place is curious, and in just 6

minutes we are condensed what happens before arriving at Hogwarts without missing much

. Once we arrive at Hogwarts we are presented quickly and in a very concise way to Dolores Umbridge, with

an exaggerated personality with respect to that of the book. The army of Dumbledore gains importance with

respect to the book and is very faithful to the idea of ​​the book, even, the change of "" traitor "" with respect to the book is

totally congruent with a couple of new small details. Everything continues its c Normal urso until we reach the

end. To the battle of the ministry. From the arrival to the prophecy room until the end David Yatesus

showsthat, although with little experience, he knows a lot about this. In fact, the whole scene that takes place in the

Ministry is frankly superior to any scene in the saga. Spectacular, dark and emotive. From the attack

of the Death Eaters in the prophecy room, the battle in the veil room and the battle of Dumbledore and

Voldemort. Frankly a few minutes that make the entry already worthwhile. The final scene of Dumbledore and

Harry is very short and explanations are conspicuous by their absence, although probably those who have not read

the novels will not throw them in lack. Without any doubt the "" guilty "" that this delivery is whatever it is David

Yates. The man faces the challenge of adapting the book longer and with more details with enthusiasm and enthusiasm (something

that Mike Newell lacked in my opinion), but above all with talent. I do not even want to think about the

damage that could have taken place if another director had been at the head of this film. Yates

gives us a very good job behind the scenes making Some moments are more emotional despite the fact

that the film has a devilish rhythm (too much for some). Highlight the amazing work that takes

place at the end of the film, especially with the battle of Voldemort and Dumbledore. A scene that, although in the

book works very well, it was very difficult to work in the same way in the film. Taking some

elements of the book (the snake, the bubble of water.), David, gives us an entertaining scene with

personality, a palpable personality throughout all the footage. The Gui���n on this occasion In charge of

Michael Goldenberg, who had only written 3 scripts before this, although it is not magnificent, is correct.

Goldenberg, unlike Steve Kloves, synthesizes the dialogues, not the plot. What I want to say, is that

Kloves was more likely to erase scenes. Goldenberg does not, since almost all the scenes in the book are in the

film, but, in return, he has eaten a lot of details, for example, and maybe the mistake m�� Itunforgivable

isthat at no time is the name of the person who pronounced the prophecy or the one who

heard it revealed (yes, I know it may sound strange but ���). Another totally different world are the actors. As arule

general, say that the characters, with respect to the book, have very few changes and are very well captured on theDaniel

screen.Radcliffe, Harry Potter: although he improves his performance with respect to the "" C� ��liz de Fuego "" (although he did

not directly act there) is not that it is to throw rockets, but perhaps, and the most surprising thing is that, in thesection

final, his performance At no time is it strident, although, during the footage "" he enjoys "" a couple of moments that

throws to the ground any theory that keeps him acting in conditions. As I said, his role in the last section,

is more than passable (and there may be some who say he does it well). Although there is a moment, during the possession of

Voldemort, that. Well, the truth, nobody could have released that speech with so little grace. Emma Watson,

Hermione Granger: even if she is unfairly labeled as a bad actress, anyone who understands a bit of the

subject can not deny that he embodies his character in a brilliant way. Watson returns to give us acharacter

tremendously charismaticwith the new nuances that Hermione presents in the fifth book. Rupert Grint, Ron

Weasley: although with a little less prominence than usual, the case of Rupert is exactly like the

of Watson, in fact, of the protagonist trio, Emma and he are the ones who approve with more note, since Radcliffe,

although improved, does not reach the level of these two.Michael Gambon, Albus Percial Wulfric Brian Dumbledore: As

always, Gambon is superb. But more than talking about the work of Gambon I would like to talk about his character,

a character who suffered a terrible change of personality and was turned into a clown in "" The Prisoner of

Azkaban " "and that I was somewhat stunned in" "El C���liz de Fuego" ". Here, Dumbledore, again resemblesDumbledore

Richard Harris's, albeit with his minor modifications so as not to be too strident with respect toRalph

the previous ones.Fiennes, Lord Voldemort: without a doubt the best of the tape. Those who did

not like Fiennes' theatricality in "" El C���liz de Fuego "" will have to swallow the words this time. Since

the appearance of Voldemort in the film is frankly wonderful. Those effects of smoke onface

Voldemort'sgive the character the necessary strength to star in the best scene of the saga. A scene (I

mean the fight) where Fiennes does not make as much fuss as he did in the fourth. Although I did not think that Yates

was going to surprise me, he did, and one of the causes is Lord Voldemort, who, as you will see, is better than ever.

Imelda Staunton, Dolores Jane Umbridge: bad, twisted, sadistic. that's the character thatgives us

Staunton. Although, as I have already mentioned, something more exaggerated (mainly because in this installment it was more

necessary to outline the characters as soon as possible), but Umbridge after all. And that I was one of those

who did not want it on paper. Gary Olman, Sirius Black: although it does not appear too much, Black appears as necessary

for the end to make sense. Oldman offers us his talent in an outstanding way as the godfather of

Harry Potter and looking better than in "" the Prisoner of Azkaban "", where, in a couple of moments he overreacted a little.

Evanna Lynch, Luna Lovegood: without a doubt, they could not have chosen someone better, and that is that Evanna is

Luna, at first it may seem something more crazy than normal (or at least in Original Version it seems), but

according to the film advances, we find a very faithful portrait of Luna. Also highlight the role of

Luna in the film, as we were many who feared that it ended up being a flat character, but no, they

devote their time and ends up being a character taken directly from the book.Now let's move on to the characters with

less footage and lesser importance in general lines. Alan Rickman (Severus Snape) great, as he was in

the first, in the second, in the third and in the fourth. In this installment, Rickman shows us a more

serious and "" violent "" face of Snape, especially in the scenes of Occlumency. The character of Filch remains in the

same line as in "" the C���liz de Fuego "", since it is used as buf���n, but not in such a sad and

degrading way for the character as it was with the fourth film, where the character of Filch was mistreated.

Here Filch is taken directly from the pages of the book and stars in some of the best gags. Neville

has less prominence than expected, and although it tells us the misfortune of his parents and the motivations of

Neville to improve does not have as many minutes on screen as for example Luna.Tonks, something bland, although the

viewer congenia quickly with the character of Natalia Tena, appears very little and his name appears named

only in a couple of occasions.Lupin appears little pulling for nothing and walks for a couple of moments

on the screen without too much ���xito.Bellatrix, although it does not enjoy great prominence, is well profiled,

enough for you to hate, and Helena a great job (and he has a pipe) playing this

woman who is truly crazy. Trellewney is a little more out of the ordinary than usual, and much more disadvantaged

than she was in the third movie a, although, as I said, the character is faithful to the book. And now,

ending with others who are "behind the scenes": Nicholas Hooper, a great unknown in the world of

Sound Bands that break into the scene with a very good soundtrack that delights during the

film, giving a lot of strength to some moments. The special effects are frankly impressive, and

all The Ministry scene is what it is, in part, thanks to the magnificent special effects. Highlight

Grawp (which by the way is very, very good) and the effects of smoke (attention to the battle of the veil) in

the Death Eaters, in the Order of F���nix and in Voldemort. Another outstanding aspect is the brilliant work of theteam

Production Design. They do an incredible job, from the new and fascinating creatures of the world of the

child magician to the Ministry's sets, frankly impressive. To me, the truth, it has caused me a

pleasant surprise to know that still This saga has something to offer us.

" 1

" Killer sheep is part of a horny idea that is not taken advantage of and that positions the

final product as a mere anecdote, a film more than B series of the mont.

Obligatoryly, you have to leave your brain at home and also go with the cinema to enjoy

the projection of this film. He is not able to surprise or show originality at any time and

manages to approve because he more or less offers what he promises, although always without going beyond imitating with a

gifted talent films of the same genre. Jonathan King has renounced fear and suspense and opted

for the traditional gore with cosmic dyes, so we can enjoy the spread of viscera,

mutilations and laugh with some jocular moments, but above all we can comment and tell us, for that

to be accompanied, how bad the film is in itself. Also, if it tires us, we can play to try to hit

that another film reminds us of this scene and where we already saw this other one, because the certain thing is that "" Thesheep

killer"" turns out to be quite boring in numerous occasions in spite of its restrained footage.references

Explicitto the great and also New Zealander "" Braindead "" by Peter Jackson, moment of fight and avionics

"" Indiana Jones "" and so one after another Killer sheep part of a horny idea that is not taken

advantage of and that positions the final product as a mere anecdote, a film more series B of the mont.

" 0

" Rightly, bad. Fun vomit. Absolutely great. Robert Rodr���guez leaves us one of those

lies that always contributed to enlarge the cinema.

Rightly, bad. Fun vomit. Absolutely great. The exact point in which the impossible,,

an���malovulgar and absurd converge on the counter of the fisherman, to unleash that other way of

understanding the cinema that is the series B. Without doubt, the film A film that only Robert Rodr���guez could conceive,

understand and film, without fear of losing his prestige as a filmmaker. The Grindhouse project is a tribute to the American

cinemas that, in the seventies and eighties, they projected low budget films. Those

who, according to Robert Rodr���guez, "" had good ideas, but lacked the means to materialize "". I imagine that the

same people who, later on, began to populate the first video-club Albacete, to which I was assiduous. It is

composed of two films, the one we are discussing today and Death Proof by Quentin Tarantino, among whichare inserted

four fictional trio of non-existent films, signed by regular directors of the film. ���nero, like Eli

Roth, Rob Zombie and Edgar Wright, and by Rodr���guez himself. Actually, the invention is not new, nor when it

comes to making a parody of the films of terror, see (or better, no) the stupid saga of Scary Movie; nor

when a tribute to double sessions is proposed. Recall that in 1978 Stanley Donen Rod��� Movie, Movie,

formed by two other films, a drama that revolves around a boxer, title Hands of Dynamite, and a

musical called ��� The Beauties of Baxter, 1,933; precisely, to honor the double sessions of the cinema

of the 1930s. In countries such as the United States, Great Britain and Australia, the Grindhouse lot premieres

completely; in the rest of the world, it is divided, because "" we would not understand this type of format "". When the truth

is that, to understand, we even understand that we will have to pay double for what others have acquired in a two

for one, and that, with the excuse of its long duration, we try to justify its resounding failure of

In this way, and waiting for the passionate pursuit of cars thathistory promises

Tarantino's, we are left with the genius written, directed, photographed, assembled and "" musicalized "" by Robert

Rodr��� guez, the idea that only he could conceive, understand and film, and that will keep the spectator out of orbit

since the appearance of Machete, unspeakable in X version, until the culminating moment in which ago-g���

discoshoots with a machine gun that carries a false leg. At all times, Planet Terror pretends to

be a film of B-series horror, and it gets it thanks to the digitalization effects that simulate the

celluloid of damage, with frames that are striped and speckled, with the loss of color and sound,

flavored by a hellish montage, if interested. In the same way, both the argument, based on

improvised heroes who fight against an army of zombies, and the characters, pursue the same objective;

arriving at the loss of the roll number 4, quese that in the Spanish cinema never would have been lost. But in the midst of

that poor quality soundtrack, of that impossible photograph, of its repetitive and intentionallydialogues

painful, of the indecent ambience that recreates supposed exterior shots captured under the economic shortage. ���mica,

emerges "" the useless talent number 12 "" to give way to a brilliant script, a careful assembly andeffects

specialthat have little to do with the Grindhouse that is honored. In front of the typical scenes extracted from

those unforgettable movies, decidedly bad, that we loved so much in other times, in which "" the

good "", of a look Vacuate, was retained when trying to save the world, and the wire of an electric saw

always unplugged to avoid the massacre; we find the summit sequence that George Romero films in 1968,

the achievement of a van to flee the infected, and the gasoline pump that explodes in the

air. We also recognize in the blue eyes, injected with blood, of indescribable tears, of theblonde

frightened(Marley Shelton), the situations that Giorgio Ferroni invented for Teresa Gimpera (The Night of The

Devils, 1972). To configure the the rest of the cast, as the producers of The Night of theDead did

Living, but for different reasons; Rodr���guez gets surrounded by his closest surroundings. From some of their

relatives (their son and their nieces, the kangaroo twins), from the members that make up the technical team (the

veteran make-up artist Tom Savini), and from their collaborators and friends, leaving the leading roles for

actors that come from television series, Rose McGowan (Charmed) and Freddy Rodr���guez (A two meters

underground). Interesting is to check the insistence shown by Tarantino, the last of the classics, by Ava

Gardner. It may be true, that "" the goals are going to force when we talk about them "", but it is a fact

that the witch-submachine gun is already an innate of the fantastic genre, and that Robert Rodr���guez not only removes a

thorn when rolling a zombie, but that it leaves us one of those lies that always contributed to enlarge the

cinema.

" 1

" Scenes of a beautiful plasticity, as well as other more raw, make up this work, in which the

combats move between the slow camera and other tricks , which will delight all

fans of the best movies. A film that nobody should miss.

Finally it has reached our screens "" 300 "", another graphic novel by Frank Miller, which becomes

images, after the exceptional "" Sin city "" by Robert Rodr���guez .Zack Snyder, who dazzled us with "" Dawn of

the Dead "", returns to get people behind him, and he is already being called director of worship.

The argument of "" 300 "" is simple, Le���nidas, king of Sparta, goes together with three hundred warriors to defend the

imminent attack of the Persian troops of Xerxes. For this, and before the abysmal numerical difference of the troops, it

goes to a strategic point of its geography, the passage of the Term���pilas. From here, and with other lines

in the middle, Le���nidas and theirs, offer us spectacular battles, showing us that the

Spartan warriors are made from another pasta, ym���sa���n, when we see the rituals to which they are subjected in

their youth. Snyder and Miller give us the possibility, together with the technical and visual effects, of seeing a new

way of making films and of capturing that particular vision. Scenes of a beautiful plasticity, as well as other

more raw, make up this work, in which the combats move between the slow motion and other

tricks, which will delight all fans of the best movies. There are other details to highlight, such

as the cast, headed by Gerard Butler (Lenidas), Lena Headey (queen Gorgo) and David Wenham, who

returns after such films portray F ramir in "" The Lord of the Rings "." One negative is the

excessive mannerism King / Lord of the Persians, Xerxes, played by Rodrigo Santoro, who, besides the

negative dubbing , we are shown in some somewhat comical situation, in which the Spartan king turns his

back on him, while this dominator from the east, puts his hands on his shoulders and releases a pearl of

dialogue. Except this, and some creature that could be more accomplished, see the Spartan hunchback, the

costume design, the artistic direction and especially the image and visual style achieved, make "" 300 "" a

film that no one should miss.

" 1

" After for me a more than brilliant first delivery and a loose, floj���sima second, little desire I had

to go through the box office to view this third part.

After for me a more than brilliant first delivery and a loose, floj���sima second, little desire I had to

go through the box office to view this third part, it had to be my wife, maybe moved by the campus

of pretty faces (Clooney, Pitt, Damon.) who almost dragged has led me to see this third installment, which

attemptscombine evenly and with little skill, moments already seen in the previous two installments, and is

not we cheated "" Ocean's 13 "" is not more than a rehash of everything previously seen, Pitt,

. CloneyDamon and Cia. are as always, nor m��� s no less, Pacino (although only his presence is already a reason to pay without

protesting the 6.5? entry), is restrained (and extremely folded), Andy Garcia linear and simplÃ���ny and perhaps

the The only breath of hope is in Ellen Barkin and not because of her intepretation, but because of how well she keeps (and

how sexy she is). ) with its 50 and so springs. In this third part the crew of Danny Oceans returns to the

vegas, perhaps and with the permission of NY one of the biggest (and most real) movie sets, in the middle of the street,

and that is that, there are so many series and movies set in that small plot of the Nevada desert, that

one can not avoid a touch of sweetness, and something like healthy envy to see These celluloid stars

go through places that the server can only dream of. I can not say that I loved it (it would lie), nor that it will be a

tape that I hate (it would also be missing). to the truth), although I have had moments that moved by a copious

meal and the cold freshness that we live in Madrid right now, I have been about to bend the backbone and

drop into the arms of Morpheus; that each one understands what he wants.

" 0

" Excellent suggestive and honest portrait of the England of the 80's. We see the progressivematuration

personal and culturalof a 12-year-old boy that will lead to a change in innocence to experience.

Excellent portrait suggestive and honest of the England of the 80's. Under the context of the depressed

English political situation, where the war in the Maldives has ended a few months ago and Margaret Thatcher

continues ruling with an iron hand, a 12-year-old child feels welcomed by a peculiar group of young people of

the skinhead movement that at that time began to spread in the neighborhoods of England. The British director

, very committed to the story, has managed to perfectly reflect the life of a rejected child in

school and accepted by a skinhead group. Pure English social cinema quite removed from what we are

accustomed to the always controversial Ken Loach. Divided in two parts, a first mÃscÃmica and made to

perfection after a brilliant presentation of the characters, and a second that nests too much in the drama and

social realism to affect the sensitive vein of the viewer; maintains the interest thanks to the simplicityunravels

with which the director graduallyall the elements of the film and at the same time we see the progressive

personal and cultural maturation of a 12-year-old boy that will lead to a change from innocence to experience.

He is accused of the absence of some important characters facing the end of the film where his

story disappears and we do not know anything more about them; as well as the figure of the mother, who goes on

tiptoe in front of the physical and psychological transformation of her son. Special mention deserves the small actor

Thomas Turgoose (winner of the Best Newcomer Award in 2006 at the British Independent Awards) who makes

his film at all times and a -too-overtaken Stephen Graham as a racist skinhead.radiography

Social and humanfull of drama, with a strong and crude panorama of the England of the eighties.

Excellent ambience, music and interpretation for a film that will appeal to those interested inissues

socialand their human background. With some of the best initial credit titles I've seen this last

year (as well as the music that runs through the entire film), This is England, deserved winner of the Best Film

award at the British Independent Awards, becomes a real treat for the senses and one of the 15

best films of 2007.

" 1

" T�� This is a typical Christmas-family film for Christmas, with a slightly clumsy father who will have to win the

love of his son by showing him that he is responsible and hardworking.

We are at the beginning of the year and we have the first megataquillazo with us. Night at the Museum, which here in

Spain has had relatively great public success, can not be compared to the success it has had in the

US, where its collection It has surpassed 200 million dollars, which makes it the first major

Blockbuster of the year. Also, it must be said that there was a Christmas break, whichboosted me

definitely, and I do not understand how in Spain and in other places not the They also premiered on those dates,

because almost certainly the collection would be even twice what they have achieved. Let's not cheat, Night at

the Museum is a children's film, with all the topicazos children and aimed at a public that is not

demanding and is satisfied with (almost) anything. He directs Shawn Levy, a director who has

behind him, attentive to the impressive curriculum: Reci���n married, Twelve at home and finally thathorror

unclassifiablethat is The Pink Panther. It is clear that I would have to accept with some film that would

be of minimal interest to the public, and it is on this occasion that it has succeeded. With such a huge box office,has already been

a second part of the filmsecured (totally unnecessary), apart from the fact that its name is associated with

large projects that had previously been vetoed, as is even more so. nor less than the direction (although I'm

hoping that will destroy) a Flash adaptation to the big screen (God !!!). as for the

pel This is the typical child-family film of Christmas, with a father who is a little clumsy,

who will have to earn the love of his son Demonstrating that he is responsible and hard-working, going to work in

the Museum of Marras, in which, by a curse, everything in the Museum comes alive at night. In the

middle, some bad guys, try to moor the museum, but hey, I do not tell you more because if not the

film can lose the little grace that in itself account. The script, flat as the map of the world before the

discovery of America by Columbus, without any surprise, with a super-super-final end, but that to the

smallest of the home you will love it, since in what stands out this film is in more than efficient

Special Effects. So, throughout the footage, we will find ourselves roaming the halls of the Museum

from a Tyranosaurus Rex, to Lions and monkeys, passing by a figure of Easter Island and even a

Genghis Khan quite come, the truth The absolute protagonist, Ben Stiller, bad actor where they are,

but I do not know how he manages to always aim at some blockbuster like this one that concerns us. His

performance in the same tone as always, same face, many exaggerated grimaces, and nothing more. I think wenever

'llsee him picking up an Oscar. They went to Stiller Carla Gugino, the only thing that could be saved from the whole movie, and although she

has a rather small role, she is correct as she is. its technique in all its interpretations. Also appear

there, Mickey Rooney and Dick Van Dyke, I think that more as a tribute than anything else, but hey, even

next to Stiller prove to be a lot better than ��� l as actors, even their years. Another two who do not

miss the foll���n are Robin Williams, playing a stiff Teddy Roosevelt, and how could it be less,

the almost boyfriend Stiller's official, Owen Wilson, having a great time as a cowboy of the West, with little

interpretation to highlight. In short, an entertaining film that will delight the youngest of the house and

to all those who still keep the child that they have inside, but that horrifies the rest of the people who

can go confused thinking that they will see something more than what can be seen in the tr���iler

" 0

" It really is a film mess, like most of the time of the uncovering, but it is still a

reference and a portrait of Spain at the time. In addition to a great love, keep a place of honor in my

collection of movies.

I have always said that in the matter of cinematographic criticism there are two parts: the first, the one that

based on objective criteria issues a verdict; and the second is that regardless of the correction

or discrepancy with respect to the usual precepts, it assesses the final result of the production, assessing the

effect it produces on the spectators and that is oriented towards a specific public that changes according

to the time and the situation. Well, once these points are clarified, and in reference to the film "" Los

Bingueros "", I have no choice but to comment on its development: It is one of the films that I marked My childhood and

I still keep it recorded on VHS, because even being a person little fond of the chemical genre, I can not help

but squirm every time I remember concrete scenes of it , and undoubtedly it is much more ingenious

at times than the multimillion-dollar productions that are exported to the world today with portentous campaigns. The

image of two picturesque beings such as Pajares and Esteso, beautifully escorted by the inimitable Ozores is

something that anyone will keep in their retinas for the remains. It really is a film mess, like most

of the time of the uncovering, but it is still a reference and a portrait of Spain at the moment, and certainly , an

opportunity to enjoy a moody and simplistic humor, but of greater ingenuity than the one that today offers us.

In addition to a great love, keep a place of honor in my collection of movies.

" 0

" Will like half the fans, and disappoint the other half. It will excite those of easy laughter, and

above all it will be very enjoyable for the smallest of the house. Lucky.

Do not deny that The Simpson is one of the best series that has given birth to television in its history.

Neither will deny the good times that have made me pass this yellow family throughout my life. One of

its great strengths is that the great majority of chapters would not stop seeing them (believe me, it's a certainty: Antena 3

has been testing us for millennia.). But the series is not having a good time, as far as the quality

of its scripts is concerned. The plots are more and more silly, the jokes are getting bad, and the

characters lose charisma and bellows as the seasons go by. And right at this moment,lands

the film of the seriesin cinemas around the world, ready to make a hole among the top grossing

of the summer (because that's what it was conceived for). And it shows , it is quite noticeable in the quality of the product that theyus

offerthe moment in which this one has arrived. The Simpsons: The film, it has seemed to me very anecdÃtica and unreal. A

moderately funny and entertaining delivery, which fortunately does not offend or deceive anyone, but exaggeratedly

light in comparison with the chapters of the golden age of the Simpson family on television. .N A few

hahaha, jijiji, many others pffff for the -more abundant- bad jokes, and the occasional smirk,

caused more than anything by the grace that makes you see some estimable characters in the series on the big screen

. But that's it. Someone else lucky gag and antol���gico (Spider-Pig, Bart's integral nude in

skateboard, the credits of beginning and end.), And stop counting. It will taste half the fans, and disappoint

the other half. It will excite those of easy laughter, and above all it will be very enjoyable for the smallest of the

house. Lucky. It is appreciated that it is a film, and that it is not the feeling that you are watching aepisode. It is

stiff and longalso grateful that you are ��� about the average quality of the series, and

that it is, to a certain extent, worthy of it, but one has not been able to avoid that strange sensation bittersweet when leaving

the cinema. and forget much of what was seen after five minutes.

" 0

" Dreamgirls, more than a story with musical numbers, is a succession of songs with a certaininfill

plotbetween them.

Like all the years, in the months of January and February, the Most favorite films for the Oscars

meet their appointment with the Spanish cinemas. Although this time several of the most nominated films were

released in the course of the natural year, as Infiltrados, La Reina, Pequena Miss Sunshine or Babel. What is

almost inescapable is that among the favorites there is a musical, or in any case a biopic (biographical film)

musical, and Dreamgirls is the example of this season. Dreamgirls is based on a musical of Broadway virtually

forgotten, which in turn was freely inspired by the journey of the musical group The Supremes and its leader,

Diana Ross. Bill Condon was very impressed by this musical, and tanned in the genre after theguide

Chicago, undertakes his film adaptation. The Dreamettes is a group formed by three friends who want to

succeed in music, and by chance, are hired to do the choirs of James "" Thunder "" Early

(Eddie Murphy). From there they will make the leap to stardom, but soon the egos and fighting will begin

. The musical is one of the cinematographic genres that raises more passions, both among its

fans and among its detractors, and therefore there will always be someone who praises the virtues of

Dreamgirls (in his right is). But honestly, Dreamgirls, more than a story with musical numbers, is

a succession of songs with a certain plot filling between them. Some of the musical numbers are fine

made, but they end up becoming unbearable soon after, even for the most acrimonious lover of the genre. A

lack of rhythm and a more than excessive duration do the rest. This is a film made as a means of

showing off the great diva Beyonc��� Knowles, to which triumph in music is not enough, as well as the new

American media star , Jennifer Hudson, winner of the American Idol. The sad reality is that

Beyonc���, whose vocal talent is questionable, hardly has lines of dialogue in all the footage, and in the few

that she has, she demonstrates her total inability to interpret. The next Oscar-winning Jennifer Hudson, aka the

"triumph", although it does not reach the ends of the Knowles, does not fall short, performing ainterpretation

flat, lacking in feeling or emotion. n. Eddie Murphy is in his usual line, while the only one who

performs a real interpretive work, and also good, is Jamie Foxx. There will be more than one spectator, who will

stand before such a cluster of disproportions, will throw themselves on the floor in despair, shouting things like someone

I tear my eyes! or whispering to your seat mate please, kill me now and put an end to my ordeal. The

question is why Milln a filmmaker who has made Gods and Monsters can fall so low ?, doubt

that could never be resolved.

" 0

" Fascinating exercise of introspection between the crespuscular western and the melodrama ... A Masterpiece of

Cinema.

Road movie: the sun burns the head of Travis, who wears a ridiculous hat and a sad andexecutive

disheveledsuit. He does not know who he is: like almost everyone. He is alone and fatigue the desert stripped of heroism, unaffected

by that typical virile of those who return from nothing, from hell, to solve the unknowns that did not clear

before the leakage. Hell is also the city and the neon of his dreams: Travis, an unbelievable Harry Dean

Stanton, is a John Wayne amn���sico, a peaceful gunman that seeks the reward stuck in the tree, thattype

taciturn, burned by a coarse and pathetic life, but conjured to meet again and to gather the threads

that he did not knot and that still They are agitated, oblivious to the biography of their owner, by the cancerous wind of the Texas

desert. Erratic, does not travel the earth, does not occupy paths and paths , mischievous motels ofroads

secondaryand abysmal landscapes that seem not to comfort the view never: what Travis does is to walk

in, to discover in his stajanovista a journey of pure citizen and fascinated by the uncertainty of not knowing.

��� Or is it that we, apparently sane and master of our destiny, know who we are? Film scarcely

dialogued except in its final section when the words are really accurate. Before, during the journey of

Travis towards his redemption, the images speak, which are portentous as we have rarely seen infilms.

recentAround, like a mantle of serenity, the music by Ry Cooder, a fascinating soundtrack that

marries perfectly with the story of losses and failures, of chance and forgiveness that Sam Shepherd, a

very unjustly underrated author, It adapts so that Wenders makes his best film. A Masterpiece of Cinema.

" 1

" I miss more disturbance capacity, more cinematographic claw. But it's not about asking for pears in the

elm, and it's about making us spend almost two hours entertained.

Mystery, magic and romance wrapped in a supernatural halo is what promises "" The illusionist "". In addition, his

cast is very attractive: Edward Norton, Jessica Biel and Paul Giamatti. ���Ummmm! The time in which it takes place, that

Vienna of intresiglos in 1900, arouses a certain fascination. And more like the setting of a story (another one this

year, after "" The young woman of the water "", "" Pal���ndromos "", "" The labyrinth of the faun ""?), Inspired by the pen, orkeyboard

computer, of a Pulitzer Prize, Steven Millhauser. ���M���s ummmmm! Our charming prince is not of such a

lineage without a humble condition, and more solitary and reserved. He is known as the wizard Eisenheim (Edward

Norton) and his tricks are so spectacular that he seems to have allied with the same supernatural forces.

Now he will use all his tricks to get the woman he loves, a forbidden lady (Jessica Biel) who

belongs to a superior class. And it will be rivaling with, this one, a prince (Rufus Sewell). Everything looks

great! But I'm still waiting for some intrigue that is worth remembering, and the footage that is based

on an idea too stretched. Film and characters advance functionally and in many cases,

why, why does the script say so. Neither the final outcome is surprising, because it is easy toand Giamatti

guess.Norton���qu��� are great! It is then when one realizes that the authentic vocation of the film �cula directed by

Neil Burger, forged in the realization of? Spots ?, is just to entertain and point. Nor does he try to make

history in the cinema. And "" The illusionist "" fulfills his goal, being thankful that no character is

really as good or as bad as he seems, not even that ogre in the form of pr�� �ncipe who plays Sewell.The

best of the function, undoubtedly, are the actors, especially Edward Norton and Paul Giamatti incarnatinginspector

the policeUhl, a representative of the Law that is torn between his two duties : the one to entertain thepower

establishedand the one to stay enntegro in the performance of its position. For the rest, the romantic plot between the

arist���crata Sophie and the prestigious plebeian does not stop following the trite scheme of "" boy meets

girl; boy loses a girl and, you know, it is expected that boy recovers again the girl "". Only illusions

���pticas.And I questioned that some of the tricks of magic that Eisenheim staged were really

possible, with that verismo, for the time, although in 1900 and began to develop the illusions � Optics that would

engender cinema. The same film uses the technique of "autocrhome", created by the Lumière brothers at the

end of the 19th century, whose chromaticism is m It is soft, less contrasted and therefore closer to black and white,

which allows to equip the photo and production design with a certain layer of unreality according to the

spirit of the film and its ambientaci���n.Interesante, and m���sa���n taking into account that history creates expectations

with moments such as the (alleged) appearances of M�� ���s All��� or an exhibition by Eisenheim that recalls

the legend of Arturo.But the staging of Neil Burger does not stop being very discreet. I miss more

capacity for disturbance, more cinematographic claw. But it's not about asking for pears to the elm, and if we

spend almost two hours entertaining, we will take it for granted, but?

" 0

" Mar���a Antonieta is really sensual. This movie is a kind of trance that absorbs you. Seduce more than

what convinces. At the same time it brings you closer and distances you from the real and the imagined.

Marie Antoinette is really sensual. It may not be historically correct but that's the

Sof���a Coppola version. It is a feast for the senses. The soundtrack hits the tone, ironically contrasted filming

in Versailles, which is spectacular. It achieves a trance of false authenticity. Of what may have never been but

in some way we can imagine. The exuberance, the costumes, the cakes. This movie is a kind of

trance that absorbs you. Seduce more than what convinces. At the same time it brings you closer and distances you from the real and the

imagined. It only lets you hear from afar what is told in the corridors. Loose phrases in annarrative

indirectthat is more atmospheric than shoes and laces. It allows between seeing this court that isolated from the

world and at the same time privacy does not even exist in the bedroom. It navigates between commitment and pleasure. It is

an experience that you could immerse yourself in. L sinrica without being sentimentalist. Exuberant if exaggerated. Taste

for my palate.

" 1

" With hardly any action and with special effects that have been more expensive than visual, the narrationus

showsa melting pot of melodramatic comics that have a clear follet flavor .N A real disaster.

I have warned you.

That third parties are hardly good is something that, surely, almost all of us think. That a lot of money is not

always synonymous with a good product, we checked it every week and another one on the billboard of our

cinema. That a film based on a comic only fulfills the function of entertaining is an axiom. But it is that no matter how

much you try to justify it, the last film of Sam Reimi can only be defined as a boring and

pathetic story that will disappoint both lovers of the superh ���roe as those who, without being sympathetic to

it, enjoyed the two previous sagas.Since hardly action and with special effects that have been

more expensive than visual, the narration n shows us a hodgepodge of melodramatic comic strips that have a clear

flavor to follet���n. And do not think that the director has had a bit of decency and he has only kept us quiet for

ninety minutes, none of that, more than two hours of unbearable torture! During the succession of anesthetic

events will appear two new characters based on the original comic (Poison and Sandman),

however, as happened with the main character (Peter Parker), these distanced ���n quite between the

paper and the screen.All this is the bizarre transformation that Spider-Man undergoes in the hands of the

alien: he gives to listen to music Discus and believe Benny Hill. Awesome, right? In short, an

authentic disaster. I have warned you.

" 0

" Ideal for a quick consumption and, incidentally, remove some conscience, between popcorn and popcorn. Years ago the cinema abandoned that id miradalic look of ��� Africa, that of a well of mystery and mysticism, and that of

a fascinating continent with great open spaces and landscapes full of exoticism and dangers. It was the

adventurous and romantic Africa that, from the seventies and eighties, was giving way to another type of treatment:

that of the denunciation and the drama of its inhabitants. couple of seasons we had a good dose of the

atrocities that were committed, in endless civil wars, with "" Hotel Rwanda ""; and last year it was "" The

faithful gardener "" that made us open our eyes to another wild and criminal fact: that of using its

population as guinea pigs for the large pharmaceutical industries. tools. But, as they were already in charge of affirming the

characters of both films, what happens to Africa, and the Africans, does not matter to (almost) anyone. Also

one of the politicians that appear in "" Blood Diamond "" states at the beginning that: "" The sad history of Africa

is that whenever it finds something of value its inhabitants suffer and die in misery. This has happened with

ivory, with the gaucho, with gold and oil. And now with the diamonds "". And the recourse of slaves

for decades, would add to me. Child exploitation. On December 1, 2000, the General Assembly of the

United Nations unanimously approved a resolution. In order to try to put a stop to the trade in

raw materials called "" in areas of conflict "", especially those from Angola or Sierra Leone. Thegroups

rebelto the government used them to finance their bloody revolution, telling theof thousands

storyof children used as slaves in long days of work extracting precious stones, such as

children. Recluos recruited as soldiers of the militias. In this regard, one of the best and most recent

complaints from the world of entertainment has been the excellent song "Diamonds from Sierra Leone", from the equally

great rapper Kanye West (and that starts with a "sample" of the Shirley Bassey song for the "" Diamonds

for eternity "", of the 1971 James Bond). And here also resides the best from the film by Edward Zwick, that

attempt to denounce, and to combine adventure and commitment using a Hollywood blockbuster format

whose list of protagonists is headed by two stars of the caliber of Leonardo DiCaprio and Jennifer

Connelly, to try to reach as many people as possible. Another issue is whether the film is scratching at the same

height. "Fast-food" tranquilizer. Zwick orchestrates a web of codidies around a huge pink diamond

found by Solomon Vandy (Djimon Hounsou), a native who s He wishes to reunite his wife and children from whom

he was separated; and the unexpected alliance he will find in a target, Danny Archer (DiCaprio), also born in

Sierra Leone, and a seemingly unscrupulous mercenary, to whom he is only interested That precious stone in

question, but that will go taking part throughout his journey with Solomon, and the clash with a beautiful

journalist (Jennifer Connelly), who tries to unmask the tragedy of that town. of brain, with

slogans of liberation and drugs, even forced to taste the blood, of the son of Solomon, and the objective of

rescuing him from the clutches of the revolutionaries, becomes the main axis of conscience and denunciation, next to

the consumerist interests that help to exploit and sink that country more. But the film is developed

routinely, with dialogs full of topics, with characters as one-dimensional as the same reporter,

or the villains that are appearing or. A strenuous footage and a quality invoice, but that follows the most

anodyne guidelines of the most trite entertainment that at the same time wants to be committed and reassuring. That is

shocking, but beautiful; with its well calculated moments of drama, distancing itself from the real

protagonists of the tragedy, and ideal for a quick consumption and, in passing, remove some conscience, between

popcorn and popcorn.

" 0

" The only positive thing is that with infinite immediate projects, the comic in the cinema is more alive than

ever.

The comments read from Spiderman 3 clarify that it is slow, which is the weakest of the three, which lasts longer than

advisable. And they are right. Sam Raimi is perhaps next to Peter Jackson, the directors who matured more

cinematographically speaking (not to mention their evolutions with the technique itself). From caterpillar to butterfly in a few

years, from Bad taste to the Lord of the rings, from Darkman to these Spiderman in the case of Raimi, in aadvance

remarkable. Spiderman 3 is not a step behind but it is a false step, an unnecessary film if you like.

Halfway in all its intentions. Hyper-accelerated montage for the action scenes, which dazzle them

but which were never the center of any of these Spiderman. From his middle part it is like Raimi

returns to self parody with scenes almost class B, like playing with his previous style with that silly andhumor

naive(dancing in the bar, the transformation of the black suit). The actors continue playing their taquito role, the

inclusion of the new villains only serve for a few incredible moments in the effects (fantastic the scene

of the creation of the man of sand) and for very little more. Phrases made related to human kindness,

too much dialogue towards any part that lengthen it and take away rhythm, the memory of the murder of Uncle Ben

repeated infinitely , a guide that erases with the elbow all the past events (���la 4 will do the

same with ���sta?), in short, only understandable its realization by all the machinery of money that encourages and

raises. The second Spiderman movie was a challenge not only for Raimi, but for everything who wants to make a

movie of superheroes. Here he could not follow his own steps. The only positive thing is that with infiniteprojects

immediate, the comic in the cinema is more alive than ever.

" 0

" Although the animation is superior, in everything else, Shrek Tercero stays behind, but very, very behind.

Shrek. Who does not know this green ogre who, with the help of his "" noble steed "" swept in the box offices

around the world in 2001 with a fresh, original and fun tape. As expected , the second part arrived.

That, although it was not like the first, it was a very good sequel that had 2 extremelycharacters

charismaticthat bewitched the public, one with his wand (the great fairy godmother) and the other with his eyes (the

cat in boots). And, as who does not want the thing, it became the highest grossing movie in

history. And now, and as expected, it arrives the third part. Third part that should never see the light.

Since it was announced that Andrew Adamson left the work of director and that the original writers

left, many feared the worst. And rightly so. "" Shrek Third "" starts in a very different way from its

predecessors, and only the prologue predicts changes. changes for evil. Although the film maintains, slightly,

the personality of the previous deliveries, it fails. Where the others surprised, it collapses. Why?

Because it does not stop being a rehash of the other two, with an argument worthy of an episode of the Lunnies. Although

the animation is superior, in all the rest, "" Shrek Third is left behind. ��s, but very, very back and maybe, the great

culprit is none other than Arturo, Arti. If "" Shrek "" (9/10) surprised by its freshness and "" Shrek 2 "" (8/10) was

wrapped up with good characters to maintain a good argument and a minimum of quality , "" Shrek Third "" only

counts as Arti's only new character. A flat character, without grace, without spark, and mainly responsible for

the film lacking interest. As for the gags. Quite poor considering how worked they

were in the other two and rather simpletons (attention to the pathetic final play of the prince), not to

say p���simos.Para I can not tell you that this year is a very bad year for

third parties, I repeat, a very bad year for third parties.

" 0

" What happens with the art part? Well, at no time is trying to do justice to the great text that

adapts, here the important thing is to entertain the audience, something very different in previous versions much more

faithful to the novel.

How is a safe success built? First of all, one of the mostscience fiction novels of

outstandingall times is written, written by the great RICHARD MATHESON, who masterfully mixes the

horror genre with the apocalypse. optical The virtues of the work echo the last man on earth withbecame

VINCENT PRICE YMS laterknown as the versinms CHARLTON HESTON, THE OMEGA MAN.Teniendo good

mimbres In a well-known story, the next thing is to find a competent director when dispatching a

BLOCKBUSTER of action, then the figure of FRANCIS LAWRENCE appears who showed his skills inHaving

CONSTANTINE.the director, a good distribution Quen that along with a MARKETING job that has to be

supported by a great action film star science fiction. It must be someone young, attractive with aphysicist

powerfulto show off in the action scenes with the delight of the fans, without a doubt WILL SMITH is the appropriate one

with great experience in the genre after me robot or INDEPENDENCE DAY among others.Now a budget of several

thousand dollars for the machinery to start working hoping to raise a monumental blockbuster that

allows big profits to all those involved. What happens to the art part? Well, at no time is

trying to do justice to the great text that adapts, here the important thing is to entertain the audience, something very

different in previous versions much more faithful to the novel. that it lacks vigor in the first part of the

film where a desert city is shown. Even an emboldened SMITH demonstrates certainskills

dramaticin a character that oscillates between the line of sanity and madness. The first appearance of the

infected is really terrifying. But little by little the concert begins to fail, the surprise factor influences

as I comment in the first attack of the human-vampires although the other appearances are no longer

novel discovering a mediocre digital effects that the they do as fearsome as they should be. The

FLASBACKS in time are not convincing, a religious end does not know very well what is coming. Well,

actually, I think so, it's a gui���o to the audience so that we all applaud the hero's courage. Another point

in favor is the German pastor's protagonism. almost eclipses the star of the function. In short, anfilm

entertainingwith good technical aspects except some digital effect with a WILL SMITH that at times manages to

be credible but in others do not remove the cosmic actor's tagline being their interpretation not very adequate for

the drama that their character should contribute.

" 0

" I imagined some history, some chicha and not a mere porno film hidden behind severalscenes

concert. Bored, tedious and quite tiresome.

I admire Michael Winterbottom, I loved "" Code 46 "" film that has not yet been released in Spain,

however, when I've seen this film that barely lasts hour and ten minutes I have felt quite disappointed,

I think the last time I was left with this face was seeing "" Ken Park "", more than anything because of the explicit sex and

why the film is not more than a couple fucking and a few musical performances in between. It is

true that I was clear about what I was going to see (more or less) but I I imagined something of history, something of chicha and not

a mere pornographic film hidden after several scenes of concerts. In short, boring, tedious and quite tired.

" 0

" It is a trick used by mediocre filmmakers: when there is no visual imagination or a story

that plays with truly original and meaningful elements, let the viewer fall with a video clip

? television? and he will be dumbfounded while devouring the popcorn cone.

Paul Greengrass directs this continuation the history of the ammonic sp ,a, who in a new cycle of enigmas

and persecutions focuses his research on the objective of understanding and knowing his true past and the true

motives of the secret operation of the CIA, marinated with the theme of revenge and reconciliation through the

knowledge of the truth. Bourne is a soul in pain that has already started a desperate race towards nowhere

, prisoner of the manipulation that he himself contributed to maintain. In cinema you can not forgive the repetition of

a previous scheme with the same essential contents and, above, reduce the quality of theresources

stylistic. The film does not really count anything that was not already implicit in its precedent, and limits its

objective to develop an insipid plot that barely advances from the first to the last level. The confused man

who wakes up in his home in India, in the first images, is the same confused man who rambles through the

streets of New York, which makes clear the vacuous narrative and the cheeky stretching of a product

exclusively designed to entertain with spectacular scenes of action and some punctual moment of effective

suspense. The protagonist spends the whole film fleeing, and the rest, they persecute and conspire against him in function of

a plot that addresses political issues and corruption in the oil companies. Worst of all is that the viewer already

knows who is the "bad" ", in advance, and the rest of the characters, with that characterization so schematized and

flat, hardly provide a counterpoint or something of life to the springs of the predictable guide. As if that were not enough,

we also have the last direction of Greengass, with excessive close-ups, use and abuse of twists,

zoom and sharp turns of the camera, clunky videoclip style. That is, everything in this film is thought by and

for the "" efectismo "", not for the benefit of a narrative and constructive EFFECTIVENESS of an emotional state or specific tone

according to the theme. which he intends to address. It is a trick used by mediocre filmmakers:

when there is no visual imagination or a story that plays with truly original andelements

meaningful, let the viewer fall with a "television" videoclip. "" and he will stay enthralled while devouring the

popcorn cone (add the role of a repetitive soundtrack that seeks a well-known effect from

the psychology, aimed at, literally, "" embobar "" the viewer). Then they leave the cinema and comment that the

film is good. In the end, worse things say that way.

" 0

" If you have small children, have them see little animals and colors on the screen. If that is not the case,

do not spend the money, unless you have a mind as infantile as mine.

Watching this movie reminded me of my young years, in which I spent my summers playing Risk. If

things were going well, you had half the world and Madagascar was more or less the same, given that it was yours and nobody could

attack it. If things went bad and you were lucky to have this region, you crouched waiting fortimes

better. Well, the film has nothing to do, but I remembered this nonsense. The film is about

about animals that live in a big city in a modern country. The star of the zoo is a Le unn a little

proud, that every day makes a show of roars and poses. His best friend is a zebra, who is neither an

artist nor wants to live where he lives. She wants to live in the wild world and have fun. Then there are

some penguins who are very funny as well as bastards. Some monkeys that do not know what they paint but they

have their points. And a whimsical giraffe with a hippopotamus that is the only rope of all history. And then

things happen to them and in the end it ends well because it is a film for children. Ale.As I say, the film is

for children. It's not like Shrek or The Incredibles. This is for children. Do not leave ugly bugs that give fear,

no scares, no complicated conversations, or nothing at all. So if you like animated movies

for adults, do not even think about going. I personally liked me. The main plot is a little bit of a moralist,

but the secondary plots are good. The penguins are horny, and a little bastards. By the way, theyme

remindof a certain folklore, I do not know why. And the appearance of the l���mures is great. They are stupid bugs

, but they have a song that is very catchy. The lion and the zebra are pretty dull. To the zebra the

filetar���as and the le len you would give a kick in the crotch. If you have small children, bring them

to see animals and colorines on the screen. If this is not the case, do not spend the money, unless you have

a mind as infantile as mine.Besitos.PD: What grace do the problems of le���n because he is

hungry and wants Eat your best friend. And to solve it, they eat the fish. What havedone to

the fishthem? They could have made the vegetarian leland and left the fish alone. And when thewere eaten at the zoo

juicy steaks? Oh, we cheated the kids with foolishness. In order.PD2: Greet and smile. Greet and smile.

" 0

" Salvador is a film that undoubtedly will remove consciences. Maybe, I would rate this movie as those, that you can not "" revisit "", like "" Requiem " for a

dream "" this is one of those movies that the sensation, the bad body and the scourge that your stomach feels, willyou

accompany" � during a very long season in your conscience, well, as my father said, it's one of those films

that "" leaves a hole "" To start with that beginning, full of some moments that form part of thememory

collectiveof many who already, or comb gray hair, or lose hair, accompanied by the excellent soundtrack Lluis

Llach.Perhaps, one of the drawbacks that I put the film is which is almost entirely spoken in Catalan,

and even if you manage a little (as is my case), you end up needing subtitles to understand it, this to the

viewer dislocates a p oco, as well as the stupid man���a to accompany the action scenes with

strident music. I have hallucinated with the ease with which Daniel Br�� �hl speaks both Catalan and Spanish, it

seems that the boy has lived all his life in Spain. On the other hand, he wanted to highlight the excellent

photography, where in some moments the B / N becomes part of the screen and where only the blood

(red) stands out if it appears in color. Finally, and not least, all the actors are excellent, although

perhaps highlight Celso Burogallo, since without saying a word in all the footage, is to see the

face and the stomach twists completely, giving the necessary credibility and complexity to the role of the

father of the protagonist. In short, a film that will undoubtedly remove consciences.

" 1

" ���The final blunder? When one pays a ticket for the cinema (with all that it entails today), at least he expects to meet

with a minimum of entertainment. However superfluous and banal it may be. But there are times, the last years

too many, in which one receives the slap of the most sad and hyperbolic reality. "" Final Destination 3 "" is one

of the products that more easily brings us closer to the exact definition of "" bodrio "". What is stolen from the

cinema at least helps us to recreate graphically the definitions of the Royal Spanish Academy. Here, even

divertimento hides its head for shame to be recognized . You can not make an extensive criticism about

this film, since there is nothing to review, let alone positive. Except for the purely aesthetic andaspect

gimmicky, which shows its high budget (���qu��� brain eg���latra could waste so much money

depriving us unjustly of the possibility of investing in projects much more interesting and, above all,

smart?), the rest is absolutely bland and bordering on stupidity. We have the group of teenagers

(sometimes not so much) Americans typically contemporary ���neos, the hormones and handsome we see in all the

films of this cala���a. That is, now with a little more variety, certainly divided between "" posh """

wealthy, select portion of the most purely elitist society, and" "macarras" " " Or, better said, "piranhas

". "We take a blender, we unite the protagonists of the airplane crash with those of theaccident

motorway, we adorn the ideas of the first ones with the brutality of the seconds, and we get the breaking

characters from the Russian mountain. Only here they squeeze less and do not build the

ultra-intelligent and elaborate theories that their partners made from previous deliveries to deceive death

(��� It was death to spend such a trivial time at the expense of that people!) It seems that the film wanted to

be more realistic and more truthfully portray plain and simple society of the country. The film is a

twist and a copy of all the elements of the two previous installments. And if these were already dispensable,

the third remains in something purely absurd and irrelevant. It does not possess the "novel" incentive (if that could be

called so) of the first, nor the savage brutality and "" gore "" of the accidents of the second, which

satisfied the fans more ac derrimos of the gallery morbid and violently attractive. It is, for more inri, a

compendium softened of both and nothing risky.That s� �� Some accidents, without being as spectacular or

wild as those of the second installment, will satisfy the followers of the free. But in this film

even that is reduced to moments. And it leads us, as its coveted end, to a new situation of "" d���j��� vu "" and

intuition of what is going to happen. The only scene that can be defined as "" idea. "" Oneif, in the face of

wondersfilms like this and how the cinema is degenerating, it should be The definition of "" seventhremoved from it

art "" is to be. " At least movies like "" Final Destination 3 "" should not be included in this concept. Fortunately,stillbreaths

wehavethat allow us to breathe and enjoy the true meaning of celluloid. Although they are increasingly

diluted m���sym���s. They say that hope is the last thing that is lost, no matter how devastating

the situation is. Let us hope that the state of alarm does not yet have to be declared. Nor is acriticism necessary

clarifyingin relation to what you get when you see a film of such character. sticas. I think that the good

listeners (come on, those who know how to read) when they see the poster, they already know what's inside. That

yes, a warning would never come badly that, like the tobacco and similar drugs, seriously harms our health.

But everyone is responsible for their actions, and if you want to go to the movies leaving the brain in the tail

of the box office, the truth is that it is in its perfect right. His doctor, later, will think about it. His

collection in our country, almost analogous to the blockbuster on the other side of the pond, leaves in question our

supposed progress in certain aspects and evidence the great resemblance we have with the aforementioned cuadr���pedos

ancestral companions. It is, avoiding to generalize (if at this point that is possible in the world of cinema, by

the courses that it has taken and majority percentages that it has acquired), which offers us the passage of time

and the establishment of new generations. Let's not waste any more time. He does not deserve it. Let's just thank

James Wong for retaking the address of the first installment and clarifying that his is not a coincidence and that he

is an expert in graphic definitions. "boredom" "by the RAE:" "Badly done,

messy or bad taste" ". We will be placing another image of a film next to it.

" 0

" Not only is it recommended, it is necessary, to make your face happy in the times we are in, with

so much disgust and roll in our lives.

This week that on a personal level we are not going too well, we wanted to go to the movies to

disconnect and maybe the best way to stop worrying for a while was a musical comedy,

"" Hairspray "" ten� ��a all the ballots for that, to let us enjoy with his story, his music and his cast

for 90 min. Sinceramente the tape gets it, and not only one passes the whole movie "" half dancing ""

under the chair, but also the great music, where there are, accompanied the actors so well on

screen, that it would not be understood thing without the other, logical, of course, this is a musical, one of the most

famous of Broadway. The story, all integration from beginning to end, where a girl in kilos (although

beautiful in all aspects, the debutante Nikki Blonsky) tries to eliminate racial segregation, in the

racist 1960s in Baltimore (U SA), they accompany Blonsky, John Travolta, as their mother, perhaps the one Ileast

liked the, and that is that, unfortunately I could not separate the idea every time I saw him appear on screen

what was that, John Travolta in disguise, he has his little boy dancing inside that suit, and moving as he moves, but

as I say, he could not separate the idea and instead of seeing Edna see �aa Travolta transvestido.The rest of the cast is

made up of a most amazing staff, since Michelle Pfeiffer, incredible as a villain of the function, and whonot

haslost a ��� pice of its beauty or of its sexy charm on the screen, Amanda Bynes, one of the queens of

romantic comedy nowadays, Queen Latifah who already sang in Chicago by Rob Marshall, Christopher Walken,

parking his serious roles and giving an amazing touch of comedy, his dance with Travolta will be one of the

scenes remembered from the film for years, Jame s Marsden the "" cyclope "" of X-Men, who blushes me to admit that he sings

of marvel and dances also excellently well and Zac Efron, and a famous face of the musicals thanks to the

television phenomena " "High School Musical" "Adam Shankman manages to lead the way, after a career

full of romantic comedies and tapes without too much cinematographic interest, with this simp� A musical and at the same time

amazing musical, leaving in its actors the narrative weight of the film and in the music the approach that a good

full-length film of these characteristics needs. I think it is obvious that I have loved it, so that I will not

extend more than what is necessary, one leaves the cinema happy and cheerful, in addition to humming the successes of

the soundtrack, it is not only recommended, it is that it is necessary, to rejoice the face in the times in which

we are, with so much disgust and roll in our lives.

" 1

" Daniel manages to mark his style, because he is faithful to his principles, to his past as a short filmmaker, to his

director's philosophy

that after a little over two weeks, a film like "" Dark blue almost black "", which comes from being released in style

with three Biznagas in the festival of M���laga, can not be seen in any of the two multiplexes of San

Cugat del Valles, and already �� Only it is projected in four cinemas in the whole city of Barcelona,reflects

perfectlythe situation of our national cinema. I wonder, with despair, the fate that will bring these

other Spanish works that were not awarded or even premiered in Malaga. The cinema does not reach the public and it

dies, irremediably, without a geared and efficient industry, legally protected, independent and with a

real power of distribution. This disaster, this evident and permanent crisis of Spanish cinema, has nothing to

do, however much we want to sell it, with the problems of internet piracy. It is the Internet,

precisely and in this case, from where it is being achieved, to a large extent, to create a real mouth-to-mouth

about this film that is driving many people to go to the cinema.Although, in reality, I never pretend to be

objective, I would also be impossible to be so when writing about this opera prima by Daniel S���nchez Ar���valo. In my

case, I know the short films of Daniel and I also know him. The film, however, is enjoyed by

itself and is made, without a doubt, for the public. That's why Daniel's biggest concern is

that his first length goes unnoticed by the great majority. We could talk not too long ago in Salamanca,

Daniel was safe, calm, knowing that he has managed to create an honest and quality piece. He has

more than fulfilled his own expectations as an intelligent author, effective and intuitive director and as a

sensitive spectator. But it is precisely for this reason that Daniel is not at all oblivious to thepanorama

dark blue, almost blackof our cinema. The plot of the film begins where one of his lastends

short films, his great and acclaimed "" Physics II "". Rescue the same characters here to draw astory

simple but emotionaland portrayed with amazing dexterity. Dexterity in the visual, to mark a style, but

without impaling. To narrate with the visual language and to separate the characters when they need it, to unite them when they

must be together, to suggest and recreate with small symbolisms and gui���os. Dexterity in a

successful staging and sober and real performances, with entertaining and intelligent di���logos. Because we know

that getting to laugh in dramatic situations is never an easy task. Another deadly pirouette is the one of

managing to mix social realism with the commercial genre. Knowing how to deal with the social issue, alleviating the

drama justly and not abandoning the already trite and maligned style of camera in hand, maintaining the decision to

leave the camera in the tripod or on the dolly. And in addition, Daniel manages to mark his style, because he is faithful to his

principles, to his past as a short filmmaker, to his philosophy as a director who believes in the great importance of

gui���ny in the direction Acn acting Who creates from the respect and the humility and knows and manages to transmit to the

spectator his own illusion for the history that he recreates. And that, is already more than half a step to para���so.Y as it

also exists in the film some but, say that the obvious academicism of its author, and the undoubted f��� in the

dramatic structures, in the genre formulas and gui���n rules, the story takes space for

surprise. The story is always quite predictable. In addition, in order to maintain the pulse of such a

successful pirouette, some moments also end up showing something improbable and unbelievable. However

, everything is so spoiled and told with so much respect, sensitivity and enthusiasm, that this does not hinder at

all a brilliant and talented premium opera that knows good cinema and achieved challenge.aiming

Finish��� Only two things, on the one hand to predict the obvious, a hopeful future for Daniel S���nchez Ar���valo, and

on the other, to send you a very clear message: You will not regret it. ��� Go see her!

" 1

" The ingenuity of Allen is evident from the first plane of the film to the last, causing

real attacks of laughter and uncontrollable laughter. Scoop is a new genius of one of the great

masters of comedy and cinema.

True to its annual appointment, with the first cold of winter, the new film by

one of the most beloved and recognized foreign filmmakers in Spain arrives on Spanish screens. ��s: Woody Allen. His last works,

especially Match Point but not forgetting everything Dem���sy Melinda and Melinda, away from the Allen more

recognizable, the ironic and sarcastic. Four years after Un Final Made in Hollywood, Woody Allen returns in

its purest form, with a comedy that will delight any good amateur of the seventh art. Sondra Pransky

( Scarlett Johansson) is a young journalism student who spends her holidays in London. There, one night he will

go to the show of Sid Waterman, "" Splendini "" (Woody Allen), who will choose it for one of his numbers, the one

of " "dematerializer" ". While Sondra waits, the spirit of Joe Strombel (Ian McShane),

recently deceased prestigious journalist, appears informing him of a great exclusive. There are few things more fun

in this world than seeing a genuine and inimitable film by Woody Allen, and Scoop is part of the norm. If you have to

compare Scoop with other Allen tapes, remember slightly that jewel that is Mysterious Murder in

Manhattan. The ingenuity of Allen is patent from the first plane of the film to the last one, provoking

real attacks of laughter and uncontrollable laughter. If the script is full of the subtlety and fine iron���a

mark of the house, the leadership that Allen develops is as always impeccable, taking the story to

its precise rhythm , without slowness or trampling, something that tend to suffer current comedies. And as

is also the norm in his films, Allen brings out the best in his interpreters, including �� He himself, who

with his very presence already brings out a smile. Scarlett Johansson, the new muse of the filmmaker, shows that

in comedy she performs as well as in the most dramatic role, although Hugh Jackman is not far

behind either, to the positive surprise of many. In short, Scoop is a new genius of one of the great

masters of comedy and cinema.

" 1

" The friend Woody returns to accommodate himself composing a minor work, without more ambition than the one of theamusement

personaland the one of delighting to his unconditional ones with a bundle of tics and hoses mark of the house.

After the remarkable "" Match Point "", the friend Woody returns (as in other occasions) to accommodate composing a

minor work, without more ambition than the personal amusement (bravo by ���l , to be clear) and that of delighting his

fans with a bunch of "" tics "" and "" latiguillos "" brand of the house, cemented in a story not

devoid of the usual ironic look and burlesque, which works modestly, especially thanks to the ease

acquired during several decades of cinema and almost always moving in the same field. This goes in favor of

the accommodating bet of a cult author, but he moves back against renovating bets as hiswork

previous, confirming the stagnation of a filmmaker who will always be welcome to the billboards and seen with

pleasure by a server, but his recent stories would go unnoticed if his first and last name did not

appear under the "" written and directed by "." The set of tics and phases that are shaping the story hides

the usual "Philosophy" fica disertada through a small group of characters, to see which of all is more relaxed

and insipid: the student pavita looking for a break to his ambition ���n journalist and researcher, the

confident friend who always supports him, the shy daddy's son who hides a secret, the funny character

from a theater of magic and a plot held in the typical serial killer that "nobody knows that it is but

we all know who will (or will not) ultimately be "". That is, to a set of characters without

any hint of originality and freshness is added a very predictable plot (and, again, too

schematic). It is not a bad movie, Allen has his great moments in some ingenious dialogues (it could not

be less) and at some point in the story that manages to come together, but they are very specific. In most

of the footage very little happens and the jokes also have an ironic and sarcasm intelligence that

surprise. It is the style and the charisma of Woody Allen that saves the function, the text and the representation, by

themselves, are too insubstantial. And that, obviously, is very little.

" 0

" A good idea, in a very good result. Sandrita, beautiful, devote yourself to the romantic comedies of those that

my wife likes so much, because the truth is that in this type of cinema leftovers.

I've been almost 20 min. sitting in front of the keyboard to write this criticism, bad is when I feel this way, and

I start to be lazy, thinking about what to write, and that is "" Premonition "" (not to be confused with the tape of it

name that Sam Raimi directs), is a well thought out idea but poorly executed, and that is, the prime work of Mennan

Yapo, is rather more slack than one expects to find a priori on screen; I do not know, maybe it's that

I've been thinking about conspiracies "Judeo-mas���nicas" for so long that when you see something weird on the screen, you never

think that they will give you a hare, no matter how much love I have for the felines and with whom I share life and

home for a few weeks ... But I do not go around the bush, Sandra Bullock's tape, lackssense

narrative, and that is, trying follow a route that has already been marked by "" disordered "" tapes like "" Memento "" or "" 21

Grams "", here the only disorder lies in how the character of "" the bullock "" lives. �as, and is that once we

learn the rules of the game the grace of the tape is over, a separate mention is its uselessness and little

artificiality at the time of showing us, I repeat, an idea that embodied in the gui���n was nothing short of

brilliant. Bollock does not believe his character much, like Julian McMahon (and that is that every time I see this

man I remember or "" The Fantastic 4 "" and I lose the seriousness.), which is reflected as usual in

him, and one joins the crusade not to protect him or the mother who pari���.I needed a separate paragraph for its

end, laughable, little elaborated and quite easy, and that is, (I repeat myself again), after being throwing

meat on the spit for a good part of the footage, one waits for the traca at the end, and encounters a smallcheatfully

firecracker, whichhidden on the screen, barely damages when it explodes.Sandrita, beautiful, dedicate yourself to the

romantic comedies of those that my wife likes so much, because the truth is that in this type of film

leftovers.

" 0

" Full of inconsistencies and absurd elements in his ridiculous gui���n. The film takes too long to start, and

everything that is shown does not have the slightest interest.

Eli Roth is on his way to becoming one of the worst directors in all of history, and soon his name will

occupy a place of honor alongside others like Ed Wood or Uwe Boll. Cabin Fever? I had no head or foot, and

? Hostel ?, despite some point of black humor and a certain rhythm, it was still a bit of a joke,

focused on the sadism of some characters without rhyme or reason, pure and cheap, just because I know. Hostel 2? it is

even worse, and the truth is that it is a completely useless sequel, since it does not contribute anything to what has already

been seen, and it is evident that it has been done quickly and running only for generate easy money. And although its results

are far below other blockbusters, the truth is that it will fully recover its ridiculous budget and

amass a good number in the international market. In addition, Roth has gotten Mr. Tarantino to welcome him in his

bosom and now identify him with him, as if that would serve as something to justify the null quality of his

tapes. The plot of "Hostel 2? It is practically identical to that of its predecessor, we simply change boys

for girls (it will not be me who complains), for the rest it is almost identical to the previous one. A group of three friends who

are in Italy, end up in Slovakia, passing it off in fear (never better said), and go to a place where

they will serve to to satisfy the hidden desires of a lot of depraved people who pay to kill someone

torturing them. But the only torture that exists here is the film itself, full of incongruities andelements

absurdin his ridiculous gui���n. The film takes too long to start, and everything that is shown does not have the

slightest interest, the presentation of characters is long and boring, and when it happens that we already know in

advance that it will happen, the film ends, no more. All those lovers of gore and strong images, are

going to leave enormously disappointed in the film, which only contains three scenes ofcalls

disgusting, in which, that's , Roth does not cut an apex in showing all kinds of atrocities, each one

more beast. In fact, the film bases everything on that, which does not last ten minutes on screen, so the

tease is brutal. The characters are all absolutely stupid, and you even want them to be charged

. Quickly to any of them. Then, the film has the handle of wanting to turn things around,

exchanging the roles of some characters, but everything turns out to be unbelievable and too forced. In this

regard I refer to its final part, in which one of the protagonists takes the reins of the matter, resulting in

absolutely unbelievable. And let's not talk about the dialogues, in which there is not a singlephrase

intelligent. It is worth noting that a film of this style is not going to have a dialogue with the Shakespeare, but one thing is that

and quite another is the vulgarity that appears here. A monumental mess, totally lacking in sense of

humor, and in which a gui���o to the sponsor of the event is allowed, in a scene in which twocharacters

secondaryare watching by television? Pulp Ficiton ?, and which they do not pay much attention, although

it seems the opposite. On the other hand, and much to our regret, despite the harshness of the film's images, he does

not dare with a certain possible psycho-social relationship that would have a�� Moradido certain morbid to the subject, but nothing at

all. On the one hand, the film is passed, and on the other, it does not dare. Roth now prepares the adaptation of a novel by

Stephen King, "Cell ?, and says it will take a long time to do it. Do not worry, some of us will not

demand that you hurry.

" 0

" This particular director is on the way to convert his films into works of worship, judging from the expectation

generated by each new release.

The director of Indian origin tells that the story of La joven del agua began to develop in parallel with

that of El bosque. At night, Shyamalan told his daughter the story of this nymph that emerged from a swimming pool

and, as she progressed in her story, she incorporated different mythological elements to decorate this storyelse's

whose end, like everyone, has a moral. . And unlike El Bosque, where the message is more

pessimistic about the man and his life in society, in the moral of La joven del agua there is a residue of

hope, of faith in the possibilities of man to reverse his current gloomy situation. If the characters of

The Forest reject a world perceived as hostile, the protagonist of this film, the character of a

portentous Paul Giamatti, decides to take the opposite path, despite having suffered, like those,

cruelty from this world. He, like other characters in this story dressed in contemporary clothes, he

felt the need to continue believing in something. They want, they need to know their mission in this world. The mysterious

nymph, which Bryce Dallas Howard puts on her face, will put questions before her that will change them during

the search for answers. and the selection of increasingly personal plans, Shyamalan demonstrates to

each new film a recognizable stamp of author, both by the choice of its themes and by the way in which it

decides to develop them. Use the fantastic genre to address current issues and, for that reason, his

characters are not extraordinary or possess superhuman qualities. Many may not like this style to

consider it as a kind of cat hare, to sell horror films in the? Trailers? and offer a story

quite far from the conventions of the genre in the movies. But there is no doubt that this particular

director is on the way to convert his films into works of worship, judging by the expectations generated by each

new release filmed by ���lY as it often happens to other directors-authors, or one enters the game

of Shyamalan's philosophical proposals or is left out and frustrated. I got hooked on this movie from end to end.

Everything in it is in its place: the work of the actors, the magnificent soundtrack of James Newton Howard and the

narrative rhythm of the story. The only erasure may come from Shyamalan's decision to preserve a

role of such relevance within history. It is well that, in imitation of Hitchcock, make a minimal

appearance during the story, but here it has gone hand in hand. He is not an actor, and that is noticeable when he

shares scenes of some emotion with those who are. And finally, the gui���oc���mico of this tape, on

behalf of a literary critic and film, has a lot of personal accounts adjustment, given the little appreciation with

which the work is received of Shyamalan in his country. In fact, tired of so much trouble, the director has

dropped the idea of ​​not working beyond and come to shoot in Europe. Here, like other artists of his kind, he is sure

to be received magnificently.

" 1

" A new sample of the enviable health that the German cinema has been exhibiting through diverse works

that unravel, with exemplary autocratic spirit, its recent history.

It is difficult to unravel how the gears of the empat���a operate. Because, in many cases, this tends to

derive from slight details or recited coincidences. And it can catch us so suddenly or get us so

deep that, suddenly, our perception of life turns one hundred and eighty degrees. By similar trance, Captainspend

Gerd Wiesler (a splendid Ulrich M���he), one of the most efficient officersin the lives of others.

of the Stasi, willthe secret police of the communist and extinct German Democratic Republic.This police group

develops an intense work of espionage on any subject suspected of actions contrary to the omnipresent

Communist Party and its r��� They moan, eaten away by a plethora of careerists and corrupt leaders. Far from having

been contaminated by the tainted environment, Wiesler continues with his Franciscan dedication to the Stasi. As

demonstrated in the staging, it is the interrogator and the most effective 'detector' of subversive elements

. Neither doubt nor mercy, and his loyalty to the party and the communist ideal is irreproachable. But his life, as

gray as that of the GDR of the eighties, will be unpredictably agitated while investigating a

prestigious writer (Sebastian Koch) and his girlfriend actress (Martina Gedeck). With them he will be unable to apply the

manual labor of the informer as he did before and his apparent inhumanity will begin to fall apart as he

feels concerned by the lives of others investigated. �, the film by Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck is gaining

in interest as it weaves a relationship between researcher and researcher based on subtle complicities. The

captain lives, secretly and passionately, the vicissitudes of the life of his objectives. And at the same time, the

spectator witnesses the decline of a regime stuck in its paranoid control of all dissident activity. In a

society like this, without the freedom to disagree, artists have to choose between creating at the service of the State or

living in frustrating ostracism. In a certain way, this first opera of the promising Florian Henckel is located. Ena in

the ant���podas of nostalgic revisions, such as the view in Good bye Lenin !, on the last years of communism

in Germany prior to the fall of Wall. But, first of all, it constitutes a new sample of the enviable health

that the German cinema has been exhibiting through diverse works that unravel, with exemplary autocratic

spirit, its history recent. Undoubtedly, the rosary of awards that is accumulating this life of

others is more than justified.

" 1

" The one about Cassavetes, is already judged on duty, since in his filmography there are titles that go

from the classic "" Delta Force "" to the unbearable "" El Noa's diary ", now stands out with this film, which

today's ad is the most boring film I remember in a long time ...

Lately they are very fashion all-terrain directors, and there is no longer a director who is dedicated to a specific

type of cinema and, like churros do all the movies in series, no, now the directors make one and a

thousand different tapes, none cut by the same employer, I understand, that, as human beings that they are, they have

to pay the mortgage, like every neighbor's son worth his salt, and from there the film diversity, but come on, what of

Cassavetes, is already a judge on duty, since in his filmography we find titles that go from the

classic "" Delta Force "" to the unbearable "" The diari or de Noa "", now stands out with this film, which today

's ad is the most boring film I remember in a long time. We started with a Bruce Willis caracterizad���simo and

unrecognizable, where behind layers of latex and airbrush we see the actor of "" The Crystal Jungle "" as

local drug lord, then we have Sharon Stone, who, applying the same thing as the previous one is a mother that in a

flashback we almost saw what happened, after Emile Hirsch, as a camel rapper, after them Ben Foster (maybe

the best of the film, although he overacts a lot) and Justin Timberlake, who after Des of 2 movies is

still seen on screen quite lost. The script is messy, boring, slow and unreal, when it is supposed to

want to capture reality through the pores, but no, fails, everything is so easily recognizable that one

can recognize the tape thousand and one similar films (without going m s far "" Wonderland "" which starred Val

Kilmer.). The use of split screen is useless, since the division points to the same, and does nothing

different, I viewing2 times, Come on, that is "" Chuli "" and the overprint of time, witnesses and such is

indifferent. A full-blown mess that I now understand why it has taken so long to debut.

" 0

" Cut cinema of science fiction. In short, it is short (70���) and long. "" A scientist sends a young journalist to look for an echo to the world of an event like no other: an

unknown planet is � approaching the Earth, with the consequent risk of cataclysms. One day, they discover

that a ship has fallen near where they live, discovering with astonishment that a strange being is inside them. Theynot

doknow if he is friend or enemy, so they will try to establish communication with him. "The critic has always said

of the tape that it is a good work of series B In my opinion it is pure Z series, made with two dollars, and

noticing in excess. For starters, his story is nothing of the other Thursday, although perhaps in his time it

was. Then you can talk about the entrables (so sloppy) decorated. They sing that it is outrageous. And the

rest, little thing. In short, it is short (70���) and long.

" 0

" That pure vision of violence, made up of makeup, gives the film an innocence. Who was going to say it treating

Cronenberg and with a guide of born assassins and of revenges and hyperbolic quarrels

David Cronenberg is a sick director who revels with the avatars and the adventures Of his sickness.

None of his films could have been made by Steven Spielberg, I would say, but he would have made,

with success, I do not doubt, The Terminal or The empire of the sun. He would have billed them with that corrosive humor of his,

hidden in the least perceptible fringes of history, solvent always. With A History of Violence,

Cronenberg makes a film that, in principle, was not his. It seemed like a project by Brian de Palma or Tony

Scott. This foreign material lacks the usual formal apparatus with which Cronenberg delves into his obsessions and

visually explains his perversions. It does not have a history of violence absolutely nothing to do with the

fly or Crash or came from within Spider .. Or no longer talk about Inseparable, jewel of insane cinema, cult

movie and probably the best interpretation that I I've seen the very remarkable filmography of Jeremy Irons,

but hey, let's not mess up. A history of violence is about the survival of a lifestyle and

mutilation, if not the absolute elimination of memory. Tom Stall (Viggo Mortensen, formidable, restrained and

sober as always) erases his past and begins a new life. Chancethat past and abegins

recoverscrusadeto recover its identity, which, in the end, in a portentous, contained image, is evident. Then

there is Ed Harris, a magnificent actor who still lacks an absolute bomb for people to recognize him on

the street and studies confess to him of relumbr������n and not, as now, as almost always,offshoots

outstanding. What deserves a separate chapter is the treatment of violence in the film. Regardless of

the director's aftertaste for the lower instincts of the human being, the film obviates violence in anway

almost Cartesian, but extracts it from the subsoil of the soul of its characters when the famous needs of the gui That's the

way they demand it. Like when he uncovers hispanic. "The script sends it." And there went and came thighs and hairy pubis

to reappear the staff, newbie in these iclicos lides. Here violence is manifested indoses

very measured, but forceful. I read that Cronenberg wanted a natural, brutal violence, the kind you see on

the street, without elaboration, decontaminated with pirouettes, choreographies and all that symbolic trash. A lica ofgestures

unnecessaryand false kicks to Bruce Lee that populate the action tapes of these days. That pure vision ofof makeup

violence, made up, gives the film an innocence. Who would say it treating Cronenberg and with a guide

of born assassins and of revenges and hyperbilic quarrels. The footage, hour and a half very scarce, does not obscure the

prop� Director's office. Straining half an hour more of irrelevant material could have distracted the spectator from the

primary function of the main show, that is, the destination as a magnum of the 32nd. The temple is on us,

even if the years go by and we do not realize the pressure of the cannon on our skin. That happens to Tom Stall,

basically. That he has lived for years and now comes the memory to collect his screen quota. In the end, Inot

willgut the outcome, do not worry, the good guys win, as always, but we do not know who they are. Today

I will not recommend that you open the cabinet of the DVDs and pull the file. If after this attraction of

violence, it would be fine to place in the player's tray John Ford's quiet man. And if you notice, you will

notice that in the background, in the same abrupt and stark background always, it is the same film. John

Ford omits the pornography inherent in all violence and sweetens the typology of the man who can not leave his

past (Clint Eastwood's loss) with relaxed Irish meadows and generous taverns that smell like

malt whiskey and October rain. Anyway. We are romantic.

" 1

" Hostel 2 is part of a terrifying premise and is only dedicated to promoting Dantesque shots that do not contribute

much in originality or create the necessary climate for a film of these characteristics.

Eli Roth I tell you, I do not think he's a great director, many critics believe that if he did not havefriend

Quentin Tarantino as his, he would not be filming movies so often that his baggage f�� �mic is quite poor in

terms of resources. "" Hostel "" in its first version had a good idea but was badly put into practice. The

idea of ​​thinking of small European hostels where bands of kidnappers capture people to serve them on an

acrylic tray and murderers with high purchasing power was chilling and very original. Who did not think

that this could be true? That is the only point in favor of the two productions of Roth: they start

from a brutally possible concept. From there on, as the director arms them, it's something else. In principle, in

this "" Hostel 2 "", three American students in Rome decide to take a weekend trip where they

meet one of their art colleagues. They are young, adventurous, uninhibited and eager to try

new experiences. The young woman (I do not name the actors because they are more illustrious strangers and none has a

future in the industry) is also making an "exotic" getaway "and invites them to accompany Take her to a

place where they can relax and forget the stress of the city. But there they will discover that there is an organization in

the shadows that is in charge of putting a price on their lives and providing the physical space so that millionaires can

slaughter at will. Cinematographic values? Few, blood, a lot! Scenes very, very strong,

spectators of loose stomachs, abstain! And a boring, apictic rhythm that barely reacheslevels

adrenalinewhen the deaths begin to happen. There is a lot of unnecessary scene (the end, with the theme of

the football, for example) and little ability to be original in the treatment of resources that the

general idea of ​​history proposes. As I said, "" Hostel 2 "" is based on a terrifying premise and is only dedicated

to enhancing Dantesque frames that do not contribute much in originality or create the necessary climate for a

film of this nature. ��sticas (Roth's black humor is loose and poor). To tell the truth, as an

old friend of mine used to say, it is just another film "to wet the pancito" ". Loose second part and we will continue

hoping that it improves in the third, they say that the third is the defeated one, not the seasoned spectator.

" 0

" Number 23 is a misused idea, although the beginning is excellent and the first minutes make

you illusions before a captivating thriller, it becomes a bluff, in a kind of moral

that Pica one hundred different sources and that does not delve into anything.

There are 2 different types of Jim Carrey, as if it were 2 Siamese siblings, one is the Jim Carrey who

plays in the comedies, that clown who either loves you (as is my case) or falls like a kick in the

On the other hand we have the Jim Carrey dramatic actor, the one who dazzles you with movies like "" Man on

the moon "", "" The Truman Show "" u "" Olv�� �date of my "", that other actor who makes caranto���as to the Oscar, so that he falls

into his arms, but Oscar is one of those who also hate Carrey; in this film Carrey is left to own

by the two brothers, largely by the 2��� giving dramatic focus, sorry that at the end of the film and in the

��� Last measures overactive and gesticulate as if in a comedy estar.El number 23 is a misused idea

, although the beginning is excellent and the first minutes make you illusions before a breathtaking

thriller, this it becomes a bluff, in a kind of moral that stings of a hundred different sources

and that does not delve into anything, it is like a small child next to a plate of delicious food, that no matter how much it pecks and he

plays, he does not profit from the stew. Flaco please do a painful coordination of the tape, Mr. Schumacher,

sincerely dedicate yourself to knitting, that the cinema is choking completely, with a bad

direction of actors, where each one goes to his ball and where there is no feelling in no moment of development. A

dark photograph, a guide that is finally diffuse, two areas that try to be different and that, as in a

bad imitation of "" The hours "" end up coming together in an "" all "" that little or nothing has to do, with a final so

squeamish that it seems caught with pins, cheat to the most no power and run almost like a bus Vs.Virginia

Madsen adorable, since I met her again in "" Between Cups "", augur��� a future full of work, and

I was not wrong a bit. Maybe better than Carrey in all the footage, giving his character the (little)

package he needs. Of course not everything will be negative, at least I liked the fragile camera movements

, and the "" promotion "" of reading (to be read, more readers, otherwise we are sheep.) It is

a film made to generate controversy, on the Internet, in forums and in other sites of debate, as happened

with "" The Ring "" the remake of Gore Verbinski, where each one saw what he felt like on screen.Resumiendo:

as he said Sarah Connor There is no future, there is only what we do

" 0

" Comedy highly recommended. Casual story about a group of forgotten Italian soldiers on a small

island in the Aegean that took home the Oscar for best non-English speaking film in 1991.

First months of the Second World War. A small group of Italian soldiers disembark on a small island

in the Aegean Sea. Strategic importance: zero, enemies in sight: zero, population: a few children, women and

old. With this approach was presented in 1991 "" Mediterr���neo "", a film by Gabriele Salvatores that won

the Oscar for the best non-English speaking film. Unknown for the great public, this Italian comedy has

its strength in simplicity. The argument is simple: forgotten by their own army, incommunicado and without a

clear objective, several soldiers with very different personalities must adapt to the peaceful life of the island

until they find a way to return to Italy. So three years go by, during which they adapt to therhythm

calmof the locals and their customs until finally they have the opportunity to return.

However,for many of them living inmiddle of the Aegean he has marked a before and despus.Con this simple

story Salvatores entertain us forhour andhalf, recrendose in pequeces of d ���aad���a, in the

deviations of soldiers somewhat bizarre, somewhat crazy, with defects and strong virtues. Stresses

the character of the sergeant, played masterfully by Diego Abatantuono, who as soon as he summarizes everything in

"" is a bitch "", and is sympathetic and pacifying to everyday dilemmas. Maybe because of what unites us

Italians we have more possibilities to feel identified with this pelot���n, because seeing them

satisfied with their four needs covered (sex, football, food and alcohol) one thinks that in reality we would not

have acted very differently. But I would like to know what the Anglo-Saxons, so disciplined andthought

responsible,when they saw the picturesque panorama presented by Salvatores. Surely the laughter is assured, although he

never looks for the easy gag. They are your characters, with their actions and reactions, who end up forcing you to

hustle. It has been said that this film was overrated at the time. Can be. Maybewasted

its potential isand in reality, although I liked it, I admit that it leaves some stories hanging and that

never goes deeply into anything in a particular way. Anyway, it seems to me a very recommendable film,

which also leaves in the last minutes an interesting reflection on the loneliness of the human being, the love, and the

nonsense of the war. And, of course, it also leaves us with beautiful landscapes to remember.

Who could miss a time on an island like that!

" 1

" One of the most interesting proposals that the Spanish cinema has offered us this year. It is curious how, quite frequently, the best of the year of Spanish cinema we have to find it in

films that are not very publicized or even poorly distributed. This has been the case of "" La noche de los

sunsoles "", the feature-length directing debut of Jorge S���nchez-Cabezudo. The official synopsis, which

never needs to be ignored. , says the following: "" Pedro and Esteban are two speleologists who arrive in aarea

mountainousof ���vila to study the discovery of a cave and determine if it has scientific interest. ��fico. They were accompanied by

Gabi, Esteban's girlfriend, who awaits them at the foot of the mountain. But when the speleologists come out of the cave, they

find Gabi terrified? "" Actually, that's not the real starting point because the film is made up of

six chapters, each counted from the point of view of one or several characters. The first two,

precisely the most fragmented, are those that will take us to the point described by the synopsis. The problem is

that this initial presentation so fragmented is somewhat stuck and does not finish being perfectly

auctioned.But just from the moment described by the synopsis, around half an hour from the beginning,

the movie The film catches the viewer and does not let go until the end. Ah��� the story, in spite of continuing composed by

chapters, begins to advance in a more linear way and offers us the most interesting moments of a plot that

moves between the social portrait and the black cinema with enough solvency, thanks to a good gui���nya the sober

direction of S���nchez-Cabezudo. In fact, at times I remembered "Fargo", the great film of the

Coen brothers. It helps the final result, and a lot, the cast of actors, among which I stand out. Always an

effective Carmelo G���mez (Esteban, a little grateful role), Vicente Romero as a peculiarguard

civiland the couple formed by Ces���reo Est���banez (Cecilio) and Walter Vidarte ( Am���s el loco) that are part of

one of the most beautiful and tragic stories of the film: the enmity between the two only inhabitants of

an abandoned town Apart from that, Celso Bugallo deserves special mention. His performance is a gift for theeyes

viewer's. Bugallo is a big one; an actor who knows how to move before the camera and who is able to express with

his eyes an incredible amount of nuances. I hope that the Spanish cinema gave you more opportunities to dazzle usmuch. Everything

with your talent because it deserves it sosaid above converts to "" The night of the sunflowers ""

in one of the proposals more interesting than the Spanish cinema has offered us this year.

" 1

" The film gives no respite to the spectator, it keeps you on guard absolutely all the footage and also causing

a prolonged sensation of anxiety. If you have seen the first one and you have liked it, this new delivery is going to freak you out

and if you did not see it, go see this one that is worth it.

Juan Carlos Fresnadillo gets out of the skin by directing this film to the surprise of all those who think that "

second parties were never good" and to the delight of those who already vibrated while watching Intacto. For those

who do not know about Who is Fresnadillo, rememoro: Screenwriter and director of Spanish cinema born in

Santa Cruz de Tenerife on December 5, 1967. His main works include the short film Esposados

1996, candidate for the Oscar of Hollywood, and Intacto 2001, a film with which he won the Goya Award for best

new director. In 2002 he made, along with Alejandro Jodorowsky, the short film Psicotaxi. Needless to say,

Intacto is undoubtedly one of the films destined to become an object of worship, it is a film with fewresources

technicaland scarce budget and yet absolutely round and great. The same goes for "" 28 Weeks

Later "", it's a completely round movie and of course there is a difference "" 28 Days Later "" (The first

delivery of what seems to be a tremendous saga. I have gone to see the film animated by the fact that directed

Juan Carlos, but I have found more than I expected . The film gives no respite to the spectator, it keeps you

on guard absolutely all the footage and also causing a sensation of prolonged anxiety. If you have seen the

first one and you have liked it, this new installment is going to blow you away and if you did not see it, go and see this one that is worth

it.Banda Sonora de Linkin Park, fabulous and as usual in my cr��� I will talk about thedetails

physicalof the actors. At last!!! I find a right detail in a movie, finally some realism and is the

next detail: Eyebrows without hair of Rose Byrne (Scarlett) and is that this girl who plays a

doctor of the army, has a completely neglected eyebrows, full of "" Puyones "" and growing hairs. And why,

because a doctor in such circumstances, would never be worried about her appearance, that is,

shaving her eyebrows, would take them completely careless, with which great detail. (By the way, Rose, stop

saying that you are 27 years old because you have 34 daughter and it shows in the face, the age). Mention that the makeup of

the movie is great too. To put some defects, I would say that there is excessive use of the vibration of the

image and some scenes, are too obscured (I assume that it has swung digitally, at

least it has all the looks). The images of the ravaged city are impressive. Finish my criticism,

mentioning that I am passionately in love with Fresnadillo, that dog-faced pach���n, those little green eyes,

lost, saying "" Prot���geme "", in short this guy is a born talent, a sure bet for the infumable Spanish cinema

, who should invest in rough diamonds like this boy, instead to be happily distributing

the pauper budget allocated to the movies, friends and suckers of other years that we have

directors.Se���ores of the government, we want more Fresnadillo, more S���nchez Ar���valo, M Amens Amenabar, More from the Church

and less "" Since the dawn it feels like "". Fuck.Fresniiiii, Fresniiii I Love You! (You'll see how this guy is going to have to

talk, hopefully I'll fall short of being able to work with the alginda).

" 1

" When there is not much more to offer, the most practical approach is to approach people with renown or to attract

attention trying to sow thepanic.

EliRoth, sponsored again by an important character, in this case the ineffable Quentin Tarantino,

insists on drawing attention and creating politics in any way possible to attract viewers to the

viewing of their works. When there is not much more to offer, the most practical approach is to approach people with

renown or draw attention trying to sow the panic. Both cases are in the person of Eli Roth. In his

film debut, "" Cabin Fever "", being supported by the figure of David Lynch was a point in his favor.

When observing that the name of a genius like Lynch is involved, in some way, in the project, many will

launch themselves to view it, even if it is simply out of curiosity. And that is being his great asset. The truth is

that Eli Roth needs a powerful advertising campaign to accompany his films so they do not go

unnoticed and remain in the absolute of forgetfulness Being produced by a controversial director,

creating a stir about the terrible and political theme of the film and trumpeting it across the five

continents is, without a doubt, a very effective way to achieve its interested prop���sito.Y is that the young directornot

ismore than another fan of the grotesque, acrimonious follower of worship close to what today's ad is called

"" geek "and persecutor of fame in the newspapers and magazines that wants to be seen in the world of

cinema. A world that, in one way or another, attracts you. He captures fans, feeds his ego, earns money and aworks

future politicianto be able to bill his next projects. Yes, he has achieved it thanks to the

spectators falling into his trap. The damage is done. We've been selling "Hostel" for quite some

time as one of the most violent and brutal movies of the � Last few years, something not suitable for the

most sensitive stomachs. And, in effect, there is something of that. But, as is usual, advertising elevates everything to a

limit close to the disproportionate. As I said, very few own ideas. To say nothing. But what little

you have you have to squeeze it to the maximum. And Eli Roth has known how to get juice. While "" Cabin Fever ""

was a conglomerate of the elements of many directors who treated terror from apoint of view

different(see David Lynch himself, Cronenberg, Hooper, etc.), he turned Going into an apparently

appealing and unoriginal product, "" Hostel "" is a much simpler, direct work in certain aspects.

What initially appears surprisingly like a purely film adolescent and carefree, of those

that make think that to reflect the social life of young people there is no more to develop the plot based on

sex (or rather, the desire to obtain it) and the party, will slowly become the explicit

film that it really is. Thus, the course of the mindless shift (which leads to Slovakia) is

a paradise for those who dream of shooting in the easiest way and free their

hormones. Impress the ease with which they achieve all their desires. And that ups and downs of lack of control and

fun is reflected on the screen in a purely unreal way that manages to bring any tourist in

search of easy sex. A whole pamphlet for the more minded planes. And effective, of course. Although, obviously,

more than impress, such a show of ease makes us doubt. A little more than normal (while the viewer

glimpses over and over again the delusions of the protagonists) in arriving the point of inflexion of the film.

But it arrives. Then, logically, brutality harasses us and will no longer give us respite. At the same speed that the

characters are disappearing, the climax of violence is increasing its heights. And, then, the speed of the

events is extreme. There are no concessions of any kind. Eli Roth tries to immerse us in that

gloomy environment with no possible return. And if there is, our memory will prevent us from escaping from there.

The real plot is discovered, and the tortures, vexations and brutal and incoherent beatings do not stop happening.

Some manage to escape, but one gets to ask if it really is worth having escaped. Theexample

clearestis that of the oriental that is part of the most "unbearable" scene in the film and that most will

already recognize on the fly. Example that makes us reflect, even on the importance that today is given

to the physicist. If you look at a mirror and you look deformed, mutilated or stripped of one of your visible parts.

life can not go. It is too heavy and painful to carry during an entire existence. The film seems to

keep a certain point of social interest, but as soon as it pokes its head, itconceals it again

abruptly. A simple concession for the gallery that, on the other hand, makes us reflect on the violence and

nonsense in which the world is becoming. It is no longer known if one acts like that for pure pleasure,

amusement, frustration for reasons that the same offender does not know. Violence is in any

corner waiting for us. Like the Bratislava children's gang. But let's not fool ourselves or look for thefive legs

cat's. The film is simply a museum of violence, intrigue and high tension that can hook us to the

couch as easily as making us get up from it. side. Its premise, in spite ofnotes

possibly social, is as simple as provoking the spectator. But the eternal seeker of terror

lost in films that is not deceived. There is no terror here. Of ambience, bestiality and suspense, I know you will

get good doses. But even the most acrimonious followers of the "" gore "", which boasted the publicity of

the film in question, will be disappointed by the lack of content (except for a couple of

scenes). What is clear is that sensitive stomachs and easy-to-impress hearts will feel

nausea in more one occasion. It becomes unbearable not visually, but psychologically. In short, a film

absolutely flat, simple, dispensable, free and unpleasant that the only thing it can offer is

entertainment and tension. It does not tell us anything new and the word "" idea "" shines by its absence. It has aninvoice

interesting, some credible interpretations, a very successful setting and an in crescendo of history that

is degenerating more and more in what is foreseeable as the end. Without going any further, surely Tarantino himself

saw more than satiated his violent palate. In fact, the film drinks a lot of the purer violence of the director

of "Reservoir Dogs." Let's leave it all in a passing fad that it really is. Exactly in the same way that

Tarantino cinema rules in our time. Maybe you will find much more interest in the followers of the

latest films like "" Saw "" (which, in comparison, could even They look like great jewels) or similar.

Of course, it is a new and widespread wave that seems to have a place in the contemporary concept of cinema. Everything

is forgotten, and the hostel, little by little, will lose customers. Later, maybe the reserves are

running out again. Everything is a matter of observing our progress and waiting for the evolution of thepalates

viewer's. You never know. Meanwhile we will continue torturing. If possible to Americans, who, like in the

film, are worth more points (black humor s patrocinatira sponsored by the creators of "" Hostel ""). What is clear is

that they will not stop surprising us. And the deceptive advertising either.

" 0

" Tru���o of typical dimensions. There is no where to take it, except that it is short. If you think you have the

least resemblance to Scary Movie, you have been deceived. It is a tru eno in all the extension of the word.

I declare myself an enthusiastic viewer of Scary Movie films. My medium courier does not understand how our

deuvedeteca covers each and every one of the movies of the saga, much less similar as the dwarf who

passes itself off as a baby. But look, it's such an absurd humor that makes me really funny. So I looked forward to the

release of Epic Movie, which promised to be more of the same. By God, do not see it, nor is it like Scary Movie, nor is it

even a movie. It is a tru���ae tru���ae.La film is about four orphans thirty years that apparently are

children of the same father, or what I know. Each one comes from a different movie (Serpents on the plane,

Supernacho, X-men and The Da Vinci Code) and meets in a strange Charlie and the Chocolate factory, to land

in Narnia. Once inside and this is a carajal that gives me shame to continue resumiendo.Tru���o, what a great

word and how well it sounds. Repeat with me, T - R - U - ��� - O. Tru���o is a word created many years ago, but

surely its creator created it only to define this tru���o. He has no fucking grace, taking away some

of those who caught you off guard (the beaver scene was funny to me), but mortals of bad guys. The

characterizations of the films are very curradas and it seems that the thing had a big budget, why they did

not spend some perricas in a simple gui���n ���tico? It is not even with the predisposition that I had to magnify

his virtues makes me say something good. Tru���o.Resumiendo, Tru���o of dimensionespicas dimensions. There is no where to take

it, except that it is short. If you think you have the least resemblance to Scary Movie, you have been deceived.

It is a tru eno in all the extension of the word.Tru���ic Movie.Besitos.PD: And in the end leaves Borat, what I was

missing.

" 0

" Awkward, long and tedious telefilme lacking in its rhythm and hook This feature film begins well. A priori reconciles a plot of mystery? A child abduction- and the drama of

racism in the ghettos of the great urban networks of the United States. If to the previous thing we united the

participation of two almost always solvents Samuel L. Jackson and Julianne Moore like heads of distribution, the

cocktail seems interesting. What happens so that the essence of this cheap copy of televisionis distorted

series about criminal investigations with a social background? The director of La pareja del a���oy and Una navidad

de locos wanted to make the leap to the thriller and for that he focused on a novel by Richard Price, which in turn

adapted to the format of gui���n. An unpleasant incident unites the ways of a woman with guilt and

irrational behavior and a police officer who fights to control the security of aneighborhood

seclusionseparated from the "white areas" of the city. As the story progresses, this begins to give off

a whiff to CSI (in any of its variants: New York, Las Vegas, Miami), also keeping a

reasonable resemblance to Crash and Grand Canyon, the soul of the city, because of its racial connotations, but with

crime in between, something that more deeply embeds the feeling of discrimination based on the guilt of the

acts. And the story runs its course, jumping from plot to plot and anticipating the end, but it does not end when it

must. The director recreates himself in the oppressive atmosphere where the incoherent actions of the

protagonists take place, comings and goings that attract the attention of all but are especially insufferable for those who already

imagine the outcome. When it seems that the argument straightens up and we see the light at the end of the tunnel, the

dialogues begin to lengthen unnecessarily and, no joke, a beautiful and tender love story emerges. The

question we ask ourselves is. Where from? Still missing to analyze the moral of this clumsy, long and tedious

telefilm. We will leave it in suspense in case you still have the desire to see a dull title inheriting theplots

policeof television products, but lacking in its rhythm and hook.

" 0

" Milos Forman does not seem to have gotten soaked enough by the great artist and the character is not quite

convincing. Entertaining, but no more.

That today films are shot about Spanish artists, whatever the time, I think it's

great. Especially if it revolves around the figure of one of the greatest painters that Spain has had and the

world in general. Although it is true that the fact that it is shot in English, sincerely, it makes it less attractive,

because nothing is more beautiful than an original work; something easy to understand especially if it is something

related to an artist, as is the case. And it is that the dubbing, habitually, denaturalizes thea little

films, no matter how good they are. Milos Forman does not seem to have gotten soaked enough by the great artist and

the character is not quite convincing; the portrait of the black Spain that pretends to reflect the film,

lacks a solid bases, amen of its characters that at no time give the sensation of own the

characteristic size of the espa���olito of the time (with the exception of Bardem and the secondary Portillo and

Ugalde), which is neither better nor worse than any other but is our. Or at least it was. In general, Goya

appears as a witness of the events of the moment, with the Inquisici���na all fuse and Felipe IV as

monarch of a decadent empire, subject to an omnipotent Catholic Church and Resigned to retreat over

himself despite his exterior strife. The Napoleonic armies and the misery of citizenship complete

the framework in which Aragonese realizes his paintings of the so-called black era, and that adorn the t�credit

Initial and finaltitles. A pity that the implausibility of the argument and the lack of morden gui���n

not allow its two protagonists to perform a better job, because we must recognize that both Bardem and

Portman are two great actors, regardless of the personal consideration that I deserve each one of

them. Those who do not know enough about the history of Spain at the time may enjoy more of

the film, since it is not bad cinematographically, although it lacks rigor. Contrary to usual, the

fact that the scriptwriter is the author of the novel on which the story is based, does not contribute to make the

adaptation more credible, and in my opinion ,N, that I had the opportunity to read the original book, the film is

much worse, without being a genius the literary work of Jean Claude Carri���re. Entertaining, but no more.

" 0

" The best, undoubtedly, the interpretations of the 3 protagonists. Tracy is a 13-year-old girl from Los Angeles who loses her innocence thanks to the influence of the mostgirl

popularof the institute, he enters a world of sex and drugs that makes him radically changeattitude

histowards his family. Her mother, Mel, who is an alcoholic, will try desperately to understand and help her. The script

of this film was written by the director with Nikki Reed, the girl who She plays Eve (the most popular of the

institute), and is based on what happened to her when she was 13 years old. This makes the characters are very

well constructed and very real. Although in this veracity are also influenced by the interpretations of the

actresses, Evan Rachel Wood is the protagonist, who undergoes a spectacular change in a very short time , conveys

very well the despair that lies beneath Tracy's makeup and brazen layer; Holly Hunter is the mother

of Tracy, is divorced and alcoholic, although she is trying to quit and at no time we see her drunk;

Nikki Reed plays Tracy's friend. Eve has no parents, she goes to live with Tracy and her mother and hasinfluence

a decisiveon their lives. He is an unbalanced character very well played by the debutante

Nikki Reed, perhaps because he lived the history very closely. The best, without doubt, the interpretations of the 3

protagonists.

" 1

" A wonderful demonstration of the power of German cinema, which incidentally gives us a camp and teaches us that the

secret of a good adaptation is ���, like good perfumes, in its essence: the story that counts and the

respect for it.

At the end of a year in which I have swallowed things like 'Los Borgia', 'Alatriste' or 'El', I was already playing

ilusionistaa movie of the time when I looked for something That's because of the costumes or the photograph. The German Tom Tykwer

directs with veteran's office a fortunate adaptation of 'The Perfume', the archifamous novel by Patrick

Suskind, that either caught me off guard or simply has charmed. I believe that the second more than

the first. I try to reason. For the two or three laggards who have not read the book, 'The perfume' tells the

life of Jean-Baptiste Grenouille, a boy who is born among rotten fish heads in a suburb of

prerevolutionary Paris . Hated by all without apparent reason and systematically beaten since he was born,

Grenouille has a wonderful olfactory gift, and an obsession: to know all the smells, to dissect the world in

which he lives through. Des of its aromas and stenches. Grenouille is called to a mission above his own life (and

that of others): to find the perfect perfume, the ideal fragrance. In one of the best (by faithful and by

cinematographic) adaptations that have been made in recent years, Tykwer establishes anarrative code

markedly visualfrom the minute one and brings it to its ultimate consequences, supported , that's it, in a

narration in off at some moments (necessary, on the other hand, and never abuses it). You will not find in this

film tired explanatory dialogues, offensive flashbacks, or spectacular script twists. the

paused but firm pace of Tykwer, always counting, always showing, get the two and a half hours of footage to

pass in a sigh, and keep you on the edge of the seat even if you know the outcome beforehand. No

videoclipe editing (well, a little at the beginning to set the pace), just one way to tell the

story appropriately for the text that narrates. actors. Ben Wishaw is the perfect Grenouille, with

an anodyne aspect and simian walk, but with a spectacular expressiveness. It helps a lot this actor to not

have to tell things with the voice in off, sometimes a simple sniffing is enough to understand the character. They

dress him a Dustin Hoffman at ease with the character of the decadent Baldini; always Mr. Alan Rickman;

and the very young Rachel Hurd-Wood does not disagree with the rest, which is enough. Special mention to the beautiful girl

(enhanced by the photo and make-up) and brief appearance of Karoline Herfurth. All theaspects

technicalfrom the film rayan at great height: photography and planning by Frank Griebe that, at times, evoke

smells without words; music by Reinhold Heil, Johnny Klimek and the same Tom Tykwer that complements the action

perfectly; and the enormous artistic direction of Uli Hanisch (the art director of 'The Experiment'), helped

by the 50 million? of budget, of course. All but Hanisch form the usual team work Tom

Tykwer.Una podero wonderful demonstration of the german film, which incidentally gives us a campion and teaches us that

the The secret of a good adaptation is, like good perfumes, in its essence: the story that counts and the

respect for it. A 9. To put a but, there is a key aspect about the personality of Grenouille that is not

sufficiently well explained, in my opinion. More things.

" 1

" Delicious film more sweet than Chocolat and more entertaining than most of the comedies that are on the

bill even being a romantic tragicomedy In all rules.

More than three months ago, some friends began to eat my head on a film they had seen called

Waitress about a waitress who was expert in making cakes of different types depending on the inspiration. In

his own state of mind and putting the most unlikely and colorful names of the experiences thathim

madecreate them. I recognize that when someone puts so much enthusiasm for good or for badly I'm left with the

cantinela and now that the film is about to be released in Spain it's my turn to indoctrinate readers

about the need to visit the halls to see this delicious film. It's more sweet than Chocolat and more

entertaining than most of the comedies on the billboard, even though it's a romantic comedy in its entirety.

Jenna has a talent for their work that not only to perform "" Feet "" delicious if not to cons to

attract the sympathy of all those around him. When she discovers that she is pregnant, she realizes that her

desire to flee from her husband is going to be slightly disrupted. Trapped in a depressing marriage, in a

mediocre job and waiting for a child who does not want little by little begins to understand that life can be

accompanied by good things in the most unsuspected places. Two of his successes apart from the gui���n are its two

protagonists that will be the sea of ​​televisions: Keri Russell (Felicity) and Natha Fillion (Firefly) whose

chemistry and grace is indescribable. In Sundace the street audience was brought something that turned out to be both logical

and surprising since it is a modest, small but very careful tape and made with a lot of love . The

recipe proposed by Adrienne Shelly (director and screenwriter) had no waste. Written while she was in her

eighth month of pregnancy, the director was able to give life to a real, confused, reckless character in

search of happiness that provokes the empathy of any spectator instantly.

" 1

" What many people call their own style may not be such a good quality. Calling it style gives it

positive connotations, but when these characteristics are so repeated and repeated for so long

they become negative points towards the work of said director.

Martin Scorsese signs with the direction of this film one more of his works. Neither more nor less. Despite being

a remake of the Asian Infernal Affairs, the film has all the keys that make up the style of

the North American director. Mafia, violence and power make up the triumvirate that reigns everywhere and at your ease

through the already extensive filmography of Scorsese. In this film, once again, they are male characters that

support everything the weight of the film (as it happened in Taxi Driver or One of ours). His new actor,

Leonardo di Caprio, shows once again that he is not a bad actor, and that the years are giving him a greater presence

on the screen, which is also greater intensity in their interpretaciones.Cabe highlight the reunion on

the big screen of Di Caprio and Mark Whalberg after having coincided both at the beginning of theircareers

filmin Diario de un rebelde. It seems that the years have also improved the interpretive quality of

the latter. In counterpoint to them you can see a Matt Damon as usual as usual with a Jack

Nicholson not overacting but rather caricatured of himself. For the rest there is little more than Saying that

the originality of the story we owe it to the scriptwriter of the original film, which causes us to bang

against the wall to be awarded an American screenwriter Oscar for "" adapting "" a gui� It's already

done. However, it is worth highlighting the always fluid and successful editing of his usual Thelma Schoonmaker, which

Scorsese should consider putting on the credit titles at the same height and with the same typography. Cuerpoay body

of letter that its own name.A film director that already exceeds seven decades of existence and that

belongs to that generation of directors called "bearded" ", should offer us something that will captivate us. However

everything he does has an aftertaste already seen. Somehow the insistent location of all his

films in his native New York, shows the stagnation in which he is submerged. An affirmation like this

can raise many blisters among its followers but often if you look at the branches the tree may not

let you see the forest. What many, both critical as a public, they call their own style, maybe it's not such a

good quality. Calling it style gives it positive connotations, but when these characteristics are

so repeated and repeated for so long in such a similar format, as are most of its films,

they become points negative to the work of said director. They say that the worst thing that can happen to an

artist is that his work generates indifference. His beloved friends Coppola and company have had films throughout his

career that have marked milestones in the history of cinema for one reason or another. Although at present

their careers we can say that they have evolved to a point where they are lost. However,

Scorsese's loyalty, which many admire, in my opinion, has been the burden of his genius and has ruled

his career. It is not enough that a couple of his films have more than remarkable and worthy elements of a great

director. Sometimes it is preferable to make a big movie and lose the direction of your career, to direct more than a

score and realize that after almost forty years, your feet have not moved or an apex of the streets of New

York.

" 0

" Fun and exciting reflection about how difficult and complex are the emotional relationships,

the confusion and confusion that often lead us to loneliness. And do not wait any longer, because the film is

losing interest as the footage goes by.

Jos��� Glusman, director in the independent cinema of Argentina, tries to respond to a "" difficult ""

question in his last film: It's good that men Are you alone? His answer hascomedy

dramatictints, one of those so recurrent in the latest Argentine cinema, between THE SON OF THE BRIDE and NO SOS YOU AM

ME. In which people and their circumstances are what really matter in the course of the story that

we are trying to tell. SOLOS is a film that tells us about love, friendship and loneliness, and portrays, in the

last analysis, a possible vision of the way men love and suffer for love. The film

tells the story of two men and their destiny. Enrique (played by Sergio Boris) is 37 years old. The

last 12, living together with his wife and two children. Sick with jealousy, he has just separated once more from his

wife. Luis (played by Adri���n Navarro), 40 years old, has just finished a passionate relationship with a

very historical television journalist, of which he was madly in love, and left for another. So one

comes from the horror of jealousy and wear, and the other from a passion that dragged, and finally left � only

As Enrique has nowhere to go, Luis invites him to live in his house, provisionally? They do not want to know anything about

women. And it is at that point where coexistence begins. A coexistence full of obstacles, stages and

sensations. A moment in which one needs the other more than ever. SOLOS tells us one of those stories

so common in the latest Argentine cinema: it is a therapeutic history. The situations thatlive

the two characters willin the film are those that will allow them to clear that "" sea of ​​doubts "" that have

weakened them in their daily lives. The suffering that comes with separating them will make them stronger, andis

that, as they say many times, "there is no harm that does not come". And I forgot, are you going to discover the power of

Viagra? But, well, that's another story. SOLOS is about a fun and exciting reflection about the

difficult and complex that affective relationships are, of the confusion and confusion that so oftenus

leadto loneliness. And do not wait any longer, because the film is losing interest as the

footage goes by, in the absence of a development of the characters as well as ambiguities in the gui .N

" 0

" Movies like "Fiction", however, are called to remain in the memory of the spectators. A

film that leaves a deposit.

"" In the city "" of Cesc Gay. I do not know why the hell I have that litany in my head, those six words

that come to my mind, as cyclically as continuously. I know they refer to a film, much praised and

commented; and a director, young and excellently valued. But nothing more. I have not seen it, I do not know what the

movie or its author is about. If this is something. The fact is that it has just been released "" Fiction "", the last film of

Gay, which has also attracted the applause of criticism. And I went to see her, to a session, thinking if I should not

have seen that blissful "" In the city "" before. Come on, I did not know if Cesc is one of thoseauthors

self-referentialto whom, to get the point, you must have followed from the beginning of his career

. But no. Absolutely. Although for the theme raised in "" Fiction ""? the relation of two urban contumaces that

coincide in a kind of creative-spiritual retreat in the Catalan Pyrenees? it may seem that we are facing the

buclico back of a film titled "" In the city "" aqulla seen, enjoyed and savored with authentic

delectaci Even without knowing anything about the previous work of its author. And it is that we are facing one of those

small and intimate, seemingly simple films that talk about banalities such as life, art,

creation, fidelity, love, betrayal, friendship, commitment and so on as long as

the various possibilities offered are the interpersonal relationships of human beings in a society as

complex and contradictory as the Spanish one at the beginning of the 21st century. And, best of all, the great success,

talent and ability of Gay lies in talking about all these issues transcendental, which in other hands would have

tended towards grandiloquence and engolamiento, in a simple, clear, pr Stina and

unpretentious,no harangues or estentreas proclamations without vacuous rhetoric without paraphernalia or ornaments gratuitos.A

throughout the film, obviously, things happen. But they are the things of every day. For example, the four

protagonists go to the mountain, they distance themselves and the two most inexperienced get lost. What could have

led to an odyssey of suffering, overcoming, drama and so on; Gay resolves it with an astonishing

naturalness: the two lost descend quietly and at the end of the night they reach a road, signalized,

that leads them to a mountain refuge and to a town. As it has started to rain, they stay in the shelter

where, even incongruously, they spend the night well. Naturalness. That is the key to the story. A naturalness in

abundance, in the characters, in their dialogues, in their relationships and in their reactions. Characters of flesh and

blood, taken from a reality that Gay, scriptwriter and director, knows how to capture and describe to perfection. And it is that

at the origin of the story there is a certain fact and lived by the author: the sentimental failure of friends and

acquaintances who, being young parents, throw their relationships in the sink. No realistic cinema enjoys of

great predicament, today. However, movies like "Fiction", paradjustical title, reconcile you with those

bites of reality, with those notes of nature that endure over time. When the spectaculareffects

specialof today, tomorrow are a game of children, those mega-productions that now arouse an excessive

media interest will be pasture of oblivion . Films such as "Fiction", however, are called to remain in

the memory of the spectators, to be part of the cultural and sentimental heritage of this society, just

as it happens, for example, with the moral tales of Rohmer, to which I was so reminded of this "Fiction" that, with

the passing of the hours, is gaining in strength. A film that leaves a deposit.

" 1

" The young woman of the water is a pure sample of visual poetry, of extreme originality, of non-sensitivity

lacrimgenicand, above all, a great step to the filmography of this genius called M. Night Shyamalan.

Until now no director like Mr. Shyamalan had managed to create so much intrigue in the previews of

his films. As you can see, I do not mean that your films have suspense and are entertaining (which they

are), but that the public, no matter how many fans are not theirs, waits impatiently his next premiere. And why

will it be? For the reason that his films, so hypnotic, poetic and symbolic, immerse you in another world,

in a world created by ��� the same. M. Night Shyamalan is unique. In his last film, The Girl in the Water, carried

out through a story that he explained to his daughters before going to sleep, the symbolism is the protagonist,

or rather the genre. This beautiful film could be described as a totallyadult story

symbolic and poeticwith the fantastic phone genre. background (or maybe not as background.). I know it may

seem paranoid, but it is that the young woman of the water is a real paranoia. Or rather, I could define it,

focusing on the director, like Shyamalan's most personal film, although that does not mean it's

perfect. And as a sign that it is his most ambitious proposal, the director has decided not tomake

simplya cameo (which in my opinion was better) but appears as a secondary actor (and of course

essential in the plot). You already know that I do not like too much to explain what the films I

criticize are about, but I think that so you can understand better what I explain to you (if not the you've seen yet)

, I'll tell you the brief synopsis: Cleveland Heep, a man locked up in himself, traumatized by a terrible

past and who does not know (or can not) see the world that He surrounds, finds a fortuitous day a nymph in the pool

of the apartments where he works as a maintenance man. The strange relationship that is created between them

after their encounter will be interfered with by monstrous beings who try to prevent the beautiful

nymph named Story from returning to their world, The World Blue. I think that all the other details and moments of the

film (which are infinite!) Are better to see them, because in a film like this, in which you have more to see than listening , it

is essential to see it from beginning to end without knowing any kind of trap, secret or small detail. This is

a movie with a multitude of characters (all of them bright and ironic described). All of them contribute

small doses of importance to the story, making it more complex and entertaining. Both the

protagonists, Paul Giamatti and Bryce Dallas Howard, and the secondary ones have been excellentelections

c eleccionessting. I believe the attention of Jeffrey Wright (as the crossword puzzle addict), Bob Balaban (in the role

of an antipictic and eccentric film critic), Sarita Choudhury ( as the sister of Shyamalan actor), Bill

Irwin (as Mr. Leeds, that man who has lived in the apartments all his life), Cindy Leung (as the Chinese daughter

of the mother who knows the history of the Blue World) and the set of friends who do not stop smoking, although it is

forbidden in their small apartment. The young woman in the water is full of memorable scenes, and for that reason, I have

decided to describe some of them (briefly if you can), the most significant of the film. It will start at the

beginning (if someone does not want to know details about the film that does not read the next paragraph): the film

opens splendidly with a beautiful and completely symbolic followed by drawings that tell the story of the

water people with humans, who after being with them, decided to separate and worry about

themselves. This introduction is what makes you enter the film, so if it does not convince you or it seems

simple and pathetic, you better not see m�� It's a piece of film, it's not worth it. For those that the opening,

worthy of children's stories, has moved them (like am���), look at the following sequences to mention���

(without revealing part of the outcome, which this time is no surprise) . Although it is not too important

for the plot, the first image of Paul Giamatti trying to kill a bug that has been introduced in the

apartment of some South American inhabitants who scream as desperate before the alleged disgust of the

animal is, apart from ironic , a great beginning, symbol of man before the apparent small animal. The second

sequence that stands out is the first dialogue between Story and Cleveland, slow and full sensitivity. When the

protagonist dives into the pool, or rather, into the hidden world of the unknown moment

, it is a scene that looks like terror and scares, but instead what he wants to transmit is that

discovery, a step more in Story's story. Another significant sequence is the one of Paul Giamatti

trying to fight against the enemies of Story, that at the same time indicates the steps that he must follow so

that the evil beings do not attack him (he will not go into details). But the best for me is that of Cleveland healing

the wounds of Story with nothing but the heart. And finally, the final shot, with that Giamatti blurred by

the pool water that has changed his life. These scenes would lack such beauty without the brilliant

director of photography Christopher Doyle (usual collaborator of Wong Kar Wai) .M. Night Shyamalan has mixed and

embedded all the pieces of this complicated puzzle with the intention of saving the beautiful nimfa, to create what

can be called a happy end that rewards everyone. As I said before, it does not have a fixed gender. In The Girl in

the Water you can find Paul Giamatti doing the clown imitating a child to tell a story

(which by the way, he does very well) and the next scene and the next sequence to a fearsome dog- wolf

who wants to eat whoever crosses his path. What I want to refer to is the great mix of genres,

with the dominant drama, that the Indian director has created. This risky proposal also enjoys an excellent

soundtrack (attention Aln to the main theme) composed by James Newton Howard (always present in the films of the

director), a worked editing and impeccable edition, extraordinary visual effects (although they are the

least), a gui��� n the most elaborate and ingenious direction. The young woman of water is a pure sample ofpoetry

visual, of extreme originality, of non-lacrimgenic sensitivity and, above all, , a great step to the filmography of

this genius named M. Night Shyamalan. It's not perfect, and that's why I admire it. The stories have never been

perfect, and less those that start from an improvised one.

" 1

" Soy Leyenda is the new product-show that Hollywood offers to win the battle at thebox office

Christmas, but despite its good start, it turns out to be a foreseeable film and the most sopor���fera.

The Christmas holidays are approaching, and if it were not enough with the constant bombardment of advertisements, the bustle

that was created would also happen in commercial areas, and the night lighting of each city, to the

billboard come the big Hollywood bets for the ticket office. After the failures (always

speaking in Hollywood language) of Beowulf and The Golden Bridle, we arrive at Soy Leyenda, in whichis

Will Smithpresented as the last living human being on the face of the Earth. With such anapproach

encouraging, in which even the cinema of catastrophes already passes through our country (although it is only the appearance of a

Madrid devastated in a poster of Soy Legend in the movies of Se���l), starts a film not suitable for the most

bitter detractors of Will Smith, since it appears in the pr�� Totalidadctica totality of the frames. In honor of

the truth, the film has a few minutes that hooked by its intensity, largely thanks to how

well rolled are the plans of a soulless city of New York. Unfortunately, the intensity is

declining as the story becomes monotonous and repetitive, and that having the lastas protagonist

living man on the planetdoes not give much play for an entertainment film. And at the moment in whichappear

the infected, the screen parades a series of persecutions and several shootings that will only

startle those spectators who have fallen victim to the torpor. fero spectacle. All this leads

to a final full of American morality and with a marked religious accent. I am Legend is the new

product-show that Hollywood offers to win the battle in the Christmas box office, but despite its good

start, turns out to be a foreseeable film and of the most sopor���fera. Ideal to spend a warm afternoon at the

movies and take a good nap to the health of a long-suffering Will Smith.

" 0

" If by the script we would be facing a real movie horror. As Scott is a cult director,

many are deceived and see quality where there is none.

I can imagine how it was managed "" A good year "" (A Good Year). Ridley Scott has just come out of a

blockbuster, "" The Kingdom of Heaven "", and is about to embark on an ambitious project ("" American

Gangster "") so it's best to do a simple movie, cheap, fast filming and a genre that enjoys

the popular fervor. Finally rolls a dramatic comedy of court (allegedly) romantic , with an

attractive and charismatic protagonist like Russell Crowe, a few women with an imposing body (you can see the

duster, Ridley), beautiful landscapes, a cool motorcycle for the prota to move a little (���homenaje at a

film of his brother?), a pinch of (cheap) philosophizes and a lot of dialogues (ridculos largely) .If

by the script would be before an authentic film horror because, being a typical

story, to top it all off is it not about topics about life, love, money and so on. Nothing differentiates the gui���n of

this movie from many others of similar theme aimed at adolescents. But of course, it is directed by Ridley

Scott and that has two consequences. The first is that the film is directed with correction and has anrhythm

entertaining, although the action advances a little to typical stumps in typical , which makes the two hours of

film do not become excessively long (although they are noticed). The second is that, as Scott is a cult director,

many are deceived and see quality where they do not there is. If it were not the director of masterpieces like

"" Alien "" or "" Blade Runner "" this film would have received some brutal criticism. Motives would not be lacking.

" 0

" For any movie lover, it is imperative to watch this movie. And it is that, today,missing

real cinema is, and this, undoubtedly, it is.

On many occasions we have stopped to think about how luck influences In the things? How many situations

in our life have not been marked by that chance? How many times we ask ourselves: what would have happened if ..? and

we realize how much luck had (and has) to say in our lives? Woody Allen tells a

story in which luck and chance change the fate of the characters. Put aside all kinds of

prejudices, be they good or bad, because the final result is what some have already called, and

rightly, a masterpiece. Chris Wilton (Jonathan Ryes-Meyers), An attractive former tennis player, he decides to teach this

sport in a London club, where he meets a young Englishman, Tom Hewett (Matthew Goode), with whom he will establish

a friendship that will lead to to a relationship with this sister, Chloe Hewett (Emily Mortimer). But from the

moment he meets his friend's girlfriend, Nola Rice, played by Scarlett Johansson, Chris's

life will be a storm of comings and goings, lovers, jealousy, despair and despair. Woody Allen reflects, with great

talent, how despair and anguish take over the protagonist, being immersed in two relationships:

the one he has with Chloe (with whom he marries), and the one have with Nola. Two totallyrelationships

opposite: love on the one hand; and passion for the other. The protagonist, come a moment, is torn between the

stability provided by the relationship with his wife, and the obsession he has with his lover. In this sense,

Allen makes us see how life is full of interests and how we move through them. Allen's work is

crucial in this sense, and only he is able to tell us magnificently how the development of both

relationships with the circumstances is, the coldness with which Wilton takes them, his lies and their burdens. And above

all, how it is finally solved, when the anguish surpasses the protagonist and decides to end one of his

relationships dramatically. Without a doubt, the film will not leave indifferent to anyone, deserving special mention

the grand finale, where luck is once again decisive, and with which Allen manages to point the viewer.

Although there are already several feature films of this style, the quality that the director prints is worthy of

all kinds of praise. His way of filming allows us to understand the anguish that invades the protagonist,

who on the other hand, is played by a great Jonathan Rhys Meyers, who undoubtedly makes his best role

to date by perfectly reflecting all the situations by which the protagonist passes. All a success

on the part of Allen, who chose him expressly, even going so far as to declare that: "since I started thinking about

him for this role, I could not take it away from him anymore. the head. "" Scarlett Johansson correctly interprets Nola Rice,

with that air of attractive and "" fatal woman "" with which seduces Wilton. The rest of the actors fulfill their mission

to perfection, "" even exceeding the expectations "of Allen himself, as he himself recognizes; although,

nevertheless, they are overwhelmed by the absolute protagonism of Rhys-Meyers. For any lover of the cinema, it is

essential to see this film. And today, true cinema is missing, and this undoubtedly

is.

" 1

" Entertaining, without losing the rhythm at any time, it is a good proposal for both children and

adults.

Monster House tells us the simple story of a haunted house, which attacks anyone who gets in

front of it and especially children. But behind the simplicity and the typical of the story hides a humorous

guide that will sound never seen and that maintains the suspense during the pr�� �ctica totality of the film.DJ

Walters is a boy who becomes obsessed with the neighbor of the house opposite, the old gruñn Nebbercracker. The

old man awakens the fear of the children of the whole neighborhood as he takes possession of all that object that falls on his

lawn. On Halloween, his friend Chowder's basketball disappears and they realize that the house

has a life of its own and an aggressiveness beyond the limits. With the help of her ingenious friend, the three decide to

investigate what happens with the mysterious house, and there begins an adventure in which terror and humor

intermingle in equal parts. On the cosmic level, the secondary characters stand out: the chubby

graciosillo Chowder and the police assistant who investigates what happens with the house take more than a

laugh. There is even room for love, since the two children will compete for the attention of the little girl who will

accompany them in their adventure and At the end of the film we will discover that love can reachlimits

unsuspectedin the case of Nebbercracker.Filmed by the animation technique used in the movie The

Polar Express (a mix of live performances and digital animation), the characters seem flesh and blood,

so that despite being an animated film they seem much more cre���bles to win in expressivity.

Entertaining, without losing the rhythm at any time, it is a good proposal for both children and

adults. A great candidate to win the prize for best animated film at the 2007 Oscars.

" 1

" An interesting film of mathematical riddles for a good-looking thriller, that without being the best

work of De la Iglesia, continues to shine at a very high level.

The new film by Alex de la Iglesia. It's not his best film, but in the case of a director that I have

totally on an altar, and of which each of his films seems like a masterpiece, "" Los Cr���Menes

Oxford"" failsdetractthe average level. And if we add that I had been waiting for this film since

I had news that it was going to be done, the fact that I have not been disappointed or an apex is quite

eloquent. The argument is simple in principle , an assassin leaves clues in the form of a logical sequence of what

will be his next step, and the duet Elijah Wood (I am unable to look at him and not see Frodo) John Hurt (who eat

the screen) has to investigate to discover the terrible truth, in a scenario full of colorful

characters and mathematics and philosophy as a background, for an outcome m��� or less surprising, and

also crosses the fiery romance between Frodo and an explosive Leonor Watling (making the joke would

say that he is not the only explosive character in the movie). ���cula) In "" The Oxford Crimes "" the philosophy is the

true protagonist, through the ideas of Ludwig Wittgenstein, and above all the message of "" there are

no universal truths "", in an interesting reflection on whether abstract ideas preexist or are mere

artifices. ���The concept "" 2 "" exists in nature, or is it simply that we call "" 2 "" everything that

fits our idea of ​​duality? that some of the equations are very tricky,

since you skip some steps or are a little pulled of the hairs, somewhat "" Deus ex Machina "" but at least

allows the viewer to play to discover the intermediate steps. But come on, that ultimately is a highly

recommended film, and is not the best of Alex de la Iglesia, and does not have that "" Alex style "", is still a movie

of the Grand Master.

" 1

" The main r enmora in the style and identity of the work is the mediocre visualization of director Mike

Newell, superfluous and repetitive. His short shots and his worst sense of rhythm (in reality, he lacksrhythm

visual) make the distinction between his film and any Disney telefilm difficult.

The character of fire tells a story of conspiracy in which Harry Potter is the magician of straw and thepiece

decisivefor the attainment of an end: the rebirth of Voldemort. The story unfolds several

substories, alternating sequences between a competition of magicians and the first conflicts in love and

friendship. Considering the saga as a whole, this delivery confirms the evolution of the Harry Potterian universe

from the infantile to the p���ber. The characters grow, Hogwarts grows and becomes the witness space of the

advance towards adulthood, analogous to events that follow a pattern of dramatic "" in crescendo "".

We consider that the most representative and remarkable attribute of the saga is that progression of tones, from

early childhood to problematic puberty. It seems that the landscape, the symbolism and the architecture of

Hogwarts, the mysteries and events that enclose their surrounding walls and valleys, is a reflection or

metaphor of insecurities, fears and hormonal changes in its human protagonists. It may

not be very risky to say that, in the future, the Harry Potter saga will be interpreted as if it were

a metaphor, in the guise of culebr���n kistch, over the passage of time and the changes of becoming. However, the

fourth film falls back on the errors of the first. The structure is quite correct, as we have

said, underlying the central motive (conspiracy to resurrect Voldemort) of which the various subplots are

constituent parts of it. What fails is the articulation of the different frames. The fire code is

a dispersed and inconclusive film because of the absence of connectors that allow to create a dramaticsensation

overall. In the course of the minutes the work is broken into pieces: Harry's nightmares and

his disagreements with his friend Ron, the teenage love flirtations, the competitions and the tests to be overcome,

the conflict between the teachers and others tics typical of the saga. The scriptwriter, in this case, has wanted to

develop too much information and in the end does not get the necessary cohesion between all the pieces. And,

specifically, it does not make any of them interesting, except for the last twenty minutes, in

a total of one hundred and fifty. How much untapped footage. The main r enmora in the style and identity of

the work is the mediocre visualization of the director Mike Newell, superfluous and reiterative. His short shots and his

worst sense of rhythm (in reality, he lacks visual rhythm) make the distinction between his film anddifficult

any Disney telefilm. And where the shortcomings are most noticeable, it is in the summit scene - or what should have

been the summit scene - Voldemort's return. On the one hand, we confirm that Voldemort is a bad decaffeinated and

with little chicha, of course with such mediocre execution, little juice can be taken out. It's a staging problem

, first of all. In short, this fourth part of the adventures of the young magician, very weak, shines only for

sporadic moments and anecdotes. That yes, the sinister end opens many unknowns that promise great

emotions for the next adventure. We will be aware.

" 0

" A way of seeing the cinema that we have never been able to see, a way of feeling at another time through

ours. A way to discover a filmmaker who promises things he does.

Because there is no possibility of more stars, that if not, it did not leave room to write and only put wonderful

brilliant satellites to this Masterpiece of Cinema. The Cinema may not be an Art, or maybe I do, but the

one who does IT has to think that what he does is not; he must think of the cinema in terms of craftsmanship,

that's why Rober Rodriguez's movie is an authentic enjoyment, a film as funny as it is violent and shameless.

We all know the move that has happened with GRINDHOUSE and its European premiere, that move to separate it in two to

get more money out of a movie conceived to be a continuous double session. That is a mistake, because this movie is not

only a tribute (and of this talk later) to a certain type of cinema, it is also a tribute to a way of

seeing it. Much has been said of Robert Rodriguez (and of GOD TARANTINO) they are great "" homagers "", which is not

true. they do not pay tribute, they steal. they are thieves of celluloid, of ideas and material, that sometimes

recycle and occasions simply copy and paste (Tarantino always, that is, with a lot more success than

Rodriguez). This may be the only "" peli tribute "" of Tarantino and Rodriguez. But let's focus on Rodriguez

this time, it's his time. There are people who have not seen the movies that were shown in the GRINDHOUSES, but surely

many have seen them and do not remember or do not know. The Weinsteins claim to have separated the movie in two for the

reason that we Europeans do not know that way of watching movies, a real gilipollez, my father (great

philosopher in his juventud years ago ) watched movies in double sessions of "" convois "" or of adventures and

"" cates "", in the 60s and the late 50s. Authentic double sessions, in which there were rolls screwed by

use, rotten rooms in which people pissed and movies that, when going in several rolls, looked

messy because the projectionist had gone his hand last night with the alcohol and put them in

the order they were not, I remember that my mother (this time she) told me that I once saw GIANT in amanner

disorderlyin a summer cinema. What I come to say with this sketch of paridas esque the motives of the

producers are always hidden, which should not matter much to the public, but to the "" frikis ""

as I like to know. We know perfectly well this way of seeing movies, our generation,

mine, those of us who walk between 20 and 25 today have not seen shit, and those of 40 do not know the truth, but

first yes. What is true is the genre that Rodriguez and Tarantino saw, it did not have much to do with

ours, they are from the cinema of the 70s ... the gore movies, the vampires and zombies, the spaguetti western instead

of classical westerns. but the way to see them was the same, with lost rolls and dirt equal.PLANET

TERROR (Finally I'm a little specific !!!) is a movie with a hellish pace. he pays homage and copies the films of

Fulci, Bava (Lamberto and Mario) to the cinema of Fleischer and the seventies and eighties slasher. Take a little bit of everything

and mix it wonderfully to make a product, like someone who makes a gazpacho of those with stumbles, of those

that do not pass at all. (comparison that possibly only understand the Andalusian) It is of normal duration and is

of action and terror, the most pure Rodriguez style, shot at full speed and in video. It has a magnificent cast

with a perfect cast of secondary, something that Rodriguez lately does better than anyone, look NO CITY.

Rodriguez also does one thing that was only done in the 50,60 and 70 and now ���ly his colleague Tarantino, who is

repeating characters, in this case the Earl Mcgraw of Michael Parks, also seen in KILL BILL and OPEN UNTIL THE

DAWN, which produces an interesting temporary vortex. If Earl Mcgraw dies in OPEN UNTIL DAWN

means that this movie happens after KILL BILL and PLANET TERROR, but in PLANET TERROR the character of

Bruce Willis (a actorazo that we will recognize in a ���os and to which the cinema owes a lot) talks about Bin Laden in

a dialogue that I do not want to disclose. A really curious thing. PLANET TERROR was written before the

DAWN OF THE DEAD was released and 28 DAYS AFTER, these people can not believe it, but the truth is

that it has nothing to do with them, this Peli is not serious nor taken very seriously. It is not a parody, but it is not

a serious vision of the zombies, it is a CINEMATOGRAPHIC vision, through the cinema itself. The actors, all, They have

caught the tone very well. above all Josh Brolin and the underrated and great Michael Biehn, who I hope will

now take off as he deserves. Reese of TERMINATOR.Si one wantsfun at the movies, which for what

is invented, you see sto and rent movies type four minutes, not saying it's bad, but bettersee

in the cinema something of the PLANET style. The movie is ingenious, full of gui���os that people will see. Rosesubmachine gun

Mcgowan'sin the leg. It is an image that will go down in the history of cinema, say what people say. if one sees the

movie, it accepts a tone from the beginning and if it is maintained, it will not squeak. It is difficult to maintain a tone and to break it with

something very different and not to scold, only a title comes to my head, THE MAN WHO NEVER WAS ALL,

who has that strange exit of tone of the UFO at the end ... and it is wonderful, maybe because we are talking

about people as perfect as the Coens. PLANET TERROR must be seen, with that trailer at the beginning of a movie that

seems to be made, but that is not made .. MACHETE. Maybe I've talked a little bit specifically about the movie,

but maybe it's better that way, because you have to see it.

" 1

" The conclusion that comes after seeing it, is that it is a good film and very strong, not suitable for

cardiac? If you like strong emotions, I recommend you go see it.

Today in my article it is the turn of a film of Terror produced by Quentin Tarantino and directed by

Eli Roth, Its title is Hostel 2. Well Hostel 2 is a film that it impresses, and a lot, there are many

very impressive and impressive scenes. It has an argument that goes in the same line of the first movie

"" Hostel "", but quite unpredictable, or at least I was surprised on several occasions, and I think the

Argument will surprise you too, personally I prefer the argument of "" Hostel 2 "" to the first

part. Overall Hostel 2 is better than hostel. To give you an idea of ​​how this film is, I

recommend that you see the pictures that were made for this occasion? are worth seeing? The film begins with the

murder of the only survivor of the group of boys who went to Slovakia in the first film and the delivery

to the head of the hunting club From the head of the boy, from that point we could say that the relationship that

could exist with the first film disappears. In this new installment, there are three girls who go to

Slovakia deceived by another girl they meet while they were on a train. On this occasion, just as

in the first film, only one survives, that is, I will not tell you who survives, how it survives, or why it

survives? All these data you should discover for yourselves watching this piece of film. The

conclusion that comes after seeing it, is that it is a good movie and Pretty strong, not suitable for

cardiac? If you like strong emotions, I recommend you go see it. I would also like to encourage

those who have not seen "" Hostel "" to see it, if you like Saw-type horror movies, you will

probably like them, and as a moral Do not go to Slovakia just in case?

" 1

" The illusionist is a pleasant surprise, very well structured, mysterious and beautiful. A small production

within the current billboard, without artifices, big budgets or pompous ambitions.

Magic is once again in vogue for movies. Far away are those early beginnings of this art, in which Melies

played a fundamental role supported by the tricks of illusionism, which contributed to make cinema as we

know it today, possible. In this year, the magic, as in the first years of the seventh art, returns to

be protagonist in different productions. On the one hand we had Woody Allen playing a crappy magician

named Splendini at the service of an eminently comic story in "" Scoop "". Allen had already shownlove

hisfor conjurors and illusionists years ago, playing with that element in "" The Curse ofScorpion

Jade"". After "" Batman Begins "" and after the excellent "" Memento "" e "" Insomnia "", Christopher Notan has also

signed up for magic. "" The Prestige "" will talk to us about two wizards in continuous struggle to be the best magician in the world,

Hugh Jackman and Christian Bale, who will not hesitate to steal tricks in their affinity for get this

distinction And now, we get "" The Illusionist "", a film based on a short story by Steven Millhauser

entitled "" Eisenheim the Illusionist "" and under the direction of Neil Burger (responsible for the false documentary

"" Interview with the Assassin ""). "" The illusionist "" is one of those small and modest Hollywood productions

that show great respect for the history they have set out to tell. One of those films that, under the

appearance of a low budget film, take maximum care of their ambience, resulting more successful and accurate

than many of the films with d�� Dollars and dollars invested in them. It can be affirmed that "" The illusionist "" is a

small great physical achievement. A drama of simple but very effective time, capable of hypnotizing the viewer with

his images in order that this does not take off an eye of the screen. The film situates us in imperial Vienna,

where a mysterious illusionist, named "" Eisenheim the illusionist "" (Edward Norton) will arrive to surprise

his citizens. There you will find Sophie (Jessica Biel), your childhood sweetheart and who is now betrothed to

the heir prince Leopold (Rufus Sewell). "" The illusionist "" has the elements necessary to achieve the

interest of the audience as Eisenheim the illusionist achieves with his amazing magic tricks. The

Imperial Vienna, magnificent and beautiful, political and cultural, is very well recreated (and with amedia economy

praiseworthy), the careful ambientaci���n and sober decorations, the m� The music of Phillip Glass (reminiscent of the one the

composer made for "" La Horas "") very much in tune with the images and a photograph of the British Dick Pope who

It perfectly evokes the beginnings of the 20th century in which the plot is located, as well as the still tender cinema of

those years. In addition to all this, " The Illusionist "" has an added attraction, that of the magic tricks

carried out by Edward Norton, as sober and elegant as the whole of the film, and that make the

p�� Audience to the room see a double show; cinematic and musical. The direction of Neil Burger is

praiseworthy. With a personal script and adapting a short story that extends without the script suffering,

Burger has created a romantic narrative that takes classical elements, such as the love between people of different

class or a corrupt power. Burger manages and executes all the technical and narrative elements to perfection and

leaves in the raised envelope, Edward Norton, the luxury secondary, Paul Giamatti, Jessica Biel and the

eternal villain Rufus Sewell (bad evil ���simo in "" The legend of the fox "" or "" Destino de caballero "") make use of their

talent and veteran in their roles. The continuous duel between Giamatti and Norton is high flying and their

encounters are one of the many successes of the film has. Without doubt, "" The illusionist "" is a pleasant

surprise, very well structured, mysterious and beautiful. A small production within the current billboard that

without artifices, big budgets or bombastic ambitions, offers us 110 minutes of good cinema, with

well-orchestrated elements for the enjoyment of all those attending the hall. A film that must be seen with

the same eyes with which a magic trick is looked at, without asking too many explanations before theends

trick.

" 1

" Another film that goes on to get fatter the list of films that do not count anythingOther movie more that happens to fatten the list of movies Queculas that do not count anything. Slow rhythm and few

resources for a simple story in which Goya (Stellan Skarsgard, Pirates of the Caribbean 2 and 3) is represented

as a simple gueb���n that together with Bardem get the best performances of this film, absolutely

boring and tedious . Bardem, work the voice please, lately I always hear the same tone for all

the characters, crass error. Let's go with my beloved Natalie, I can not be objective with her, I can her beauty,

is that although she does not say anything, I am fascinated by his look and he distracts me completely, even though I can say that

unfortunately it is not the best he has done, it is much better in V de Vendetta. Here it happens without pain or glory.

The double interpretation Mother / Daughter seems to me pathetic, but this is the fault of Milos Forman of course. It is beautifully

misdirected, and I say amazingly because I have Milos for a great director and I do not explain this badness to the

director. . To highlight the costumes, the soundtrack gives headaches. The title of the film does not

refer to what is shown later, it is more a story of unrequited love than anything else. I thought

he was going to show more of the inner hell of the painter, but no, he's just a pe���nm���s.

" 0

" Throughout its 160 minutes we attended a game of cats and mice with an exemplary planning that

perhaps sins in excess of the ellipses. Do not even think about blinking, you're missing it.

I remember being a kid I went to the cinema to see JFK and I left the theater terrified. Okay, because that

same sensation hits me today after seeing Zodiac, I do not know if the best David Fincher's film, but if the more

"classic" and contained (and the longer). At the end: the one who expects to see Donnie Darko and Iron Man wandering around

looking for an enigmatic murderer, to stay at home, because this looks more like everymen

president'sor a good seventies political thriller (and a movie). That Spike Lee genius that was Summer of

Sam) that Se7en, which is neither good nor bad, just different (and a little longer). Throughout his 160

minutes we attended a game of cats and mice with an exemplary planning (the zenithal planes, the

first thirty minutes), that perhaps sins in excess of the ellipses (there are situation signs every five or

ten minutes cough, and that in a movie of 160 'are many little signs) and information. Do not even think about blinking,

you'll miss it. I only see one problem, and as I say before, it's a "police / newspaper" and

not a thriller today, of those that Fincher directs, we go, and it comes to the case (that opportune expression)

because there are moments in the film that are magisterial, historical, terrifying, superlative , and one

wonders why he does not have that tone during all the (long) footage. Of course, then it would not have been called

Zodiac, it would have been called Se2en. And another hit would be the characters, not the actors (all

master), which in some cases go without more. You have to see it, which is the entrance of Fincher in the Olympus of

the directors, the rest of the new virtuosos rely more on the script, this directs as God.

" 1

" The most risky product that has been seen in years within the panorama of Spanish cinema.proposal

Wildat times, rebellious to 100% and made with much passion. That's just why the film deserves to be given

a chance.

That the Spanish cinema urgently needs new blood that radically changes things, is something that is obvious

. Last year we had three ���peras raw that made us hope for the future of Spanish cinema

, "AzulOscuroCasiNegro ?," The Night of the Sunflowers? and? Un Franco, 14 Pesetas ?, three great examples

that make other films of more consecrated directors pale. This 2007 is on its way to offer us the same,

and now Rodrigo Cort���s' proposal comes to us, someone I will refer to as the enfant terrible of our

cinema, a born provocateur, who knows what he says and defends Either way, what he believes in,

cinematographically speaking, of course. And for that he does not mind rebelling against the system and offering us

the most risky product that has been seen in years within the panorama of Spanish cinema. The argument of

? Contestant? tells us about a young professor of history of the economy who one day wins the biggest prize ever

awarded in a television contest. What at first should be an enormous joy, is

becoming, little by little, a hell to discover that being a millionaire costs money that you do not have. At

first I will try to fix the problem by asking for a loan from the bank, but this will only make things worse. The

film is a complete act of rebellion towards everything we are used to seeing come from these parts

. Realized with a lot of courage, it's like performing a double somersault and without a network, something that I think

Cort���s has come through gracefully, at least as far as the management work is concerned. , which seems simply

exemplary. Without hiding his influences from American cinema, ranging from Martin Scorsese (his particular God)

to Paul Thomas Anderson, the film is a true prodigy in terms of montage, inflicting a

rhythm to the film truly vertiginous, in which there is hardly time to think things over. Thanks to that

frenetic pace that does not give any respite, the criticism that the film makes of the current economic system is

simply brutal, not letting you head down. In that aspect, and of course the distances, the

film could be paired with the wonderful film by David Fincher? The Fight Club ?, although the film by

Cort���s lacks a more definici Den of personas.Y is that I think that there lies one of the weak points of the

film, since leaving aside the main character, I think that all others are careless , some to

the point that he practically does not paint anything in the story, as for example that of the protagonist's girlfriend,

who almost forcibly disappears from the narrative and before it is incomprehensible the fact that in a few

moments is the typical foolish t���a who does not know anything, and in others it is more clever. We also have the

character of a lawyer without scruples that I find excessive and burdensome, intentionally exaggerated, but

I think it is out of place in the whole. To that we add a partner of work of the protagonist and an oldeconomist

extravagantthat can be of an incomparable help for our protagonist, who has his moment of

brilliance, but to which we miss more of what We should. As for the acting work, evidently

shines a sensational Leonardo Sbaraglia, carrying absolutely all the weight of the film, in one of

the best tour de force that have been seen in a long time, also achieving Do not fall into histrionics with a

character that lends itself to it with ease. Chete Lera is like the Obi Wan Kenobi of the function, offering us,

along with Sbaraglia, the best sequence of the film, one in which he explains how banks work , using

a chess match as a metaphor, a unique and extraordinary moment, which makes you want to never ask for

a credit to the bank. Miryam Gallego and Luis Zahera are the hardest hit, with two characters barely

interesting, as much as the first is the girl in the film, and the second a striking character, yes,

but empty ���o.It can also be said that, at times, the formal aspect of the film ends up partially drowning

some aspects of the story, as if it were the trees that do not allow to see the forest. And there are certain

plot details that do not convince me or the least. To start, the profession of the main character:

professor of history of the economy. It is a little shocking that someone with his knowledge is so foppish

in a subject that he knows more than most people. The relationship you have with your partner is not well

defined. The issue of a certain bank loan is not entirely clear. And finally, something really

shocking: a millionaire uses a mobile card and not a contract? I do not believe it. So, then? Contestant? It is an

interesting but failed film, or if you want to say it in another way, failed but interesting. What I am

very clear about is that Rodrigo Cort���s has a lot to say inside our cinema, because he knows perfectly well

what happens in our cinematography (something that is already I will talk to you another day, if the occasion

deserves it), and its way of manifesting itself is making a wild proposal at times, rebellious to 100% and made

with a lot of passion. That's just why the film deserves to be given a chance.

" 0

" You get up from the chair with the feeling that you have just been robbed by a film production company. The

number 23� ?? I was hooked through an interesting trailer that invited me to spend a couple of hours drunk

with suspense but, rather, I ended up drunk with boredom.

How many times have we fallen into the tentative world of creativity and bought something that, subsequently,

It has not exceeded our expectations. In these cases, it usually happens that the advertising campaign is better than the

advertised product. Well, exactly the same thing happens with enough movies. The tr���iler is quite

attractive and adventure a story that will leave us, at least, moderately satisfied. However, the

reality is totally opposite and you get up from the seat with the feeling that you have just been robbed by a

film producer. "" The number 23� ?? I got hooked through an interesting advance that invited me to spend a

couple of hours drunk with suspense but, rather, I ended up drunk with boredom. The parallelism between the life

of a Reader and the main character of the book that is enjoying dar��� pi��� to a spiral of obsessions that will

end with an end that borders on schizophrenia. One of the biggest mistakes of the film is thetreatment

visualthat shows the literary history that the protagonist reads: the chosen artistic style, that of a comic,

subtracts all the mystery from the thriller and, therefore, it expels you from the narrative. Throughout the script, we

find an infinity of suspicious narrative traps: I still do not understand why one of the

characters introduces his address. Personaln personal between the pages of a book that tries to publish anonymously;

but I still understand less as in a hotel are the wall of a room full of blood and not

only calls the police but, a�� Later, the blood will continue to be there. The end, as expected, is

quite bizarre and any student of the first Psychology can suffer a mental collapse quite

strong when See it Finally, the strange association that makes the number twenty-three with certain

historical characters, any resemblance to reality is pure coincidence. The best of the film, without a

doubt, the trailer.

" 0

" Surprising film of the most famous film trio of the 70s and 80s in Spain. It suffers from whatsuffers

everyone, which start quite well but as we approach the resolution of it, everything wanes and

loses completely the north. Still, highly recommended, and even topical.

I had not seen a film from the Caspoteca for a while now, and it's just that my half-courier sees nothing but women

in leather and pat Ticos di���logos where I see deep social and political criticism and overflowing irony. Well,

maybe some women in leather also see, but anecdotally. By the way, the film baggage of

my baby is already greater than that of the medium Spanish. The film is about two families of the deep Spain, the

Bellotos. and the Mondongos. They dispute from before the Civil War the property of a well, in the middle of a wasteland

where only the goats graze. One day, in the midst of one of their usual disputes over the aforementioned,comes to them

the newsthat they want to take away the land to put a nuclear power plant in them. So they start a

series of protests, which have so much impact that the Arabs, the government and the Americans are interested in

buying them "" their fame. "" What a pleasant surprise to find this movie in my particular caspoteca, which had not

made any case until now. It has a very critical beginning to "" the two Espa "as "" that fight for the smallest thing

(a well that nobody uses or shares). The corrupt politicians who only dedicate themselves tothemselves continue to cache

enrich. Then we get the petro-dollars and the American dollars, which bring out the worst in people. And

finally he tells us that being good does not get anywhere and that the whole thing is moved by the same, those

who do not have scruples. All this dotted with women in leather everywhere (in which I remember

seeing) and impious touching to brighten the male pupil (the female can fall to the ground of

fright). Resumiendo, amazing pel� The most famous film of the trio of the 70s and 80s in Spain. It suffers from what

everyone suffers, which start quite well but as we approach the resolution of it, everything

wanes and loses completely the north. Even so, highly recommended, and evenof the end, if it would

topical.Lastnot be almost the best.Besitos.PD: Anecdotally, I think it is in the first one that comes out silicone in the

breasts.PD2: The scene of the self-destruction of the tape is "" Made in Iba���ez "". PD3: And the dialogue of the

room ��n the brothel is delirious.

" 1

" It shows us a spooky world, but that is there. Five hours away from our comfortable

lives.

We wrote a few weeks ago that the American cinema is living a glorious moment so that many

of the great films of the moment are showing an admirable level of analysis of This globalized society

in which we live and a stimulating political commitment to the causes of truth, freedom and justice. "" The

Lord of War "", written and directed by Andrew Niccol, is a step-by-step, another link in a chain that

rewinds us Recent entries such as "" Syriana "", "" Munich "", "" Crash "" or "" Good evening and good luck "". Where do

the weapons with which millions of people go fighting every day, across the length and breadth of the

world? That is the question. And, as the first person narrated by the character played bytells us

Nicolas Cage, it's not a balad��� question. The film starts with a powerful and powerful sequence that shows

the path followed by a bullet since it is nothing but a piece of metal in an assembly machine until it is

embedded in the head of a poor African boy, spattering all of blood. At that point, all the

spectators stepped back in the seat. and we no longer take our eyes off the screen during the two

hours of projection. Among the best findings of the film is the point of view adopted by Niccol.

Being able to have chosen an impersonal and analytical third person to scrutinize, Deus ex machina, the

activities of an arms dealer; choose a more complicated solution, but much more stimulating: give

voice to the despicable character, in first person. It gives voice to a sinister trafficker who, in addition, is the

absolute protagonist of the story. A trafficker who the spectator hates and despises, of course, but

who also has a certain sympathy and even a point of admiration, for his coldness, his

professionalism, his determination and his ability to succeed even in the mostsituations. Nicolas

complicatedCage, an actor who has never been a saint of my devotion, is superb in his recreation. of the

skilled businessman who conquers the woman of his dreams through a skillful stratagem, who tries to

convince himself that his activity is not it is as bad as the others think, that it is justified with the "" ifnot

I diddo it, anybody else would do it "", that makes fun of all those who try to get in he comes to

retaliate cruelly and ruthlessly against his enemies. "" The Lord of War "" shows us a spooky world, but

that is there. Five hours away from our comfortable lives. All the African sequences, from Liberia

and Sierra Leone, on���ricas, dur���simas, estremecedoras, are masterfully shot, transmitting all the horror

that Conrad already described in "" El coraz���n of the darkness "" An excellent film that puts the finger in the wound

of one of the most lacerating situations that we face in today's world. As the character

played by Ethan Hawke says, the real weapons of mass destruction are not the atomic or hydrogen bombs

, but the AK 47, the popular Kalashnikovs, those goat horns that, from so simple, to the

crÃos can make authentic butcheries with them. "" The lord of the war "" part of an excellent gui� He

brings a smile to you, and a moment later, leaving it frozen in his face, turned into a grimace of horror.

A guide full of memorable phrases - "" The bullets change more governments than the votes "" -, not at all Manichaean

and with an apothetical end that, fortunately, is the height of the rest of the film. A film thatyou

forcesto talk continuously with your armchair companion, to make comments and apostilles, that makes you angry,you

turnson and makes you angry. "" The Lord of War "", in short, is one of those movies that, passing in a

sigh, invites to talk, reflect, discuss and think. Nothing less.

" 1

" This mix of genres does not quite marry at all and sometimes you wonder if you are really

suffering with the characters or you are laughing with them.

From the director Christopher Smith comes this mix of surreal comedy and horror where a group of executives of

a weapons company are invited to spend a weekend in what they expect to be a luxurious mansion

in Romania. After being abandoned by the driver of the bus where they move they go into the forest with the

idea of ​​finding the house themselves, but they run into a group of murderous paramilitaries. The film

pretends to be a movie of serious terror, but at times it is interrupted by gags of the most idiotic, that they

have their grace, but that they break the rhythm and the tension created. To my taste, this mix of genres does not quite

marry at all and sometimes makes you wonder if you are really suffering with the characters or you are laughing

with them. Some of the gags are really accomplished, especially the moment standing in the fridge, one of the most

successful.

" 0

" Creep is a combination of all the defects that a film can suffer from: it is poorly

structured, the idea is simple and vulgar and the actress on whom all the weight falls of the gui���n does not measure up, not

even far.

've always liked movies more suspense than horror film,least because except honorable

exceptions, usually well above plot level, and also because of a timethe

pel Scary movies, for the most part, are a parade of ulcers, dismemberments and any imaginable subject;

at least in the films coming from the United States and many countries of the old continent that have seen in the

"Americanization" of their works the only possibility of gaining screen share. It is very possible that part of the

incipient success of Japanese cinema is due to this cause, since until very recentlycould be counted on the

the Japanese productions of this typefingers of one hand. they were released in Spain. Creep responds perfectly

to the stereotype that before commented, since its gui���n is of a magnitude magn���rrima; practically the whole of

it takes place in the subways of the London underground, where a strange creature (more than a monster

looks like a guy to whom they have thrown a cauldron of boiling oil over him) he is dedicated to take to his

lair to everyone who is. To make matters worse, the strange being emits sounds that resemble those of a

eunuch tuneless in the choir of the church. Creep is a combination of all the defects that a film can

suffer from: it is poorly structured, the idea is simple and vulgar and the actress on whom all the

weight of the gui� rests He does not measure up, not even far. And it's Franka Potente, no matter how many people want to praise it, it's

a monument; but a monument to the inexpressiveness and the lack of claw before the camera. As in almost all

films of this type, the following question arises: Why do you never auction the bad guy when they have him at

his mercy? In short, a film to put it to students in film schools. So that they

are clear about what not to do.

" 0

" Despite being a superproduction dated in 2006, La Dalia Negra is an impressive example of the Black Cinema

of the forties.

In spite of being a superproduction dated in 2006, La Dalia Negra is an impressive example of the Black Cinema of

the forties; a cinematographic genre par excellence, that owes its name to an invention of the critics

of Cahiers du Cinema. In this film, some of the best elements of Brian De Palma's cinema come together,

although the filmmaker's worst mistake is also made: to start from a brilliant idea to achieve

outstanding development, and finish the job with a final that does not convince, very far from the expertise of the English genius

of suspense, so many times pursued by whoever signs this tape. All those people who, after the

first viewing, manage to configure an exact mental scheme of the complete plot of this film, enjoy,

from this very moment and forever, all my admiration. I would be reassured to know that James Ellroy

wrote some chapters in a drunken state, as Raymond Chandler confessed in TheDream

Eternal, but I am satisfied to think that there is dirty play in the approach, impossible to tie, cheating,

or simply a basic component inherent in black film: the complexity of their arguments. Indeed, we

are faced with a torrent of ambiguous auxiliary frames that, without prior notice, they converge in an infinity of

names and surnames, to end in a unique plot basis, the murder of the Dalia. Betty Short

? real character- would be the classic reference of " "Holly is riding in Hollywood" "fictitious character" Double

Body of 1984, the same director. The repeated story of an aspiring actress who misses the door and

enters a sordid and ill-advised world. The life of this character - and everyone's - are described through

the dialogues. Some essential and impressive conversations that are never uttered at random, and

as a fundamental part of a revealing whole. His career is shown in black and white, with the

projection of his casting tests, in the that the researcher adopts the role of "" intruder "", in the purest style

of La Ventana Indiscreta. His death turns the spectator into an indirect witness, thanks to anplane

imposing impossible: no one will He liked being in that mattress impregnated by his blood. As the crime is part

of the cinematographic field, the allusions made to the celluloid world are continuous. It is mentioned in

numerous occasions to producer David O. Selznick, to Mack Sennett, or recourse to La Dalia Azul, a film

starring Ver���nica Lake, for which the novelist feels real weakness in the story thatadapt

Curtis Hanson willfor the screen: LA Confidential. Although perhaps, the greater existing parallelism between both

arguments, is the one that makes reference to the traumas that drag their personages. Recall (for example) the

role of Russell Crowe, who loses nerves in the cases of mistreatment of women, and

relate to the role of Aaron Eckhart, who abandons an important case to focus on capturing the

murderer the young actress. The discovery of the corpse, is exhibited in a spectacular plane synthesis, which links the

main plot with another important narrative adjacent. In both scenes appear crows, asanimals

annoying and inopportune, in a preclear Gui���oa Los P���jaros.Finally, you can not conclude this section

dedicated to Betty, without mentioning expresses the good work of Mia Kirschner in her portrayal of a bad

actress. A curious paradox. The experts of the genre say that every good film of black cinema requires the

presence of a woman who, without being the protagonist, always sets the guidelines of the action; and it is here where

the sixty-six-year-old blonde enters the scene ... and in what way she does it! An original movement of the camera flits

to his back, he approaches it from the left side and fixes on the brim of a hat, which rises to

pronounce an indifferent hello! with a hoarse voice. Et voil��� miss Johansson. More than a great actress, she is a

great product, which is forged at the moment in which her mother baptizes her with the name of the protagonist of What

the Wind took. A myth that is maintained thanks to improbable but effective manifestations, such as the

funeral he said he had organized for his little fish of colors. Undoubtedly, an undisputed diva, inside and

outside the screen, protagonist of "" inventions "" that already ridiculed the master Lubistch in Being or not Being.

However, the real star (the fatal femmes are always brunette) is Hilary Swank Poor rich child !.

Sometimes fragile and unprotected; at times, ruthless and lethal, with a characterization and within a performance

suspiciously reminiscent of the Italian Alida Valli, starring in 1947 The Paradine Process, of how not?

Alfred Hitchcock. Within this footage, of important technical values, it is necessary to draw attention to

its assembly, a key element in the best films of De Palma. There has also been an exceptional photo,

faithful to the classical chiaroscuro of the genre, oscillating insistently between the shadows and the blurred lights.

A photograph in which they have managed to filter, in a very correct way, images captured through blinds or

between the railings of the staircase of the strange family, which we will know by means of apremonitory

subjectiveplane ... And so far I can write about the history of a tribute to classic cinema made in the

21st century. A film that will delight lovers of this genre, complexity andends

loose. To my taste, too many.

" 1

" Going to the movies to see this deserves to be returned the entranceBuf, afraid of poster, with all the Russian mountain dead and with the face of fright. Ugh, what a bad thing.

Even if someone had been given a clown's nose it would have been more suitable for the film thatus.

bindsThe film is about a group of students who finish high school (that is, of those who are in their

twenties and try to pretend that they do not reach the age of majority) and prepare for theparty

graduation. Before the same, they decide to go a group to the amusement park to ride in aRussian mountain

tremendous. When they are mounted on it, a girl has a premonition and sees that everyone is going to die. Hea

mountsnose and manages to get several of his friends off the Ferris wheel. Moments later, all those who did not go

down die when the wagon derailed. From here, death seeks tirelessly (and with much

imagination) compensation before the audacity to snatch those sinful souls from their cold hands. Is theringing

argument? Well, the first one was funny. The second, come on, okay, we accept ship as an aquatic animal.

Fuck, but the third is infumable. Is locked inside the genre "" Is it funny, is it scary or is it a

bullshit? "", Which is also a genre with great titles nowadays . The actors are pathetic,

saving the two that come out in balls for what a nude always gladdens the view. The deaths are a

laugh, absurd and gimmicky that they are (the one of black grips is gracios���sima). And the argument is too

linear. In addition, as you already know that the pod is going, it does not surprise you at all at any time. Reminiscing, a

moj���n of a kilo with which you can spend the afternoon with the cronies in home (when it comes out on DVD) while you

inflate pizzas and beers on a hungover Sunday. Going to the movies to see this deserves to be returned to you

.

" 0

" The Fantastic 4 and Silver Surfer is the perfect movie for the summer. Without another pretense to

entertain. Without another speech than the obvious one.

The narrative solvency of the Marvel films does not respect nineteenth-century accords nor considers among its

fundantional virtues that of pleasing large segments of the audience. Their aesthetic concerns alsonot

dorequire the more thoughtful (and perhaps plime) intervention of a gourmet philosopher to understand the message,

for example. Here there is no message or worries about how many. The upper segment of the audience, the staff

already talludito, can abstain: you will not miss anything. Singer, Raimi and Nolan have put the

Marvel list at a great height, but there is still a well-nourished number of unpretentious filmmakers (Story) who

only comply with the commission and invoice a spectacular product -this is not difficult in the times we live- and

simple consumption. The fantastic 4 and Silver Surfer is the perfect film for the summer. It's about bringing

together a bunch of kids and giving them a generous ration of superheroes and sidereal bullets. Looked like that, the

film is exemplary: it does not get lost in ramblings about the loneliness of the hero, it does not obscure his entertaining speech with

reflections on the goodness of the human being. The plot is released in a plispl���s: nothing left over and nothing is missing, as

in a good film by Frank Capra. Honest and direct, then. The emotional and psychological chiaroscuroes of

other heroes (Spiderman, Batman, X-men) are here deliberately omitted from the script. Nor do we have to

support the regulatory introduction: we already know who each is and how he spends them. So the plot

starts with less promptness and we enjoy (yes) with a foreseeable avalanche, infantiloid and majestic

special effects. I do not think anyone with a few fingers in front look for this summer artifact destined

for oblivion any more. If to this benign cluster of visual treats we added the intervention of Estela

Plateada / Silver Surfer, as honey on flakes, that my grandmother said. If the kind reader was a fan of the

stories of Stan Lee and Jack Kirby is assured of entertainment. When you want to take a bath in purity, you will

surely know where to go and what spiritual spirits to take to comfort your slack composure.

" 0

" Shrek Tercero is an unnecessary film, made for the simple act of making money; the formula is

exhausted, the characters worn out, the writers tired.

Something bad happens to a comedy when the two most important songs in its plot are thecompasses

initialof Paul's Live and Let Die and Linda McCartney and Damien Rice's 9, which is not exactly the joy

of the orchard It's too lazy to comment on a movie like this, so I will not use many words. Shrek Third

is an unnecessary film, made by the simple fact of making money; the formula is exhausted, the characters

worn out, the writers tired. There is no life in the film, it is an inert product for 90 minutes. Everything

that happens is predictable and without grace, not even for the children, to whom it is oriented. Technically it is more

of the same, there is no innovation, not even saved in that aspect. It has neither the irreverence (although with

many nuances) of the first, nor the parodic tone of the second. In short a horror, which is not even for

children to have a good time in the cinema (checked). And the worst is that they have already given the green light to the fourth and fifth

part. In short, flee like the plague.

" 0

" Lions Gate lords, do not kill your franchise saga or your golden egg hen, disappointing

and without contributing anything to the saga, or the development of it, without motivation , empty ... Can you say more

negative words in so little space?

As I said at the time when I saw both "" Saw "" and "" Saw 2 "" as the third installment "" Saw 3 "", while the

first one I found an excellent movie, which saved ��� the ass and the checking accounts to a small production company

like Lions Gate that had thought to launch it directly to DVD for rent and that, avatars of the destiny decided to

premiere it in Hallowen of the 2004 in cinemas , the rest have been coming out thanks to the good reputation (and excellent

taquilla) of this, and while the first was an excellent experiment (as I said) the rest have been

depreciating its predecessor, and showing that with little, can do (or raise) a lot, without great

efforts, or actors or effects, leaving,, to the audience with an open mouth with a

incidentallyvery similar ending to those who like to put M.Night Shyamalan (but in shabby), and making the mouth to mouth of

the adolescents is who is responsible for doing the rest. Sinceramente I did not have any kind of bet on this

fourth installment, especially when I started reading and checking that the criticism put it as the worst in the series, as well

I waited for DVD and! Voila! one afternoon / night without having anything better to do I prepared to see her; and once more my

opinion joins that of the majority, although the film delves into the aspects of Jigsaw's life, which, as if

from a vulgar Hannibal Lecter will tell us the reasons that led him to become the bloodthirsty

serial murderer who tells us his movies today, after explaining those reasons the film is lost in atwists and turns

thousand and onesense, that they are useless, and where a "" anyone can be the murderer of the

Puzzle "" seems the leitmotiv of it, on the other hand, the traps, which in the first tapes were not

only curious but aptly cruel, they become mere stupidities, from which it is increasingly easy to

get rid of, and leave the viewer again with a very bad taste (for the time lost in his viewing) and

with little desire to m Ens.As for the actors, all unknown, and secondary of a multitude of series,

none of them are seen all, lost, without contributing, without expecting anything, and without showing the "" bad feeling "" that

It supposes that they have to pass on the screen, mention apart that of showing in some moments Jigsaw as a kind

of avenging hero, and not as a bloody and murderous murderer. In short, that if the saga continue on this path,

for my part is the last film I see, it has happened to me with other installments of horror movies, where I left

the movies and I refused � round to continue seeing new deliveries. Lions Gate lords, do not assassinate your

franchise saga or your golden egg hen, disappointing and without contributing anything to the saga, or the

development of it, without motivation, emptiness ��a. Can you say more negative words in so little space?

" 0

" Great movie of genre (fantastic, it is understood) shot as if it were a story. M has done it again. Man, does not reach the excellent results of The protégé, but is fighting with

signals in my Top 3 particular Shyamalan (The second is The forest). Once again he demonstrates that he is the best

composing shots, filming them afterwards and suspense to any story that comes to mind. I'm not going to

tell you anything about the movie so as not to make you a predetermined idea of ​​the film, but it's a great film of

genre (fantastic, it is understood) shot as if it were a story (that is). It is a tale. With the

successes and the defects that entails. Poignant Paul Giamatti, excellent child Howard and thecast

highest secondaryof M to date. This time, the usual role reserved by the director is

much more relevant than usual, but it does not matter, it does not clash with his character. How is going to clash,

if he has written it? Great image that gives movie critics (they are so) and maybe limps, to say

something, the usual humor of their movies, that, if in this movie it works in some occasion, it rubs the forced in

others. And have three (or four) resolutions. (That's not final) Anyway, Shyamalan is

vigorous in the direction, and the music orchestrated by the usual James Newton Howard is outstanding. You have to

see it. A 8.

" 1

" Argument easy, simple and predictable, aesthetic videoclipera to the most not able, the music deafening,

skinny please do to the tape.

I must admit that the first 2 films I liked, it is more, the first, with the direction of video-clipero

Rob Cohen, was an original proposal, ideal for the crazy of the tunning and the sports vehicles, the second,

with a loose direction of John Singleton (food film where they exist), is simple, but again Paul

Walter and Eva Mendes manage to save it, apart of Cole Hauser, in both I grab something I like, but in

this one? Let's be serious, complicated in this class of films, a tape where at 10 min. Of projection you are

wishing that it ends, or that the protagonists are struck by lightning. It's not a good sign, is it? This happens with

both protagonists, on the one hand we have Bow Wow (or as the name is called), a boy I met in "" Like

Mike "" and that should be as cheap as the lady of the cleanliness of the casting, since lately it appears

in enough films, by another one to the unknown Lucas Black and is that its papers of secondary in "" Cold

Mountain "" "" "Jarhead" "and" "Friday Nights Lights "" also do not give for more. The aesthetic videoclipera to the most no power, the

deafening music (low and sub��� the volume of the DVD to the less on 500 occasions), the argument easy, simple and

predictable when you can not, the girls wearing "" chicha "" (well, that's on the positive side, do not fuck),

the plans quick, almost done by the one-armed brother of Michael Bay, a disservice to the tape. And to

think that I kept at least a small hope that I would like it.

" 0

" An excellent film, dramatic but fun, human, filmed and written with intelligence, demonstrating,

once again, that cinema does not require big budgets or bulky stories to reach people .

Here we have the road movie of the year. Compared to other genres such as horror, comedy,films

roadappear as one more, although, they can usually be framed in one of the master genres,

to call them in some way, it is true that by structure, for purposes, all the calls road movies

share characteristics. Small miss sunshine represents an exemplary film within the genre.have

So wethe family protagonist, a set of losers (loosers) so typical of American cinema: the father who

has designed a whole methodology on how to get there to success in nine steps and constantly waiting for a

phone call to confirm that her book is going to be published, the plump little girl obsessed with

beauty pageants, the heroin���mano grandfather, the depressed t cono with suicidal tendencies, the adolescent son

who constantly reads Nietzche and who has been nine months with a vow of silence and, finally, the mother, the

character who tries to put a point of sanity in the whole matter. The trigger of the whole story is a

children's beauty contest for which the little Olive has been chosen after a small carom. As the

economy is not buoyant, they decide to take all, albeit reluctantly, their filthy van and travel

two states of the southern United States, the deep America, so that the child to get your dream to

participate. As in any road movie, the destination is not the important thing, but the trip itself. The film, which

could be described as drama with a dose of comedy, revolves around the frustrations of not achieving success. The

father is a man obsessed with being a triumphant, stubborn in that his method is infallible, obstinate in

refusing to recognize that he himself is a loser. This behavior affects everyone around him,

starting with his children, the teenager who hates his family of losers and wants to become apilot

fighterand the daughter who lives obsessed with beauty contests. The mother and the grandfather in opposition

assume their scale in the society, although they have put the hopes in the girl, in whom, at least she is

a winner. Meanwhile, the uncle, played brilliantly by Steve Carell, has taken the opposite step, has

gone from being a winner to being a loser. Despite the dramatic tints the film is peppered with a

multitude of fun and hilarious moments, like that rickety van that ends up being a character more

than the movie or the children's beauty contest. The script is a success, the characters, despite

their bizarre point, we seem close, understandable, human. In addition it presents a very suitable rhythm

alternating comedy and drama, introducing novel elements so that the plot does not decay. The actors are

very well, you can tell they have a good starting material and they know how to get the most out of it. From Greg Kinnear, brilliant

as a father obsessed with triumph, to Alan Arkin, an authentic robaplanos like the heroin-grandfather and

addictedporn addict. The direction is also effective, without abusing the accelerated assembly and making great use of

the panoramic format, a risky decision, with which the film has been shot. �cula. They get reallyshots

interesting, helped by an excellent photo. The soundtrack is also very stimulating, being

many of his songs instrumental arrangements of well-known songs that add a crazy and funny point. In

short, it is an excellent film, dramatic but fun, human, filmed and written with intelligence,

demonstrating, once again, that cinema does not require large budgets or bulky stories to get

to the people. By the way, for anti-studies people, anti-American cinema, this film that won several

independent film awards and the public prize of the San Sebastian Festival, has been produced by a

Great study: 20th Century Fox, even if it was through a Fox Searchlight affiliate.

" 1

" "" The promise "" is a pretentious proposal that wants to cover too many topics and that abandons thebeauty

simpleof its predecessors to embark on the digital world

After having seen films like "" Hero "", "" The house of the flying daggers "" or "" The curse of theflower

golden"", one hopes to enter a magical world when he attends a new adventure ���pica China. However,

the new bet of director Chen Kaige and the team that rolled "Tiger and Drag" left me with a bitter taste

. "" The promise "" mixes the fantasy It's a fairy tale, with the typical of the oriental battles and the

romanticism of the pink novel, but precisely the mistake of dealing with all those issues together results in

a confused and overly convoluted story, closing the end absurdly some of the frames

raised. The beauty of its aesthetic loses much of its charm by the abuse of digital effects,

causing laughter in various scenes of combat. It is incomprehensible that in the 21st centuryare left aside

important details (like the weapons of the protagonists)in favor of digital technology. Even the

soundtrack weakens in some scenes of the film, as for example when one goes to great orchestrations in

intimate moments of the tape. The only thing that saves the film of a Total disaster is the good definition of the

four main characters, confronted by love and ambition, among which the great performance of

actor Jang Dong-Kun stands out, and, of course, the colorful rojiblanco that stands out during all the time. In short,

"" The promise "" is a pretentious proposal that wants to cover too many subjects and that abandons the simple beauty

of its predecessors to embark on the digital world.

" 0

" In this org���a of offense and insult,? Borat? ends up getting a mess, pointing in all directions and

without clarifying what is? criticizable? or not.

It is a matter of taste, but the type of cinema as "" Borat "" (with the addition in its title in Spanish of: "" The

second best reporter in the country " Kazakhstan's travels to America ""), is in the antipode of which I am interested. The

thick humor of "" poop "", "" vaginas "", "" straws "" and "" ass ""; of the blows and blows; The provocation to provoke,

curling the curl of bad taste, neither original nor attracts me. Although, as in the case of "" Borat "", it is a sociological

phenomenon due to its ���xitazo (surprise) in the North American box office (one more example of the "" terrible "" effects of

Bush's policy, to make a film like this one a blockbuster). And it does not appeal to me even if it defends itself with

the alibi of exposing the difficulties of fraternization between cultures or of being a reflection (that

is, as faithful as pathetic) of the current society "" more civilized "". In fact, Kazakhstan, in Central Asia, is

used as a distorting mirror of the worst of Yankee culture, society and beliefs? Y? of theworld. From

westernthe jokes that he spreads like poisoned darts Sacha Baron Cohen, aka "" Al��� G "", alias "" Borat "",

a redneck raised to the maximum power, it seems that escaped or diminished physical, deficient mental,

gay collectives, feminists, senators, preachers, blacks, wealthy people, ordinary people of the street, well-

thought, malpensive, citizens of the deep America, of the New York City or Jews. The irony

according to "Borat" It is understood that in many cases Borat ironizes about prejudices very, dangerously, rooted.

Thus, the excuse to make his documentary in the US is to take ideas to modernize and find solutions to

the "" main problems "" of Kazakhstan, which are, literally: "" economic, social and Jewish. "" One of the

most (allegedly) funny sequences shows us this sexist, retired, vain andjournalist

anti-Semitichoused in a home of? Horror! Jews. The sequence is treated as if it were a

horror movie, with a guide included to one of the most remembered scenes of "" The project of the Blair Witch. "" But do not

scream in the sky. I have been blown away that the British Sacha Baron Cohen is precisely Jewish, and also

convinced and practicing. So he will know better than anyone what is the sensation, many times, of being

Jewish before the others. However, in this org��� to the offense and the insult, "" Borat "" ends up becoming a l ,o,

pointing in all directions and without clarifying what is "" criticizable "" or not. What is also your intention to

separate the one from the other, and that each one decides? Well, that is not understood even Borat

Sagdiyev.Genial Borat, unfortunate Borat.To confuse the viewer more, travel to a format of? Road

movie? in plan "" false documentary "" with deliberate feistic aesthetics (and this does not suppose any defect, on the contrary,

the form adapts to the content), and where it is supposed that there is a bit of everything. People who know what type of

film they are working on, others who smell it and others who catch them totally by surprise.

Mixing with each other, Borat makes his way, m��� s that to obtain "" ideas "" with which to modernize their country, to

satisfy their own and selfish sexual desires, and that basically materialize in the meats and forms of

Pamela Anderson. Kazakhstan is very good. Also hilarious the? Gag? at the hotel, where this

Kazakh journalist confuses the elevator with his room, and refuses to leave because the space already seems to be

hellish and he thinks that his room will be smaller But at half an hour I was wishing that Borat would shut up,

and at the time of projection, waiting and wishing that the film would end, heavy, gross and disproportionate. Not

even a sequence as "" antol���gica "" as "" grotesque "" of fight to the ?, sumo ?, with Borat and his orondo producer

naked, in frank competition of free fight provoked by the audacity from the second to masturbate before a

photograph of his beloved Pamela Anderson, served to brighten the function. Neither the fact that the sequence has

one of the most hilarious and ingenious details of the film, that of placing a long black spot

censoring the (allegedly very long) penis of the protagonist.Borat in the museum. while, instead of

giving in and enjoying this laughter, one wonders things like: Why does not Borat listen to his

interlocutors after asking them? Why does he meddle anywhere and insult everyone? Why is

the madman constantly doing if he knows very well what his intentions are? ��� Clear! It will be because it also speaks

of the lack of communication and the need to provoke as a means of transgression. Art, of course, is

transgression. You also have to have a sense of humor and know how to take things easy. But "" Borat "" is like

planting a cagarro in the middle of the Guggenheim museum. Some would be scandalized, others would laugh, others would admire their

daring, others would kick her out if they could. It would also be the option to take it with indifference. But

I do not remember any "" shit "" in the shape of this, "" shit "", that has done nothing for art or culture. In the

same way that seldom a film with an intelligent humor (that does not comedy) has triumphed in theticket office.

North AmericanGood! At least now many people, including myself, will know that Kazakhstan

also exists.

" 0

" The best comedy of the unforgettable (and unequaled) couple Esteso / Pajares in a whirlwind descacharrante

that only fail his last fifteen minutes.

I release my newly acquired dvd of "" Los bingueros "", the peak of the Spanish comedy of the late seventies.

Mariano Ozores directs with a firm hand what may be the best comedy of the unforgettable (and unique)

couple Esteso / Pajares in a whirlwind discarding that only fail his last fifteen minutes because he

totally loses the rhythm and it does not show a climax or something that resembles it. Anyway, yesterday I was descojon���

as if it were the first time I saw it, with those ingenious phrases (especially from Pajares) and the gestures

( Esteso before starting to play his first bingo) and I still miss Antonio Ozores, very little role

for such a great comic. The edition is great, with a clean master, current interviews and audiocomments that

I have tried and they seem funny. I suppose SazMann will soon be leaving me a little cry on my supposed

"" cinephilia "", but I say with my head held high that the collection in dvd of these cracks was something that many

We took a lot of years claiming. ��ticas of the film: Bring us some spikes of something fun.

���Frenes���! "Row, that line! And my favorite, the one that Pajares says when Ozores does not let anyone win at

bingo: ���������But how are we going to win anything with that shark 2 ah��� he swallows it everything! Hahaha, I write it and I

get it off. Torrente should learn that sometimes, the secret is in simplicity. (As he did in the first

part) I wanted to see her and even the Omega man, who arrived to see the last half hour, broke into

his sofa. A 8.

" 1

" 53 Days of Winter is a hard, bitter and depressing film, complex to assimilate even for the strongest

spirits

The cinema it is an art, it is, although some do not like to recognize it, that moves in stages, gusts, or as

the most modern, tendencies would say. For a few years, at least in Spanish cinema, the

tendency to make films that reflect reality, everyday life, at all costs, has come back to such an extent that it comes close to

touching the fake documentary. This trend is clearly framed 53 Days of Winter, a film that aims to

show the human soul and the difficulties we face and how some are able to overcome

them while others they sink into the most absolute misery. It is not a simple tape to see easy

to digest, since the three stories it tells are very dark and depressing. Judith Colell, in her effort

to show everyday life, endows the film with a really excessive bitterness, sometimes free, made

only for strong and resistant hearts and spirits. The script has serious ups and downs, and there are times

when we do not know what motivates the characters to do what they do. Neither is there greatdevelopment

emotional, and almost all the secondary characters are quite blurred, as if they had not been

given the necessary attention. The way in which the film is shot does not help the viewer to focus

on the story, being the photograph unwise. The most outstanding is the work of an always brilliant

Mercedes Sampietro and a ���lex Brendem���hl who seems to be the fetish actor for the Spanish independent cinema.53

Days of Winter is a hard, bitter and depressing film, complex to assimilate even for the strongest spirits

. Those brave people who go to see her will come out of the cinema beaten and sunk by the excesses of Judith

Colell.

" 0

" Unconditional love until death. An impossible love story that distresses from the beginning to the

end, unforgettable. A lesson of excellent cinema.

Hiroshi Inagaki's splendid film, that of the "" Samurais "", full of virtues, both cinematographic and

human. It is both fun and emotional, making the spectator alive the wanderings of the protagonist as

their own, despite their rudeness and ignorance. Some characters can be traced in their overflowing humanity, who must

live daily in peace, being worthy and honest, through the years. �os (we are at the beginning of the

XIX century). Excellent performances, where the great Toshiro Mifune stands out, once again, a giant of the

dramatic composition, perfect in its intensity and in its containment.race, or

Moments like the endurancewhen it plays the drum of Gion, are wonderful, as well as the beautiful picture and the impeccable and beautiful

costumes. A story of impossible love that distresses from the beginning to the end, unforgettable. A lesson

of excellent cinema. This film won the Golden Lemon at the Venice Festival of 1958.

" 1

" ���Second parts were never good ?. Neither so painful. Two parts were never good ?. Not so painful either. The new nightmare of Wes Craven - predictable,

simple and indigestible - shines through the self-destruction of his dialogues, the absence of originality and

incongruity in the script, the inconsistency of his characters . And he makes the mistake of dispensing with the

only intelligent elements of the saga, which were no other than the dogs. Let the reader. The Return of the

Damned is the first sequel to The Hills Have Eyes by Alexandre Aja, which, in turn, is a remake of The

Hills Have Wes Craven's Eyes, which, to his, had another sequel entitled The Hills Have Eyes 2.

Too many eyes that, at the moment, add four films, three directors and four screenwriters. Come on, the

nightmare goes to the terror of the night. With the clear influence of La Matanza de Texas, in 1977, the Carter family

visits some old silver mines in the middle of the desert, to be attacked - it is not known why - some

things repulsively repellent. A tremendously original story in its time, which arrived at thetime

rightand censored in several countries, becomes a cult film, catapulting fame to its young

director. Eight years later, the survivors of the massacre (the dog and a few others) return to the scene

to set up an absolutely forgettable film, unbecoming of the acclaimed master of terror. In 2006,

Aja, a terrorist remake expert who is already preparing Pira ela in 1978, uses The Night of theDead

Livingin 1968 to explain the repulsive-repellent phenomenon. and La Noche and La Matanza to specify the

presence of the new Carter family in New Mexico. The result satisfies those who do not know that it is

a remake, the lovers of the smooth gore, the unconditional ones of the genre and the specialized criticism, that

considers it the best film of the ���o. So, until then, everyone was happy, nervous, jumping in

the seats, screaming with their eyes closed and vomiting in the bucket of popcorn. In this way, taking advantage of

the good reception of the mutant bugs among the new generations of cin���filos, the Craven (father and son)

improvise an attractive guide for adolescents, which dispenses with the family environment that characterizes the saga and

is based on archetypes characters from Scream. Among the clumsy mini-squad of clumsy andrecruits

novice, the handsome brainless boy, Lieutenant Ripley on Earth, the

brave bastard, the funny little bastard, the goonie will not be absent. kind and who does not know what he does in this story. Of course, it would not

be a sequel with eyes if it were not incorporated into the cast to the young mother who takes the worst part.

Set the bases, you just have to start a fire to distract, try to reach the top of Iwo Jima

without a beach and make an adventure in Fraguel Rock singing the Ten Negritos song. On this occasion,

with nine soldiers who went to explore, one was lost and eight must be left. The "" interesting "" gui���n,

full of unimaginable failures (recu���) the opportune suicide of the colonel), he puts himself in the hands of a

director expert in dizzying with the camera that, ���ived of the ulcers, will abuse the short planes, the soft ones

retimes and sound effects for more than frightening-bothering. Meanwhile, thesoundtrack does not

torturousaccompany, but pursues; the surprise factor is non-existent, the forced touches of humor, ridiculous; and the

message issued, Americanly devastating. And it is that the greatest of the pacifists becomes a cruel quarrel

when the occasion requires it. Violence, at times, (therefore), is justified and they

manifest it. Back, very far, is the genius of Wes Craven? Director of La � Last House on the Left

(based on The Spring of the Maid of Bergman), awarded in Sitges, creator of Freddy Krueger - to give way

to the orgÃa of Blood and Sand that opens the door to all kinds of excursions to sector 16, Final Destination of

unsuspecting tourists. The current blockbuster can be followed by many more hills with eyes to the detriment of the

slightest indication worthy of quality. Definitely, Hollywood does not succeed in raising the war to the Phantom Menace

of the already established Japanese horror cinema. ��s. Not even with its heavy artiller���am���s.

" 0

" "" H���roe "" is a (good) example of good cinema, one of those films that only with the images does not leave sitting

and looking at the screen dumbfounded.

"" Hero "" is going to be, maybe one of the shortest criticisms I can make. Why? Because it's a waste of time to

comment on a movie like that. Let's go in parts: The Direction: superb. The actors: more than brilliant I would say

great (look at those (impressive) fight scenes). The Gui���n: although "" simple "" (for lack of aword

better) the director takes all the juice delighting us for 100 minutes that fly by. The Photography,

the Artistic Direction, the Staging are. pufff imagine yourself. How to explain it? What would the word be?

despite the vulgar seem dir���: org���smicas.Las scenes of martial arts take the hiccups and all the rest. The

soundtrack goes to the film like a glove and at no time it takes away from the images, which it

complements in an unbeatable way. In a few lines, he says: that "" Hero "" is a (good) example of good cinema, a

of those films that only with the images do not leave sitting and watching the screen in a gag until

the final credits end.

" 1

" The Esf���rica Charter is a film of intrigue that tries to bring a lot of tension and emotion and in the end itnot

doesfulfill what was promised.

There are genres that the great public seems to associate only with a certain cinematography, usually the

North American one. Genres such as musicals, blic cinema, adventure films orsuperproductions

vintageseem that in the eyes of the spectators can only be made in Hollywood. Therefore,films of

non-Americanthis type almost never connect with the respectable, however well done they are. The cinema of

intrigue and mystery is the same, although ironies of the destiny, this has been a genre quite cultivated in Spanish

cinema, which continues to produce excellent fruits such as La Caja 507 or X. Now comes the Esf���rica Charter,

adapted Den from the homonymous novel by Arturo P���rez-Reverte, one of the authors whose works have more times been

reflected on the big screen. The film tells a story in which a sailor banished from the sea will be

forced to help a mysterious woman in her b���suqeda of a sunken ship, which holds many secrets. The

Esf���rica Charter supposes the return to the cinema of Imanol Uribe, one of the most valued filmmakers of the last

decades. The film has a good start, which seduces and captivates the viewer, but little by little the plot

loses its tension and intensity. After its good start, the tape is unable to maintain the interest of the

public, and little by little it becomes monotonous and predictable. The characters become flat, without any kind of

development, especially the one played by Aitana S���nchez-Gij���n, who pretends to be a fatal woman although the

attempt loses credibility as the minutes The actress' own work does not help to

give strength to the character, who ends up sinking without remedy. On the other hand, Carmelo G���mez does not end up

endowing his character with the necessary strength, although in general he fulfills his task.elements to

There are fewhighlight, although the photograph by Javier Aguirresarobe stands out above all. The Esf���rica Charter

is a film of intrigue that aims to bring a lot of tension and emotion. And in the end it does not fulfill what was promised.

The final result is not bad but neither is it what I could have given of itself in other hands.

" 0

" Nacho Vigalondo's triumphant debut on his way to the feature film, everywhere except on the other side of the

Pyrenees.

Thanks to the great organizers of CINEMAD, a handful of lucky little people have been able to see the very

enjoyable premiere in the direction of long hyperactive Nacho Vigalondo. I say lucky because, for those

who still do not know, 'Los Cronocr���menes' is a Spanish film that has already won a couple of festivals (Austin and

Trieste), he has secured distribution and remake in the United States and has filled rooms in the fewestpasses

festivalhe has attended. And fortunate, too, because 'Los Cronocr���menes' does not find anyone who

dares to exhibit it in their country of origin. Now, we go and blame the crisis of Spanish cinema on the

Internet, the great American studios or the Spanish public, which is very freaky. Surrealisms apart, Nacho

Vigalondo debuts with a small clockwork mechanism that catches, above all, by its very careful gui���n. So

delicate is the balance of the story that says, as its director has been warning for

some time, the slightest slip when it comes to writing an impression about the film. Afectacula affects the small big

surprise that is assisting its development. Therefore, for once I allow myself not toon the narrative: 'Los

dwellCronocr���menes' tells the tremendous journey undertaken by H���ctor (a hallucinated Karra Elejalde, in a state of grace)

when he decides to investigate an extra� Suo event in the forest surrounding your cottage. There is more, of course,

but it is much better to discover it with H���ctor. Vigalondo starts from a minimalist approach (a few

actors, a handful of locations and a few more) and surprise the viewer with a story that we have already seen,

yes, but that we have rarely been told in such a coherent way. The management work is quite

careful, without being spectacular. In fact, the sobriety (others call it poverty, but it is just lack

of money) of the production even plays in favor of a dark and claustrophobic development. The scarce music that

is used is included with a lot of success, and the darkness of the nocturnal and exterior planes (fruit of

a budget surely inferior to the one of 'The Orphanage') helps to understand the oppressive climate that surrounds

Hctor very early on. Could it have been done better? With more money, without a doubt; with it, difficultly. In

the interpretations section we have a sober and effective B���rbara Goenaga; to a Candela Fern���ndez that does not

bother, but neither falls in love; and to the same Nacho Vigalondo playing a key character of the film,gesture

brave(and usual in ���l), but at times it takes away some power from the final result. Luckily, 'Los

Cronocr���menes' is all about Karra Elejalde, and this one easily handles the weight of the story.

Is there a defect? The truth is that you can ask for a little more of a Spanish premium opera and of a genre, but I dare to

say that I expected an end. Well, I'd prefer another ending. It's horrible that I can not tell anything about

a movie. But Nacho Vigalondo's triumphant debut in his move to the feature film, everywhere except on the other side of

the Pyrenees. For my part I look forward, for once, to the American remake. There will be more media, the same

director, the same story and, maybe, get a blockbuster in their country of origin. An 8.

" 1

" It gives off such whiff to telefilm, that difficultly you will be able to avoid to smell it ... Woody Allen is a great one of the cinema of all the times. He is a genius, there is no doubt about it. But, quoting a phrase of

its own, not without meaning, I must say that "the geniuses also dispose". "In his third film shot in

London, Allen returns to the line that he had traced recently with his masterpiece, Match Point. But this time,

ambition adds family, lies, crimes, and money. All these elements in the hands of the New Yorker can

result in a great movie. But, of course, this is not the case. The main problem of

Cassandra's Dream is the whiff to telefilm that it has. Your first ten or fifteen minutes are worthy of an

Antena 3 movie, a Saturday after lunch. I greatly regret the vulgar comparison, but it is the most

appropriate. The di���logos and the photography are so mediocre that one can not understand that we are really facing

a work by Allen. Although the plot on paper has its point of interest, its approach and development is

so insipid that it bores. Mediocre. Very mediocre. Probably the only virtues of this, no longer minor, but

bad film, are the performances of Colin Farrel and Ewan McGregor. They are not exceptional, but they do have good

times. But their biggest drawback is that they carry the full weight of the film. And it is not enough to

raise it. But, if that were not enough, the rhythm is excessively slow and the film seems to combine drama and

comedy with a formula that does not finish. The way of inquiring into the human psyche turns out to be chemical, and itnot

doesseem to be the pretension that gave that result. McGregor's character is reminiscent of Rhys-Meyers in Match

Point, but the depth of it is vague and almost unbelievable. So, Allen ends hiscycle

London, probably in the worst possible way and who knows if he thinks he did not put too much

interest after Match Point and Scoop. His next film seems to take a worse path. "" Vicky Cristina

Barcelona "" will arrive on our screens next year. Go name

" 0

" Tremendous film of humor and criticism, which laughs at a very critical historical moment in the history of

Humanity as it was the cold war . Highly recommended for everyone, especially for those whous

govern.

Take this film on the shelf, inside the pack "" Stanley Kubrick "" at least five years, but I was not encouraged

to see it. The poster the truth that is not very interesting, until he told me my half courgette that was laughter.

So with that premise, and given that my career as a film critic has to be truffled with

reference to archaic films, I set out to see it with the baby, which will be learned Memory. The

dialoguesfilm is about a high command of the army, which decides to declare nuclear war on the Russians. For this purpose, it

sends a signal to all aircraft that have such weapons, which forces them to launch their cargo over

Soviet strategic locations. Enclosed is the high command, together with an intermediate position

that tries to avoid disaster. On the other hand, the president of the North American government reunites to his

advisors to try to solve the situation, having to deal with the Russian ambassador and until with the

same presidente.A m��� the pel� Old characters of humor tend to be very puerile and I do not end up

liking them. But this has nothing to do, the humor he uses is very ingenious at the same time absurd. But not

only is it a humorous film, but it shows us a very real and alarming situation, how easy it can

be to destroy the world. It is enough with a series of coincidences and to raise mauves all. Highly recommended, given

that he has not lost too much news, only the "" actors "" who dominate us have changed. Resuming, tremendous

film of humor and criticism, which laughs a very critical historical moment in the history of Humanity as

was the cold war. Highly recommended for everyone, especially for those who govern us.

" 1

" Theology is an inexhaustible treasure of narrative skeletons for authors without imagination. I do not know what critics say that new works are not invented from the They are bad re-readings of the old ones.

There are those who grope the predecessors because they believe that they can improve them. For example "" The harvest "" is the rereading

of a spectator who was left wanting to get away with the eared child that plays Demian in "" The prophecy "".

That thorn could explain half a movie. The end no. The end belongs to the fashion "" poker "" of today's cinema,

which consists of taking a letter out of the sleeve that turns everything we believe in, the mayor'snot

wife ishis wife, a transvestite, the town is not a town, it's painted. Everything, just to surprise. Atest

sureto distinguish when an intelligent director tells you the story and when a fool tells you

how the protagonist discovers the truth. The truth can come from the hand of a scientist with white hair (the

fast way), a dying man, a gossip, a computer, a secret that nobody should know (This

is usually the most reliable). The intelligent protagonists filter what they hear, they argue, they refuse to believe. The

director of "" The Harvest "" has chosen a shorter cut-off than the scientist of the white mane: he has chosen

the mounting table. I still do not know whether to congratulate him on the nose he says or tell him to go

gargle. There is no waste, the protagonist learns the truth of the story because the editor puts

forward the sequence of events as they happened. No one talks, no one explains, the scenes appear andalready

weknow that it was so. The protagonist is a university professor who studies miracles to give them a

scientific explanation. She had been a missionary in Africa, but a tragedy made her renounce her faith. Now they

call her from a town, Haven, where some paranormal phenomena point to a child being theembodiment

devil's. The havenenses, or havene���os, I am not the patron���mico, they are suffering one by one the tenplagues

bábilicas. The list of the ten plagues is just as helpful as that of the seven deadly sins, or the four

evangelists. Theology is an inexhaustible treasure of narrative skeletons for authors without imagination.

Conscious or not of the headache that means its proposal, the authors have put everything of their part so

that at least it does not turn out to be indifferent. Haven is the place where the battle between good and evil is fought. That's

where you decide if the demon is going to dominate the world and therefore the phone receipt is still going to come

up, or if Hillary Swank is going to save us from having to queue at the bank window. I wonder

why the devil chooses such weird shapes in movies when you meet him in every corner withclothes

walking.

" 0

" At first glance, and also taking into account La Quimera del Oro and El Circo, Luces de la Ciudad would be the

definitive work as soon as the character and life of the mute vagabond is talked about.

Overwhelmed by the sound film -which had already been successful for two long years- Chaplin decided to make a

"sound" movie "". but without di���logos. Lights of the city - against all the prognoses - turned out to be a solid film, almost

without bumps, with the excellent interpretation of Charles of always, but adding him , a bit more subtlety and

incorporating the melodrama again, or perhaps in a more serious way; as I did already successfully in the

famous El Pibe. The only critique - as it happened in almost all its dumb shorts - is a poor montage and a

too aesthetic camera, all being generally reduced to one �� Single plane, where all the action takes place.

Content in detreimiento of the aesthetics. The finding of the initial scene - commented until the satiety - in

which the florist confuses it with a millionaire, is the base and the fundamental pillar of all the film (next to the

fight to act "" correctly "" to the unknown until that moment actress). The final sentimentality never

becomes excessive as in other cases of his filmography. The last moments are of an unknown ambiguity in

his cinema so far, leaving aside the Happy endings - sometimes introduced by force -, betting on

a bittersweet, logical and beautiful culmination. This is also the scene - along with the now seer florist and a

vagabond m� It's ragged that never-of a poetry and feelings, only comparable to that maintained in the

reunion in the police truck with the little Jackie Coogan in El Pibe. An exact combination between the

naive of his shorts and the imminent and close "" seriousness "" of Charles. At first glance, and also taking into account the

Chimera of gold and Circus, Lights of the city would be the definitive work as soon as the character andis talked about. Summary

life of the mute vagabond: Charlot saves the life of a drunken millionaire, this friendship binds him but he

totally ignores it when he is �� sober. Before, he falls in love with a blind florist, who ends up paying for his

operation to see again, confusing him with a millionaire man. He is accused of robbery and when he leaves

prison, he finds the florist who only recognizes him - and is disappointed - by touching his hand.

" 1

" M cinedem's cinema is, per se, poetic in character. But, alas, the line that separates the verse from the gravel is

so slight?

The visitors of this page know that I am an admirer of "" Lovers of the Polar Circle "", the masterpiece

of Julio M���dem, although I am not a fervent follower of the cinema of this Basque director, in whichworks

splendidlike the aforementioned coexist with other interesting but less interesting ones, such as "" Luc���a and sex "", or

decidedly failed, as "" Earth " " With this "" Ca���tica Ana "" it seems that he plays the one of sand: the cinema of M���dem is,

"" per se "", of poetic character. But, alas, the line that separates the verse from the gravel is so slight? The new film

of Julio is far from approaching, even remotely, to what it pretends, a poem about reincarnation, with an

Ibizan girl literally and typically "" ad lib "", rescued for art and society by a francoise patron, in

love with a Berber tormented by his past, and finally literally emptied of his many (and tragic)

previous lives through hypnosis. The background of M���dem allows the spectator to grant him a

credit that the Donostiarra squanders soon, as soon as we see that the story is Martian, what should be

poetic is simply cheesy, and there is hardly a scene with the brand of the house, which recalls the powerful

visual creativity of the so-called "" Lovers of the Polar Circle "", and is a considerable mental empanada.

Ca���tica, as its title, it soon becomes clear that M���dem does not know what counts in this film, except that weall

arenot one but a thousand, a great discovery , entirely like that of penicillin? The characters are

unfortunate, from the Ibicencan catetita that could shout, as in the Bible, that of "" my name is Legi���n ""

(although without demons inside; ���os���? ), who goes from p���nfila for life, to his patron, a Charlotte Rampling

totally out of paper, without profile, without edges, a kind of matriarch (something interested: 60%,

specifically?); the hypnotist, which goes from ���ngel ser���fico, a little "" glam "", is true; the Berber empoll���n, with

its ethnographic depressions and its stormy past; the father of the catetita, who as soon as they take him out of the cave

where he lives, dies? the only character with any consistency, and the best served by her actress, is that of

Bebe, the friend of the protagonist, a video artist of great self-confidence and with a peculiar vision of the

relationships between men and women . Mention aside, in the negative, to the dreadful end, in which M���dem,

poor, takes revenge on the fautores of the war in Iraq (taking advantage, for this, to a kind of Dias

Rumsfeld , the "" hawk "" Secretary of Defense, supposedly the intellectual author of that bizarre nonsense that

so many headaches are giving, and what will haunt you, brunette?), doing that our protagonist gave him

a gift, that we will not disembowel, but that sounds like a tantrum when the boy is not able to

kick the big man who abuses him. Anyway, each one is very good to take revenge as it seems, but not at the expense of

bastardear a film with a goop that does not come to mind. Or maybe, maybe it is the right bluff to this

dispel inevitably bound to the box office.

" 0

" Tony Scott seems to have lost the few film foundations he had and Denzel Wasghington

has forgotten that one day he was an actor. To forget.

Preceded by a monstrous advertising campaign and only a week after its official premiere in the

United States, a multimillion-dollar production arrives on Spanish screens. The goal is to

restore and revitalize the decadent careers of its director Tony Scott and its main protagonist, Denzel

Washington. But as the talent, fortunately, there is no money to replace it, the result has been a

mediocrity full of absurdities and that at times borders on ridicule. And is that after a promising start,

the film is deflating and slowing down to be tired. For those who do not know, d���j��� vu is

a French expression that describes the sensation of having had an experience before of something new;

that is, experiencing at a given moment the feeling that what is happening has already happened. And

this is precisely what happens to a detective and what is worth for his inquiries. Playing with a subject

with which the American society is hypersensitized, as is terrorism, this film has a difficult

frame because it is halfway between science fiction, drama, thriller , suspense and

peripatetic comedy. Tony Scott seems to have lost the few film foundations he had and

Denzel Wasghington has forgotten that one day he was an actor. It is possible that it is a box office success, since

the promotional expenses have been brutal, but that will only be enough for the producers, who do not see more

there of the so-called vile metal. A new disappointment in Hollywood; and a few are going this year. To forget.

" 0

" Not only does it satisfy the expectations of all those who enjoy the first part, but it also

re���ne its own merits to please even those who crucified it.

Few films of the last years have been loved and defenestradas like Hostel (2006), the second film

of Tarantino's protege, Eli Roth. The most benevolent ones described it as grossly exploitative, mis���gina and

xen���foba, which is very surprising in these times in which the dandruff is easily enthroned. the

seventies (maybe we only want this type of tape as something that has already happened but we do not have the courage to

accept its existence today). However, we were not few who thought that Hostel was one of the

best bets of horror films last year, one in which the essential thing was not the amount of viscera and

hemoglobin released on screen , but what I wanted to say with that particular violence, the exposure of a

sub-world of abandonment and depredations that hid behind the appearance of the most refined of the "" civilization ""

western, in addition to a black descojono made with a lot of bad grapes. That Slovak hostel where the rich people

paid to torture kidnapped youngsters is, at least tem���tically, the equivalent of our time to what

was at the time the seventies rural slasher, bitched today until the satiety. But even many of us

loved the film agreed that if something did not need was a second part. Given the

particular conditions of the story, it seemed impossible that Eli Roth could get asequel out of his sleeve

worthy. With this idea, I entered the movie theater, and frankly I could not be more wrong. Hostel 2 (2007) not

only satisfies the expectations of all those who enjoy the first part, but also

re���ne own merriment to please even those who crucified her. There are not many surprises regarding the argument ,

since the scheme is repeated to a large extent: instead of a trio of boys, this time the victims of thehostel

Slovakare three American girls art students who are dragged to a supposed spa where

They will be the pieces of fun for a group of millionaires anxious for torture. The difference is that, in

this opportunity, the story will also be shown to us from the point of view of the

"Elite Hunting" participants, especially two traveling American millionaires. to Eastern Europe ready to move to the

"" next level "". It is this plot twist that gives the film a look that its predecessor

lacked, and that apart from honoring in that decadent world of closet sadism, takes the film toterrains

completely new. The tribute to European horror films could not be more evident, not only in terms of

certain sequences that reproduce the work of the exploitative Old World genre, but also through Des of the

presence of old stars of the European caspoteca like Luc Merenda and the diva Edwige Fenech, in addition to the

surprise and undisguised appearance of Ruggero Deodato (director of the Cannibal Holocaust (1980) , another of those

beloved / hated movies) in what is probably the best cameo of this year. All the other elements of the

first part are there. , from the increasingly bizarre methods of torture (attention to the tribute to the

Countess Elizabeth Bathory) to that gang of chungos children with whom nobody I wish I could meet. But

above all what is still present is that self-confidence before the violence that Eli Roth had already shown in

his previous films. Unlike what we are used to seeing, charcuter���a in this story is

entra���able by the constant play that is made of it. In addition (and this is definitely not so common) it is

good to see that violence in a film is not an adornment with a shoehorn and aimed at the enjoyment of

the less privileged sector (intellectually less) of the room but is an integral part of the history and

style of what you want to tell. Perhaps that is what sets Hostel apart and its sequel from the hundreds

of torture / psychopathic tapes that we have had to endure in recent years. My only conclusion is that

those who have enjoyed the first part have a thousand reasons not to let this tape escape, but on the

other hand, those who have hated it should also come and see that with Roth we have a guy

who knows what he does and who, sooner than we think, could surprise us with a great work.

" 1

" It's sad to be poor, but better than rich, of course ... A tape, which will be joined to all those that,

like "" Wall Street "" and "" Weapons of Woman "", it will be seen in economics classes.

Before starting, a little reflection that I do before starting to shed the ins and outs of the

film, ad���a of today, in this world in which we live, of misery jobs and expensive mortgages, and however much we

pray, we want and put a candle to S.Pancracio, it is better to be poor than rich, and is that having pasta, such is

the plot development of the tape that brings us today, is a shit, it's better to be poor and unhappy, than rich and.

Happy? With the herd of vultures that are there, waiting to take out the livers with the best of

smiles. Leonardo Sbaraglia, actor that I have in esteem, interprets here, after an excessive narration ( me

boring movies where the narrator tells so many things that you have to guess a little and delve into

it.), the story of an eccentric economics teacher who wins a contest he ruins, because he can not

keep up the costs of the prizes he receives, we see his metam���rphosis (excellent his performance), until he

becomes completely crazy. On the other hand we have a secondary school, headed by Fernando Cayo

(as bad as in the recent "" The Orphanage ""), Chete Lera, who always plays the same role, or the small group of

television actors in turn. I do not like his narrative, mixing the order , trying to alternate reality and dreams

and where you have an odd face, not understanding that you are being told at any time about the

footage; it draws the attention that there is hardly a soundtrack, 2 or 3 songs and stop counting. The ending, although

waiting and predictable from the beginning, does not manage to stir consciences, pity in a movie where one

tries to deepen the dangers of being rich or poor, and how to enjoy, what noses, what one

has in hand. A tape, which, will join all those who, like " "Wall Street" "and" "Weapons of Woman" ", will

be seen in the economy classes, more to talk about Keynes than anything else.

" 0

" It does not look like a gangster story, but it's actually a good story, where there are also

gangsters.

I could start this comment with a question: Did you like A History of Violence? If the answer is

yes then do not hesitate to go see the new Cronenberg movie. It's not just that the style is the same,

including montage, photography and rhythm but we also have the same actor as main character, Viggo

Mortensen, and we go back into the criminal world. With another simple story , but not for that boring,

Cronenberg allows us to follow the characters, discovering their motivations, seeking their way or trying to

escape from it. Unlike in the previous film of the director, in this case there is nocharacter

mainthat we constantly follow, but we jump between two main lines. On the one hand, the

Russian driver played by Mortensen, and on the other, the London nurse, but also of Russian origin,

played by Naomi Watts. We are participating in important moments, those that advance the story

or are important for the characters. Both actors are great in their role, but above all Mortensen is the one

who carries the weight of the film, with a role worthy of an Oscar, with scenes that we will remember a lot of time,

but above all with the impression when leaving the room, that he has filled the screen completely, even when he is

simply sitting reading a book (actually, a diary) with his vodka and his tobacco. Because this is not

a politically correct film. There is tobacco, there is vodka, there are prostitutes, and in general you do what you

want, what you want, even if you have some good will and make up your performances. There are great performances

also of the secondary ones, although always hidden behind Viggo Mortensen. Highlight for my taste Armin

Mueller-Stahl as the criminal boss, who is able to look like a nice grandpa and bonach���n when he needs

, but can also give a sensation No danger, which makes his own son, played by Vincent

Cassel back scared and not be able to raise his voice. Every time Mortensen and Mueller are together, everything

revolves around the two of them, with the other characters being in the background losing importance. I have already read in

some reviews, that Cassell has a somewhat ridiculous role, but I do not agree. For me, it is the merit of the

actor to reflect so clearly the weak son of the great boss, who constantly falls into ridicule. It is not a bad

act, but precisely that we do not distinguish the interpretation of the role that has touched him. For me, the

merit is of the director, having been fully successful in the cast, putting as a last example, Naomi Watts,

which may seem somewhat bland even, but that for me perfectly interprets his nurse, who is going through a

bad time in his life , as we learn by causal phrases in their family meals and desperately looking for an

objective, or that policeman specialized in Russian mafia that barely appears twice, counterpoint of thebarber

Mafiosowho also appears little, but who Both cases are vital for the story. To finish, we

find again the brand of a Cronenberg customary in his life before the blood and the harsher scenes

, which is violence. As in his previous film, it comes up suddenly, it's fast, it's deadly and it's very, very

bloody. Nothing of beautiful combats and precise choreographies. Here you fight as you can, in a dirty and

ineffective way. The wounds are not a blood stain under the shirt, but damage that causes displeasure in all

those who did not follow Cronenberg when he made horror movies. In summary: It does not seem like a story

gangster, but it is that really is a good story, whereaddition there gangster. Well directed, slow, but

not slow, well-chosen actors, highlighting Viggo Mortensen, and its new brand of factory, realistic andviolence

bloody, not suitable for fans of Hollywood type fights.

" 1

" The protagonist: a Cillian Murphy that is Oscar. Who else could interpret this

type of paper? No one.

There are films that for whatever reason, can treat many issues at the same time and not be intriguing. Neil Jordan

is able to get it. His latest work, Breakfast in Pluton, can start with the story of a boy who

has homosexual tendencies and, after half an hour, can deal with the topic of IRA members who

pretend put bombs in the city (although both stories are related, there is no doubt). Perhapsmyself may

the way of explainingseem a bit simple, but what attracts me most about this film is its capacity to

develop so easily. Breakfast in Pluto is told as if it were a personal diary, withchapters

numbered and fairly short. But above all, it also pretends to be a film, and moments like the beginning and

the end, are not found in a simple diary, but are typical of a cinematographic guide. graphic It does not pretend to

be classic, rather it pretends to be as original as possible. The film has a great starting point, and as

I said before, it knows how to develop excellently. Nothing is missing, it is totally round. It has

moments of great dramatic intensity, so I can say that it is an extremely depressing movie.

And is that the story of a transvestite boy with hardly a hard in search of their biological parents and with IRA in

between is not a very pleasant topic. The protagonist: a Cillian Murphy that is Oscar. Who

else could interpret this type of paper? No one. From the great cast, totally Irish, I would highlight, apart

from the aforementioned Murphy, Stephen Rea, playing a magician who helps, like many other characters, the

protagonist; Liam Neeson, who does not appear too much, but the times he goes out, he eats all those who are

ahead of him; Brendan Gleeson, who also appears little, but acts great; and many other secondary ones of

which I do not know the name now, but certainly deserve to be mentioned. I will not extend much more because Inot

dohave time, so I will only comment that I thought it was a wonderful film, where inside the aspects

t� Technicians highlight photography, music (composed of several songs from the 60's) and the calculated

montage. Wow, everything in Breakfast in Pluto is worth it.

" 1

" I am a film that will raise great passions among the spectators who see it, and it offers a good

series of questions, reflections and readings that will vary depending on the eye that judges it.

The term independent cinema has been in vogue for several years, encompassing all those films that have been

theorized without the support of the major studios. A definition so vague but at the same time so

exclusive that it is quite snobbish. And if there was still some logical talk of independent cinema in the United

States, talking about independent cinema in Spain is absurd. For there to be independence from industry, industryfirst

mustexist as such. When a film crosses the threshold between originality and innovation

and goes into the weird and incomprehensible? Perhaps the difference lies only in what a film can win in

the different film festivals in which it competes. For example, when David Lynch presented at the

Cannes Film Festival his last work, Mulholland Drive, the first question asked at the

press conference was "But what is Mulholland Drive?" ? At Rafa Cort���s' first feature, Yo, something similar happens to him. It

is a really strange story, that has neither feet nor head. But having been chosen as the

Fipresci del A���o Revelation and being presented at the Cannes Film Festival, it has automatically become a

cult film, when before it had neither distribution. I will not leave anyone indifferent, there will be spectators who

connect immediately with the proposal that the film proposes, and there will be soon after that they will be asking for the

time. Rafa Cort���s can not be denied his good work as a director, and more when it comes to his debut in the

feature film. He still needs to polish many aspects, but he creates an atmosphere that envelops completely,

transmitting that feeling of anxiety and anxiety that Hans is experiencing. Neither can say anything to the impeccable

interpretation of ���lex Brendem���hl, screenwriter in addition to protagonist.It is a film that will raise great

passions among the spectators who see it, and offers a good series of questions, reflections and readings that will

vary depending on the eye that judges it. For some, a cult film, for others an authentic waste of

time.

" 0

" The sad loneliness of the queen is in crass experiment of eccentric result. The adventures of the

argument, in short, do not convince either: they are lost in the sewing of the costumes, in the brightness of the lamps.

What is spoken of in Marie Antoinette is the glorious preamble of the French Revolution, a milestone in the History

of Humanity, an episode where reason debates its fierce struggle against his monsters, but the language of

Soffia Coppola is conveyed by conventions, frivolized and stands as a vulgar trace of fairytale petarderia

of what, in other hands, would have given a symphony with an orchestral mass overwhelming, sublime and, in its

artifice, coherent, lyrical. None of that is in this marketing exercise of the daughter of the teacher Francis

Ford. Marie Antoinette is not, however, a bad movie. Alone in the dark, which I had the unbearable sin or

caprice of seeing a few nights ago, it is in great sumo. The pseudobiographical film of this girl turned into

queen from her waltz Austria to the fiery Paris of ideas sacrifices the psychological depth of some

characters, necessarily, rich, in in order to provoke (and it succeeds) with majestic doses of glamor, as if

everything, in the end, resulted in a long (two hours) video clip to MTV as a great thing about Queen called It's a

hard life Kirsten Dunst, the infant queen, is willful, delicately chic, abandoned like achair

refinedin a Versallesque saloon, never better written, happily unstable in her world of protocols, wigs and

fifty kilos suits, efficient under her print hairstyle. The character, reduced to banal adornment, attends

to the coming and going of paintings of the season, seasoned by an unusual musical thread, provocative and pleasant, but

obviously inappropriate It is not, under any circumstances, a (necessary) updating of the genre for more that

we have placed so much hope in the confidence that Soffia Coppola, seen Lost in translation, was going to

make a film of greater name, limit��� I am going to build an unbearable, baroque, vintage painting,

without background in the latest commercial cinema, made with impudence, but unreasonable, subjecting everything to the noise of

the sequins, to the astonishing palace that we see one and a thousand times, shot in bewildering and beautiful angles.

The sad loneliness of the queen, her assignment to a modern profile of a woman subject to the strict

conventions of society, remains a crass experiment of eccentric result. The adventures of the argument,

in short, do not convince either: they are lost in the sewing of the costumes, in the brightness of the lamps.

" 0

" Failed story of revenge, with a couple of notable moments and not a few laughable ones. And in addition, quite

boring.

It's been 30 years since the premiere in Spain of 'Taxi Driver', the film that put Jodie Foster on the map. Now, it

is Iris who plays the judge of the night in the New York of the 21st century, and not his "" adored "" Travis Bickle.

Iron���as del destino.'The Brave One '(' The strange that there is in t��� 'will be titled in these parts) tells the story

of Erica Bain, radio announcer at "" green dog "" in the Big Apple that is dragged to a revenge

against the worms that inhabit it. But now his main enemy is not the criminal, but the Law,

personified in the detective Mercer, a relentless police who struggles to overcome his divorce. Well, and for

catching the night watchman, too. The ragged Neil Jordan launches himself with direction and little else what

looks like an adult review of the popular saga of Charles Bronson. . The unique situation of the character

that crosses the line shows us the traumas that this tremendous decision entails in a normal citizen

, trying to convince us that we can all be the same thing happens But for this, 'The strange thing that

exists in you' employs all the subjects of this type of cinema: everything is evil around Erica, its executions

are never unjustified; the police, although they want to capture the murderer, deep down they are glad that

someone cleans the streets; the justice is never betrayed by the victims it rescues. and of course, theproposal

realisticof Jordan ends up looking, and too much, to that jewel of the eighties dandruff video store called 'Angel

2' or the aforementioned films of Bronson. Because if this is a reflection on the therapeutic (in) utility of

revenge, you have that incredible orthodox end. And if it's an exaltation of it, I prefer Paul

Kersey with a missile launcher before Erica Bain with a 9 mm. The technical aspect, that's it, is well taken care of . The

photograph of Philippe Rousselot is dark enough (not blue) and realistic to immerse us in the

progressive sinking of the protagonist. For my taste they emphasize too much the mental instability of the

announcer with those wobbly camera movements, but what is said, a question of tastes. And as is normal in a

film produced by Jodie Foster, She is the main attraction of the film. It seems that he intends to look for another

Oscar by the route 'Accused', and at times (his narrations on the radio and some more moments) shines. But the

transformation of his character does a lot of damage to his interpretation: he moves from trembling killer apprentice to Mrs.

Majestik (including lapidary phrases) in just one pu��� murder, and it takes away a lot, but a lot of

credibility from the tortured announcer. The others, with a proper Terrence Howard at the helm, are that, the

others. Well, we have to mention Naveen Andrews, who in just one film has gone from a scientist to a ballplayer

('Planet Terror') to a sensitive and exotic lover. failed story of revenge, with a couple ofmoments

remarkableand not a few laughable. And in addition, quite boring. A 4.

" 0

" Movie done to chubs on two murderers and their interrelations in a day's work. Considered by

many Tarantino masterpieces. I do not think it's that much, although it has moments that make it

worthwhile.

Director: Quentin Tarantino: Two and a half hours, not less. Year: January 13, 1995. Viewers:

. Duration2,154,692 of human beings. This criticism is in response to a challenge that He launched the great Plissken. Not long ago I was

talking to my film studio and I came to the conclusion that I do not like Tarantino, given that all the

virtues he told me about it, I thought they were defects. For example, the impossible conversations that they

hold, in some cases seem to me to be sympathetic, but they do not seem great to me. It's more, they areconversations

pretty silly, like the discursi���on of what they call hamburgers in France. I do not know, this guy does not

finish understanding. The film is about a series of sequences in the lives of several people, without apparent

relationship, but finally each and every one of them have a nexus. This connection is given by two thugs,

Travolta and Samuel L. Jackson, and how is their work routine. You already imagine, if you split that leg,

if you hit four shots to that, etc. On the other hand, we have a boxer who is facing his last fight and this

has to be a tongo. A girl who is the boss's girlfriend, a couple who wants to rob a cafeteria, and

some more little characters who complete the cast. Let's see, this of the disordered movies will be genius, but to

me the picha makes me a mess. Suddenly, one who was dead dislodges me. And this movie is done

like that. On the other hand, it is truffled (that pretty expression) of di alogos to each more strange, on thesubjects

most banal and absurdthat can you imagine? But it has good points, such as the inclusion of the best secondary film

that has given, as is the great Bruce Willis (I like more in these short papers, than in leading roles

). Another point in favor of the film is that it has left for the future great moments, such as

the dance of Travolta (which seems silly fool), the phrase "" Gentlemen, we do not suck still cocks ""

Mr. Lobo or not worse phrase "" We will play the medieval with your ass "" that has even given for a song.Resumiendo,

film made to horns about two murderers and their interrelations in a day's work. Tarantino instate

pure, which is considered his best film and masterpiece. I do not think it's a big deal, although it has

moments that make it worthwhile. Even if it's only for the memorable moments.Besitos.PD: Thinking it well,

there are very clever phrases ;-)

" 1

"One more argument for those who think that second part was never good. It's very bad, but

honestly bad. No subterfuge.

Although that of second parties were never good sound typical and there are many better continuations than

their predecessors, the truth is that as a general rule I know that there is usually a decrease in quality as

the sagas They are accumulating titles. The return of the damned meets this maximum to the letter, and if we take into

account that the film from which it proceeds, The hills have eyes, is in itself a bore, because you can already imagine

the magnitude of the offense to the optimal art that this aberration supposes. The truth is that little more could be expectedad

from Wes Craven, outdated and repetitivenauseam, with a shortage of monumental creative resources and

an obsession with bloody and viscous death that borders the psychotic In this case, the punishment begins with an

expedition of members of the US National Guard, which is on track to deliver material to

a New M�� scientific research camp. �xico. When they arrive, they find that there is not a

soul there, but when they go to look for them in the hills that surround it, devouring mutants begin to emerge.

This is all. The cast, as is usual in these garbage, is made up of a group of half-

deaf people (nobody who has a minimum of prestige would agree to star in such nonsense). In any case, we must

be clear that the films of this sub-genre are basically oriented to an adolescent audience that only seeks

to have a fun time with the Friends in the afternoon of Saturday. That is why it must be said in his defense that it is an

unpretentious production, that it does not attempt to pretend what it is not, nor does it fall into the temptation of sendingmessages

moralizing. It's very bad, but honestly bad. No subterfuge.

" 0

" It does not contribute anything, it does not tell anything new, not from a new point of view, it does not engage, it does not frighten, it does not intrigue,

in short ... it does not achieve anything of what it claims, although in fact ... no I know exactly what he intends.

Moscow Zero. ranker. They will forgive me the easy joke, but it is that some films put it to egg and, in short,

I could not resist. Suffice it to say that the best thing about the film is that, one: I saw it in a press pass (that is,

free) and two: it ended soon and I was able to go to the "" after "" pass. of the wedding "", which turned out to be a movie. But that

's another story. The fact is that Moscow Zero came out as cold as it came (it was a rainy day). It does not contribute anything, it does not

tell anything new, nor from a new point of view, it does not engage, it does not frighten, it does not intrigue, anyway. He does not get

anything he wants, although in fact. I do not know exactly what he intends to do. The film by the Spanish director

Luna (AKA Mar���a Lid���n) is set in the basement of Moscow. There, Father Owen is looking for a friend,

the anthropologist Sergei Karparov, who disappeared under strange circumstances when he was investigating the legends of the

marginal society of the Muscovite underworld. In the search he was accompanied by three other men (do not make me say

who they are exactly, a couple of mercenaries, a collaborator, something like that) and a woman (a vagabond who will

have taken the last Miss Spain street). Together they go through dozens of narrow corridors, now left,

now right, now I have seen a mark, now I smell that it is around here. and meanwhile some mysterious children

are watching from the shadows. History trilled, empty and with a certain smell to "" The others "". Parallel worlds

where each one thinks that the devil is the other, legends that want to seem very enigmatic and in the end. No

surprises Anyway, it's really boring. More than claustrophobia causes fatigue and more than fear laughter. The

motivations of the protagonists are unclear and, in any case, they are shallow. But in addition to

flat characters, there is a total absence of work in the dialogues. Especially annoying the monologues of

Sergei Karparov, who is talking only through the corridors as he does not want the thing: "" Oops, an inscription. I'm going

to read it and explain it out loud. " That's it, we even have a love story. After several hours walking

around the happy galleries, the vagabond decides to retire (everything is very scary and now I do not remember

what I came for, with how well I was eating rat wings. I better go alone.) Despite not having

practically crossed word with the prota (except a couple of hints without coming to mind) before leaving decides to

plant a good morreo to Father Owen who, of course, receives the enchanted gift. Momentazo.Not even a

couple of scares can take you. Everything is predictable. For example: Alec, one of the guides, sees a lantern that he

had lost in a hole where only his arm fits. He decides to take it and, ���vaya !, the hole had a trap.

He pulls it out suddenly, screaming and looking at the bite mark he has. Everyone worries about what happened but,

despite the initial anxiety, they end up accepting that they have had to tear themselves with the stone. More careful the next time

Alec! The only positive thing I can find for all this is the faith that Mar���a Lid���n puts into her projects. Of course,

something is good to move them forward. Sold in advance in a myriad of countries, with a budget of

ten million dollars and a very interesting cast, Moscow Zero was shot in real stages, mostly

in Moscow itself. ��� And there are three movies with this one. Anyway, let's hope that the fourth one will beat. For the

moment, he leaves us with this pretentious grotesque, which someone will dare to describe as auteur cinema.

" 0

" Rocambolesco Hitchcock film exercise that ends up being a circus show ofacr���batas

boringthat end up smashing against the ground. And I'm glad ...

The unthinking spectator is anesthetized by the sudden interest in good movies with products of this

kind: films billed under the always easy recourse of going deception Going, adding false clues that

lead to viewing a pathetic tour de force with the inevitable slogan of "" to see who is capable of filming a

deception with better ingredients "". Because Seducing a stranger is an elegant scam, which does not stultify the

casual spectator, but which angers those who still feel pleasure in the hazy atmosphere of the classics of the

g ���nero, worthy and imperishable, written with respect to the intelligence of someone who sacrifices a couple of hours of their

time to lose them in a deranged carousel of computerized goodies, forensic merrymaking andclattering

finalthat disarm the unwillingness of that some of what we have just suffered may, over time,

give us some beautiful memories. In short, all that the cinema seeks and that makes life pleasant and

joyful. We agree that there are dozens (read if you want hundreds) of worse films, but the wickers of this one,

its cast - as it was said before - and the tremulous machinery of m? ��� the world deserves a

certainly higher level. We ask for mediocrity and find mediocrity. Or maybe it's going to happen that when you see that

James Foley directs the work, we believe that we have the right to find something that we saw, and that weenjoyed

greatly, in his film Glengarry Glenn Ross, masterpiece of the recent American cinema in opinion of this

(today) stunned chronicler The popularity of its actors (Berry, Willis) does not guarantee anything: in any case it makes it worse.

I will write it very clearly: a very bad film. Fortunately, I rent it at a video store.

" 0

" Days of Glory denounces a profound historical injustice and pays a profound tribute to thosesoldiers,

"indigenous"but as a film is not up to the story that says.

The image that the cinema (especially the American one) has always shown of the war is an image of

nobility, sacrifice, heroism and patriotism, no matter what the conflict is. The cinema served in the United

States to raise the morale of a nation and encourage it to continue a war (the Second World War) that was

waged thousands of kilometers, and therefore all the Blicic deculas of the time were generally mere

pamphlets. Then came Kubrick with Paths of Glory, and the genre went into the deepest oblivion with the

wars in Korea and especially in Vietnam. But wars are not like the wars painted the cinema, because in the

face of values ​​such as the nobility of sacrifice are suffering, pain, hunger, hardship

for the civilian population, and death, in many cases absurd and meaningless. And in the face of purelyheroism there are

propagandistalways anonymous heroes, and in many conflicts there are always unjustlyheroes

forgotten. Days of Glory, by Rachid Bouchareb tells the story of a group of those forgotten heroes, of

Moroccan and Algerian volunteers who fought for France against Nazi Germany. Days of Glory pays a

profound tribute to those men, and demands a just restoration of their memory. This is the greatest virtue of

a film that however is not up to the story that counts. The tape is full of

highs and lows, and does not have the intensity needed to completely catch the viewer, and with the lack of pace and

excessive duration, ends up losing their attention. To any fan of history the film will know little,

as it remains on the surface of many things, such as the French surrender army practice (both in

homeland and in the colonies) before the invaders. The height of the desprop���sitos is the character of

sergeant Roger Mart���nez, of which hardly anything is known but to which they assign an Arab origin. The

performances are good as a whole, especially those of Sami Bouajila and Jamel

Debbouze. Day of Glory denounces a profound historical injustice and pays a profound tribute to those

"indigenous" soldiers, but that as a film is not up to the story that counts. After this, we

ask ourselves when the time will come for France to recognize the Spanish Republicans who fought in

the Foreign Legion, and who were the first Allied soldiers on the streets of Paris in vehicles

with names such as Teruel, Belchite or Brunete.

" 0

" Exceptional work, once again, its director shows us to what extent a great creator can innovate

through the staging and narration, a filmmaker may���sculo

In a few Sometimes a server will see an unconditional surrender to the qualities as a filmmaker of some

director in the current times, something very difficult given the difficulties with which they usually find

all of them at the time of shooting, as soon as to creative freedom, to be slaves of fashions or the tastes of the

public to reach a certain band of spectators. But there are still filmmakers who, for one reason

or another, in this case a privileged position in an emerging cinematography like the Korean one, can

express themselves with total freedom. Park Chan Wook has always been a saint of my devotion, irremediably, film

after film has marked me and made me hope for the future of cinema, at the risk of It seems

too risky. It could not be less in the conclusion of his particular trilogy on revenge, a new

sample of Mr. Wook's wisdom. On this occasion the story takes us to aprison

Korean, in which Lee Geum-Ja is serving a sentence for thirteen long years, due to the death of a child which

Lee herself Geum had kidnapped. Once he leaves prison, we follow his first steps in freedom, as he

gets a job in a bakery and plans revenge on the man responsible for his imprisonment,

which is none other than Choi Min-Sik ("" Oldboy "" ) playing Mr. Baek, an elementary school teacher, with dark

secrets about several missing children, and even, the daughter Lee Geum had, and who was forced to

part with her because of her .Park Chan-Wook takes us back to previously traveled lands in

his exalted work, those in which redemption, revenge, and political justice go hand in hand to

form, new, an explosive cocktail in its final result. All this narrated with adramatic progression

commendable, only paused by those flashbacks that remember Lee Geum in the women's prison, which, by the

way, has a theatrical tone that I do not know if it fits the reality of the priests of Korean women,

but that results from an oppression that transpires the screen and supported by the angled frames of its director,

transmits that sensation impeccably. This dramatic progression reaches its climax in the final part of the

story, in which moral ambiguity seizes the film to reach one of the most poetic endings of all

his work, and that he remembers, especially at the end of Oldboy in his visual elements, especially the purity of the

snow, in contrast with the long and tortuous path towards redemption by our heroine (� ��?),

As a final liberation. In the technical section, we can say that, as usual, the formal brilliance and

staging of this genius of the image is Park Chan Wook , takes over each and every one of the

scenes. These extraordinary travellings that give intensity to the story, without being forced or

gratuitous at all, or the aforementioned angled frames of constant oppression, full of edges, like the emotions

of the characters in their films, becomes, once more in his films, an element that is more important than the

narrative itself, advancing in the story precisely from that perfection. All this together, of course,

with his particular sense of humor, always so black and that Chan-Wook always knows how to exploit so well. Sequences such

as the final execution, which is a very up-to-date update of any kind of vengeful cinema,

always from that ironic and macabrely humorous distancing, or the on���rica of the execution of a

dog-shaped Baek (really significant), give us an idea where the film is heading, towards a

magical realism mixed with a very black sense of humor, sometimes reaching the discomfort sought by

its director to cover all this with a series of religious elements such as purity of soul,

destiny or redemption. He even allows himself the luxury of resorting to certain visual resources of great originality

and, nonetheless, to be ironic, to cite as an example the scene of the sexual relationship on the table, and

as with his own vaiv���n of the bodies arises from under the table the written title to show on screen

the time of condemnation of the girl who exerts such activity, brilliant once more. Many scenes remain in the

viewer's retina throughout the footage, including that bright scene of the attack in the alley, with

certain echoes to the scene of the Oldboy crowd fight, resulting in this violent occasion if possible,

to be dry and direct, without contemplation, as a Greek tragedy oper���stica. It is just an example of the

amount of details and nuances that arise from the work of this great creator, using, once again, the

intensity of the colors as a visual clue to the animate or vital state of the characters, with im� Blurred genes

that do not result in valde in the history. If we add to all this an excellentwork

acting, even of the most secondary characters (perfect the group of parents in the final scene), we will

find a film that brilliantly closes the particular and revealing trilogy of revenge

initiated by Park Chan Wook with "" Sympathy for MR.Vengeance "" (containing one of the final plans more

cruelly emotional that a server remembers, removing the stomach of the anxiety provoked), a work

somewhat inferior to this "" Sympathy for Lady Vengeance "" because it contained a half hour in hisknot a

storybit confusing, but on the contrary, it was still painfully dramatic that is what concerns us

today. Above both is the one that is precisely in chronological order, the

masterpiece of Korean (and probably world cinema) "" Oldboy "", for which this subscribed, the best film of

the last ten years. The only one, but you will find amateurs unaccustomed to this type of Korean cinema,

is precisely the fact that the narrative sometimes goes towards a cinematic ellipsis that makes

certain scenes jump from one to another without going to a conventional narrative, which in my opinion,

does nothing but enrich the narrative ,N, however contradictory it may seem. In spite of this, it can be a

small burden for a certain type of public not used to this common resource in Asian cinema. In

short, exceptional work, once more, its director shows us to what extent a great creator can innovate

through the staging and narration, a filmmaker may���sculo, at the expense of repeating, but that has already

demonstrated throughout his career (without going further than the recent and commented here "" I'm a Cyborg, but that's

Ok "") that is a privileged director and a breath of fresh air in the world panorama. Absolutely

essential.

" 1

" Viscarret's film offers us a trip back to the roots to, at a second opportunity,

find oneself. One of the great Spanish bets of last year and a movie that invites you to dream.

Sali��� as a flaming winner in the last edition of the Malaga Festival with the awards for best film,

director, actor (Alberto San Juan) and gui��� No novel under the arm. Under the tutelage in the production of one of the

great Spanish directors and producers, Fernando Trueba, the beginner director Felix Viscarret, signs one

of the best Spanish films seen in the rooms in many years, and one of the big surprises (at

least for me) of 2007. Seeing "" Under the stars "", you realize that maybe there is still a a glimpse of

hope to save the current Spanish cinema. The magic that transmits the character of Alberto San Juan (in his

best role so far), the freshness of the montage, that hypnotizing soundtrack that transports you to the very

Navarrese village where the film takes place, and of course that ins� ��lita child-adult relationship that develops

throughout the film and that evolves to unsuspected limits for the spectator. The tragicomedy thatus

Viscarret gives, has that smell of good Spanish cinema before, but with the means now. And they do not have to

be re���idos classicism and topicality if they sign works like this. Viscarret knows how to insert

humor in some dialogues that even making you smile do not confuse you and do not fall into easy laughter. It is fascinating the

magic that has he managed to create the director in his first long work, and that magic wraps all the

film's footage without resting a single frame. That mix of everyday simplicity and at the same time the poetic

poetry that the work possesses make this film a cinematographic portent. A bold, courageous film that

I hope will become a key piece in the future of Spanish cinema. Alberto San Juan is simply sublime.

It manages to transmit everything that is proposed without hardly acting. He has that innate ability to act

naturally. Throughout the viewing it looks like a mere improvisation of theater. With a perfectlycharacter

defined, San Juan seals what is for me the best performance of his career. After a somewhat

hesitant work in "" Days of Cinema "", San Juan gives us a stellar performance, a transcendental evolution of his

character Benito through some superb dialogues (great also Viscarret writing the adapted script of

the novel by Fernando Aramburu) where he finds the perfect tone always between comedy and drama. Emma Su���rez

meanwhile est ��� simply correct. The truth is that I expected much more of her in this role, but fails to

fill her scene every time it appears. The girl, Violeta Rodriguez, is really fine. Represents an

introverted creature, for the lack of affection and attention of an abandoned mother. You can see that he has fit

perfectly with San Juan, and in each scene they have together, the chemistry between them is everywhere. The

encounters between Benito and 'Puerquita' are the best of the feature film, creating a subtle friendship between them

to complete in a mutual love. The evolution of his character, and the complicity that this acquires with Benito

is the most natural, highlighting the scene in which both characters in which they are known. They do not need to

speak to understand each other; the game of looks of the two says everything in certain sequences. 'Puerquita', which

is how San Juan refers to the girl in a caring way, finds in the figure of Benito the father whoso much

has searchedin his childhood and who has finally found.Finally, Juli���n Villagr���n, who plays the brother of San

Juan, claims himself as an actor, leaving us a very moving role, mainly for his bonda and innocence,

complementing himself perfectly. with his other half, his brother Benito. The truth is that without wanting to, Alberto San

Juan obscures in a certain way the interpretations of his companions, falling on him the whole weight of the

film and leaving not only airy, but approved with nota.En referring to the section of sound, Mikel Salas

seals a phenomenal work worthy of the same Alberto Iglesias in any movie by Julio Medem (except the

failed "" Ca���tica Ana""). A soundtrack chosen perfectly, and that fits into the film which gear in

a clock. To emphasize, the beginning and end of the film, and the scene that gives title to the film, in which San Juan

crosses the way of return to the town under a blanket of stars. Excellent work of music and photography

in that scene. Viscarret's film offers us a trip back to the roots to, at a second

opportunity, find oneself. In short, one of the great Spanish bets of this year, a

film that invites you to dream; because after all life are dreams

" 1

" Still with all the drawbacks that I have taken to gui���and others, I can say that it is a good movie. �cula. We can

be proud that above is Spanish.

A very correct film, entertaining, good, and inconsequential. Those are the characteristics of this

movie. Very correct (it is well recorded, well directed, with correct performances), entertaining (it is a

suspense film, and it fulfills its purpose without boring us at any time), good (it is a good film, which

together like a lot), and unimportant (American, Chinese or Spanish, is irrelevant and will be lost from the

memory of people before the end of the year (if you have not done it already)) The responsible (and I do not say it as something negative)

of the film is Daniel Monz���n, who before getting into this film, made his own cr ���tico. Hisproject

most knownis "" The biggest theft ever counted "". I have not seen such a film, but of course, it enjoys the

sympathy of many people. As for the film that concerns us, well enough. I, of course, have not given up

for the afternoon. In general terms, the film is "" intelligent "". But as usual in this kind

of movies, "" enjoy "" a couple of moments that should have fallen, not in the editing room, but in the

first rewrite of the gui���n. And is that where all the elements of the film are supported is in the gui���n.

That it has its gaps, its holes (or its gaps) and its slips. In general it is a good guide, but it

suffers from a couple (I say a couple as I say a dozen) of moments that do not contribute anything to the story and that

makes us not take it seriously. For example, that moment on the plane, when the protagonist sees that kind of

bloody bug or whatever on the computer. Tell me: does it contribute anything to the story? Does it make any sense?

Does it establish connection with a later event? DO NOT. Those who have seen the film will know what I am

talking about. It is a real pity that the script has so many incongruities and moments that they have gotten them into a

shoehorn. As for Monz's work After the cameras we could say it's good. But we would be unfair.

The direction of Monz���n has many ups and downs. There are moments in which the man sees enthusiasm and enthusiasm, they

are moments with an outstanding direction. But when there comes a time that does not interest you too much. quite the

opposite. But in general, as I said, good. As for the work of the actors. Correct Alone, uniquely

and exclusively. Hutton, in the leading role. Well, very bland. But correct. Luc���a Jim���nez, very correct,

but sometimes, maybe he overreacted a little. The only one that really undertakes his work with great skill, is David Kelly,

in the role of the evil Kovak. And the fact is that every time the screen appears, the actor leaves the others

behind. Another notable aspect of the film is its unbeatable soundtrack. Signed by the increasingly

international Roque Ba���os. Even with all the problems I have taken to the gui���and others, I can say that it is a good

movie. ��cula. We can be proud that above is Spanish.

" 1

" Collage ���cido of American society (and Bush was not yet). In these times of de-cinema

juicedShort cuts is an allegation of the importance of having a text of height.

There are those who admire the now sadly deceived Robert Altman for his heroic attitude as a filmmaker against the,

tide���crata, decadent, and do not manage to see that above that politicization of his cinema beats, beautiful, alook

neat, singular���sima that avoids any concession free (except the very unfortunate Pret-a.porter) and

offers free, complex, intellectualized without being hermetic at any time. Short cuts is a

story still skillfully linked: the plot is of a thick warp, but the puzzle

assembles with precision and Altman's story-teller gives us in consciousness with a history full of life,

that breathes life, that touches us all and that we can all consider part of our history, a fragment of

our own life. The routine of the characters, which are many and varied, becomes ��� pica:

routine and hermanapica twins, confused, so n the gray photograph of the leaden fatherland of the director, whom he

mocks like a Michael Moore, more cold, less cold. For Lives crossed, a dozen longbeings

wanderingmarch past. , anodyne, losers, marked by failure, involuntary bastions of a moral bragada in

daily battles against loneliness and against disenchantment. And in one way or another, the world of Altman (or the

short stories of Raymond Carver on which the film is based is supplied by people who are broken by pain, but

sometimes oblivious to their evidence in their lives: yes at the end eventually recognize, as the toxicmano that

solely gets serious with his addiction whensuffers too voltaic trip. Here there arelosses

irreparableand small The most frivolous abandonments, but they are varnished by the fine indifference of a director

who does not put his hand in what counts and lets everything flow naturally: what he does amazing the vision of

this film is the ability of a genius to assemble all the stories and that they are, in the end, a.Thecinema

choralof Robert Altman is the reference in which Paul Haggis (Crash ) had to drink before addressing his

(unfairly) Oscar-winning film, or Paul Thomas Anderson and his very superior Magnolia (with the Tom Cruise in

front of a camera that I have seen). Altman leaves no one alone: ​​not even a baker, apparently

unconsubstantial, unnecessary, seems obvious to us, even if it only appears on the screen for ten minutes. Until the

earthquake at the end is a character. Crossed lives or Short Cuts (short cuts, a title of asonance

greatin Spanish) is a prodigious collage of stories: the deliberate atomization of its plot, the

excessive acting machinery, is then resolved in a well oiled rise to the denouement, which also brings moralism

, but let's not say what we should not. In these times of de-ionized cinema (���sa is my claim in the

desert of a solitary spectator), Lives crossed is a plea ���cido of the importance of having a text

of height. I have not read Carver's work in its entirety, but I do know some of the stories that guide the film.

Then each one will take the story that you like the most (or that most shocks him, anyway.) I'll take the one of the

policeman who plays Tim Robbins, detestable, goon to the paroxysm, and his story ofreconciliation

conjugalby truly ins���litas routes. He obtained the Golden Legio in the Venice Mostra, which in addition It was

awarded, unusually, the prize for best performance by the entire cast. . In the Golden Globes they created

a special category for Cross Lives that also gave the cast the interpretive prize. Altman aspired (

failing) to the Oscar for best director.

" 1

" Another misfortune to which "" Jeta "puts" "Santiago Segura, and from which one almost forgets at the speed that is seen

.

Recreativos New Park is an old recreational lounge in the center where teenagers spend their afternoons in

a world of neon colors and loud music. Among them, Dani (Jordi Vilches) and his gang, a

group of kids from Fuenlabrada, are the masters of a singular videogame: La M���quina de Bailar. Dani works in

a supermarket. There, a security guard with the look of a serial killer thinks he is a good kid, so much so that he asks him to

take care of his albino boa (a whim of nature) during the month he will spend abroad. And of

course Dani, in addition to guarding the animal, uses the floor to organize a little party with a girlfriend and

send the snake to the other neighborhood in an unfortunate accident. The gang has no choice but

to look for a spare animal, but the only one they find is a paste. They do not even know where to start

until they discover the convocation of the first national competition of The Dance Machine, which will be held in the

Manga Saloon. But in order to compete at a high level they need the help of an expert choreographer,

someone to guide them in the complex world of dance competitions. Johnny, the manager of the New Park, was

an old champion of when the music disk was raging. Moved by the kids (who remind him a bit of

himself), he decides to prepare them. Every day, on the way to work, I found the Atocha station

full of posters and banners of this "sensational" "(n latese the iron���a) film, on the other hand, I am not very well

the reason, and although I always try to deny to this kind of lamentable shows, I just fall, and that is,

here this sad mortal, prefers a mortadella sandwich to a ration of the most interesting delicacy, that's why

today, and without having it planned, and thinking about going to see another movie, a part of me, maybe the most B (from

barriobajera and Bananera), has ended up dragging me to such a lamentable spectacle Does one contemplate knowing in

advance that it is before the worst that their eyes can see, and that Santiago Segura is usually nourished by this, his

cutrecine, to knead? at the box office, in a shabby but effective way, without doubt, with Jordi Vilches, moreholed

pigeon-than Michael Landon, in the role of a geek youth (who already repeated in "" End of Course "", " "Platillos

Volantes" "and in any film where it appears). On the other hand, the film seems a" "publi-reportage" "of the

company KONAMI, famous not only for the Pro-Evolution Soccer , but also by those hellish machines of

jumping and dancing (for which our body is not trained for this tremendous coordination), at the rhythm of

music incessant, heavy and machacota, brought from the East. Anyway, another shit that puts "" Jeta "" Santiago

Segura, and from which one forgets almost at the speed that is envisioned. By the way, Jos sale also leaves. � Corbacho,

although better that it was dedicated to films like "" Tapas "" or to his casual appearances in "" Buenfuente "", because here he

is to forget his mask.

" 0

" A true visual portent full of symbolism. The fall is the second feature film by Tarsem Singh, known for his excellent career in the world of

video and for his first film, The cell, starring Jennifer Lopez. On this occasion, thedirector

Hindihas visited more than twenty countries to film The Fall, a film that, according to his own words, is ���

inspired by a Bulgarian film called Yo Ho Ho. After being acclaimed in this edition of thefestival

Toronto, The Fall has been rated as the best fairy tale without Fairies from The Promised Princess. The

film begins with young Alexandria, a young woman with a broken arm in a Los Angeles hospital in 1920.

There she meets Roy, a double for the dangerous scenes, who tries to take off the life based on morphine. With

As if to forget his hardships, Roy decides to tell Alexandria "the most wonderful story in the world", atale

dreamin which five heroes will travel through �s of space and time to put an end to the evil

Emperor Odius, who has frustrated their lives. Of all the films that, for the moment, a server has had the

opportunity to see in this edition of the Festival de Sitges, without a doubt The fall is, momentarily, the great

winner. And with difference. Halfway between The Promised Princess and The Adventures of Baron Munchausen, The

Fall is a visual poem, an ode to fantasy and the imagination that captivates the viewer in anway.

irremediablean alleged story for children, the second feature film by Tarsem Singh maintains

that same video clip aesthetic of La celda, in which each sequence is a spectacle of contrasts for the

eyes and in the that the colors seem to come off the screen, thanks in large part to the costume design of

Eiko Ishioka, acclaimed for his wonderful work both in La cell and in Coppola's Dr���cula, for which he

took ��� the Oscar in 1993. Leaving aside the visual rejoicing that The fall supposes, on the other hand, manages to

convert each of its frames into a picture of incomparable beauty, we can say that the film could Defina

defined as a beautiful song to life and hope, full of sim Bolisms, humor, and with moments as hard

as moving starring Lee Pace, who plays the role of the convalescent stuntman Roy Walker in

real life, and the Bandido Masked in the story, but that certainly would not make sense one without the

sweet characterization that the young Catinca Untaru makes of Alexandria. The more skeptical ones may be able to say that

The fail sometimes rubs ridiculous, that their characters can be laughable and that his plot is full

of incongruities and unexplained temporary jumps, but Tarsem Singh's film manages to introduce us

so much into his story, he manages to achieve such an affinity between his characters and the spectator, that incongruence or

defect is negligible while the story takes its course. A true visual portent loaded with symbolism, and

one of the best candidates to stand with the triumph in Sitges 2007. I give an 8'5 on 10.

" 1

" A cin He is independent, brilliant, who is torn between intelligent hilarity and the most honest drama.

The father is a failure trying to sell his formula to succeed, the grandfather inhales cocaine and advises his

grandson to be promiscuous, the son wants to be an aviator pilot and as they do not let him have sworn to keep silent until

To achieve this, the gay uncle tried to commit suicide because of a lack of love, the small and plump daughter wants to be a queen of

child beauty and the mother tries to put order in all this chaos. And they all ride on an equally

comical journey aboard an old yellow Volks Wagen van in one of the best and funniest movies

of the year. I insist a lot on the scripts of the tapes that I see, in this occasion I have to

stop to talk about the background, since I think it is one of the brightest I have seen filmed in a good

time, from its simplicity, its accuracy and spontaneity, apparently, without much effort goes from thelaughter

screwy, but intelligent, without falling into the typical gringa and silly comedy, at moments deeply

touching, without making great dramatic boastings. A script that is not wasted, or wasted, that gives its

right moment to each character, their break, and that they build step by step a whole full of colors and

intensity. But for a movie It is not enough with an excellent script, it takes an extraordinary direction, and

this was done by the writers themselves, it is Valerie Faris and Jonathan Dayton,

responsible for a an impressive number of video clips from iconic groups such as Red Hot Chilli Peppers and RE

M., together, they were in charge of the simple but just creation of the tape, of acrobatic balance of

the various tones opposites that has history. But undoubtedly the greatest success of his work, is theensemble

acting, to get the actor and the right actress for each character and in addition, put them to work forming

an excellent team on screen, a true family, which is rarely seen in the movies. From Toni Collete

as the mother, Greg Kinnear as the father, Steve Carrell as the suicidal uncle, to the grandfather and the youngest,

all of them perform an outstanding acting work, always highlighting the irreconcilable differences between each one

of the members of the family and taking their adventures to the limit? Des And misfortunes! In this way the directors

erect a story about the nature of the family, the search for authenticity and at the same time an

incisive critique of Yankee life that aims to convert everything who plays in a beauty contest, as one

of the characters shouts it; life is a beauty contest after another, the high school, the university? A

life in which all are supposed to strive to be winners and a country that considers as losers and

"freaks" all those who do not try. But as the story progresses one ends up asking: "Who

is really normal or" "freak" "? Who is really a loser? And although it may seem complicated, perhaps the

whole film could be summarized as a single scene, great, fun and meaningful at the same time. in which,

after the vehicle they travel in is broken down, everyone has to push it to start it and one by

one approach it between jumps and races? What is not about being part of a family?

" 1

" Audiovisual hybrid with Ir���n as the chosen setting to recreate Afghanistan within a fictile as atrocious

as inescapable

Winterbottom once again demonstrates its mastery of the technique cinematogr���fica, something that has been patent in the

measurement in which its filmograf���a has been taking packing. Without a written guide as such and with some characters

? ver���dicos? who wander through a fictional reality, Camino a Guant���namo is one of those films that strike a

heavy blow at the spectator because of their emotional and ideological load. Necessary cinema, yes, but also daring cinema not

only for what counts, but for the way it does it. The director of titles such as Wonderland, Welcome to

Sarajevo and C� ��digo 46 has us accustomed precisely to the fact that we do not get used to its kind ofmaking

film, disparate between some projects and others, but with the same rigor in terms of its aesthetic and formal precision.

His last premiere is once again an audiovisual hybrid with Ir���n as the chosen setting to recreate Afghanistan

within a fictitious and inescapable figure. It looks a lot like this variant from the road to hell a

In this World, the film in which the British filmmaker told the story of two young

Afghans who, from Pakistan, begin a journey of no return to the Silk Road to London, where

the promised edifice of a better future holds. Path? It is closer to the documentary genre but it is not like other

more periodical products since it aims to highlight the entertainment component that has all fiction. The

drama of "the three of Tipton, three British Muslims confused with terrorists and embarked on the worst

trip of their lives, stars in this essential story to position ourselves, with solid arguments, in front of

the politician." Ethics of terror imposed by governments such as the United States and the imperialist affair, camouflaged

as an instinct for survival before the American colossus, of countries like Iran.

" 1

" A show that aims and hits the target, which is not usual in the current card. In short, if you

want to know what an epic adventure is, here it is for you:

The Tolkien universe seems at first sight an immeasurable challenge both for its extension and for its

infinite sub-frames and its various and varied characters. After watching this film and the direction thatperforms

Peter Jackson, it seems easy enough to do it or at least, the best way to achieve it. More

incredible seems to be the same Jackson who began his career with Bad Taste (Bad taste, 1988) a

gore-trash movie with the easy r� Bizarre title, but of a sympathy and an improvisation in exaggerated doses,

showing now a growth and maturity (with films of transition like Celestial Creatures) little seen in

directors of his litter As enjoyable as it may be, the trip is back for more than three hours of action and

adventures that will pass briefly and improve, the rhythm of the first. Jackson is faithful to the book

again, taking the essentials and without discarding (as in the first part) scenes that we might have wanted to

see but that would have made it even more so. Unique of what it was. The two towers starts to all action with one

of the best (maybe the best) physical start of the year. It is also praiseworthy to have filmed the three

parts in continuous due to his fluid narrative, agile and effective, with excellent photography and more.

technical aspects.This time acquires more importance with the running of the footage the warrior-hero Aragorn (Viggo

Mortensen, measured and innocuous) and his multiple battles with his company. ��ero Legolas (Orlando Bloom) and the dwarf Gimli

(John Davies) to the detriment of the long journey of Frodo (Elijah Wood) and even of the resurrected Gandalf (an

as always excellent Ian Mc Kellen). Another point in favor is having made the virtual Gollum (a lovable and

detestable at the same time), a functional character in the story and not a mere entertainment or escapism and to

show this, a single example: Jar Jar Binks.En he must only mention a tedious incidental music

that highlights some already solemn dialogues and have wanted a greater dose of humor, but really not

necessary in this kind of story. Surely it will be compared to the exhaustion with its contemporaries Harry

Potter and Star Wars removing a body for the moment both in realization, as effects and maturity, but

there will be � what to expect to give the final verdict to conclude all the sagas but that said, and it brings them an

appreciable advantage. Curiously, in all of these series the second parts are better than the first, as if they

needed an intro to later evolve and go more clearly into the story. A

final battle without respite (and a real challenge to overcome in the third and last part) they crown a brilliant film

in every sense, a spectacle that points and hits the target, which is not usual in the current card. In

short, if you want to know what a typical adventure is, here it is for you: The Lord of the Rings: The two

towers. Enjoy it.

" 1

" The feeling that I have left is not of anger, but of sadness, of "" another wasted cartridge "". A 4, because the

director tries, at least, to make a good commission.

Antena 3 has done it again. It was not enough with the series that of the paparazzi of Santi Mill���no with the

bochornazo of 'Ellas y la sexo d���bil', no. I had to invest 10 million? in a miniseries (I hope, and will

talk about it later) about the intrigues of the Borgia family in fifteenth century Rome. And to premiere it in

cinema, to give it more cach���. If this is the future of directors like Antonio Hernández, we go sideways

here. "The Borgias" tells the turbulent facts that they surround the Borgia family, originally from Xativa, since

the appointment as supreme pontiff of Rodrigo, the patriarch of the clan, until his fall from grace. A story

comparable to that of the Corleone (Mario Puzo recognized to have been inspired by them for his mythical saga), and that

could give real game on screen, is reduced to a faint cr� Unique about the corrupt power of the

Church of the time, and the war of interests around the Vatican. And all due, in my opinion, to two

key factors: - The role of man The strong clan (C���sar Borgia) falls on Sergio Peris-Mencheta, a young

actor from the quarry of 'Al salir de clase', who gives a lesson on why not all actors can make a

paper It's not so much that it's bad (it seems to me, yes), it's that it's a want and I can not be constant, it's incapable of

sustaining the film on its own. If the election has been in charge of the producer, they are worth it; if it has been a

bet of the director, it has ruined all the previous documentation work, setting, photography, etc.,

because every time C���sar Borgia appears (and appears almost always), the dramatic tension, thegoes to

historical recreation and everythinghell. Neither some efficient secondary (Poncela, Dechent, sometimes Lluis Homar) can

save the entire function .- The script: Antena 3 has prepared, I bet anything, a miniseries of at least 4

hours , that perhaps makes sense as chronic, but of course, how four films ofvolume will be released in cinema

historical. So I guess Antonio Hernndez was asked to use the scissors to leave it in a

reasonable size (sounds the play?) For what is styled: two and a half hours . Are the beginnings of thecounted

Borgias in Rome? No. Does the story of love between C���sar and Lucrecia develop? With intuition, okay. What

happens with Jofr���, the "" Fredo "" of the family, and Sancha, his wife? Apparently, it is not relevant to the

viewer. They go, period. Total, a comprehensible first part, and a sindi���s at the end. The sensation that I have

left is not of anger, but of sadness, of "another wasted cartridge". The production is acceptable, but for

the standards of television, the national and current, I say. Nothing to do with 'El P���caro' or 'Fortunata and

Jacinta', for example. And with the cinema, less. A 4, because the director tries, at least, to make a good

commission.

" 0

" One of the most beautiful films that the history of universal cinema has given. We have not been able to explain it better;

its qualities exceed the capabilities of any analyst.

They send us a copy of the Jos��� Luis Guerin film (European production of the year 1997) accompanied by a

warning, as the sender knows We have been searching for great discoveries for some time now. In truth, now,

after the viewing, the pulpit and emotion directs each letter that, with difficulty, will try to put in writing

what can only be and be understood in the eyes of a God who has made the meaning of the image,

or essence of the cinema, his own. Of course, we say, the cinema is not only technical, it is art. But art is more than aesthetic,

especially when we face certain realizations that arise from an imaginative flight that sinks its

origin in a search as beautiful and as plicated as inducement of restlessness. To which we hope to go, without falling into

excessive grandiloquence; the seventh art is a mystery, and life is the portion of lived image that can be

captured, or, at least, that we desperately try to capture and understand. The more I understand, the more I love you,

because everything that is understood is good. The more I look (LOOK, not see), the more I love, because every image hides something

from Being. A Being in time. A Being in space. A Being in remembrance. Traje de sombras is a look at

existence, naked, primal, but at the same time it digs deep with the light of a look that ages to find

the past, and rejuvenates so that past and present hatch in a radiography of a world subject to the

rules of time and the flow of physical forces in the most confined spaces of a home, there where

nothing and silence are the best space to locate the perspective of a narrator. It is not a "" nothing "", in

reality, it is an aspiration of a creator of images, images without words (in truth, what is the need for

world of words, when the cinema is the gaze of God?), sequences of rhythm and montage that convey the

gaze on the rapping tapping of the celluloid, as a pause in which the cinema is reborn to throw again its

light on the days of life, and you will see the dawn, you will see in black and white the happiness of a family, you will see

the eyes of a child. When you look at the sky, you will see people running through the countryside, looking at the camera as if they knew that

behind the camera there is a spectator who looks at them and asks questions about nostalgia and the sense of the passage of

time during decades. The structure of the film is the structure of the lyrical time and the "physical" time "; from

the past in a home full of laughter and silhouettes that do things that only a human can do, up to the

present, the emptiness of the home, the ticking of a clock that emphasizes the temporary pulse in each room, in

each photograph, a curtain moved by the wind and the shadows that advance while the sun is falling on the

horizon. Corners of the Being. The universe would not be what it is if there were not a conscious entity that contemplated its

emptiness. As a poet would say when looking at the rooms, the dining room, or on each shelf

or photograph: there is nothing, and yet there is something, the mystery, in short. The thread is the image

itself that focuses the world with consciousness and intentionality, and establishes two fundamental achievements: the passage of

time has a sensitive aspect, the viewer can feel the very materiality of time, of how the

abstract can be metamorphosed into an almost empirical sensation induced by the play of images. On the other

hand, we are facing an essentially lyrical film, which uses its structures in order to delve into the

metaphysical concept of time, that is, in mystery. Construct of time, and time that takes a concrete

representation in each sequence. There is more, and it has been insisted on his intention to recover the purity of cinema,

but it is also a look at life and the "depths" of the world. This is something intuitive and no

explanation that we tried to give here could clarify the concept: something as simple as showing aplan

generalof a street that leads to the river. or a life that changes with the evolution of phenomena, or a movement

of images that seeks -with an almost desperate urge- to capture the essence of a face, the face of

time, the illusion of retaining a mark that never dies and that the cinema wants to capture to dignify itself, to go

further. To understand life. If it is not clear, one of the most beautiful films that thehas given

history of universal cinema. We have not been able to explain it better; its qualities exceed the capabilities of

any analyst.

" 1

" New reading of the cinema of monsters. Much less good than some vocinglan and acceptable, in its

mediocrity, as adult cinema. Entertainment is plentiful when the creature comes out to do the pu���eta with

its baboser���as. Out of there, little meat to be cut, none to sell.

I am afraid to disagree, for once, with the militant cin���fila orthodoxy that ensures the excellence of a film when

I only contemplate more of the same, but in this case (and that's the case). which is relevant) with that

cultural decontamination attributable to Korean culture. I am afraid to disagree because I have not seen muchcriticism

pessimisticand there is more praise than dissent. The Host is credited with exceeding virtues when it treasures (it is

true) only a few. Japan's post-nuclear monster heritage has powerfully curdled in the idiosyncrasy

of a country of enormous Western adhesions, which it has in Hollywood, a cultural referent and that

undeniably has its own identity patrimonies. In this context, Bong Joon-ho perpetrates the masterful move of this

millennium start: a film of monsters foreign to the Yankee merchandising and with enoughcharms

nationalto dazzle all Korean with the desire for an icicle and with muchinfluence

Hollywood, of course. South Korea is not an armored territory: it is porous, it is permeable. Thisfactory is

scarenot too frightening either: the monster is well explained, it is well designed and it is surprisingly

well dosed, although it appears much more than the aliens and the sharks that have nurtured the cine-creature

recent. For all this or more that will be desgranar��� lines below, The host does not excite. ��� Like? Well

do not upset, that's enough. The family resource is well focused, but poorly written. We do not understand the

Korean humor or the pseudo-dramatic mixture of crocodile tears that the hard-working characters release so

that we understand that they are very sorry for the loss of the little girl. A family, which is theaxis

emotionalon which all the (cumbersome) footage is tilted. Containing portentous scenes like the first time

we see the monster on the banks of the river Han de Se���l, The host then falters because of the weight of its own

fiction machinery. It does not matter that there are strong positions taken with respect to chemical weapons or that one

understands that the director wanted to give us a subtle discourse on the dangers of the dictatorships ofState

the Welfare. All that is very good, but the building falls when we realize that twenty minutes of

very good start have already staged everything we wanted to see. The rest is an abuse ofjokes and

boogeytours technologically managed by the sewer of the city. The political speculation comes to life

with clarity. The monster is the excuse to stun the citizen's neck. Often happens. The family

protagonist (excuse that no names) is portrayed with an Italian verismo, perhaps detailing with

too much rigor his reasoning and his psyche. It is not a Bergman or Sirk movie. Nor does his clever director

demand it. The host can tell us the moral temperature of a country weary of American cultural colonialism:

doctors are Americans, the culprit of all barbarism is American and the methods of resolution are

American, that is, , excessive, cinematic, pompous, hollow, bald���so, in the last and obvious instance. The

"" kaiju "" or Asian cinema to Godzilla and company The host owes a greening ofdimensions

unpredictable. If until now the West was going to Korea-Japan to steal scripts from ghosts and hallucinations, now

we have a blockbusterian filin, a vein of untouched gold. I fear the worst. We did not have enough with the

Americans and now we have creatures with slanted eyes to run over the billboardsinconvenience

. Another noteworthyis the mixture between horror and film cinema. There are moments in which one does not know if he attends a

parody of the Scary movie or the original. The familiar family is broken, frayed. Those moments of

domestic intimacy are the sins of na���f, an unheard of bêtemic enchantment that makes the whole group lose its nerve.

On the contrary, scenes with monsters compensate for this drop in tension. We have criticized many times that

the cinema supported in the presence of a creature (Predator, Alien, Tibur���n, juristic issues or Mimic)

show outstanding dramaturgical deficiencies: characters without substance, argument bordering in the invisible

Well now you have one to disdain. What fails in The host is precisely all this: the familiar thing, the

strictly emotional plane. What are we going to do? There are unnecessary, abrupt registration changes. There areactors

hard-workingthat we can not hierarchize into good or bad because the script that is offered does not offer

enough appeal to make your work splendid and exciting. The question becomes, after all this,

fundamental: ��� It takes emotion in a movie of bugs? The idea that theshould not be detached from this

filmreview �cula is not bad. It is not at all. What is not and you do not have to look for three feet mutant bugs is

an outstanding or relevant film or as one wants to say. It is not new sap to fantastique. Nor is there a

before and after in the monster cinema. Three minutes of Alien in the Nostromo fill more than twenty of them

through the sewage of Se���l. Do not forget the reader ���ived of strong emotions. The scenes that open the film

(the attack of the monster on the banks of the river) are absolutely recommended. Is it worth paying for ten

minutes?

" 0

" Wilder proverbially emphasizes the corruptions of power.page lives in freedom, is written in

Frontfreedom and is filmed without the homicidal cors��� of the filters of the censorship of the time ...

In a way, First page, very precariously summarized, is a film Billy Wilder's film, and in it they

meet, also very schematically raised, the leivmotivs of the author, his particular interests in film,

his way of seeing life. So, the front page contains formidable sentences, iron���a, sarcasm, bad milk

(not coarse, no cazurra), dizzying dialogues, characters with a dramatic depth and a This is a cinematic

test for drowsy spectators. Wilder's cinema is a cinema of words, an auteur cinema in love with dialogue

as an absolute trick to hook someone who lets two hours of his attention be stolen. n to attend a story

that happens to other people. What is the cinema, if not this? Wilder's words are uttered bypsychiatristspetty cash

moronic, corrupt sheriffs, gazetteers of, mayors sponsored by a brand of

sausages and poor in spirit who can not stand the more or less irremediable injustice of this world, but

also the words of Wilder are uttered by whores (a job that never goes wrong in the Austrian

master's film), professionals of journalism as the cup of a sequoia, office workers with a

cathedral heart and poor in spirit who are removing the shit out of life and taking out the nose to find, in the

air tainted by the stench, a point of honesty, aromas and beauty. Unlike the film by Howard

Hawks that gives rise to ���sta (New Moon, 1940), First Floor lives in freedom, is written in freedom and is filmed

without the homicidal corset of the filters of the censorship of the time. Wilder emphasizes proverbially the corruptions

of power. Hawks makes a more dynamic film: Wilder, in the seventies, forty years later, signs another work.

finely ironic, with a more virulent set of comedy because Wilder's humor hurts when listening

concentrated. It is a caustic humor: a humor ���cido and corrosivo.Since Wilder was a journalist in his

young years in Vienna, knows what the thing and First Flat, the thread from this kind of lived event, it

becomes a formidable monument to the freedom of expression, to the nobility of the art of journalism and to its

dignity as an indispensable trade in the last (at least) two centuries, without count the one who runs. Theitself

argumentis a meticulous, meticulous in its simplicity, but forceful in the extension of field it

reaches. Walter Burns (Walter Matthau) is the director of a double-run newspaper with a large staff,

but scarce in talent because, apparently, he will have to resort to his star journalist Hildy Johnson (Jack

Lemmon) to cover the execution of a murderer in the local prison. Everything is going on when Johnson announces,

theatrically, with an intelligent and manifestly contemporary jocularity, that he quits his job to marry

a concert artist from Philadelphia and earn a living as a publicist. Despotrica against journalism, it is convenient

that the press only read for a while and that the newspaper ends up wrapping some herringbone

in a garbage can. Walter Burns tries, by all possible means, almost all artillery, recover his

man for the news, return to the office, prevent him from marrying, mostly. So far we notice theguide

conventional, the commercial part, avenible to the conventions and the usual gags, but below, at the level of

metaphor, it beats (powerful, sublime) the self-confidence with which Wilder portrays the function of the journalist as a

notary of reality, as well as very expressed. Much of what we see only happens in the

press department of the prison. From his window, then broken, the scaffold is visible. Journalists who

drink there, play cards and talk about frivolities and old rush have no scruples, have no

honesty, have no difficulty in modifying reality to their liking and greater glory of the pompous andheadline

grandiloquent: vendor. The mayor and the sheriff are nonexistent and are an enormous trick in Diamond's guiding and

Wilder himself, over a small play by Hetch. Both are degraded, turned into scum that

covers (as it can) the powerful guild of the press (of the serious, that there is) so that they do not air their

whims, their legally punishable sins. the Eggelhoffer, the psychiatrist who interviews the inmate

Williams: one of Wilder's best sidemen, without a doubt. Rich in his caricatured profile,

reduced to hyperbolic imitation of Freud, which Wilder also ridicules. It is said that Freud himself met

the Wilder journalist in his native Vienna and that they did not have, let's say, good tuning. "" The truth, the whole truth

and nothing more than the truth "", says the slogan of the Examiner, the newspaper of yore. Cinema and nothing more than cinema,

I added. God, in the voice of Trueba, was assassinated by modern cinema, cinema less semantic, cinema eaten by the

fever of technology. In heaven where I do not think I'll be taking notes on the turbidities of the angels.

Bad times for the lyric, they sang in the glorious Eighties Low Coups.

" 1

" At first the film promises, but it ends up being a lot of "pop" wrapping with little content.

I notice that I am not one of those people who adore Sofia Coppola and everything she does. "" Lost in

Translation "", although aesthetically pretty, it seems simple and, the story is very annoying, with

a woman suffering for her paid vacation in Tokyo and a lot of cajondeo of Americans-in-Japan n on how

curious the Orientals are and how bad they speak English. "" Suicide Virgins "" I liked it, but of course, the

film adapts with great fidelity the precious novel by Jeffrey Eugenides, so it does not count. In general, I think

that Coppola is very overvalued and that it works in what it works, in large part, thanks to being a daughter of

who it is. On the other hand, I do not usually like those films that play with current elements in contexts or

environments of other times, and I consider "" Romeo + Julieta "" and "" Moulin Rouge "", by Baz Luhrmann , more like a

failed experiment than anything else. Having said all this, I suppose it is not surprising that she says that I went to

see "" Mar���a Antonieta "" without expecting anything more than a show of modernity that her director can become. And,

to be honest, at first I thought I was wrong. At first, the thing promised, and although it is

true that details such as music or layered hairstyles are not too rigorous - nor do they pretend to be -, itnot

wassomething that caught our attention. not exaggeratedly or that it was annoying. At the beginning, of course. Then he

totally goes out of his way and starts the "" everything goes "", with dances that show that soundtrack in a very obvious way or

scenes from commercials. There will be someone who will appear a few Converse very

funny. I suppose it is, but, of course, it is also representative of what the film is: a lot of

"pop" wrap and little content. And, to top it off, for a long time. Because that is another: "" Mar���a Antonieta "" is

going through long "" phases "". The phase in which nothing matters more than her virginity and her enmity with themistress

king's, the music phase, cakes and colors, the bucolic phase "" sheep and garden " �n "", and so on until the end

-precipitad���simo, by the way-. Jumping from one thing to another without any coherent connection, or even merely

formal. In short, that despite its careful image, this reinterpretation of the story of the famous queen I did not

like. In fact, I think it's the worst thing the director has done. But I have already noticed that I am not one of those

people who adore Sofia Coppola?

" 0

" A fast-paced movie that will keep the viewer nailed to the seat until the end of the show.

Temporarily abandoned his career as an actor, Mel Gibson has become one of the mostdirectors

interestingof today and one of the most independent: he puts the money and does what he wants. That's why

his films, especially the last two, are so personal and risky. Being such a famous actor

brings him a dangerous burden: watching a film directed by Mel Gibson it demands of the spectator an important

lack of prejudices. Prejudices, on the other hand, based almost all on their presumed ideology (as if

ideology influenced the quality of cinema). My recommendation to all of you, is that you forgot who is behind the

cameras and enjoy the visual spectacle that is "" Apocalypto "" I'm not going to enter to tell you the synopsis of the

film, knowing that it is an adventure set in the pre-Columbian Americas is enough, but I would like to

clarify some aspects for which the film has been attacked. Gibson has always presented his film as

an adventure film, not as a historical treatise on Mayan culture. Whoever wants to see it in such a way that

he forgets the subject. Despite this, there are aspects that are very well reflected. The Mayans, in fact, had

extensive knowledge of astronomy, as it could be deduced from watching the film, in a sequence that can

remind "" A Yankee in the court of the king Arthur"". In addition, despite what has been said in many media, theMaya

Yucatecis not a dead language; It is still spoken today by more than 800,000 people. Returning to the movie, it

has to be said that it is perfect for Gibson, which is not coincidence, not in He is co-author of the great

script with Farhad Safinia. A gui���n full of emotion and adventure in which they even allow themselves the luxury of

making some humorous and ironic guide to the viewer. One of which has become one of themoments

most commentedof the film: a final joke by Mr. Gibson that took me totally by surprise. His movies,

as I say very visual and ���sic, is ideal to get fully into the life adventure of the protagonist and to

make us feel like our story that is, after all, about very basic andfeelings

elemental: survival, fear, the family, the love? Something that almost nobody will talk about when commenting on

this film, are the impressive interpretations of the whole cast. The actors are so well that no one is

going to give importance to them because they interpret with such realism the Maya of the time that people think they are

seeing authentic Mayans instead of 21st century people. The problem would be to highlight one of the actors

above the others, which does not stop confirming that Gibson is a great director of actors (remember Maia

Morgenstern in "" La pasi��� Christ "still excites me." There will be people who complain about the shocking violence that

runs throughout the film and in which, to tell the truth, the director recreates himself in some moments. But I think that

such violence is justified by the story that counts, that its use becomes something natural

and perfectly understandable. If I have to say what I liked least about the movie, �cula, I would say that the entrance to the

city ​​is a little longer and it can tire a little. But the bajn unique rhythm of afilm

thrillingthatkeep the viewer nailed to the chair until the end of the funcin.Ardo anxious to know

what It will be the next challenge for the director Gibson. What I'm sure is that, on the day of the premiere, will be in the front

row to see it. Feedback moonfleet.es: 9 out of 10.

" 1

" Some may seem a pedantry, as often happens in any author's work in the

most free and avant-garde European cinema line. But that's just what the cheesy and the ignorant say.

Art - contemplated under a process of conscious ontological self-assertion - takes a giant step every time

an artist creates a universe. It makes no sense to dedicate life to art without, in advance, recognizing that

this is the most noble and transcendent facet of the human condition. The human potential reaches its maximum goal in

the creative act, that transpiring of the thinking soul by means of which the creator projects himself towards

an unrepeatable world. That is, it gives us a piece of something of our own, something that can not be felt or understood

at the conventional level of communication. In this way, the untransferable becomes transferable, and art,

as an act of communication, becomes a way of fraternity between sentient beings and

creators. "" Europe "", of Lars Von Trier, is a unique object for its meaning and its form. Theidea

fundamentalof the base text consists of an immersion in the depths of the omniscient narrator's mind

that is made explicit by voice-over (Max Von Sydow in the original). It is the fears, ghosts and

anxieties hidden in Trier's mind that are parading in disguise as bitter tears for the

European continent and its unfortunate recent and present history. Although the argument is situated inGermany

post-war Nazi, the situations, the words, the gestures, the plots of conspiracy, the hatred and the

irrationality that motivate the different entities that entail the essence of the human characters, are

elements of the most immediate present, going through the war of the Balkans or any latent conflict between

the "" our "" and the "" other "" that still threaten the peaceful coexistence of some areas of Europe (Ireland,

Basque Country). Therefore, a part of the thematic content consists of an elegy crying aroundconflicts

universalfrom a contemporary frame. In another stratum of the content, a constant motive appears in the

filmography. �a danos director, the figure of the innocent lost in the forest of conflicts, victim of the

interests of each other, known as Leo Kessner. It is, at the same time, protagonist and impartial observer,

materialization of the consciousness of the spectator, which is being guided by the voice in off according to the trip that

Trier proposes. A journey full of shadows and ghosts that haunt their role as corrupt characters or

slaves of their murders or complicities with the agencies involved in the contest. Another is the

basic constituents of the content: its tonality on It is the same as that of an atmosphere imagined by Franz Kafka, and

here Trier fixes the pulse of his camera in a visual space that contains the maximum information. n possible for this

purpose: the depth of field and the arrangement of the different profiles on stage always seeks to position Leo

Kessner at a point of neutrality with respect to the rest, but, above all, it emphasizes the sensation of No choking

between the harassment, the imperatives and the deception perpetrated by this set of Kafkaesen entities. As for the

writing, the script collects different thematic and emotional aspects: satin tones. ��ricos y / o sarc���sticos,

melancol���a, decep ci���n, Apocalypse, paranoia, love, lack of love, appreciation, contempt. It is fascinating how magnificently

structured all that amount of tonalities are and Lars Von Trier achieves it through a simple

story of love and disillusionment in an environment of ideological hostilities, nothing original in that sense . But the

transcendence of Europe does not lie in history, but rather in what it is approached: Trier's visual imagination is

evident in very large numbers, travellings and the use of chromium resources. They are used to create different

narrative dimensions within the same story and in the same scene, from which there is an intentional

ambiguity-confusion between the real and the unreal, thus accentuating the the on���rico character of the representation. The

final destruction is preceded by tensions in the psychological framework of Leo Kessner, who, overcome

by the banality and stupidity perceived in their peers, decides that, after all, the genocide it is the

only way out, following the most turbulent thread of Trier's concerns, as we saw by

"Dogville". "In view of all this," "Europe" " it becomes an intellectual and creative game of its author, capricious

in the choice of themes and forms used, of enormous variety, but not in his finalconstruction.

intention, which is to communicate a universe of images that arise from their nightmares and the worstmemories

autobiographical, organized and represented by a dantesque allegory about the conflicts in our

civilization. n modern and about the danger of isolation and loneliness. Rather, the danger of

incomprehension, which is the factor that can cause any of us, in a desperate flight, to take the

decision to activate the bomb that gives way to horror. Finishing, and attending to its great qualities in the

thematic order (to deal with complex issues with an effective structure), to the visual polychromy in line with

the multifaceted representation of emotional and narrative states, for being endowed with a personal seal

which makes it a unique piece, and considering that art must produce genuine works, works of

which it is said in colloquial expression: "" only he could do a work like that "", that is, part of the

idiosyncrasy of the author is given to us through his aesthetic production (he gives us, in a certain way , a vision

of the world that enriches and amplifies that of the spectator, that is why it has much more intellectual value than

simply offering a Mannerist or pamphlet vision, that is, a non-creative and fossilized vision, as

in the speech of Spielberg in "" Saving the soldier ryan "", which is no more than a mere copy of the

North American state discourse, art is much more than that.), from "" Images and Words "" we are not left Another

option is to classify "" Europe "", in an indisputable and absolute way, as a work of art. Some may

seem like a pedantry, as is often the case in any work of author in the line of the European cinema more free and

avant-garde. But that's just what the cheesy and the ignorant say.

" 1

" Overvalued extreme eccentricity wrapped in the form of mystery and psychological drama. All the enigma that appears

at the beginning goes to a broken bag, losing everything suggestive and stimulating that it was.

Overvalued extreme eccentricity wrapped in the form of mystery and psychological drama. It is true that it starts well, it

starts off very well, but little by little and as it progresses, it becomes diluted in an inscrutable way, wanting to cover

more topics than Richard Kelly's film can really bear. For starters, we have a mysterious and

disturbed Jake Gyllenhaal (nothing hits him) as the protagonist of the story; posingteenager

as a high schoolin his early twenties. But that's not the best of all, the best thing is that ���ATENCI���N! Drew

Barrymore (Drew, you're almost at the same level as Sandra Bullock on my blacklist, what happened to the lovely little

girl from ET?) Plays her teacher !!! For God's sake, maybe he's older than her in real life. At the

moment a 0 for the person in charge of casting. Returning to the film, it seems that it wants to start, hook the

viewer, hypnotize it by the mystery that surrounds it, but everything stays in a want and I can not. You really

want it to work, but it does not work. All the enigma that appears at the beginning goes to a broken bag,

losing everything suggestive and stimulating that it was. It wants to be independent films and at the same time attract the

youthful public with the history of problematic adolescents in the typical American town. All this is very

touched already, so we sneak the time travel, and voila; we already have a movie I do not swallow it. Apart

from all this, the rhythm is tedious and slow in equal parts, with meaningless scenes (smurfs) and quantity of

resources that lead nowhere (scenes and montage with a 100% video clip rhythm) and that only they fill

minutes of footage. Let's go now to the good things. The interpretation of Gyllenhaal isand

interestinginteresting. You empathize pretty well with your character, even if you do not know what's going on. The music

is great, it fits perfectly in the "" roll "" that the film brings. The starting idea is good, but

as I said, it is diluted as it goes. He wants to touch many existential and philosophical themes, and in

the end he ends up not completing any of them in depth. The "evil rabbit" is awesome. For me,

the best of the film by far. It manages to reflect the anguish and bewilderment felt by the protagonist. Every

time the film appears, it gives real fear. Bravo for the design people. In short, part of a

good premise but remains a simple intention. The end is seen coming from afar, a little more

originality Mr. Kelly. The conversation of the Smurfs, Smurfette and sexuality - what did you intend? Please,

leave the work of the absurd conversations to the genius of Tarantino, and see yourself in his film; the public will

thank you. In short, I do not know, it has been too pretentious at times, and especially in the last

few minutes. Thematic like the great Trapped in time, and the suggestive The butterfly effect.

Undoubtedly for me, it is in the third place of the three. In short, sobrevalorad���sima from end to end.

" 0

" Towards Wild Routes is a film with many philosophical and moral aspirations that is shipwrecked by the

pedanter���ae inconsistencies of Sen Penn's speech.

After Oscar nominations have been made public, in addition to making pools on which and

who are the favorites, we must also think about the defeated ones. . Perhaps the clearest is this TowardsRoutes

Wild, by Sean Penn, which many gave as a clear candidate for the most important Oscar Awards.

Sean Penn must be said to be one of the best actors in the current scene, but his incursions in the

direction have not been very lucky. Towards Wild Routes is another film that can add to that list of

fiascos, and that is that Penn uses the adventure of Christopher McCandless to make an ode to the freedom of thebeing

human, to anarchy, and to cruel and heartless that society can become. And he does it without ever losing

a philosophical-religious halo that, in addition to pretending to justify the acts of the

character, is the most pedantic and pretentious. Penn focuses more on the relationships thatis establishing

McCandlessin his adventure and there are moments when he leaves aside the adventure itself, and rarely does

the viewer transmit that struggle of the human being against the wild nature. If the story itself is not a big

deal, the rhythm and the way it is told (who would like to alternate fragments of the final scenestory)?

with the rest of thenarration?) make it even less attractive. Penn also happens with the disproportionate footage, and

that is two and a half hours is a longer than excessive for a story that could have been solved in a little

more Ninety minutes. All the actors are correct, although Hal Holbrook's Oscar nomination seems

more recognition to his entire career than to his performance in the film. Rutas Salvajes is a film

with many philosophical and moral aspirations that is wrecked by the pedanter���ae inconsistencies ofspeech

Sen Penn's. Little can be saved from such a film, the most remarkable being the fantastic

photography direction of Eric Gautier.

" 0

" Great act of Felicity Huffman I have no words to describe this movie, it's just GREAT. Felicity does a great job and

shows how great an actress she is and why she has taken all those awards (the Oscar has to win), I

had only seen her in Desperate Housewives and I liked the record change and if you see the movie in VO,

it is much appreciated. Point in favor: the same that doubles in the series has been responsible for putting the voice in the

film, but does not put it serious enough, at first a little, but then you forget. The first

half hour is a little slow, but once the stories of the characters are developed you get

hooked in that world. To say also that I like the American tagline more than they have put in Spain;

Life is more than the sum of its parts.Bree, before Stan, is about to get the authorization to

undergo his sex change operation, but receives a call from a boy who claims to be his son Your

psychiatrist tells you that you must meet the boy before signing the authorization. Regaadientes Bree agreesgo to

New York to take the boyof jail, but bail is $ 1, Toby is not ningn little angel, with 17 years

trapichea with drugs and has been arrested for prostitution. The kid convinces him to take him to Los Angeles,

where he will become a porn actor, and they buy a car. The trip is full of incidents and lies. Bree has not told him that

he is his real father and less that he is actually a man (he has told him that he is from the Church of theFather

Potential) and Toby ends up discovering his secret. Although at first he reacts badly, he ends up accepting Bree. A

hippie steals the car and leaves them lying on the road without more clothes than the one they were wearing. In a bar,

Bree joins a man who leaves them in Phoenix, at Bree's parents' house. The mother reacts fatally to seeing

her daughter, but the rest of the family does not seem to have any problem (about all the sister). When he

confesses that Toby is his son, the mother begins to treat him beautifully, and even wants him to stay

with them as a condition of paying her the airline ticket Bree so that she arrives on time for her operation. .N Bree

finally tells Toby who he really is and reacts fatally, hitting him in the eye. Already in Los

Angeles, Bree is operated, but that day is not the happiest of his life, he misses Toby. The best thing without a doubt is the

great performance by Felicity Huffman. Many of the phrases "" my body may still be in process, but there is nothing

wrong with my soul "". The blonde tranny and her friends. The mother of Bree

" 1

" In this case, it was never more true that expression of "" I liked the book much more ... "" Admito, no blush I love all the books of Michael Crichton, (well, less "" Congo "" that I find

insufferable.), but I do not understand why Crichton, seeing as always, or almost always (there is the exception Den

de "" Parque Jur���sico "" and "" Harassment "") the rest of the films completely detract from the narrative resources of their

works, and as, in the greater In the cases, when passing them through the cinematographic screen, they remain bland, poorly

made and worse faced. In this case, "" Rising Sun "" is not an exception, tape that, read on

paper, is attractive, fun, fresh and well developed, and that, on its way through the screen, only

stand out the interpretations of Sean Connery, the frugal apparition of Tia Carrere as a woman vase of

it, and a Wesley Snipes, bland and linear to the best of his ability, in addition to the light of the "animal of action" that was much

later. The script, in which Crichton has enough "" to say "" stays in the water of borage and is so predictable

and so badly run, that from the first min. and despite having some twist of gui���n (which also has the

novel), ends up disappointing the most painted, especially if you have read �do the work on which it is based. In this case,

it was never more true that expression of "" I liked the book much more. ""

" 0

" There is no possible middle term, there is no bondage; one of the most devastating "bad" films that this

chronicler of his vices has seen in his already a few years of cinematographic experience. Is it clear?

Being rigorous, Next incubates some of the most vicious vices that plague the current cinema or, moving away for

once from the defeatist tone that is going to ground this hazy review, apart from the billed cinema in Hollywood and

conjured in the company to raze at the box office, provide little or nothing to the memory of anycin���filo

medium-intelligentand, above all, enter the DVD market as much as the amount collected in movie

theaters . I am not the cause and I may not get too involved in looking for it, but it seems to me a very complicated task to

write about what amazes me and gives me pleasure (writing about pure excellences) and, on the other hand, , my

fingers are gone like nervous lizards when it touches me (today is the pleasant day) ranting against some

product of manifest mediocrity or already direct and nauseatingly bad. Infected by all the possible evils

and some more than my nap laziness of Wednesday makes me not reach now, Next plays with the advantage of not

being in violation of any cultural law, but it must skirt the crime and case that in the future somebody

quality public inspection(IPC, ja) decides to veto or warn on the card of the terrible evil that can

cause its consumption, Next It carries the formidable golden palm of absolute chaos and the platinum bear in terms of

annihilation of everything that smells of simplicity, clairvoyance, quality, in short, those things that make life

travel on roads more fluffy and we all get the hair on end and the soul up when we seethings

beautifulon a screen. Taste, common sense and beauty, absent abstract concepts in thisrubbish

embarrassingas an anal intercourse in a sainete of the brothers ���lvarez Quintero. We can fine-tune the configuration

of the torture colt ling� �����stica going to a typical or two hundred, but for once will be a typical (or 200)

convenient: our friend Nicolas Cage is already fond��� n, he has four films left over a year and that is young and

still has rea���os and ability to take flight and redirect a career that has hadmoments

interesting(Leaving Las Vegas ) or even some undisguised good (Adaptation). It lacks man a

role that redeems it, but it will cost a lot to erase from our memory, so greedy, so bombastic when you want,

motorized disasters with burning skulls or fortune tellers against the clock like here of clumsy and foolish

portrait. he is unconcerned with the narrative coherence and goes without blush to an argument so laughable, so

fragile and light, so bad, that one thinks, armed with a sack of good intentions, that Lee Tamahori

(Warriors of yesteryear ,O, his best film, Mulholland Falls, the brigade of the hat, on the good side and XXX: State

of emergency or ���sta in the dunghill of disaster) has wished with all his New Zealand forces to fall

low enough to from there, take off and do something worthy. Ah, the height of nonsense is that

my beloved Julianne Moore comes out. Ah��� all the purposes of temperance were undone and I thought very

seriously not to expose myself in excess, to give him a death certificate and not to attend a function of such disrepute. Everything

is for the good times that this great actress has given me, also afflicted - like so many - of thatvice

mundanethat is the bitches and the stable curro.Next is not even bad by itself, but it needs the

help of the sins of others to formulate the already musculated their own. The fortuneteller who sees thefuture

near(two absurd minutes of precognition) is obstinate in not being a hero to use and recites adages of

Zen transcendence to caper - and be carried on the way to the cot - to the lady obligatory, that we do not have to

insist that she is a concupiscible wench, with a cute face and more stunned in the film roll than a

seminarian in a bang gang in Cannes (Jessica Biel). It must be difficult to take the gallant that surrounds you,

while being sweet and delicate, attentive and overwhelmed in mimes, a magician of supernatural powers in whose hand

is to save the world ( USA included) or - allow me the semantic excess - send everything to holy shit.

Par���ntesis: I have to open on my page - neglected lately - a corner in which to play the worst

films in the History of Cinema: those made with empe���oy turned into pure churro.Next (I keep digging) has already

presented credentials and is nominated in all the more grenades nominations. The spectacle of the cinema - noble

art, noble art - has taken this intriguing path: it becomes disgusting to the serious industry and embraces withfreshness

brothelthe sometimes decent mercantileism disguised as art, to adult or adolescent entertainment,

delivering a generous dose of boredom. I could have written a brief Authorities blah warn about the

dangers that came with the consumption of this product, but you can not go hand in hand and just like that. The

videoclubs live, after all, of this: of trash, of remains, of palomitero balance that only shows the advances of

technology and the quality of the new teles, with their colors and its assorted pack of connections. I, at the

time, that I'm reconsidering my self-esteem, I open wide the windows of the chest and let out the

demon of masochism. I got stuck and has been loitering for my soul since he threw me in the face such a

disproportion. Go, go

" 0

" Pseudoscientific and criminal action film that makes it essential to leave the brain at home. As

you do as I do and you question everything that happens, you will finish and you will continue saying "" amos hombre "".

How fat is Van Kilmer, mother, if it almost did not fit on the plane. And that's not to mention the clone of Fernando

Alonso who comes out trying to give sanity to the script of science fiction that the film has. By the way, the

Deja vu thing will have been put on because it will make them look better, given that the tape has nothing to do with deja

vu, ���no? Tratacula is about a brutal attack suffered by the city of New Orleans, still not recovered

from Hurricane Katrina. A ferry full of soldiers explodes causing half a thousand victims. A policeman in

charge of the case discovers a body, found an hour before the explosion that seems to have died

in it. Pulling the thread, he gets recruited by a government group that seems to have the power to see

what happened a few days before, exactly four and a half days. Well, I do not know what to say. I can with the films

of flying Chinese, with those of Martians, with those of superheroes, etc, but with those that pretend to be serious and

kick the elementary physics, I can not. And that has happened to me with this one. The whole film is based on the happy

machine that shows us what happened a few days ago and there is a moment when the thing wakes up and I do not think

anything serious . Then they talk about travel in time and they already give me a reprieve. For the rest, it is an action tape with

some explosions and such, camouflaged by a somewhat light police investigation. It's not too bad, but I can not deal

with it. Resuming, a pseudoscientific and criminal action movie that makes it essential to leave your brain

at home. As you do as I do and you question everything that happens, you will finish and you will continue saying "" amos hombre "".

" 0

" Good, delicious and very fresh Strawberries with milk and sugar that I took to see if I took away the

bitterness of a comedy that becomes drama and annihilates the viewer. The comedy of laughing, the drama of

crying, let's not mix.

I remember a while ago that came out a story I do not know where, they were looking for people to make the poster of this

film. How to put an ad "" You are looking for a designer that does not charge a hard film poster "" It seems that it does not

encourage the staff, they decided to give it another touch. "" Sketches contest for the movie Day poster. The premi���

will be to make the poster of Days of cinema "". Here the one who does not run flies. I'm going to do a contest "" Contest of

licks on the penis to Tito. The winner will be able to give her a full fetal "" in case something falls (afrom my

waferchild as read the blog). The film is about a theater director who wantsthe leap to the cinema with a

Takepolitical guide in the Spanish transition. On the other hand, a producer who knows what the viewer wants (as

Ozores knew) wants a musical with a child prodigy with some kind of nugget and unnecessary nudity. On the other

hand, the star wants a role that catapultes him back to fame. And on the other hand we are the

spectators somewhat stunned. The beginning of the film is fine, with moments when you laugh and you do not understand

how many people have called it a "pata patatero" and Spanish cinema. ol in low hours. Then the film moves forward, the gracietas are

over and a co���azo drama begins, not so much, with sad situations (like watching Fernando

Tejero do what he cries, most of all) sad that can be seen in the cinema). The idea of ​​making a film about the

filming of a film is not new. But this in particular is supertriste am���s not able. I mean, a fewago

years, the great Jan pulled out a Super Lopez cartoon called The Great Superproduction. Coincidentally, it was the filming

of a film that was taking place in a mine, that everything was a disaster, that a girl wanted to break up and

ended up with all the movies congratulating the director (Super L���pez ) for his great work. Coincidence, I do not believe it

(Iker Jim���nez dixit). Resumiendo, buen���sima, delicious and very fresquitas the strawberries with milk and sugar that I took

to see if I took away the bitterness of a comedy that becomes drama and annihilates the viewer. The comedy

of laughing, the drama of mourn, do not mix. This type of comedy is that I can not stand it. Bits. PS: Why do they run

at the end of the movie? What a silly thing, really.

" 0

" A small great film, brilliant in all the senses and with a cast in absolute state of grace.

Remember, above all, the phrase that Paul Dano writes to Carrell: I Hate Everyone. That Dakota Fanning trembles!

Indie cinema is getting better every time, which I find really fair. During the history of cinema

we have been presented with wonders such as Magnolia, Memento or Fargo (possibly these are the three that stand out

within the independent, for my taste) and all of them have been very well received so much by the p Public as

per the criticism. And here is another little indie wonder called Little Miss Sunshine, which was released

last year and that I have not been able to see so far. It is, without a doubt, one of the mostreleases of 2006

masterful, with the permission of El laberinto del Fauno and Sons of Men. The film is directed by the

couple Jonathan Dayton and Valerie Faris, both debutantes. Maybe the film is accused of being recurrent to several

aspects that are always habitual in this kind of films where the family is somewhat dysfunctional, but I believe

that this is not a mistake, because each The character is superbly written and they hardly have a lack of common sense

(well, maybe a little yes, but what are we going to do if they are geeks). The fact is that Peque���a Miss Sunshine

exceptionally portrays the life of a family, which is united thanks to the trip they take to

bring the smallest beauty contest. And is that the theme of the family is not the only one, since that

criticism must also be highlighted to this type of contests, to the lack of personality of the organizers

and to the overcoming of Den of oneself. In short, the film is a trip to the impossible, but also a journey that

represents life itself, full of problems along its journey and knowledge never explored until then

. This, then, is a symbolic, moving, emotional and funny film, intelligent and really

essential. Like the direction, its gui���n is �� endowed with the same doses of intelligence and wit

until it seems to Oscar (which is, in this case). Perhaps he is also accused of being somewhat typical

of independent films, because he has several common places where the action takes place (gas station,

dining room, hospital?) , ys���, in this I agree, but I do not find that it is a point against. The structure of the

script is not that it is the height of originality, but only some of the gags that occur in the film

(the police and the porn magazine, the dinner that begins the film or the final scene of the film, absolutely

incredible). That yes, there is one of them that I think it is superfluous: the meeting between Steve Carrell and his old boyfriend in

the gas station, nothing cre���ble and totally out of tune. For the rest, we can say that Peque���a Miss Sunshine is

really original and that, above all, it lifts you up. But what has no fissures in the film is, without

hesitation, the cast . It was a shame they did not nominate Steve Carrell (the best of the function, for me) to the Oscar,

because he was, in my opinion, much better than Alan Arkin (who was given the unfair, especially for being

excessively brief, award for best supporting actor). In short, what really matters is that each and every

one of the actors in the film are proud of each of their appearances: Greg Kinnear as theloser

fatherwho thinks only cheat; Steve Carrell as the uncle of the family, who is welcomed by all of them after

attempting suicide; Toni Collete is probably the most normal of the family and the only thing she wants is for everything tosmoothly

go; Paul Dano, on the other hand, is the strangest, the most freaky, but nevertheless, the one that best falls of

all; Alan Arkin as grandfather, splendid, but it appears too little; and Abigail Breslin as Olive, the

small protagonist and the center of everything, who plays an incredible role (deserving of an Oscar, without a doubt). "

Dakota Fanning, I would not want to stop mentioning the magnificent photograph and the calculated montage, although

it is not that they are the best. All the technical aspects are very worked, but I think, this time, that

the recognition will have to take more gui��� and interpretations than the paragraphs m�� �st���cnicos.In

short, we have a small great film, brilliant in every way and with a cast in all

state of grace. Remember, above all, the phrase that Paul Dano writes to Carrell: I Hate Everyone.

" 1

" Very interesting film of political genre that, although it seems that speaks of past things, it is undoubtedly

has connotations of raging news.

Rober De Niro is narrating us life (apparently based on one of the kingpins of the CIA) of a man

looking sad, dull, lonely, that of an honest official who goes about his, without messing with nadie.Nada

m It is far from reality in some aspects, although it is also close in others. It is close to sadness and loneliness

, having put its homeland, USA, before its personal life, its family and friends. . And distant because

his life is full of violent events, from the suicide of his father to the attempt of the invasion

of Cuba in Bah���a Cochinos, to overthrow the regime of Fidel Castro.De Niro achieves a good film, maybe a

little long, but full of good times (the harsh interrogation of ³false, true? Valent���n Mironov ),

with a clear narrative, great interpretations (extraordinary Michel Gambon and very well Anjelina Jolie,

who with only the look expresses all the pain and loneliness that dominates his empty life), and a use of montage vivacious

that gets the viewer to follow the story with gusto. Among other things because of Niro puts a good dose of

intrigue, with that unclear recording that throughout the film try to unravel the members of the CIA.The technical

aspect is impeccable, with a perfect atmosphere thanks to an excellent work in the chapter of

costumes and makeup and hairdressing. "" The good shepherd "" requires that the spectator knows that he will be many

minutes in the room watching this tape, but if you already know it, you will manage to get involved in a story that will undoubtedly

fill you up and leave you satisfied.

" 1

" It is obvious that Susanne Bier did not want to do a thriller, but in my opinion, some situations are

out of place - like the speech of the bride at their wedding - and are in service of a drama, that stops the

melodrama.

The Danish films that come to our country are torn between the family drama, the shameful secret and the

emotional autopsy. After the wedding it is not an exception. Mads Mikkensen is very far from the role for

which we mostly remember him: in Casino Royale as a torturer of a Daniel Craig in balls

starring in that memorable scene in which the agent tied to a chair laughs in the face of thisplayer to

pokerlose badly while saying something-so little Bond-as: "Everyone will know you've died scratching my

balls?" In a radically opposite role, with the same face of man with past , here is a soul of

charity. Literally, since we find him in Bombay at the head of an orphanage at the bode of bankruptcy. One day, he

receives the offer of a dan���s millionaire who offers him a generous donation in exchange for him going to visit

his native Cophenague. Once in Europe, the fil��� Ntropo invites him without mentioning his daughter's wedding and there the

drama for Milkkensen is to rediscover his past. I will not say more because if something I did not like anything about this film

is that it is absolutely predictable. It is obvious that Susanne Bier did not want to make a suspense, but in my

opinion, some situations are out of place -as the speech of the bride at their wedding- and are at the service

of a drama , that stops the melodrama. That, or the Danes love to use the celebrations to

dust off the skeletons of the closet. I did not get bored with the film, but I was not as enthusiastic about it as I was able to

read in other chapters. Ethics In some I see that just like when a film is Iranian and has gone to see it in

its original version, it is a masterpiece, I think that many people get excited by the mere fact of being in a

? offcinema? listening to eloquent parliaments in Slavic language -or Chinese mandarin-. I prefer other works by the

same screenwriter as Mifune or Wilbur wants to commit suicide - also with Mikkensen - that this rosary of

existential dialogues that concretely left me quite cold. However, it resists very well especially because the

actors are great and impeccably bear the weight of a film that was nominated for the Oscar for Best

Foreign Film - just snatched by the much m� It's exciting and contained The lives of others.

I put it on my blacklist of overrated films in the history of cinema with La fuerza del cari��� andpotas

El club de losmuertos. Here I stay, like Daniel Craig tied to the chair, waiting for the sticks that will

fall.

" 0

" The one who was one of the most raw enemies (physicists, it is understood) of Maggie Thatcher in the 80s, looks

back at a week in which for many people completely changed the concept they had about the

monarchy.

Stephen Frears has begun the century attentive to what is going on in his country, moreover, looking for clues that

interpret the news of that island that was once an empire. 'The Queen' is good proof of that. The one who

was one of the most raw enemies (physicists, it is understood) of Maggie Thatcher in the 80s, looks

back at a week in which Many people completely changed the concept they had about the

monarchy. On August 31, 1997, Diana Spencer, ex-wife of Prince Carlos, died in Paris. from England.

The whole world, shocked, mourns the death of Lady Di. The press elevates the plebeian princess to the altars.

The recently formed government of Labor Tony Blair meets a hot potato that soon becomes an

opportunity for the young leader to shine. And the royal family? On vacation, in Balmoral, he decides not to

modify his protocol in the face of the death of someone who is no longer a member of the Monarchical Institution. Isabel II,

from her more than fifty years of reign, decides not to expose her grandchildren (nor her son, nor herself) to the

media whirlwind and to stay in her castle until that the news passes, whoever falls may fall. The bad thing is that,

this time, what can fall is the very same British Royal House. Structured as a sober critic that mixes

reality and fiction, 'The Queen' probably go down in history by the excellent interpretation of Helen

Mirren, who composes a Isabel II of flesh and blood, as capable of driving a jeep or walking in a pink robe for the

sumptuous summer residence as of throwing a pulse to a whole country. She is the center of the function, although the

shadow of her deceased and hated ex-daughter-in-law is very elongated, and her character is so full of nuances that it is

a delight to see every gesture (attentive to the hands in moments of stress), each look, each phrase. A far

cry from the cliché of a historical character so helped by biopics, Helen Mirren will be in the battle for

the best actress Oscar. And there is more. Michael Sheen is a fun Tony Blair, but sometimes too cartoonish.

James Cromwell as king consort, Sylvia Syms as queen mother and Alex Jennings as Prince Charles

make up a royal family Berlangu, perhaps debtor of the spirit of the ancient 'Spitting images'. Roger

Allam, Mark Bazeley and Helen McCrory, the latter in the skin of a Republican Cherie Blair, also have their

moments of glory in a choral cast. On the other hand, the staging of Frears is an example of elegance

and simplicity, except in some tremendous planes from the helicopter of the great landscape of Balmoral, thefeud

privateof the Queen. For my taste, they totally clash with the rest of the proposal. Otherwise, neat and

direct the style of Leicester, in the service of SM Helen Mirren. As negative points, in addition to the

aforementioned lightness of Tony Blair's character, a certain lack of claw in Frears at the time of finishing the

film. The positive part is the hilarity that is the clash between that Martian family ("" of the planet Zorg "",

suggests a Blair collaborator) and the rest of the world. And also in the positive, a question in the air: "It is the

useful monarchy within a democracy, or it is the same democracy that uses the monarchy." to not

succumb to a revolution? Intelligent, fun, sensitive and prudent (sometimes too much): an 8.

" 1

" Movie days opens on Friday in many rooms, but if the blog a blog works? It will not last long.

The team from The other side of the bed, The two sides of the bed and Day of football marks another originality,

Days of cinema. And it's what it promises, nothing. The action is located on this occasion at the end of the 70s where a

director of neurotic cinema tries to make a film claiming a singer who lived her best years

as a child prodigy. The pressures of censorship, of the one who puts the pasta and others, convert the original idea of ​​the director

-Alberto San Juan- into an uncovering film with Martian invasions and other devades. At the first

glance the well-informed cynologist will observe that, except for the annotations ca ,s, the script looks like

Ed Wood - a of my favorite movies-. But neither San Juan is Johnny Depp, nor David Serrano is Tim Burton. They

are not even the Ozores brothers who did these things, but in their time they were funny. And this movie is one of

those with two fairly lucky jokes that come out in the trailer.El main fault they have had this

time, is that the public who is looking for another unlikely vaudeville of couples is going to meet with a

melodrama with folkloric overtones. As well as the characters of his previous works were stereotypes more or

less identifiable with the viewer, in Days of cinema the time, the situations and the characterizations -that

in some In the case of the carnivalesque, the sector will not reach that sector. On vis a vis with Serrano, he told me that his

main references had been the aforementioned Ed Wood and? Bullets on Broadway !!!! and he stayed so comfortable,

hey. Even in his megalomania he came to compare San Juan with Woody Allen as an actor. And he proclaimed his teachers to

Berlanga and Azcona. As it is ugly in these events, tell the director of the film to write down the address of his

camel, because he stopped talking. That's it. He hit the nail on the head when I asked him if he made the movies that he would like to

see at the movies - it's recurrent when you do not have anything ask- and he answered that he did not know, that he was

like that. As churros, I was about to add. As a pin, he declared that the last Spanish movie he

had seen, he did not like anything and he did not want to give me the t�� Title. I suspect that he was referring to the one we had been seeing

for ten minutes. PS: What I should point out positively is the performance of Nathalie Poza and Fernando

Tejero . Are they great as folkloric of Valladolid and? Mam��� of the artist ?. The others -Malena Alterio, Miguel

Rell���n, San Juan? -Are fine, of course, but their roles are as always, you know. As the garlic are

repeated.PDI: Days of cinema opens on Friday in many rooms, but if the blog to blog works? It will not last

long.

" 0

" Oriental movie about shaolins playing soccer. To see her surrounded by cronies, with beers and

other narcotics. An ideal remedy to combat any depression. Great, no palates.

Director: Stephen ChowDuration: Then I tell you what lasts.Standing: June 3, 2005 (according to the

IMDB). Viewers: According to me, it has not been released in the commercial cinemas Seeing the data in the IMDB is the closest

thing to Bernarda's story. On the one hand, you find that the duration goes between the two horazas and the onehours

and a half, depending on where you have seen it. The premiere date is Spain, I really do not believe it,

because I'm convinced that in theaters has not been released. It is more, in DVD they have not published it in Spain, what

indicates to me that they have not translated it into Spanish (in Castilian if est���). Rebatanm���, if you have what you have to

have.The film is about a former Chinese soccer player who, after an incident, falls into disgrace. After

the years, discover a kid with extraordinary strength in the leg, so they are encouraged to make a

shaolin soccer team with ability to defeat the evil team (Evil) clear dominator of the

championship. The first time I saw this movie (which was longer than the second one, I'm sure) it was in Korean

with subtitles in English. Crazy. And he thought he died of laughter. Now I have seen it again, inSpanish

Latin Americanand I almost defeated myself with laughter. I explain. Take the series of "" Champions "", the one of Oliver and Benji with

a field that of how long it was was the spherity of the Earth. All right. Hire people, cut out the

fields so that they can arrive in less than 3 episodes, forget about mid-party conversations about

honor and friendship, leave the infernal catapult of the Derrick brothers, the brutal cucumber of the ass's eye.

Benji, the stops resting on the post of Oliver, invent some more shots of these and will

result in Shaolin Soccer, one of the most original films and fun I've seen in life. Resuming,

oriental movie about shaolins playing football. To see her surrounded by cronies, with beers and other

narcotics. An ideal remedy to combat any depression. Great, no palates. Great

subrealismo.Besitos.PD: The team of women mustached. The captain of the team that drops a monkey wrench

before starting the game. The shoes he plays with. The shaolin shirt. The conversations.

The dance in the middle of the street to nothing. The blows and other absurdities. To frame it.: And thatin

PD2nobodySpain would dare to bring it to him. PD3: It has the most unusual special effects that have been done. Mix of

cutrez and genius. Impressive.PD4: And in the end it's just a drama.

" 1

" Shyamalan never fails an original idea, and always comes with something new. It achieves what very few

cineastan achieve, and is that viewers are impatiently waiting for each of their films.

M. Night Shyamalan achieves what very few cineastan achieve, and is that viewers arewaiting for

impatientlyeach of their films. You will like it less, but your viewing is mandatory for those who like

well-structured cinema. Shyamalan never fails an original idea, and always comes with something new. In The

Sixth Sense, everyone was left speechless with that ending that no one would see, a milestone in the history of

cinema. The Protected One defrauded many to depart from the path of terror and configure a story of good and

evil with a quite anticlimatic end. With Signals he returned to a semi-terror with shadows on the roofs and

footsteps behind the doors. Nobody expected the Martians to show up, and that pisses off more people. The Forest

was a hoax for many who, watching the trailer, went to see a horror story with monsters and

found something deeper and more mundane. The problem comes there. If you're going to see cheese, because the ad shows

cheese, they give you meat at the movies, it kills a lot. The trailer of La Joven del Agua sells a horror story with

ruthless monsters and yet this is a fantastic story, childish and romantic, with its good and

bad, but a story in short. Whoever goes to the cinema to see something else will come out pesting. All this

speech is useful to understand why this movie has failed with the public. Shyamalan has played it several

times and some may be tired of so many flourishes to tell a story. If it confuses

staff in the advances, word of mouth can be implacable. The reason for the crushing of criticism I can

understand to some extent. To see this film you need to go with a clean mind to the cinema, forgetting

who directs it and what you directed before. Getting in time in the story will leave the room with the feeling

that you have told the story before bed with a masterful staging. If you do not get it, you can

say that La Joven del Agua is the biggest mental straw to date of an egomaniac named M. Night Shyamalan.

So of course. I'm one of the first, but I'm not so obtuse as not to understand that there can beof

plentyseconds. Cleveland (Giamatti) is the fix-all of a residential one that discovers a

mysterious young girl (Dallas Howard) out of the communal swimming pool. That young woman is a narf, a creature from an

old children's story, and who has to return to her world, avoiding a monster that stalks her. To return

to where he belongs, he will need the help of Cleveland and other tenants of the residential, who will have to

shed their prejudices to accept the role they play in the fantasy world of the narf. Paul Giamatti

maintains that stereotype of insecure man with a tragic past that is so typical of Shyamalan, giving moreshyness

of a tone ofthan the usual Willis or Gibson. His performance is impeccable amid so much chaos, and perhaps his

sof escena scene, behaving like a five-year-old to learn more about the story where the narf comes out, be the

best summary of what is the film itself, a story from the mind of a child. What seems more

incredible is that a normal person questions so little the fantastic origin of a t���a exit of a swimming pool.

I suppose that digesting it in several days would stop the rhythm of the film, but it hits a bit. The counterpoint is given by

Bryce Dallas Howard, which is not that it has too many lines. despite being present in all the footage. His

role is quiet but tremendously expressive. It already turned out well in El Bosque, and I can not imagine what would have

been in the hands of another actress. It fulfills the objective in ample way. Sobrada, but in a negative sense, it is the

decision of the director to become an actor. In the other films it came in the form of a cameo. Here it has a

rather major role, and it only leads me to think that it has wanted to reserve protagonism unnecessarily.

He makes me distrust his character without knowing very well how to explain it, and without a doubt it is the worst thing talking about

interpretations among all the cast that makes up the residential area where the young protagonist appears. La Joven

del Agua is a movie. �cula where each and every one of the characters must find their place in the operation of

salvation of the narf, but also in the world. So many twists and turns can be confusing, but the pieces will

fit in the end. Esthetically it is impressive. Visually it has no comparison with anything we have seen

this year. But it will also be misunderstood among a broad sector of the public. It is as if Shyamalanneeded to

urgentlyendow all his films with a transcendental background that overwhelms those who do not want

many complications. But that's Shyamalan, and the mistake is to turn blockbusters withpretensions

stratosphericat the box office into films that are, first and foremost, personal bets. If you thought El Bosque was

a joke, hair, with La Joven del Agua you will finish for life with this director. The rest of us will remain

impatient with each premiere of a director, who with the threat of feeling misunderstood by the industry,

may end up turning to his way of conceiving cinema, and it would be a shame, because a� Some of us like to be told

stories, which is very different from a succession of events.

" 1

" Irreverent Winterbottom comedy that from the beginning does not call to deceive those who believe that they will see

a reliable adaptation of Sterne's book.

This is the story of a cock and a bull. This is my father's bull, the cock now I teach it ?. So

begins Tristram Shandy (A cock and a bull story), an irreverent Winterbottom comedy that from the

beginning does not call to deceive those who believe that they will see a reliable adaptation of Sterne's book Because

what? Life and opinions of the gentleman Tristram Shandy? It was unadaptable with its nine volumes and its long

interior dialogues could be seen. So Winterbottom makes his version lib���rrima where confessions and

intimate thoughts of the character that gives name to the film are the least, giving way to an excellent comedy

film in the cinema And the result is excellent. The film immerses us in the vicissitudes of the filming of the

adaptation where, as in all, the dwarves begin to grow soon after starting. The rivalry between theactor

main- Steve Coogan - and the aspiring secondary - Rob Brydon - provide the best moments of the film

with some conversations - between surrealism and dada���smo - that are really great, discussing from the

height of his booties to the color of his teeth. Winterbottom -or not- is a bit too much in the excess of

some situations - too eccentric - and performs homages, gui���os, Cin���filas self-satisfying - or as you

want to call it - any wig movie and miri���aque that you have seen and liked, leaving you aset

very c conjunto��mico / pedante. But you can see that making this film has been better than the make-up artist of 9 songs

and that he knows what he's talking about, doing an excellent exercise in criticism that I think is

autobiographical. ��fico.Pero if something I found striking is that the director of 24 hour party people commits a

sacrilege for me unforgivable. It jumps to the bullfighter an unbreakable rule of cinema, include in the

soundtrack emblematic themes from other movies! Specifically: Eight and a half (8 1/2) -Fellini, Barry Lyndon

-Kubrick- and The contract of the cartoonist -Peter Greenaway-. This is because it has touched me but I would have to listen to the

passionate of Stern's book, that if there are of Proust these should also abound. What he says,PS

Winterbottom is a licentious.: As a curiosity comment that the interview that supposedly do Steve

Coogan in the film is made by a real New York Times journalist who came to the shooting to interview

Winterbottom on 9 songs.

" 1

" Was anyone ever tempted to comment on two films at the same time? ���sa is the essence of Souls on the

Street.

Was anyone ever tempted to comment on two films at the same time? ���sa is the essence of SOULS IN THE

STREET. Gelsomina has a child's soul and that's why she is only comfortable in the circus. It was sold to Zampan���, a strongman withto act

little brain,as lover, assistant, clown and tax collector. And, little by little, with the innocence of

children, she realizes that her mission in life is to take care of the strongman because if she does not do it. n what

har? Augusto has a soul without conscience. That's why he's just comfortable with thugs. He is sold to life, a

strong-willed little, to act as a con man, trickster, dishonest and collector. And, little by little, with the

self-consciousness of the bored, he realizes that his mission in life is to take care of another life,

because if he does not do it. He will do it, Gelsomina has naivety in the look, expressiveness in the face, desire

to be useful in the middle of a permanent wander on second-class roads and third-class towns. Peace only exists

when it abandons itself to its illusionary gaze, and knows that its suffering is the only apparent happiness of a man

who does not love it, who does not notice it. It's for your own benefit. A man who, one day, looking at the

stars, will realize that he lacks the one that shines the most; the one who, with only his soul, guided him as a man

only once in his life. And it will collapse. He will collapse alone, exhausted and exhausted, with pain raising his

inevitable share of failure and remorse. Augusto has the hard look, expressiveness in his face, wanting to

swindle with scams of little time in discreet farms of helpless people. Peace can not find it except by

spotting, a little there in the distance, her precious and forgotten daughter who needs money for her passage to the

university, and she knows that her suffering is the shame for her, which is the slab he has to carry when

the police is on his heels accusing him of being a thief, a swindler, a victim, a cripple, nothing And one day,

looking at the top of a road, you will realize that the happiness of a song from a family that comes back from

work is a reflection of what you should have made man and left for the easy life, for money

without conscience. And it will collapse. It will collapse alone, exhausted and surrendered, with pain rooting without conscience that

money that is time lost. "" Souls without conscience "". "" La strada "" Souls in the street.

" 1

" Pure black cinema taken out of context and inserted in an institute today, starring an

immeasurable Joseph Gordon-Levitt and directed with a mostly stable, but sometimes irregular, pulse

by Rian Johnson.

From time to time it is a delight to be able to take a look at the current independent cinema. It is at the moment

when it departs from the classic contents of this type of cinema (drugs, problematic family relationships,

social denunciation and similar exploits) and focuses on revitalizing a Genie of all life. The recently

released Hard Candy is an exercise in suspense. Brick, on the other hand, is pure black cinema taken out of context and

inserted in an institute today, starring an immeasurable Joseph Gordon-Levitt and directed with

a mostly stable, but sometimes irregular, pulse by Rian Johnson Despite the long shots

combined with cool visuals, the natural photography and the almost total absence of a soundtrack,

characteristics with which the indies have been surprising / torturing us since 90, Brick meets

the rules: there is a victim, a fatal woman, two gangs of gangsters, a representative of order, and a

cleverer antih���roe than hunger, who He knows all the plays and has an undeniable practical spirit and

a dose of intelligence above normal. The great asset of the film, as we have said, is to put all

this panda locked in an institute. It's a great idea but it's even more: it's a brilliant development that

lasts for most of the film until its last scenes, in which thebreaks slightly

balancewhen we enter the film. ground of the firings.Brendan and his girlfriend Emily (Emilie de Ravin).sense

Commonin front of deranged paranoias. However, the forces of Brick reside in another place: di���logos and

actors, which is called. Although the general lines of the plot sometimes remind too much of the

masterpiece of the Coen brothers that we mentioned in the headline (yes, Fargo is very good movie and Arizona Baby is

funny, but Death among the Flowers plays in another division), are the conversations between the characters and the

conviction with which everyone interprets those that turn Brick into something more than a simple experiment

Mondosonoro de los cojones. I do not usually do it, but I recommend that you see the film in a folded version because it's

incredibly easy to get lost: the story reaches incredibly twisted limits and the dialogues look like

machine-gun fire, plagued with flag replies (in particular, for example, "I've given you to this guy

to see how they ate it, not like you comma "").is easyturn that phrase into a joke, but

when Gordon-Levitt says, an actor well ahead of the rest of his generationhas survived

pel You have as H20 Halloween. Brendan Frye, the protagonist of the film, is three-dimensional thanks to

Gordon-Levitt, who combines human weakness (the trigger of the film is the murder of his girlfriend) withagility

panther mentaland above all, disdain for the rest of the human race that shares with the great

private detectives of the genre. The rest of the cast is practically swallowed, but Lukas Haas, Noah Flynn (in

his role as half-haired mafiosetes) and Nora Zehetner must be mentioned, particularly the latter, which works

wonders with his role as fatal woman.Brendan and the Femme Fatale. The photo does not do justice to Noraeyes.

Zehetnera's bigWhat is said here extends to Johnson's particular vision of the institute, where again all

the groups are perfectly different (the cool ones , the hung ones, the posh ones, the nerds, the

abandoned ones) but who move at the same time in an almost surrealist environment (the Roman party where Brendan arrives

by chance). It is the touch of alienation that breaks the routine practically in each shot of the film, which

nevertheless never lets the story get out of hand, supported by a couple of action scenes. , inserted at

the right moment, quite surprising and shot with energy. However, if Brick inherits all the virtues

of black cinema (as a constant tension: it is practically impossible, with a good story behind, bored

the viewer) also has some shortcomings, and some drawer: the end, rays, is not that it is little

unsatisfactory, but leaves a taste of mouth a little strange. Let no one wait for a climax, but a kind of

quiet end, where all the pressure ends up yielding almost at once. Johnson seems to realize this and

tries to put an emotional component (an unwanted pregnancy, without specifying more) that was not necessary before

being introduced, and in my opinion seems a bit forced, because with what's behind (the famous "Brick" "

brick" of the title) is more than enough. In any case, there are plenty of reasons to lose an hour and a

half of our time: it is fresh, it is original and there is more chicha than it seems behind a brilliant idea.

And a brilliant idea is a real find, the problem is that it only gives a short one.

" 1

" This movie is not for prizes, do not fuck When I saw the Syriana trailer I thought two things, that it was a very political movie (subject that I missed �� in 2005

in the films in general) and that hopefully it was not the American self-promotion that would lose her. Well,

fortunately or not, neither of them was fulfilled. Is it difficult to make a summary of the story in a

few lines? An agent of the US government accidentally "" loses "" the whereabouts of a missile, a US

corporation does everything in its power to merge with an Arab oil company and

when I say everything that's it. In turn interconnected with a succession in the government of the Emirates and theavatars

personal and laborof an investment adviser that the destiny wanted to be planted in the

middle. Syriana is the typical movie. �cula in which every two or three scenes appear at the bottom of the screen an impression

indicating the place in the world in which the action takes place, the most important is that it arrives a point where you

cross your fingers to be able to keep up. Of course like all political thrillers in which they have to

explain many things and delimit the sides, the number of dialogues is thick. At times it seems that it will make

water at any time but no, it is that one put the necessary concentration. Sometimes one falls in the

satisfaction of watching the big cast go through the screen, in Syriana are available George Clooney,

Jeffrey Wright, Matt Damon, Christopher Plummer and Chris Cooper and everyone does exactly what what you have to

do Although I regret that the characters are so small and do not finish delineating, you never know very well

what is the real engine that generates the actions, whether they are good or bad, what they think Well, it's

not all bad. The big point I can criticize against is the core of the script. According to the United

States, the best criticisms of the film were for the rawness of the story and for showing with courage a behind

the scenes of the furious scene. to the handling of oil. It seems that they are the only inhabitants of the planet

who did not know, then from that point of view anything that is said is risky. At this point the

story is pretentious. A scene that I thought was excellent is when one of the bosses of the corporation

argues with the lawyer who insinuates him that the "favors" and Pressures are not as good ideas as they seem to

respond: "Corruption is our protection. Corruption is what keeps us safe.

Corruption is why you and I are strutting here instead of fighting eachfor scraps of

meat on the streets. Corruption is what we win. "" Yes, this movie is not for prizes, do not fuck.

" 1

" Enterable, fun, original, fresh. This film can be defined with all these adjectives.

Personally I recommend it, it's a round movie with a simple structure.

Enterable, fun, original, fresh. This film can be defined with all these adjectives. Personally I

recommend it, it's a round movie with a simple structure, but it's so nice that it tells me that it really

has moved me and everything. We can always go further than we thought, we just need that little

cricket that Morgan interprets. And we can always discover great things where we least expect it and

even find someone special like the character that Paz plays. As a production of Mr. Freeman

I have to say that he has It was a success to make this movie, I like the line that leads with this film. As the

great actor there is more than the obvious to comment, we go to the skinning that is what more you mola.Paz Vega,

Sorry guys but I have to admit that this time I can not criticize, It's great, yes, it is, but? Hahaha

I can tell you "" why? " To interpret Paz's character, he needed a diction that would make his

Latin condition believable (By the way, Morgan, we Spaniards are not Latinos and Spain is not ��� in Mexico), for this we

need a great actress or therefore someone who speaks horribly English, ah��� you have it, Peace is

perfect, if you � ��is the movie in the original version you will appreciate what I tell you. In addition, Paz's

chach��� is probably below that of most actresses Morgan liked and who accepted the

role, thus "" we save budget "" and finally we must recognize that the peace that Paz has does not

have the American balurdas, she has the grace of her land and that is noticeable even in Hollywood. And of

course "" She is very well directed "", she is relaxed, concentrated and credible, Not like in "" Teresa, the mess of "I say

the body of Christ" "But I have What should I say to my compatriot: Peace Fields Wheat, for love of

Jesus Christ, do not accept in America more Latin papers that you are pigeon-holed and do not obsess over the body

. I'm going to give you 10 reasons to watch this movie: - Paz Vega (After Lucia and Sex, her best

performance) .- Morgan Freeman.- It's fun. - It's cool. - It's done a lot. - You have to support the actors

that come out. - For the mane of peace. - For the extra scenes after the credits. BSO.- Why

Ironcita recommends it.

" 1

" Monstruoso is a film of cat���strofes with which all those who look for ancinema will enjoy

unpretentiousand have an entertaining time, and that can give rise to a new way of facing a genre in

need of fresh and original ideas.

A great and calculated strategy of promotion and marketing can work miracles, and convert a lowfilm

budget(for American standards) into a blockbuster. The best example isWitch Project

Blair's, although Monstrous does not stay behind. Taking advantage of the pull of home videos that proliferate

like mushrooms on the Internet, the idea of ​​Monstruoso, which in addition to original offers an extraordinaryhook

commercial, had to be reflected later or early. And it is not more than a film of catastrophes in which the

action is seen through the camera with which a few characters are recording the events (like [REC] without going

any further). The truth is that the film is quite entertaining and decent, which is quite a bit if

you take into account the level of cinema Hollywood Hollywood. The beginning is very long to present

some characters who basically are going to run from one place to another throughout the city. Evidently it

is made by purpose, to create in the spectator the curiosity and certain anxiety to see the bug that gives

title to the film and the destruction that it is capable of causing. Anyway we must recognize that the protagonist is

gaffed, and is that you have to have very bad luck for your girlfriend to go with another and a monster attack the

city ​​a few hours before traveling to Japan and be appointed vice president of something. In some of thescenes

spectacular action, the fact that the film is shot with the camera on its shoulder can make it dizzy

. The visual effects are of good quality, and the monster, although it is seen little on the

screen, is very successful and is not disgusting or unpleasant. Monstruoso is a film of cat���strofes

with which you will enjoy all those who seek an unpretentious cinema and spend an entertaining time, and that

can lead to a new way of dealing with a genre in need of fresh and original ideas.

" 0

" "" Flight plan: missing "" has the privilege of being the first film that I qualify with the note "" Fucking

Shit "", in what will be a "" chanante "" resource "" that will apply to the infumable films that I put between my eyes

from now on.

This film, if it had been shot ten or twelve years ago would have been a luxury vehicle for Stallone,

Schwarzenegger or Seagal, but now it's Jodie's turn. If the horrible film of Robert Schwentke would have

Bruce Willis or Harrison Ford, at least he would have action and among the passengers there would be, at least, one

dozen of "" minions "", but now the turn is Jodie.Da embarrassed others at times (the incident with the

Arabs, which in addition to being out of place contradicts the plot , because in the end it turns out that Jodie was not right

and therefore has lost the roles), falls into ridicule (the applause of the crew) and ends with the

the viewer's patience, that far from empathizing with Jodie, she just wants someone to silence her with a good

kick in the mouth (I do not even want to think about the wafer salad that I would give her if I'm on that flight, the

sweats if it is crazy or not). I will not summarize the argument, because last night I slept fatally and I think that the fault is

this "" masterpiece "" of the zafiedad. "" Flight plan: disappeared "" has the privilege of being the first film

that I qualify with the note "" Fucking Shit "", in what will be a "" chanante "" resource that will apply to the pel� ��culas

infumables that I put between my eyes from now on (and that is equivalent to a 0, for purists) One sentence:

"" He's only six years old. People do morbid things with six-year-old girls.

" 0

" Is inspired, more evil than good in a work of, nothing less, Le���n Tolstoi, where they appeared thosebeings

mysterious and terrifying: the Wurdalak.However , the film is more boring, rather slow and with

few moments of dramatic intensity.

"" To a place apart from the Russian steppe, comes a businessman from the city, who runs a lumber business.

He wants to meet another man to reach an agreement and transport a large amount ofto his company.

woodLamed before two roads, he enters with his car for the worst of them, when it is already dark. At one

point he thinks he sees a woman wandering the roads and almost runs over him. Suddenly he no longer sees her, but the

car's crt is seriously damaged. Wandering through the woods, he finds a strange family

composed of his grandfather, three children, a beautiful daughter and the fascinating widow of another son who has just been

buried. He must spend the night with them, learning that the woman he thought he saw is actually a witch, an

undead, a Wurdalak, who seeks to someone alive to make her one like her. "" The critic always said of

her that, although mediocre, she was superior to many of the same hair that was made by this then of the early

seventies. And it may be true, but it's still pretty bad. It inspires, more evil than good in a work

of, nothing less, Le���n Tolstoi, where they appeared those mysterious and terrifying beings: the Wurdalak. However,

the film ���cula is more boring, rather slow and with few moments of dramatic intensity. At all

times it seems that there will be something really good, of visual impact, of terror, even if it is contained, but the

truth is that the minutes go by and the sensation of loss of time increases. .Only your first twenty

minutes, until a flashback takes you back to the Russian steppe, they're fine. We still do not know what awaits us and

the presentation of the protagonist is showy and very mysterious. But, except for scenes like the confrontation

between the grandfather and the Wurdalak or the end of the film, which is not for as much although it is not bad, the rest

is, sometimes mediocre and others simply silly. special effects, seen today are ridiculous,

although in those times they were good, but since we saw "" A wolf-American man in London "" all the

above seems more good tinker. Very beautiful Teresa Gimpera and Agostina Belli and convincing Gianni Garko, an

Italian actor whose famous character "" Sartana "" gave her immense popularity, but she pigeonholed him, I think,

seriously, because she had a quality superior to the average. Ah! And all this comment must be subject to the copy

that I saw, that is, the one that was broadcast by a Spanish payment channel. The most sure thing is that it was, apart from

a copy in quite bad condition, with strips and everything, I guess it was the version that was released in Spain. It is

well known that some co-productions between Spain and some foreign countries had the peculiarity that, in

the rest of the countries, they were issued complete. In Spain, however, it mutilated when there were scenes that were raised in tone,

that is, erotic or very violent. Maybe the full version of this film and that some of you might have had the

luck to see, is superior, but I'm talking about the one that I see, that It's pretty cut.

" 0

" A different film, that knows its virtues (that for some can be defects), well shot, well

directed, with good performances, with a gui���ns���lido and that excels by m Own rites in thesection

technical. The Painted Veil, is a film for a select public.

It is curious how unperceived this film is being. At first I thought it was because the movie was

kind of silly, but after seeing it, I can say, flatly, that NO. The film is a drama, not a melodrama. And it

is something that is appreciated. It could be said that "" The Painted Veil "" is a love film, but we would be

lying. The movie is not a love story. It is about the clash of two totally different people

who from one day to another are in Shanghai and married. It could be said that it is a film for a

select public. It is not a commercial film, of course, it is. I do not know what it is. But it is not a film for all the

public. Regarding that it requires a minimum capacity of reasoning, a little interest, and some

patience. And this is something that we enjoy a small part of the world population. The unknown (or at least

for me) John Curran, delights us with an explicit direction , in an explicit film. The most admirable is

the rhythm that the director gives to the film. No rush, because it is a film that needs time, but

at no time is long or tedious. In addition, Curran, uses small clashes between the protagonists (or what

is the same, comments edges) so that the film is not boring. And what to say has

got it, because they make the film is not so cold and becomes more pleasant. The (for anyone unknown)

main actors, Edward Norton and Naomi Watts, They do a brilliant job. No shrillness, no

overacting. simply perfect. Both (producers of the Film) do a job that

(inexplicably) has not given them renowned prizes (although Norton has been nominated for a couple of

important prizes). The script is solid, without holes, without loose threads. Very well built. Those responsible for

the script can be proud. Other highlights in the film are the wonderful photographythe

magnificent soundtrack of Alexandre Desplat, which cost one merecidsimo Golden Globe for Best

SoundtrackIn general, a different film, which knows its virtues (which for some may be defects), well

shot, well directed, with good performances, with a gui���ns���lido (and above all good) and that excels by

own merits in the technical section.

" 1

" Another of those nonsensical continuations, in which you try to mix mythology with science andterror

classic, and you end up getting mediocrity, boredom and predictability.

If I have no remedy. For more I say that I'm not going to swallow films that I suspect are going to be a

mess, in the end I always end up seeing everything that is put in front of me; and of course, with this lack of criteria

that I recognize that sometimes dominates me, because what happens happens. Perhaps this is the beginning of one of my

shortest critics for this space that is so dear to me that it is for me Muchocine, but precisely because of that affection I

feel for this place in the network, I do not want to waste your space messing it up with words about the mediocrity

of this aberration What's up with me today? Return to house on Haunted Hill is a bad continuation of a film that was

already a bad remake of the classic horror there by the year 1958 William Castle directed, and that

counted on the assets, among others, of Vincent Price and Richard Long. As the great Tito Chin- Chan, is little

more than casquer���a, rumble, and liters of ketchup parading through the screen. Nothing remarkable in the

interpretation, nor a bad gui���oa their predecessors in the gui���n. Nothing at all. Tremendously dark scenarios,

absence of subplots of intersymmetrical filming, gui���ny and postproduction defects, is the only thing that I can

think of to stand out from this caste It's transatlantic, I've got a bit of a fillet between the tapes I had

planned for these days, where I rush with despair and apathy. Last moments of a vacation

you have known less than nothing.

" 0

" A more than remarkable film to know the bitter back room hidden under the? Glamor? and the luxury of

those golden years of cinema.

Not always the dirty rags of the shining world of the stars have been washed at home. Sometimes, the

film industry has aired its own shame through what it does best: films.

Probably, in the peak of works of this theme there is always the classic of Wilder Sunset Boulevard (The

Twilight of the Gods). Also Robert Altman (in The Hollywood Game) acidly portrayed the miseries of

those who run the cotarro of this illusion factory capable of generating so much garbage from inside doors.

Hollywoodland, the first feature film by the television director Allen Coulter (12 chapters of The Sopranos and one of

A dos metros bajo tierra, among other series, endorses it), is also a story about these sinks based on

the sad real story of the suicide of George Reeves, actor who became famous for his role in the series The

Adventure of Superman. The strange death of Reeves at 45 years of age was always lent to various hypotheses.

The official? I would say that the actor, embittered by his pigeonhole in the television role of Superman and

after ending his career as a film actor, decided to end his life with a shot. But the doubts

never got to dissipate, and around them the central nucleus of Hoollywoodland revolves. A private detective

without large cases on his desk, Louis Simo (Adrien Brody), sees in this investigation the perfect occasion to take

flight given the wide media coverage of the case. But, as he investigates the life of Reeves, more

parallels will find his own personal drama: divorced from his wife, with a son who knows little and

a lover / secretary who cheats him . Thus, the sequences of Reeves' life are mixed with that of Simo and the

thriller tone of the investigation with the drama of the stories of both characters. Coulter's work in

the realization of It's neat, but the best thing about this tape is the magnificent performances of the cast.

Beginning with the best work of the career of Ben Affleck, an actor that some already doubted that possessed

such a condition. The Californian won the Volpi Cup and was nominated in the Golden Globes for a role full of

nuances to give life to Reeves, "" a man? Affleck says? who was called "George the honest", andtried to

alwaysmake it happen to others, although in a certain sense he did it to feel loved "himself".

Also the actor, who was conscientiously documented for his character, who "was generous and lent more

money than he actually had, (?) But not it was perfect; He was ambitious and impatient and maybe something

superficial ". Of the rest of the cast, Adrien Brody is as good as almost always, something that is not news in his

case, a beautiful Diane Lane shows that improves as an actress as a good wine and Bob Hoskins returns to exhibit

his talent for a role already habitual in him, that of the fearsome big shot that does not threaten in vain. In short, a more

than remarkable film to know the bitter back room hidden under the? Glamor? and the luxury of those

golden years of cinema.

" 1

" Cuar���n gives a lesson on how to make a film, how to shoot sequences, how to reflect a lot

things, without leaving aside the plot. There is no other way than to applaud ... this is cinema of the good.

Many directors have reflected the future, near or far, in their films: many times with optimism,

others more pessimistic, and others really catastrophic. Apparently, Alfonso Cuar���n sees a reallychaos

worrying, and launches a fierce criticism of current Western society: we are going to go under. While the story

may seem somewhat inconclusive, missing something because of the female infertility (although in fact

, it is not the most important and dedicates a few brief strokes), the plot is very interesting: 18

years without a child born, the problems (so current) of illegal immigration reach unlikely points, the

chaos takes over all the world capitals. What happens? What do you do when you know that mankind hasthe

counteddays? Cuar���n already received praise for making the third part of 'Harry Potter' take on a

much more gloomy and somber tone than its predecessors (it was not very dif� Easy given the childishness of themovies

Columbus), which was appreciated by all sectors of the public and the critics. And now, not only doesreturn to

that darknessprint, but the impressive setting is really priceless: I never saw achaos

futuristicso well reflected, with so many details that guide the eye to the viewer , both in the visual and in the

clear background message. If this premise you add a correct Clive Owen that, without getting to shine,

fits the role with a very good performance. n (another one in this interpreter's account located between glamor and

professionalism) as well as a veteran's degree with Michael Caine (another great one), and the solidity Juliane

Moore (one is left wanting more.) In addition to the aforementioned technical section (I had already said that it is

formidable?), the result is one of the best films of recent years that, without becoming a

masterpiece, will be classified as one of the best of this ���o.de away. But, without a doubt, there is aaspect

really achievedin 'Children of Men': the sequences of a single shot that are given throughout the film. How much

the viewer is grateful for these images, shot without any pause. Both movements filmed so well that

the tension manages to penetrate the screen easily, to the point that in the end of the tape, the sensation

of having been nailed to the seat is inevitable. In short, Cuar���n gives a lesson of how to make a

film, of how to shoot sequences, how to reflect a lot of them things, without leaving aside the plot. There is no

other way than to applaud. This is good cinema.

" 1

" Awesome. The fight scenes and the choreographies are amazing, and they leave the Trojan war stories in

almost an anecdote. I saw it in original version with subtitles, which help, because from time to time they use

strange grammar turns ...

I had been told a lot about the movie. �cula 300, and although I have not read the comic of Frank Miller - a god in that

world - in which she is inspired, I wanted to see if the adaptation It was worth it. And I think it's

worth it. The two hours justitas that tell the story of the battle of the passage of the Term���pilas in 480 BC

I left in a sigh, and enjoyed every moment. I had long since known that Miller was a genius, because

among other things he was in charge of legendary Marvel scripts like the minisaga? Born again? of Daredevil, a

classic that many cynical fans know, but I no longer collect, so I've lost track of

this and other artists of that eighth art. But it is clear that if one is worth, okay. Apparently Miller was on

top during the production - something that other authors pass, see the case of "" From Hell "" and the film

crap that came out � from a masterclass - and that has allowed the film to faithfully reflect the

greatness of the c���mic. I would say that it is very likely to exceed even the graphic novel, because the film is

pure plasticity in movement. The digital treatment of each of the frames showsscenarios and

impossibleenvironments, but it does so in a surprisingly affine history. A story that is - with

some liberties regarding what actually happened - simply ���pica. The actors embroider it. All of

them, from Gerard Butler - a spectacular Le���nidas - to Lena Heady, who like in other movies, is like a

cheese, in addition to doing it well. The scenes of fight and choreography They are incredible, and they leave the war stories of

Troy in almost an anecdote, and the script - which is everything in a movie - does not do What to help. I saw it in the

original version - with subtitles, which help because from time to time they use extraneous grammatical turns -

and that's already the lemon pear.Imprescindible.PD: The good of Net���mbulo has already made his own assessment of

some scenes - suspiciously Julai? of the movie, but the less serious aspects (such as the sponsorship of

Suchard, tiny chocolate tablets that the Spartans had for sit-ups) already speaks to him :-) PD 2: I recently

left a column of P���rez-Reverte in which the always ingenious writer talked about "The other 300�? �,

the almog���raves, who were also from here, waited for you. But as Arturito says, as we are in Spain, the

national does not sell, and have been practically forgotten.

" 1

" A magnificent tape in all its audiovisual scaffolding and interesting in its story, clearly divided in

two.

"" A great civilization is not conquered from the outside until it has destroyed itself from within "",

with this phrase of the French historian W. Durant the new film begins Mel Gibson's film. It is the prologue of a

tape that is more overwhelming by its visual power than by its underlying message condensed in thequote

previous. A risky bet of a director outside of industry fads or commercial intromissions.

Because you have to be on the sidelines of everything to shoot a film about the end of the once

powerful Mayan civilization, do it in Yucatec and with a cast of actors with no previous experience recruited

from M�� Mexico, New Mexico, Southern California, all of Central America and Canada. And the result is a magnificent

film in all its audiovisual scaffolding and interesting in its story, clearly divided in two: the presentation

of the tribal life of a village, and the destruction of � This is at the hands of an invading force decimated by the

diseases that, with dread, blame the fury of their gods. Before that point, Gibson makes an approach

with the greatest affinity of verismo possible to the daily life of the members of a Mayan village: dedicated to the hunting

and raising of their children. He takes his time the film is to describe that life in which the lawsare respected

of natureand the elderly are venerated as a source of wisdom. But the seed of a terrible fate

is already planted in that prologue when Jaguar Paw (Rudy Youngblood) contemplates a fact that disturbs her during a

hunting day. For the first time in his life fear seizes him strangely; an unpleasant

sensation of which his father warns him severely as if this were a plague capable of infecting all his people.

And with fear he will assist the spectator to the savage destruction of the village of Jaguar Paw. This is where

a second part of the story more familiar to the viewer starts, with the typical structure of an action tape

but, in this case, all wrapped up in some powerful images shot with the nerve of who handles

the language of cinema with absolute skill. The wealth of resources with which the persecutions and

struggles are filmed have hardly any parallels. And even here the poetic halo of the whole ensemble does not disappear in this part. In

this adrenal���tica part of the footage, Paw will attend the cruel destruction. n of his people and the terrible abandonment of

the children after all the adults were captured. They will be driven to a great Mayan city in decline,

wracked by disease, corruption and slavery. The women will be sold as slaves, while

the men will be led to a large altar pyramid to be sacrificed as offerings to Kukulkan, the great

god of the Sun, whom they pray for to cease the drought and the plagues. Luck, in the form of eclipse, saves the

skin of our protagonist, who has a powerful reason in his village to fight for his life until

exhaustion. As if from a hunt In this case, in which the roles of hunter and prey arereversed

constantly, Paw will be persecuted by his captors once he manages to escape. In this part, following thetechnique

generalof the film, the explicit violence is exacerbated. A violence that has caused many controversies, not only

because it is excessive to repulsion, but because those who consider themselves heirs of that past qualify the

film as a defamation of the Mayan civilization. I do not know until what point the historical rigor has faltered to

succumb to that side so 'gore' of Gibson. For example, in the article that I link, they speak of "describing"

the Maya as practitioners of human sacrifice, by taking the victim's heart out in a show. public

on the top of a pyramid. This was an Aztec and not Mayan ritual, a fact well known to any student

of Mesoamerican history (.) "". However, the whole of the story is more than remarkable and in his epigraphis riveted

the argument expressed in Durant's quote.

" 1

" The self-confidence of the literary dialogues produces the sensation of seeing someplay

marvelous...

The ferrea censorship of the Francoist dictatorship, recently erected as a tim In the face of national morality, he did not see the

enormous damage that this film could do to him: his blasphemous and liberal proposal escaped him. That a

citizen, one very precariously supplied with hopes in the working world and defenestrated by a girlfriend

firmly convinced of the mediocrity of the future, decides to commit suicide and proclaims his adi���sa this world, did not

marry the Christian idea of ​​supporting the hardships of this world waiting to embrace the goodness of the

other, that is, the theo-dynamic-redeeming of the Catholic Church. And even less that the suicide, in full

possession of his mental faculties, is dedicated during the entertaining hour and very little footage to

pontificate the happiness of his state of mind and no boring, bland and decadent life of those who,

drowned by misery, tied to an unhappy marriage or enslaved by a job that gives them nothing and

poorly paid, subsist without any other benefit than letting themselves live melancholy and maybe insensibly.

Wenceslao Fern���ndez Florez, the great Galician writer, recreates the archetype of the p���caro of our Golden Age, the tah���r in

love with his manga, but recomposes it and transforms it into a p� ��caro-fil���sofo, tongue and viper, sententious and

sane until the degree, which shows the enormous sadness of the world in which he has had to commit suicide, one

rich enough, discursively speaking, to endure without apparent fracture the weight of the

arg umento: there is no scene where it does not come out, there is no twist of the plot that is not well propped up in the light of the

psychological evolution of the character.Antological, the scene in which Federico Sol��� decides to make public his

drastic decision and instead of talking about armed cement, his professional specialty, he uses the rostrum from

which he has been called to confer bother the astonished parishioners with a catechism of truths like

pu���os until, in the end, pompous, he announces the audacity of his company. Vigoriginous in his di���logos, the man who

wanted to kill it is adult cinema, cinema over a cinematographic production entrenched in the rigors of

a post-war necessarily poor and where the regime had conceived the strategy of entertaining the people with

the folkloric lightness of the sainetes, the syrupy portrait of the virtues of the simple and, above all ,

Poor artistic an industry requirement (the film) used to entertain winners and losers, and

join them, even in the dark theater gourmand. (At times, create one be attending a comedy

Brothers Marx: sparkling di���logos, delirious surrealism ..)

" 1

" A boring and irritating movie. After an entertaining movie like 'El Bola', we got this

stupidity of unbearable children.

John Ford already said that in the list of the 10 rules that had to be strictly followed when making a

film. And this is going to mass. In that list the same phrase was repeated 10 times "" do not bore "". Well, in this

film Achero Ma���as does not comply, because it is a pretty big tost���n. The movie is based on a funny idea, it is

a kind of false pseudo-documentary, in which the supposed statements of the theater group

that is spoken of in the history constructed as a fiction are mixed, with this part, the fiction itself. We can see how

the members of the theater group had their experiences ac���mara and then we see the normal story. To

begin with, in terms of its content the movie is quite irritating, putting on screen a collection Den of

stupid children that go from artists with a completely unattainable neo hippie roll. This type of tribe

alternative urban that exists now that they go of progressive and they are compared to themselves with the youths of May

of the 68, without having fucking idea that cojones are speaking. All very "" cool "", all in the smallof a

parkpark sharing a porrete with a guitar talking about that art is something that should be completely

free. please. more childish impossible. It is easy to call someone to say what I say facha, but nothing is

further from reality, the last thing I am is a façade, but I do not like anything how fake these types of

young people are . They all go from red-green Communists with their Ch camisetas shirts and red stars, not knowing that this

red star is the one Mao wore, a genocide as big or bigger than Hitler himself. The same thing is to

take an esbastica.La movie is more irritating for its content than for its structure or rhythm, which are quite

slow because the director does not know at what time to put statements and at what time put the part

of fiction; and that makes the movie lose a lot of rhythm, and it is not clear where the approach is,

where the development and where the conclusion. The message of the film is the art should be totally free, that

anything can be and that limits can not be set. Art needs limits, it needs them, at a

technical and structural level but not at a content level. I mean that a movie, for example, can not have the

structure that you want. there are rules that must be met, and this is so. Oscar Jaenada seems to me an

actor as bad as overrated, everything is the same, with the same expressions and the same face. A character

that nobody believes and that you do not like cn its roll "" cool alternative "". They go to young anarchists without having any

idea who Bakunin is. If you want to see a film with a really strong and anarchic message, you have to see that

wonder raised to the cube that is THE CLUB OF THE FIGHT, a movie that says true about the man and about

our nature. The little group of guays this, does not stop making representations in the street, all painted and

making the parguela; except for a representation in which they falsify an attack by ETA, the rest has

no interest whatsoever. The representation of the murder of ETA is the only interesting because it is the only one that provokes

a true reaction of the environment, the others only create reactions that are not important, that do not create a plot. A

falsified murder creates an interesting reaction that Ma���as does not take advantage of because he does not want to develop and returns to

the same thing of all. freedom of creation and blah blah blah a movie that I do not recommend because bored more than anything, and

because they make you nervous those irritating characters.This generation of neo-hipis do not know what was May

68, can not compare with them or want to be like them. Those people were like that for the moment, today there is

no Vietnam, there can not be hipis. hipis is not that, the hippies have died or are old. And that wonderful

movement they made is unrepeatable, they did not imitate anybody, they just reacted. Nowadays it is easy to

be like that, in the comfort of the modern world. We can not be like them, and the people who imitate them are fake,

and those who compare worse. Also. That time we made the best music in history. Speaking of cinema and

after this pollez that I released and that sounds the pretentious host, to say that it is a film that has no

rhythm, and that it seems to have a conclusion, just a lot of scenes together without any narrative sense.

" 0

" Pure trash in which a child apologizes all the possible rudeness to the impassivity of the

agencies that then boast of protecting the child and defending their interests. Although of course, it is always easier to

blame the professors of the prevailing slavajismo in many educational centers ..

In case it was not enough to hold the series in the mornings of a national transmitter and in more than one of thechannels

thematic, now they move back to the cinema to the disgusting, rude, bad-mannered and uncouth Shin Chan, that disgusting

child who makes himself drunk, show his intimate parts and utter constant procacidades a way of life.

At a time when even a protected schedule for childhood has been marked (where all

the clunkers of programs in which they dedicate themselves to discuss who has more silicone or to challenge people to

demonstrate before a machine with whom they have gone to bed), the existence of theseshould not be tolerated.

productionsI do not know exactly what the children find these drawings. They are badly made, the

stories are absurd and inculcate the most negative values ​​for minds in formation. This enormous reputation

of the bug is attributed to the sinverg���enzas of the programmers of the television networks, who

apparently do not have to have children, or they should care very little. Everything goes to get an audience. The absurd

argument is to lead Shin Chan to lead a group that aims to counteract a gang that is

dedicated to drug adults to behave as infants. Under the mantle of freedom of expressionare

many aberrationscommitted, and one of them is to allow the emission of this garbage. But no government is

capable of risking rejection for taking a measure that would protect the mental health of

children. Also some parents are very guilty, they allow their children to get soaked in this dirt. But of

course, if the child is problematic, it is easier to blame the teachers.

" 0

" Start: infamous, banal, hollow, minimal. But after these four qualifiers, I notice that my

vocabulary will always be extremely short.

Byproduct of adolescent fattening that almost does not lack anything to be declared the worst film of the

last years. And in addition, it seems that two years ago it was done. Then he could have gone directly into the

DVD shelves of the videoclubs: he sure has his audience there. ��� How did I fall so low? Because the

brain, at times, disregards cinephilia and other paraphernalia of the cultured ego that we all carry

inside and lets itself be contaminated by innocent peccadilloes to be able to later (in the café, in the queue of bread, in these little

corners of the red) rant at ease and use those scoundrels adjectives we seldom use and weso much.

likeArranco: infamous, banal, hollow, minimal. But after these four qualifiers, I notice that my

vocabulary will always remain extremely short, prudent in its voluntary vexation, and that there will be someone

with more bad temper sem�� �ntica (today I have a happy day and I can even think of two or three bondados of the film, which Inot

willsay because I do not feel like it) that destroys this grain of pus on the world's billboards. Served

" 0

" Long film about the wizardry of the wizards, which would be incredibly amazing if theysimply

hadtranslated the original title. Even so, the final product is of very high quality, in spite of the downturns

in the rhythm that haunt us.

Good, it's been a long time since I was stuck with the title of a movie. It turns out that this is called in

English "" The prestige "", whose translation can be "" The prestige "". Okay, well now, to say whatis already

the fishingsold. Well no, they have had to change the name to fuck us the final surprise. It reminds me

of the scary movie that should have been called "" The son of Rosamary "" and they called it "" The seed of the devil "",

when it could have been "" A Rosa Mary has been fucked by the devil "". Seeing is to believe. The film is about

two apprentices of a magician who are separated by things that happen. Well, for things that happen and why one does something

that the other feels like a kick in the same testicles. Overall, they put it on their own, but as they

are the two best in London (and Europe and World World) because they devote part of their efforts to bitching the

other. By the way, nothing else to start seems that one kills the other by drowning him, that I had forgotten. Je,

je. I have to admit that, for a change, I did not get it too well. The use of flashback kills me totally, and

as they spend half a movie changing their appearance to bitch the other, because I do not know. But as my half

cour- ber if he finds out, he guides me with wisdom. The first thing is to comment that the film is long, and it becomes

long. In addition as you know that in the end there is a tremendous bar (that does not bar) because you spend the time thinking what

will be. The setting is more than correct, and the plot is very successful. I was pleasantly surprised by the inclusion of

Nikola Tesla, and to know that the magicians of that time had engineers who assembled all the

tinglados.Resumiendo, long film about the machinations of the magicians, which would be incredibly amazing

if they had simply translated the original title. Even so, the final product is of very high quality, in spite

of the downturns in the rhythm that haunt us.

" 1

" Nasty movie about the cannibal of the famous fiction. It's long and it's long. It is unpleasant

and manages to remove the stomach and the conscience. I did not like anything, but I admit that it manages to

transmit.

What a laugh with my half courgette, that I tell him to see the one of Anibal and he tells me that he did not know that they had recorded

any film of the conqueror. Hey, well, it would be nice if they took one of Anibal with his elephants loading

on Rome, instead of these prequels that are already beginning to smell. They could even take advantage of scenarios and extras and

make an "" Anibal and the Jedi against the Orcs of Persia "". Tremendous film, with Peter Jackson doing the

extended 6 days and 200 extension DVDs. Hahaha, it's like the movie is bad, I have to give it a touch

of interest. The film is about Hannibal Lecter, a boy who lost his childhood and his family at the end of

World War II. Total, as a teenager decided to devote his life to pursue those who ended with

his family and incidentally eat their chubby cheeks. And there is also a Japanese woman who lost everything with the atomic bomb and a

policeman who chases the bad guys but not to eat them. And little more, the truth, that they are all the time with

flashbacks of those. Well, the movie I did not like at all. It's disgusting, with a continuous

reminder of a horrible and spooky scene. Those of you who have little children, abstain from watching the

movie, then you will have nightmares. The actor who plays Hannibal is very strange, with anface

expressionlessthat does not hit anything. Then they sell us to this cannibal as a kind of swordsman that does not

soften the bottom, which is what he then eats. On the positive level, the picture is very good, with some

magnificent shots, but only that's good. Resuming, unpleasant film on the cannibal the most

famous fiction. It's long and it's long. It is unpleasant and manages to remove the stomach and soul. I did not like

anything, but I admit that it manages to transmit.

" 0

" Entertaining film and cube prequel, where even close to the quality of l���, but it

seemed better than 2���.

Entertaining film and cube prequel, where not even close to the quality of l���, but I found it

better than 2���. Very few things clarify us about the cube, although we get an idea of ​​why the

cube is the chosen people (not all). I think the chip in the soldiers' heads is enough. At least he knows how to

lead the same environment as the first part (the second is so bad). In fact, there are times when

I have felt quite identified with the film (since I also work as an operator) and seeing the

"" Cube operators "" has made me see things that I I usually see at my job quite often. If youyou will

liked Cube I thinkspend a moment entertaining with this one. It has an ending that could be a loop with the

first part.

" 0

" I was afraid to think that the movie would collapse for having that incredibly bland capacity to

tell the facts, that totally impersonal photograph or many gags (some fun, that's ���) that it is

not worth laughing for them.

Since the great film Notting Hill was released, the English romantic comedies that have been

appearing over the years are still copies (some good, some mediocre ) of the already classic film

by Roger Mitchell. Four years ago the fun and very good Love actually was released, a romanticfilm

choralthat, however, little resembled the already mentioned film. �cula. But it is true that this was an exception,

because many others, among which is this semi-disaster, Love and other disasters, are quite

simple. Focusing on the Keshishian film, to say, very briefly, that this film lacks

personality, several times of coherence and has a cold, distant, rare atmosphere. Already starting, shows a

lack of respect to the public, without just presenting the characters and lacking a minimum of meaning. And that

already tells us everything. It is worth some other good moment (the end, in the cinema), or some

successful notes, but this, without a doubt, is a jointly failed film. And as I said before, the

guys who come from Notting Hill, whether it's the streets of London, the lovebirds, the final race in a

small car with the t�� Typical English friends are all too common in this type of cinema. Itnot

is, far from it, a Bridget Jones or the already commented film of Curtis. These are exceptions to every rule

in English romantic comedy. I was afraid to think that the film would collapse for having that

incredibly bland ability to tell the facts, that totally impersonal photograph or many gags

(some fun, that's it! ) that is not worth laughing for them. And what about the embarrassing (never better

said) end? A bad movie, which is forgotten at the beginning of the final credit titles and with acast

more bland(Brithany Murphy is still decent). We can say that it has some fun moment and that it does not end up

being heavy, but it manages to entertain a lot. But that's it. Hopefully the nextcomedies will

Englishshow that they have something more to tell us and that they no longer drink from Mitchell's film (written, by the

way, by Richard Curtis).

" 0

" Invasion is practically a covert, free and totally unnecessary remake. And as a thriller, it fails

categorically in its first precept, that of intriguing and holding the spectator in suspense.

There are literary works for which the cinema feels a special weakness, and these are moved to the big

screen regularly by the various cinematographies of the world. But it is striking the case of the novel

by Jack Finney The Invasion of the Thieves of Bodies, which in just fifty years has seen four adaptations

to each more distinct. For anyone who dedicates his life to the cinema, be they technicians, directors or actors, it

seems that one of his goals is to reach Hollywood, the Mecca of the seventh art. No wonder that after

that masterpiece, The Sinking, Hollywood tempted Olivier Hirschbiegel. And the result is Invasi���n,

a science-fiction thriller starring Nicole Kidman and Daniel Craig in which a strange alien virus

gradually takes over the Humans. After seeing Invasion, one is assaulted by adoubt

terrible, and it is if the alien virus is also transmitted through the projected celluloid on a screen, since

the film does not it just does not excite but leaves you totally frozen. More after a brief period of time of

anguish in which our brain struggles in this dilemma, we come to the conclusion: the one affected ishimself

Hirschbiegel, who has lost the ability to transmit emotions to the p Public. Leaving aside the usual

mistakes and inconsistencies of the script, the development of the story is at least strange, and the development of

the characters is simply non-existent. What Hirschbiegel has not lost is his good work behind the

camera, endowing the film with a good package, although occasionally the chaotic montage can play

tricks. Unlike the characters of Invasion, who can not fall asleep, the spectators are victims of a

deep drowsiness. Between yawning and yawning, in the middle of suffering comes the best of the film, the supposed

embrace between George Bush and Hugo Ch���vez, which will provoke a flood of laughter among the respectable. Nicole

Kidman on the other hand continues in the downward line in which she embarked after The Hours, while Daniel

Craig, Jeremy Northam and Jeffrey Wright devote all their effort to defend something practically

indefensible. Invasion is practically a covert, free and totally unnecessary remake. And as a thriller, it

fails categorically in its first precept, that of intriguing and holding the spectator in suspense. Perhaps it is that the

virus has made its nest in Hollywood, nullifying the ability of their films to convey emotions.

" 0

" Totally dispensable if you do not go with a child. Yes, I guarantee that if you are under 14 years old or your

companion is in that age range it is a safe place to be enjoyed.

Occasionally I try to take a good critic to the cinema that I know, is my cousin of nine years and can be

the sea of ​​use for some films that I find unclassifiable or certainly frustrating . Manyago

yearsthe producers realized that watching a movie in a cinema environment full of people who

enjoy the film can affect the view of the critic and make her feel a little more generous when

writing about her. That is why inviting press passes in cinemas with children in the case of children's films was

a common practice that got quite good results. There is no heart that can not say that a

child movie is bad when hundreds of kids have been enjoying and throwing popcorn at each other

around you because even though the reader of your criticism be your father can not ignore the fact that the child

had a good time because, for better or for worse, it was the public who was believed ��� the film and that will

consume it in the rooms, DVDs and merchandising variously. The variant that exists now is that after the irruption of fantastic

cinema there is a new adventure genre for children and adolescents that is picking up

alarmingly with protagonists children's adventures and adventures in parallel worlds like The Crónicas de Narnia,

Eragon, or Harry Potter. The public of these is broader and should be studied with great care because despite the fact

that infants up to fifteen years enjoy these after-dinner entertainments the possiblespectator

adultwho has enjoyed with tapes such as Los Gonnies or El Chip Prodigioso wants to revive the decade of the

eighties and ends up stuck with a simple display of special effects spicing the latest success of

juvenile literature. The Six Signs of Light tells the story of Will, an American teenager who has just

moved with his big family to England and who will discover that he is the one chosen to carry out a special

mission to find Through time the Six Signs of Light that will help fight against the Darkness that

wants to take over the world. On his way to the signs Will will count on the help of the Ancients,

timeless people who help the seekers to discover their powers and use them in time to save the

world. I am a great follower of the fantastic cinema of action and adventure. I grew up with adventurers with hat and

whip and Gold Guys. I can not help it every time a teenager gets into a magical world to remember

children's readings like The Endless Story and all this baggage is what that makes tapes like this a

bit boring and lazy. Impeccable invoice but careless in the care of the adult public it

leaves little trace and a nostalgic and pretentious memory after its viewing. Totally dispensable

if you do not go with a child. Yes, I guarantee that if you are under 14 years old or your companion is in thatrange it

ageis a safe place to be enjoyed.

" 0

" Well directed, well interpreted and entertaining enough, but far from being the

masterpiece that many tout. One thing is the intentions or the message and quite another theresult

artistic.

Announced as the end of the trilogy of the pain of the scriptwriter-director tandem formed by Guillermo Arriaga and

Alejandro González Iríritu, at last I have been able to see what it will be, in all likelihood, one of the mostfilms

nominatedin the Oscars of this year. "" Babel "", tells us several stories intertwined with the epicenter of

an unfortunate accident: some children Enos in Morocco shoot and injure an American tourist (Cate Blanchett) who is

traveling with her husband (Brad Pitt). I will say it bluntly: the film I like but I He has disappointed. After

all the positive criticisms I had about her, praising her as a great narrative exercise, poetry in

images or great script. I expected more. I'm glad that scriptwriter and director have decided not to do more

joint work because I think it's time for both of them to fly separately before they start to be

too repetitive. I like how to direct I������ rritu, and I agree that it creates images of

great beauty, supported also in a magnificent photograph and a good soundtrack. Can create

emotional and dramatic tension with very few elements in a scene; something essential in a good director. The actors are

all proud, especially inspired Adriana Barraza in her role as caretaker of the children of thecouple

Americanand Rinko Kikuchi as deaf-mute. It is a pity that in Spain the film is broadcast dubbed because not

only the title, the message and many scenes are meaningless, but also, , we miss a verypart

importantof these interpretations. I think Franco has been dead long enough for us to carry

one of his first "cultural" laws "without too much remorse, is not it?" Returning to the subject at hand, in my

opinion the main problem is the gui���n. It seems to me a good idea, that of the apparentlyevent

inconsequentialthat, in a kind of butterfly effect, gives rise to all the events of the film, but I think

there are things that are too close to the hair. And I do not mean , only, that there are elements difficult to

believe, that it is also a handicap in a film that is not sold as a fable (which ���a very well

"" Crash "", for example) but as a "" realistic "" portrait and deep on the problem of incommunicado and

lack of understanding. I mean that, in reality, the history of the Japanese does not have a clear relationship

with the central story although, in turn, it may be the most distressing of all and the one that m��� It hooks the

viewer. The director himself had to be aware of this by reserving the wonderful final plane of the

function. It also seems to me that the character of Gael Garc���a Bernal does not make much sense and almost all his

actions seem inexplicable. I am afraid that both the character and his strange decisions are nothing more than

an easy resource for the writer to complicate the situation further. In the field of anecdote �tico comment that

some problem must have Arriaga with masturbation because both in his guide to "" The 3 funerals of

Melquiades Estrada "" as in this case, masturbation Pren precedes the tragedy. Is there a psychologist in the room? In

short, the film is well directed, well interpreted and sufficiently entertaining, but it is

far from being the masterpiece that many proclaim. One thing is the intentions or the message and quite another

the artistic result.

" 1

" In the Valley of Elah, the new masterpiece of Paul Haggis, dissects with great aplomb, moderation and without a

drop of cynicism the devastating effects that the Iraq war has on American society.

A little less than four years ago, Paul Haggis caused an earthquake in the world of cinema with Crash, his first

film as a director. From one of the most human, exciting and truly full screenplays of the last

few years, Haggis built one of those memorable films, which are the history of cinema ��� themselves, and that remain in

the collective memory. After a few years in which he has developed his facet as a screenwriter, leaving his mark

on films such as Flags of Our Fathers, Letters From Iwo Jima or Casino Royale, Paul Haggis presents his

second film as director. At the outset, we must praise the courage of Paul Haggis when he unceremoniously faces

something as hard and thorny as the war in Iraq, viewed from the perspective of the young soldiers who return

home. The investigation that a father carries out to unravel the mysterious disappearance of his son is

used by Haggis to portray an America that lives the horror contained in a war and the terrible

consequences it has on those who have participated in it. And he does it without his eyes distorting

facts that counts, rejecting grandiloquence and focusing on a small community, a microcosm that

reflects the reality of the whole society. It is a hard and harrowing film, which has moments of

extraordinary emotion, capable of leaving breathless even the coldest spectator. And when the story seems to

be over, Paul Haggis provides that wonderful final shot, in which he sums up the whole feel of the film.

Of course, the interpretative level of the film is very high, with some extraordinary Tommy Lee Jones,

Charlize Theron and Susan Sarandon. In the Valley of Elah, the new masterpiece of Paul Haggis, dissects with great

aplomb, restraint and without a drop of cynicism the devastating effects that the Iraq war has onsociety

American. It is a great film, mistreated in his country unjustly forgotten for the

prizes.

" 1

" Only self-satisfied and hollow images, untapped ideas and navel gazes. More than??,

EnrapturedIrritu and Arriaga leave us? Embabelados ?.

If it is already difficult to reach an agreement between a couple, between a community of neighbors living together under the same

roof, or between the group of coworkers sharing objectives; and also speaking the same language,

imagine what can happen on an international scale, in a "" Babel "" which is a mosaic of cultures, languages,

interests and ways of acting. As a film is the magnum opus of the Mexican Alejandro Gonz���lez I������rritu, endowed

with the ambition necessary to develop a project that leaves its mark, supported by his usual screenwriter

Guillermo Arriaga, an artist of the crisscrossed, circular and fragmented stories in terms of structure and

spaces, physical and temporal. And together they have given birth to films like the magnificent "" Amores perros "", or the

irregular "" 21 grams "" In "" Babel "", from a banal fact, two Moroccan brothers who trynew rifle

their father's, get entangled in child bites and end up shooting a bus injuring antourist

American. This will unleash an international incident, never narrated in the foreground, but citing the

diplomatic obstacles and the spectrum of Islamic terrorism. But above all, it will have consequences in characters and

countries as apparently distant as Japan, the border territory between Mexico and Californiachaos

. The modern. For the purpose of "" Babel "" to hear ,N, and read, a lot of the word "" globalization "". As well as what emerges

from the film and the director's own statements about his intention to make a film about "" the

physical and language barriers "" and that ended up being concretized not in these pitfalls sin��� in "" what unites us: love and

pain "". Which is true, because in the end the hugs and hands inserts abound. In addition, we must

add other important issues, such as the unpredictability of chance and fate, feelings of guilt, and a

look at human stupidity. So Irritu stands, with this and his two previous titles, in a chronicler

of "" pain "" and "" the human "", of the beings more fortunate or not, with af���n of transcendency.But in spite of having

some ideas and such interesting material, what remains in evidence is the pretentiousness, the empty And I love

that they break down this huge tower (of artifice) which is "" Babel "" and all the best intentions of

Irritu and Arriaga. "" Babel "" can make us think about many things, but more for his

grandiloquence or for his careful photography, than for the sincerity of his images and characters, which

seem to act more than the blows of fate , to stroke of gui���n.Retratando the pain. And so that the message

is clearer, each one of the varied protagonist personages will have its moment, its great "" pose ""

(meticulously its T udiada), of pain and isolation in the form of a plane or a peak scene with which to show off

that you are more lost in these islets of global isolation than a figure of JJ Abrams

looking for answers or outside help. There are many of these moments, but to highlight: Amelia (Adriana Barraza, and

the best of the cast), an illegal girl lost in the middle of the desert with a, as striking as grotesque,

red wedding dress; Yasujiro (Koji Yakusho, the second best of the cast); a deaf-mute teenager

traumatized by her mother's suicide, the inability to communicate with her father and stubbornly losing her

virginity, alone and lost in a sea of ​​people and a nightclub ruin (not for her, as she is responsible to

make us notice the intermittent sound cuts); Chieko (Rinko Kikuchi, the best of the male cast),

leaning desolate in the elevator; or Richard (a Brad Pitt who does not clash, nor with the addedand wrinkles

grayness), demonstrating his suffering every time he has to hug his badly wounded wife (Cate Blanchett, shining

even in minimal interventions) or grab the phone to achieve the most suitable photogenicity. There is little life

beyond. Only self-satisfied and hollow images, untapped ideas and navel gazes. More than

"enraptured" ", Irritu and Arriaga leave us" "embabelados" ".

" 0

" A patriotic father in search of the truth that finally reflects on the mental and political state of the

Goliath in which he lives. In the Valley of Elah is the proof that this 2008 can be a true year of cinema.

In the biblical story of David and Goliath, a strong monster-Goliath-challenged a town on the other side of the

valley to fight with him, and several of its inhabitants dared, but however, none ofmanaged to

themdefeat him. One day David appeared, who with his ingenious strategy succeeded in defeating Goliath, not approaching,

but with a simple sling and a stone. It is known by all that the United States has always been

symbolized, politically speaking, as Goliath, a strong and powerful guy who only attacks with his

useless physical powers and not with his head. The Vietnam War was already symbolized as this confrontation,

where the Vietnamese people represented David and the aforementioned Goliath States. And this, as,

unfortunately, with time has not changed, continues to be done with the current war in Iraq. Brian de Palma

showed us with a hard realism the lives of the soldiers in the latter war on the fake documentary

Redacted. Now, after this and several attempts to reactivate USA consciousness, like Redford with his lions

and lambs, comes the director of the great and award-winning Crash, Paul Haggis, to show us how they return

those Iraqi soldiers and where and why they have become virtually inhuman beings. With an

overwhelming and superb interpretation of Tommy Lee Jones, the film advances with a prodigious rhythm slower than

fast; is a discourse about the evil and the futility of war, about a patriotic father in search of the truth that

finally reflects on the mental and political state of the Goliath in which he lives (masterly and memorable the last

plane of the film). Charlize Theron gives us another of her great interpretations, putting herself at the height

of the great protagonist and perfectly endowed with pure humanism, like the always sensational Susan

Sarandon, who in brief appearances shrinks our hearts all . And is that behind a police plot and a

terrible family drama, is a fierce and already mentioned criticism of the politics of one of the countries most

powerful in the world, with brilliantly carried out and cinematically wonderful sequences thatour

reachhearts and consciences. Perhaps the only thing that we can cross out to this magnificent film is the amount

of characters that appear in a seen and not seen and that, nevertheless, could have given much more of itself (as a

result of this, there are some scenes of which I, personally, would dispense), although not in this

intimate drama. Full of realism, with a practically perfect script and some interpretations of Oscar, In the

Valley of Elah is the proof that this 2008 can be a true movie year, then, without Doubt, it's anstart

exceptional.

" 1

" The longest and heaviest 2 hours of my life. For a good part of the footage, I cared 3 things that

would happen to "" our hero "", the film becomes bland, tedious, boring, simple, with dialogues that provoke the

laughter

In seventeenth-century Imperial Spain, Diego Alatriste, a valiant soldier in the service of his majesty, fights in

a war in the cold lands of Flanders. In an ambush of the Dutch, Balboa, friend and companion of

arms, falls mortally wounded. Alatriste hears from his friend's lips a last request and promises to

fulfill it: take care of his son I���igo and take him away from the trade of a soldier.Presentada bajo el est�� �pido sanbenito

being the most expensive film of Spanish cinema, this production led by an excellent enlenco is still

the longest and heaviest 2 hours of my life , it is more, during a good part of the footage I did not care 3 things that

would happen to "" our hero "", the film becomes bland, tedious, boring, simple, with di quelogos that provoke

laughter (the question of Pilar L���pez de Ayala to Malatesta.), and some things that nobody believes them, II

'm gladdid not get carried away by my cinef��� Lia, and having done with the books of Arturo P���rez Reverte

before, but now, and after having seen the film, I honestly do not have any desire; true is that the costumes,

the photography and even the sound and the characterization of the characters is excellent, but this stupid idea

of wanting to peck of all the novels (as I have understood), it has been a disservice to the tape. In short

, I had it but I was disappointed about it.

" 0

" La Luna en Botella is the story of some of them, people who dream of changing their lives, with

everyday utopias, those who do not necessarily intend to change the world, but rather the how he treats us.

Today I had a wonderful experience to see this movie, I have seen by chance the possibility of doing something

different in Spain come true. Thank God, the universe has conspired with Grojo (Director of the

film) to make us the greatest gift of this year. A film full of that magical surrealism that makes you vibrate

and believe that the No, can be an S��� and that it is enough to believe to be. The Moon in Bottle for me as an actress is the light

of the hope for the Spanish cinema, is the hope of being able to work with a genius, full ofromanticism

Bohemian. Grojo means an incentive to continue with a profession that in Spain is absolutely

distorted. The aesthetics of the film reminded me a lot of that of Mouling Rouge (Saving Hispanics) ,

the soundtrack is talented, catchy and there are moments in which you laugh with happiness and emotion, mythical moments

for a guide with a message as clear as utopian, but that is precisely what it is, to have our own

cosmic utop���a (in my case it would be to work in a movie like this) to become brave, evenus

if they tellhow crazy we are to do things outside the norm, we are brave because we do not only want to be,

we also want to be (Phrase m���tica de Carmen Rico). It was time for someone to take care of the details

mechanically, considering vitally important even the cat that goes through the alleys. And make no

mistake, the donkey is the real protagonist. There are secondary characters of a lifetime, which we are

used to seeing and which continue to be secondary although with more importance, but the interpretation of these

is so brutal, that they become real animals before the camera, leaving the new

protagonists (Barbara Goenaga and Edu Soto) aa���os light. In fact the only one that I'm going to put on the film

is this, B���rbara and Edu are absolutely insignificant, overshadowed and minimal alongside such

talent: Dominique Pinon, Pep Jov�� �, Leight Zimmerman (Fabulously regal and immense and for samples, the

sequence with the piano when arriving at caf���: SPECTACULAR), Michael Jenn, Joan Dalmau, Federico Luppi, Francisco

Algora and Richard Collins-Moore. What a piece of actors is that I do not know which one is better. It's a shame that

people with such talent have to see the misfortune that their film has no distribution, it's not fair.

I said sometimes there are so wonderful films that are not suitable for all palates, this is one of

them. The average viewer is not prepared for this avalanche of talent. Director's Note There are people who

love to say NO. People who get tired of hearing it. And there are people whose lives are broken after a NO.La Luna en

Botella is the story of some of them, people who dream of changing their lives, with everyday utopias, here Those

that do not necessarily intend to change the world, but the way in which it treats us. As the story

progresses, the characters discover that not everything is impossible and that there is always a second chance; it is enough

to really believe in it. Music, circus and cabaret in a choral tale with Spanish, French,actors

Argentine, English, American, Korean, Swedish or Chilean, gathered or mixed in the caf�� � Rossignol,

a place with a very special charm and personality, where Ren��� Dup���r���'s music plays the role of a

universal language. I could be in any western capital of our days. At Café Rossignol, everyone

gathers around the piano, to laugh, to cry, to love. It must be a party! If we manage to

spread hope, hope for it. n. If we forget what is established, what others think or say. If we

add a point of madness, rebeld���ay and transgression.Acabaremos putting the moon inside that bottle.GROJO

" 1

" In short, a film too long, with a story devoid of narrative claw ,characters

stereotypedand that searches excessively for the common places of a genre, which in itself had the subgenre label

in its time.

The debut on the spot of animated feature film by Goro Miyazaki, son of the celebrated Hayao

Miyazaki, starts beforehand with expectations that are perhaps too high, not so much self-imposed by the

director himself, but rather for the mere fact of taking with him so praised surname. The path chosen by

Mr. Goro Miyazaki has been divergent in tone with respect to his father's cinema, trying to look for more

a simple story, lacking metaphysical power, and even visual , moving away a bit from the cinema of the master

of Japanese animation. In spite of this, as we will see below, he has not been able to bring his debut

project to fruition. The story, somewhat confusing indeed, situates us in a world inhabited by magic, dragons and

slave traders, in a land where it seems that evil has taken over everything, and the population

lives in distress their depressing days. In that place, a magician saves the life of Arren, in fact the son of a King

whom he himself took charge of assassinating, and they undertake an adventure that will take them to the great city and to

remain for a long time, they were housed in a farm owned by a friend of the magician. Meanwhile, a

powerful witch is taking charge of subjugating under her terrible power the entire population of the place. Said witch

seems to know our protagonist wizard and towards the end of the story there will be a corresponding

confrontation between the two, with the final revelation by Arren and his new friend Theru, who also

hides a magical secret. This magical story has its roots in the old tradition of a certain kind of

animated cinema that during the 80's, even before, he dominated a large part of the Japanese market, with

the excellent "" The heroic legend of Arislan "" or the series of King Arthur in the lead. The big problem in this

case, is that the story progresses in a very confused way, with a script that sometimes lacks a sense of

narrative logic or a narrative pulse that increases the interest. Pors on the part of the spectator, most of the

times being more pending the syrupy reactions more typical of those series of the former type Heidi than of

the Japanese anime current, so given in the times that run to excellent parables and metaphors about the human being

and what surrounds him (without for that reason renouncing the roots of his culture). In spite of this, just recognize

certain scenes very well achieved, such as the description of a decadent city or the great sequence of

persecution of the wolves at the beginning of the film. But that mixture of influences from the Celtic culture, thenovel

chivalricand a childish vision of romanticism and magic, ends up making waters everywhere. In addition,

the visual aspect has an a tonoejo tone, an anchylosed animation in the past, that although it is pleasant to

see for the nostalgic of the anime in its version. Traditionally, it required that at least the strength of the story

be greater, otherwise the looks would be very destined to look at other aspects, and in thataspect

visual, it also hobbles. Goro Miyazaki's film. The cold and distant tone does not help much to compensate the tedious

evolution of events, especially the section of film that takes place on the farm, stretched to

exhaustion in a film that as if it did not offer the level of density enough to extend it to two

hours of duration.Adem���s the character conform to various stereotypes, and therefore the sensation of history already

seen is no stranger at any time to the retina of the viewer. Being especiallycertain scenes

reportablelike that in which the character of Theru, so reluctant at first to establish a relationship with Arren, startsimmediately

singing the corresponding song andboth characters seem little less than soulmates,

really worrying in the eyes of any viewer such amount of decompensation in the creation of

logical reactions in the narration. With obvious influences in addition to other films �� Peaks of now and forever,

like that scene of the magician riding his horse and his glowing staff, which clearly reminds the magician

Gandalf of such a popular trilogy, or the final resolution in those menacing stairs by which themagician

eviltakes Theru as a kidnapping, and how cool they are in the memory of the most seasoned spectator

in the fantastic cinema with that estimable movie called "" Dentr or the Labyrinth "". The originality is not

also, the predominant note in this film worthy of the best direct product to video of the 80's, within the

anime more presepable. Little more than ��� To add, perhaps highlight the fact that it will be tremendously complicated for the

director to remove the label of being the son of a large one, and if instead of looking for his place in the

genre, he limits himself to resorting to the most trite terrain of heroic fantasy (and not only Japanese evidently).

With an ending as grandiloquent and excessive as usual in those animated films that do a disservice

to the truly interesting products, and a final message about life and death, extremely

confusing, childish and lacking in everything. Rigorous analysis on the true emotions. In short, a film that is

too long, with a story lacking narrative claw, stereotyped characters and that searches

excessively for the common places of a genre, which is already in itself it had the label of subg���nero (in the mostsense

foreseeable and tedious) in its time. Required.

" 0

" The originality and freshness that supposed? Shrek? We are left in a very distant place regarding this third

installment.

Again the nice green Ogre comes to us wrapped in another adventure surrounded by his s���quito, made up of Ass

and Puss in Boots. "" Shrek Third "" lowers the level reached with the previous proposals, since history suffers

some ups and downs that resent the global structure, but even so, Chris Miller shows us veryparts

interesting, like the enlistment by Enchantor in the tavern of the "despojados" ", or bad mal��� simos

of classics stories, or presentation asactor in theater caf. The dream of Shrek becoming a father,

the subplot of Ass and Puss in Boots, the death bed of the King, and some other sequences, make that

approach to the halls to see this movie. But the most demanding will feel a little

disappointed with this adventure. The effects continue for their privileges, managing to create very good realms, and some

staged theater (final act) very successful, so that in that aspect dazzle the

viewers. The soundtrack is composed of Harry Gregson-Williams themes composed for the occasion,

as well as a good ���mero of songs that complete this work. In short, the originality and freshness thatsupposed

"" Shrek """we are in a very distant place compared to this third installment.

" 0

" Cmedia tender, fun, with surreal moments like life itself. "" In this life there are two classes of people: the winners and the losers. Do you know what the difference is?

That the victors fight for what they want. "Olivia's father (Greg Kinnear) is very clear about the

supposed formula of success. As a good optimist, he dreams that his family will achieve success and therefore supports his

seven-year-old daughter in her decision to enter a contest. of children's beauty in which the winner

is crowned as Peque���a Miss Sunhine. The whole film focuses on the rugged journey that thisundertakes

peculiar familyin their dilapidated van to California, where the contest is held . But as

in any self-respecting roadmovie, the journey will change the lives of the characters (perfectly interpreted) and

strengthen the relationship between the members of the strange family. A family in the one that coexist a cheeky

and amusing grandfather (Allan Arkin) addicted to drugs, a suicidal uncle, a brother who goes on a silent strike

until he is not allowed to enroll in a pilot school, a mother of innocent personality (Tonny Collette)

but that serves as the main axis of the family and an obsessive father with success. Paradjically, the person who

is most mature in the family is Olivia (Abigail Breslin). The girl does not seem to fit into the

prototype of beauty they are looking for. the contest (she has her teeth separated and she wears huge glasses) but her dream

is to become a model and she will try her best to achieve it. Although the illusion will sometimes

fade away and the child will fall into disillusionment and feel unsuccessful. Her grandfather explains that she is not a

failure, because "the unsuccessful are the ones who give up trying for fear of not getting it" and she does not stop

trying. With a Gui���oa Proust in another of his scenes, the film shows us that triumph in life

is something relative and that it does not have to coincide with the image of success that reigns in society . Acriticism

fierce, apparently light, of the American dream, represented in the figure of the obsessive father and in

beauty contests. The competitiveness of society is exemplified in the talent tests to which

the participants of the contest are subjected. Because society obliges us to demand more and more of

ourselves, and leads us to frustration with the successes of others. As the character

of Olivia's younger brother, "Life is a beauty contest behind another." In spite of the undisputed

drama that suggests, Peque���a Miss Sunshine is a tender, funny comedy, with surreal moments like

life itself. Because life is full of moments in which we feel losers, and others in which

the greatest triumph is being able to be ourselves.

" 1

" Upon seeing her, the spectator feels like one of those twelve men who have in their hands the life of an

18-year-old boy.

This film manages to transmit everything it intends, it is intense and suffocating, hence it is set in

the hot day of the year, we see almost all the characters sweating and then on top it starts to rain to

create an atmosphere of damp, oppressive heat. This may seem a minor detail, it seems to me

quite important because if one day loneliness and normal igual.A filmnot be part of this, we have

12 characters locked in a room, is all we have throughout the film, there are no changes in thethe toilet

scenario, except when they go to. Seeing it, the spectator feels like one of those twelve men who

have the life of a 18-year-old boy in their hands, they must decide if he is innocent or guilty and everyone is

convinced that he is guilty, except one, the character of Henry Fonda (who is spectacular), he has a

reasonable doubt and from then on, he will try to convince the others that you can not take a decision

like that lightly. The characters are very well profiled, each one has a perfectly marked personality and that

influences their opinions and the reasons they have to give their verdict. The camera movements take us

from one place to another in the room as if we were there with them passing heat and deciding if a

boy lives or dies; there are abundant close-ups that bring us closer to the psychology of the characters, since

this is a film of characters, it is of the actors, uniquely and exclusively theirs and it must be said that all

they do it very well and they hold the first shots excellently and that is not easy. With this film Sidney Lumet

shows that with little money and few means you can make a very good film.

" 1

" A totally sordid movie full of surreal characters with an enveloping atmosphere. In short, a

debut that presaged a hopeful author with refreshing ideas to contribute to the genre of horror.

The Spanish cinema has a strange talent in squandering different directors who could well give a

new focus to our exhausted formulas. One of the most bleeding cases is the Elio Quiroga that imprim � its

particularism seal a decade ago with the Martian photos. A totally sordid film full ofcharacters

surrealwith an enveloping atmosphere. In short, a debut that presaged a hopeful author withideas

refreshingto contribute to the horror genre that lives in permanent crisis in Spain. After creating the FANTASTIC

FACTORY that gave us authentic barbarities like ROTWEILLER or FAUST among other byproducts while nobody

offered an opportunity to the young director. After ten years of silence he attacked again with a similar film in

outline to the day of the dead of the great ROMERO. With a ridiculous budget that only allows you to shoot in a couple

of sets, it is solved with great skill where each dollar is used in surprising effects that

achieve their goal together with the good use of space and the great atmosphere. sfera.Among the performers only highlight

the beautiful SILKE seen in other horror productions such as Tuno Negro. A 8.

" 1

" The tape is irregular and tries to intersperse comedy and drama with ups and downs in the script. It is a product,

unfortunately, dispensable.

American comedies are all the same. It is fascinating as they also attract top-actors

notchto make them. PS I Love You is a clear example. With an Oscar-winning Hilary Swank and a fashion gGrard

Butler the thing has a safe box office. In addition, since it was shot in just 45 days, it is easy to intersperse it among

the big productions. Gerard plays Gerry, an adorable Irishman who is married to Holly. After a little

scene of anger and the credit titles Gerry dies of a tumor. But Gerry is a great guy and has

decided to leave letters to his wife to help her overcome her loss. Each of them hasinstructions

preciseto meet the new Holly post-Gerry and end with PS. I Love You (Postscript, I love you) that gives

title to the film and rescued from Cecelia Ahern's homonymous novel. The tape is irregular and tries to intersperse

comedy and drama with ups and downs in the gui��� n. Her main actress does not believe what she does in any scene and it seems

that it is clear that the field of tragicomedy does not go with her. Gerard Butler makes desperate attempts between

Leonidas and El Fantasma de la ���pera, showing heart and singing in almost all his scenes. It is a product,

unfortunately, dispensable.

" 0

" A story of Soviet rabbits in a world without audience ratings. Does anyone understand me? Here is the

deep substrate of this problem.

Inland empire is a bluff, a sidereal fly in a foam ashtray, a beautiful psychedelic fish drowned in

an amphetamine juice, a superlative adjective in a text with no possible outcome, a song by Philip Glass (

of the thickest and unaffordable) in a tavern bursting with retirees. Inland empire is David Lynch in

its purest form. I recently wrote here a little text about the things of the friend Lynch when he looks proud of his

creativity and dares to walk, bare, bareback, the arcane of art. I do not know, at this point, if the journey

has been satisfactory. In my case, thinking exclusively of my rejoicing as a spectator, it has not been a

recommendable trip. And that this good man has made me spend pleasant moments, tall jíbilos with

some of his films. Also here is a (necessarily brief) comment to his Blue velvet, but this

Inland empire is something else: something of a slower chewing and a bewilderment m��� s systematic because when

Lynch decides to embarrass us there is no doubt that he will get it. Knocked out, we fail to elucidate

reasons that only his reason understands. I do not want to disrupt the curiosity of others so I will not gut

the argument. Neither do I have the certainty that I could. I do not know what state of narrative trance you have to be in order

to get the right verbs, with the right adjectives that specify a synthesis, a synopsis or as

you want to say. His generous footage gives to want to leave or to want it to last one hour more, according to the

minimum. We are then in that this film is a challenge to our patience or a gift for our

morbid / masochism. I have read comments on the net that give complete information (thoughtful, thought, exquisitely

written) about the film and others that, fortunately, align with my disenchantment or my perplexity.

empire (I'm ending) just like it's reviewed. Like some films by Dreyer or the most robust and

personal Cronenberg. It hardly matters that Laura Dern comes out (that there are thirty women in one or not is no

woman and everything is a political twist of our hallucinated mind) or my beloved one (except in Eragon and some

other trip to the sweetened cinema of elementary school students) Jeremy Irons. What I am very clear about is the tremendous

game that Lynch gives to the bored blogger (today with dark circles due to the hectic schedule of the ���scars) or to the

responsible philosopher who he wants, in spite of the inconveniences, to always and everywhere give a clear, clear,message. I

decodableabstain: I am enchanted by the legitimacy of not pronouncing myself. What others think. Or this is

an opinion: the only one, maybe. Everything else is a tightrope exercise of unshed sins, of women on

the verge of an attack by Lynch, rather. I promise that I will see it shortly with a less contaminated mentality. If

possible And I will write (as God or Billy Wilder sends) another entry on my page, another review in this every

full page of film in the net. To the benefit of cin���filo inventory. The world is strange.

" 0

" What's your head cut off! -I thought yesterday as I left the cinema after seeing the last work of Sofia

Coppola- and I did not refer precisely to the one already decapitated Mar���a Antoinette but to the author of such nonsense .

What's your head cut off! -I thought yesterday as I left the cinema after seeing the last work of Sofia Coppola- and

I did not refer precisely to the one already decapitated Mar���a Antoinette but to the author of such nonsense The film

begins with an interesting historical rigor (which shows us that in this sense, the homework has been done)

but the narrative development focuses too much on some aspects that can be boring for the

spectator (half of the narrative is devoted to explaining the fact that they did not consummate theact

sexualuntil several years after their marriage). On the other hand, the director has indicated in more than one

interview that the intention was to show us that the sovereign was not an idiot but an intelligent woman who

retained her human side, but in the movie. The only thing we see is a girl who is dedicated exclusively to

taking cakes at all hours and drinking champagne with her friends from the Court. (Obviate the comment of the

human facet of Marie Antoinette and her husband since I do not think that Coppola knows what it is to go hungry). The

main problem of the film is that the design has been valued. And the image to the detriment of the plot, that is

why I had the feeling of being watching a video clip instead of a feature film: the scenes of Maria

Antonieta and her friends in a retirement palace. reminiscent of a famous advertising campaign in

which they asked us what the clouds smell like. As for the soundtrack, the great controversy, I have to say that

I did not seem strident or bad taste. There are few pop songs that appear and sincerely, they were not

out of place in the environment, in fact, I would not have missed that the fashionable couple, Almodovar and "" Pe "",

appeared in the midst of so much movement, that s ���, moved Parisian.As a final shot, in such a cool world to grownot

issynonymous with aging, in fact both Marie Antoinette and Luis look exactly the same when they

get married (she fifteen years) and the sixteen) that when they flee from Versailles (thirty-five and thirty-six,

respectively).

" 0

" It seems that Eastwood learns from his mistakes and while "" Flags ... "" the flashback came to bore the

viewer, here they are numbered, fair and quite concise, and help understand the character in question which

has been counted.

I've always heard that saying of "" To sentence a lawsuit you have to listen to the 2 parties "",seems to

Eastwoodapply that rule, and after "" Flags of our parents "" now shows us the Japanese perspective with

this "" Letters From Iwo Jima "", where with a careful monochromatic photograph (only highlights the red of the blood

and the rising sun flag.), In this amazing film, premiered in all the world in VOS, and with a budget

even less than "" Banderas. "" from where it takes advantage, not only sets, but also some plans already filmed

before, is the reunion of Eastwood with the more author's cinema, where one delves into the courage,

the courage and the obedience of the Japanese soldier. On the other hand, the inexpressiveness of many of theactors

Japanese, I have found little less than surprising, especially when in the oriental cinema, the "" everything "" are the faces

of the protagonists, generally very e Here, the great majority, except the great Ken Watannabe,

suffer from this fact, and show the same expression whether they laugh, or suffer. The soundtrack, simplistic,

But effective, I have been masterful, I was already warned that we were facing one of the best scores

of 2007, where with just a few chords, few, to tell the truth, show the poetic, the divine, and the inhuman

( a war like that is, for good or for bad.) of a blic war. The planes with camera on the shoulder, in the

most crude scenes of the battle, contribute, as they already contributed in "" Banderas. "" Aaspect

documentary, which begins to be "" house brand "", for the director; On the other hand, you will be thankful for less Gore

than in the previous film, just showing the right thing, so as not to traumatize us too much. Perhaps, another of theparts

negativeof the film is its excessive slowness, sometimes weighing it in excess, and it is that those

144 min. Projection becomes brutally heavy, especially in the final part of the tape. It seems that

Eastwood learns from his mistakes and while in "" Flags. "" The flashback came to bore the viewer, here

are numbered, just and quite concise, and help to understand the character in question that has been counted. If

I highlight a map of all that I have seen, I'll take the last one, Mount Suribachi and the beach , to

rhythm of the Soundtrack of the same, beautiful and at the same time sweet, showing the lives that were lost in that

small piece of land.

" 1

" Boring dissertation on ethics and moral values ​​that remains in a reductionist prospect of cultures

confronted not by the supremacy of science but by the tinsel of the show.

Naturalistic scientism is a flimsy cinematographic genre, but it has survived on the basis of strained

tapes between the melodramatic and the crassly documentary. It does not matter if the foundational premise of the film is the

survival of some macaques in Borneo or the desire to confront faith and science, metaphors and pure logic.

Kindergarten anthropology, travel magazine exoticism on couch��� paper, simian caricature of a script that

could have given more case that they had not wanted to insist on matters of such scant interest for a

modern spectator, oblivious to these operetta Darwinisms, to these easy guides where the clash of two

cultures resembles the lofty mating of two koalas.Eso of the link lost and miraculously recovered for public

exhibition has hook to have produced a film with more sobriety, less stereotyped, much

more interested in the moral distress of some characters than in the didactic didactic of a scientist barely

credible and an anomalous situation, between the exotic and the plasta. If it is that this hybridization of epitates strikes.

There is more: it is man���quea in its expositions; naive in its solution and, above all, flat in what it proposes,

although the galas that it exhibits are bombastic and it seems that we are attending a great opera, something

incontrovertibly relevant. done, but boring. And the

drowsiness is so huge that one abandons the interest to find meaning to this foreseeable and very vulgar staging

that, at times, seems a Sunday sermon on the pre-eminence of moral values ​​cat�� Ics (flatten

what they crush, go where they happen) that a rationalized and argumentatively attractive trip to the

human heart, something that seems to be drawn in the first minutes of the film (the hunt of the pygmies) excite

and provoke expectations that then they are hidden by a delayed, slow assembly, of astonishing inefficiency because at

the half hour of projection all the mechanisms of interest are deactivated and one begins to look at the clock (qu��). �

such a terrible thing in the cinema) and wish that the time pass quickly and leave soon to catch the first

unsuspecting passerby and trust him, without burdens, our conclusions. "Do not go, stay at home." "Do not

rent it on DVD: ask for Babel or some modern edition of Extra���os on a train with extras and all that." "Go to

Lynch and his Elephant Man, who talks about them (dir ���amos) but more twisted and lucidly.

" 0

" A masterpiece that you have to contemplate with all the senses. Frank Miller had the Battle of the Therm���pilas recorded in blood and fire since he saw thein his childhood

movie"The Le���n de Sparta" "(The 300 Spartans, 1962), which was one of his great childhood influences,

so when he considered himself capable of doing so, he decided to give his own interpretation of that fact, in a

graphic novel that I highly recommend reading. Zack Snyder, in which is his second film after "" The

dawn of the dead "" composes his best work here, leaving the same footprint that he left on a server Robert

Rodriguez with his "" Sin City "", to capture, in real image and if a ���pice of problematic the world of the comic (or of the

graphic novel for the scholars) to the big screen, Zack Snyder obtains it, leaving to all the characters and the

whole environment of paper in a movie hard to forget, and that we would like to contemplate again and again. The

tape at no time waver, in reverse �s, the almost 2 hours of footage are an absolute pleasure for all the

senses; Mention apart the interpretations of Gerard Butler (great as King Leon���das), the unknown and

beautiful Lena Headey, the always remembered as "" Faramir "" David Wenham, as well as Dominic West as the p�� �rfido

Theron, I almost forgot the "" Bellismo "" Rodrigo Santoro, with a makeup that reminds the poet Ru-paul. On the

other hand highlight the soundtrack of Tyler Bates, great in all its composition, although in some moments

have typical sonorities that remind "" Gladiator "" or "" Troy "" and is that the shadow of both tapes is elongated

for this kind of cinema. The digital effects on the tape are almost one more character, since the film has

been shot on a blue screen, adding both the luminosity "" yellow "" of the comic, like the blood, that

populates the screen giving it that fictitious and spectacular air that looks so good in the patido of

armchairs.Resumiendo, a masterpiece that is necessary to contemplate with all the senses .

" 1

" Simptic but quite mediocre comedy, which could have gotten higher. Nice comedy that is not good, far from it, but it's a result in l��� general lines. The truth is that,

although it maintains many of the negative constants of the Yankee comedy of the last times (which lastlong

too), it is carried out with pleasure, not much imagination, but ��� Effective in eliciting the smile and sometimes the

laughter of the spectator. It is quite irregular, starting well and following that path, for something more than half an

hour. However, little by little the movie stagnates, being its comedy something plémbea, repetitive and quite

chorra (in my opinion, and without wanting to offend, ���ojo!). seen in other movies of the same

hair, where they join the gags, little achieved, with the pure romantic comedy that does not make too much fun, except

for moments like the fun game of tennis doubles, (picture 1) Pretty jocular although itnot

isoriginal either. But the truth is that it makes us laugh beautifully. In the final part, if we except his tont���simo ep���logo

by a comedy actor not accredited in the film, the rhythm rises again, and we attend somewell-

technicallyresolved scenes, with an excellent montage and a soundtrack that reminds us of the best movies of

intrigue and action. But in short, it's not very there � this tape, although it is sympathetic as a whole and pleasant

to watch, despite its simplicity.Billy Bob Thorton and John Heder do well and are credible in their roles,well

asas secondary , as also the director Todd Louiso.

" 0

" Ingmar Bergman stuns us with truths like pu���os, naked to the human being, reveals his miseries,

our miseries.

"" Saraband "" is one of the films that has impacted me the most in recent times, I do not know how to describe it, if it is

melodrama or Horror. Such is the impact on my memory. Ingmar Bergman stuns us with truths like fists,

strips down the human being, reveals his miseries, our miseries. The great Liv Ullmann (Marianne),

reunites after thirty years with Johan, a former ex -married (picking up the same characters as "" Secrets of

a marriage ""), and Johan's son Henrik and his daughter Karin also spend the summer. In their

relationships there are conflicts, hatred between parents and children, humiliation, lies, fear. Bergman seeks the worst

of the human being and shows it shamelessly, naked. Johan despises his son Henrik for his soft character and

appearance. Henrik hates his father for his humiliations and contempt. Henrik's wife died two years ago, and

Henrik has not overcome it, only relies on his daughter Karin, whom he teaches to play the cello. Karin wants to

go to the city, to the conservatory, but she knows that if she leaves her father she will die of grief. Uff, and this just the

approach. Then it contains really chilling scenes, so hard and naked thatare shown

emotions, with a depuration in the look that frightens, a delight for the eyes.Saraband in its sense It

is often a dance for two dancers, and the film is structured in ten chapters, preceded by a

preface and an epilogue, and all of them are conceived as di ���logos between two characters, except the prologue and the

epìlogo that are monologues of Liv Ullmann. It does not formally boast, although it is allowed that at the beginning and at the end

Marianne speaks with the spectator, masterfully directs the actors, all of them, unrepeatable moments,

overflowing emotions, revealed miseries. With what I've seen of Bergman, it happens to me that I love him or leave me

indifferent, and this goes alongside the ones I like, side of "" Person "", "" Wild Strawberries "" or "" The seventh

seal "".

" 1

" Eighties aesthetics and blood in abundance in the new production of the overrated Rodr���guez. In an experiment that surely will not have continuity, due to its stupidity, and with an est Ethics characteristic of

the B series films of the 80's, it premieres in Spain Grindhouse: Planet Terror, which together with Grind

House: Death Prof, composes a vulgar story of zombies, whose filming has been shared between Robert Rodr���guez andTwo

Quentin Tarantino.directors greatly overrated and with an almost sickly devotion for violence,

blood and ulcers. Two little gems, come on. The part that today has to analyze is the one of the first, Planet Terror,

whose synopsis is reduced to that two doctors prove that the town has been filled with living dead and in a

reaction of the most normal is the Aan shots, sticks, razors and shoves with whatever you put on hand. To get

an idea, something similar (although to the beast) to what one can find on the street on the day of

\* Erizada. The struggle for survival, the vindication of the human being's resilience and the ability to

overcome it, are some of the habitual nonsense of the genre. They are here

present. The poor quality of the image, the static imperfections and some other details, still accentuate

the premeditated image of two decades ago that the film is already it transmits. Although I know that they enjoy

a huge list of followers, I can not finish without saying that Rodr���guez and Tarantino's films, except for

some exceptions like Kill Bill I and II and Sin City, I think incongruous, vac���oym���s own of an alienated

that of the genius that some see in them. In any case, the viewing of this monster can be excused if

it means spending a couple of hours on the air conditioning in the living room. \* La Erizada is the act that

traditionally inaugurates carnival acts in Cadiz, and consists of thousands of people eating sea urchins

and drinking non-stop through the streets of the District of La Vi���a de Cdiz.

" 0

" Between confused and suffocated by so much violence, Munich liked me so little that the whole movie was spent wanting to be in my house watching the castings of

American Idol, imagine my boredom. I'm an unconditional fan of Steven Spielberg and I liked it until The War of

the Worlds (many did not forgive him), but this one left me confused and suffocated by so much violence

that I no longer understood. Who was Israel, who was Palestinian, where were the protagonists and, finally, a

mazamorra of characters and stories. OK, the film was intended to be a denunciation that barbarism only generates more

barbarism and more barbarism and more to the infinitum. That, in the midst of so much confusion, is achieved. In this case

the story is told from the assassination of eleven Israeli-Jewish athletes at the Munich Olympics in 1972,

by eleven Palestinian Arabs, belonging to the organization. In Black September, they intended to "" mark a

political "" position. The truth is that I do not know myself since when I started this rivalry between different ethnic groups

(?), But I do not know when it's over. And in summary, that was the main message of the film, which

could have saved us a few deaths and minutes. The film raises several moral dilemmas for the

Israeli protagonist, Avner (Eric Bana , The Incredible Hulk, 2003): Is it due to your family or your country? ���h���roe or

murderer? Justice or revenge? And the options he takes condemn him forever, because he will always live in him

the memories of so much violence even though at the beginning of the film he was basically an average man :

kind, dedicated to his family and with a profession "" boring "". He is strangely chosen to lead agroup

secret anti-terrorist, composed of a series of characters so inexperienced in the "art" of killing like him.

Who are the real terrorists at last? This servant did not like Munich, however, my

tastes could be very wrong, since the Academy has given her five nominations: Best MovieBest Direction -

Steven SpielbergBetter Tail Adapted - Tony Cushner and Eric RothBest EditionBest MusicThe performance of Eric

Bana is in my opinion The only one (om���s) salvageable from the film and this has not been considered in the

selection. I believe that my career of revision towards the Oscar is not being very promising. Generally the Academy

and I usually agree a lot, but this year we have seen it so far. We will continue watching.

" 0

" If it were not for some too obvious rhythm changes, I was going to masterpiece, but it remains at a remarkable

height.

Difficult, very difficult to talk about the successes and failures of the new proposal of Christopher Nolan without

gutting more than the account. Adapting a great novel by Christopher Priest, Nolan makes her his with an

exemplary start: the first shot of the film is beautiful, but I already say at the beginning that it will be very difficult to talk about

the film without disembowelling it, especially on the part (which is supposed to be) explanatory. The first hour of

footage (it reaches 130���) is simply masterful, with some great characters that start to

differentiate little by little and then end up being the same, and that is the obsession of a man, and everything if

this is a magician, can be very dangerous. Both Jackman and Bale shine with their own light in their performance,

leaving Scarlett with a secondary role and more corseted than ever, which I will thank Mr. Nolan all

my life (Encorsetar: put cors���, especially when you cite a lot), leaving Michael Caine with arole

somewhat confusing(especially in the final part of the film) and Sir David Bowie with the inventor / visionary Nikola

Tesla, a man (very, very much ahead of his time). We must highlight the use of the camera on the shoulder, which

is shocking in a product of these characteristics, where we expect more elaborate and elaborate plans

(which have them, of course), and also the environment that surrounds the film, a kind of "" Scorsese movie ""

with magicians instead of mobsters "" and precisely those magicians keep you in suspense like a small child who has

a function. What happens is that we are not so young and we know that magicians always keep an ace up

their sleeve. And the biggest flaw of the film lies in it. And it is not because of the classic (and already abused in too much

regardless of the genre) only final turn, because the viewer knows that something will happen (especially the

spectator who has read the novel), but because what happens is not, in my opinion, too well explained, and

one leaves the cinema with a sensation similar to the one he had when he finished Memento, having understood the story ""

half "", although there may be someone to whom the end of the film seems the last trick of Nolan, make

us feel like one of the characters in the movie. In short, it is a highly

recommended film, directed by one of the greatest talents of the current North American cinema and starring two

super actors who despite having been superheroes (and follow Even if they are more

effective and with more records, supported by a great cast and with a couple or three of splendid moments of

pure magic. If not for a few too obvious rhythm, I went to masterpiece, but it remains at a

remarkable height. Note: The Prestige will be released with the title of The final trick. Take it now

" 1

" A mess that looks more like a remake of the first part that the continuation of a story that was already a

bit boring.

I admit that I like to see from time to time some of those films that nobody expects to be

masterpieces, but that are supposed to have some capacity to entertain, resorting to great predators and

many other arguments based on the fantasy combined with the action. Well, as I said, one is

aware that you will not enjoy a classic, the truth is that I know that less is the expectation of being

able to have a good time, face a less coherent gui���nm���so, contemplate some special effects

cre���bles and, why not say it, perhaps s see some unknown and beautiful actress who begins in the difficult world

of celluloid. Unfortunately, in Mand���bulas 2, there is not even the slightest trace of cinematographic decency �fica,

then more than a continuation, it seems a remake of the first part. The characters are traced from their

predecessor, without the least novelty or modification. Something similar happens with the gui���n, because the course of

the tempos repeats itself in a shameful way, without contributing anything new. It also deserves to be mentioned thatmixture

strangebetween the film of acci���ny and terror with a touch of comedy crass and insubstantial that both like on the

other side of the Atlantic, but that I find abominable and grotesque.Sin nothing to savor or enjoy,

as I finished �� This casta���a, I am sulking at the beach bar below the house, who lives,

unfortunately for his faithful, his last days of the season.

" 0

" The script is not important, because the plot is as confused as it is loose, and the characters do not

connect with the viewer.

It begins to lose bellows Tony Scott, that after the stupendous fire of the revenge returns now to its

personages in rooms of hotels that are pointed to each other while it puts a music that gives aspect to him of

parodia. The story of Domino Harvey, as I suppose that by now you will all know her, I'm going to

skip it. Scott continues filming more planes than Michael Bay and continues to saturate thewith different colors and colors. The

screenscript is unimportant, because the plot is as confused as it is loose, and the characters do not

connect with the viewer. Well, Keira's yes, but for his little face of Angel basically. To forget the

"" sex scene "", almost as blushing as Alone in the dark, only more cool. Echoes of Kill Bill, from his

previous movie (those subtitles) dancers) and Love at point-blank range in a film in which the highlights

are (ATTENTION) Ian Ziering, Brian Austin Green (do they sound?) and credits . (the initials and the endings,

splendid). A 4.

" 0

" With Salvador are pending accounts in Spanish cinema. It was not enough with metaphors andexercises

author. Better late than never. A necessary film. Catharsis.

Some time ago I had the chance to chat over the phone, in a radio program, with Manuel Huerga, director

of SALVADOR (PUIG ANTIC). One of the first things I told him was that he considered his last film

"necessary". Huerga did not think so, but called it "" movie therapy "". A qualifier in the mouth ofof

onethe best artisans of SALVADOR, without forgetting the most important work (as producer and precursor of the

project) of Jaume Roures (Mediapro). I proposed, starting from the director's comment, define cine-therapy: tratamientoa film

treatment? A new way to treat depression? We could talk about the film astherapy

audiovisual. A therapy that does not cure, but that can help when facing real dramas. In this case, the

film is the vehicle through which we get the message that helps us move forward. The film as

medicine to our ills. In the case of SALVADOR, it is not that we get better when we leave the cinema. In fact, the

sensation is totally inverse. From there, the first definition that I proposed to Huerga: it is a film

"" necessary "". That allows us to know (especially if we refer to the new generations)facts

horrible. The therapeutic of the viewing of the film happens, possibly, by "" that which can not be

repeated "". In short, to know to grow, to be able to advance. This type of film allows us to

distress, suffer, cry and, at the same time, debate, relive what happened. It produces impotence but

also gives us the possibility to download it. And it is reflected in us, as spectators, the injustice (that

denominated "social depression") in front of wounds that are difficult to be closed sometime. In the final credits

of the film of Huerga, appear a series of real images of the last massacres that have happened

in our world: from 11-S to 11-M. It tells us about that new fascism, of fear, ofvictimsEverything

innocent.that we have not overcome. The message is our failure., in the absence of justice a

So"" film therapy "". Almost everyone knows the case of Salvador Puig Antic. On March 2, 1974, this young

militant of the Ibérica Liberation Movement (MIL), became the last political prisoner executed in

Spain. a through "" garrote vil "". The film tells his story and that of the desperate attempts of his family,

colleagues and lawyers to avoid his execution. The international paradigm of film therapy is, without

a doubt, in Argentina. In the Argentine cinema of the last twenty years we find key pieces. I'm going to name

four essential titles: THE OFFICIAL HISTORY (Luis Puenzo, 1985), THE NIGHT OF THE LAPICES (H���ctor

Olivera, 1986), GARAGE OLIMPO (Marco Bechis, 1999) and CR��� NICA OF A LEAK (Adri���n Caetano, 2006). With this type of

cinema outstanding accounts are made with executioners, assassins and savages. Making express such a complaint

requires focusing, without hesitation, on the victim, above all, person. It describes, in detail, the

humiliating and inhuman situations suffered, with greater or lesser luck in its outcome. A memory

rescued as the best antidote against oblivion. And in the most direct way, describing facts and not judgments, at

least explicit. Again I insist on the idea of ​​cinema as medicine to our miseries.is the

Wheredifference between the last Argentine cinema and ours? Simply in one: the elapsed time. Three decades

after the end of Franco's dictatorship, the first and, genuinely, film therapy appears. In Argentina,

two years after the fall of the military dictatorship (in 1983) with the Puenzo film, interpreted by Norma

Aleandro and H���ctor Alterio With SALVADOR outstanding accounts are settled in the Spanish cinema. It was not enough with metaphors

and author exercises. Better late than never. A necessary film. Catharsis.

" 1

" Absolutely unmissable film with images that must have made the American censors fall from the

chair

The Hills Have Eyes (2006) was defined by Richard Roeper (the second film critic most popular in the

United States) as "" an ugly piece of splatter-porn "". It's the kind of movie that your girlfriend leaves you with, the

kind of tape people refer to when they leave the multiplex, furious, saying "" but if I come to the movies

to have a good time "" . If this does not convince you to go see it, I do not know what can work, because without a doubt

we are facing the piece of terror of the year. The Frenchman Alexandre Aja not only has understood perfectly what

makes Wes Craven's original film great, but elevates that concept to unsuspected limits. At the

beginning, Aja displays the story by practically tracing a copy of Craven's original, following exactly

the same story line as a family suffering an "accident" in the hills of New Mexico and being attacked

by a horde of can���bal mutants. Among the subtle differences (apart from the geographic location and the

fact that on this occasion the accident is provoked) is the greater emphasis that is made in this occasion in the

origin of the mutants: the harmful effects of the radiation product of decades of atomic tests. However

, the similarities end at the moment when the Carter family is finally captured by their deformed

persecutors. The brutal attack is shown by Aja in all its splendor, without reserving a single detail, and the

abuse suffered by the Carter women at the hands of their attackers is, in my opinion, very difficult to endure,

especially one particular image that must have made the American censors fall off the chair. These

details are not free, since only showing the savagery of the mutants (which on this occasion, thanks

to the unparalleled work of Greg Nicotero and Howard Berger, seem really mutants, I mention ��n especially for the

new and spectacular Pluto, and that I forgive Michael Berryman) can Aja show what is undoubtedly thepoint

essential: the reaction of the family protagonist. After all (and here is where you can see the effectiveness of this

remake) what is really horrible about the film is not the suffering of those who die, but what happens with

those who survive , the bestiality that arises in those apparently shy beings who must choose between

dying and becoming authentic inhuman monsters. Aja wriggles and expresses this idea in the figure of the deceased

democrat that everyone laughed at and ends up becoming a bloodthirsty fierce and thirsty for

revenge, whose actions are to top it all with a typical music that makes one, as a public, not know

if the director is making a song or a critique of bestiality. It is curious, moreover, that this appears

with a somewhat patriotic profile (the American flag becomes here a cynical instrument of destruction).

This may be a pot-walk, but now that I know that Alexandre Aja's father is a remarkable politician

of French socialism, I'm not so sure. Another success Huge of this remake is what it refers to its

antagonists. The new mutants of The Hills have eyes, apart from their ugly ugliness, they are authentic

animals that have been almost completely devoid of dialogue (something that in my opinion to do the

original). In addition, their numbers are no longer limited to a family clan (although Billy Drago makes a great

Jupiter in a brief cameo) but his story extends to mythological levels. Logic in what for me is the best

sequence of the film: a visit to a ghost town inhabited by the race of canals and their offspring.

This, added to the agoraphobia that produces that immense and hot desert from which there is no possible way out, and that

tremendous final picture of the survivors, makes this a film absolutely unmissable. And I wonder:

what can Alexandre Aja do in the future? Whatever it is, it will have to be seen.

" 1

" More bad than bad. Another clear example that if Alfredo Landa had been an American he would have eight Oscars in

his house.

Buff, that I'm in an Iberian cinema, I think I need a couple of sessions of orcs and spaceships to

detoxify me. The film is about Jenaro, the preacher of a town in deep Spain andplayer

inveterateof pools. A good day, the surprise of the football day takes him from being the fool of the

town to Jenaro the 14th. So with the beret pierced by thread, part for the capital to charge the money.

But there he discovers how bad society is and that everyone wants to take advantage of him. I do not understand, with the

face of intellectual that this man has. Well, another clear example of our shabby cinema of the 70s. And there is

no where to take it. We can see it as the home version of "" The beauty and the beast "" or "" The ugly duckling "", given

that we find a lost loser, who from night to morning is the most popular man in the country. The

women who go to bed (to use an appropriate language) with him, to give the brag of their lives. In the

middle of the film we see something very obvious, "" Pretty Woman "" is not but a sequel adapted to thetimes

currentof this. A prostitute knows a millionaire who takes her out of the street and fills her with whims. Ja, I see

Alfredo Landa asking for image rights to Richar Gere. By the way, there are renowned collaborations, such as

������igo "" el del mustaote "" or Jaime de Mora y Arag���n. But it does not convince and it's boring. In addition, to make matters worse,

you can not see a breast or refill. This is not cinema casposo, it is the essence of dandruff. Resuming, more bad than

bad. Another clear example that if Alfredo Landa had been an American he would have eight Oscars in his house. A

caspita for the performance of Don Alfredo.Besitos.PD: "" Instead of continuous look is alternate look "", fine

patriotic humor.PD2: "" And that is a razor? men we use this "" says Jenaro unfolding the knife of Curro

Jim���nez.PD3: "" He has lost half a glasses "" he tells Jaime de Mora y Arag���n to see his monculo . Of course they will

shake and fall acorns "" iiiiiieeeeeepa, dispatch !!!! ""

" 0

" A real gem filmed with intelligence and passion The tape focuses its attention on a practice that every It has the largest number of followers: climbing and,

more specifically, speleology. The interior of a cave, a safe and familiar environment for fans of

this activity, becomes a claustrophobic microuniverse for those who are not: canyons, tunnels,caverns

undergroundof twisted tracing, which must be overcome with effort and ability to reach the other side

and return to see the light of day. Not to mention all kinds of animals, insects and alima���as that inhabit the

darkness, oblivious to human action. "" The Descent "" follows a group of six women who spend their free time

in an unconventional way, to add emotion to their normal and pleasurable lives. Their previous expedition was to

the r��� from a river, which ended in tragedy for one of them. And now, one year later, they

reconvene, this time to explore a little-known cavern system under the Appalachian Mountains, in the

United States. But things start to go bad when a landslide blocks the only way in / out.

Then they will have to master their panic, and their personal conflicts, to find another route. Which will not be

so easy when they discover that maybe they are not alone in the gloomytwo different parts in the

cavern. There aremovie. In the first half we meet the city girls who are looking for adventures in the caves of the

Appalachian mountains and accompany them in a relaxed first descent, which allows us to get to know each character better;

In the second part, the events become tragedy, the tension gives way to an accelerated and violent

survival horror in which "" something "" stalks deadly women. The great ability of the filmmaker is to treat

each stretch of the footage in a radically different way, maintaining the rhythm perfectly from beginning to end and

dosing the shocks and violence with success. The director and screenwriter Neil Marshall ("" Dog Soldiers "",

a remarkable debut feature in these days) has done an excellent job in both fields. His libretto

is composed of interesting characters and dynamic relationships, which the actresses transmit effortlessly

, showing us facets of their personalities without the need for excessive dialogues. Now, do notus

confuse, the film is far from original. In fact, it is not difficult to find in its entrails (and

never better said), traces of other jewels of the celluloid of terror, from the design of the creatures, inspired

in equal parts in the Nosferatu de Murnau and in the Gollum by Peter Jackson, until the whole show of

butcher's shop directly imported from the seventies gore of the great masters : Romero, Wes Craven or even Tobe

Hopper. What happens is that Neil Marshall orders and dynamizes all the hodgepodge of ideas, concepts and tributes,

in such a compact way that, the result, far from the postmodern aesthetic to which we areunfortunately

soaccustomed to, approaches its creation on the shores of the genre classicism. An atmosphere of authentic

infarction, a creepy makeup that proves that it f��� convinces more than the digital when it comes to

scare To the viewer, a disturbing sound treatment like few others, and even some but convincing

attempt to grant some psychological depth to the characters, complete the long list of virtues of "" The

Descent "", a film that, if they enjoy horror movies, do not get dizzy by donating blood and are tolerant of

overdrawings, they should be seen by law. We are in front of one of the best horror films

of many years, with surprises, scares, very well defined characters and an unforgettable ending. Visually

powerful and terrifying, it is a must-see for all fans of B-series horror movies made with

quality. A real gem shot with intelligence and passion.

" 1

" A "What is beautiful is living!", Much smaller, light and modern. We are facing a very typical and predictable film. Only to see the poster and say "" ���JA! I know how it

ends "". But the film is so well performed and interpreted, and it's so entertaining, that you end up importing

a bit. Well, it's not sooooo entertaining either, because if a fat stick has this movie it's its excessive

duration. Paran for what counts. It's two hours of "" aaaaaaaay that I have no pa 'com���eeeee !! "" and several misfortunes

that Will Smith and his mini-bold-cool MTV have to endure. As they say in the esteemed website Las Horas

Perdidas, it is the 'Terminator 2' of the Kleenex films. At times it becomes eternal and in others very light, a

very rare thing. But that is the only snag. Everything else is a joy. And Will Smith is huge, hisnomination

Oscaris more than deserved, and the rest of the cast, including his son, is a dignified height. �sima.Un "Whatbeautiful to

islive!", Much smaller, light and modern. The original version (as with all movies, butIs mandatory

good.).

" 1

" The first was a kind of kitsch movie, playful and cheerful, which came to an approved scraping for

its naivety, rhythm and grace, like a catchy pop radio song. This new sample of the Fantastic 4 with

Silver Surfer, nor becomes just a good guitar riff.

The expectation was not really much. The first was a kind of kitsch movie, playful and cheerful, that

came to an approved scraping for its naivety, rhythm and grace, like a catchy pop radio song. This

new show of the Fantastic 4 with Silver Surfer, not even be a good guitar riff.scene

Another danceat the beginning (as in the ill-fated Spiderman 3, it seems that the dances do not go with the superheroes ) and an

anticlimitical intro about the relationship Reed-Sue, anticipates that we are facing a problem of rhythm and gui���n. The

same cast class B of the first part, does what it can with a guo���o gui���o, which leaves no room for big

surprises. With the spirit of a chapter of any series of science fiction of the seventies. Too little

compared to the existential (and richer) problems of fellow comics such as Batman andhimself.

SpidermanEverything as artificial as clear contact lenses and Jessica Alba's blond hair, like Julian

McMahon as the Dr. Doom (again this time) and the eternal cameo of Stan Lee in all marvelita.Marvel project

has a gallery of great characters untapped in the movies, all of them with excellent personality:

Punisher, Daredevil, Ghost Ryder, Elektra, Hulk, these same Fantastic 4 and now Silver Surfer. Films that

disappoint by their lack of depth in the psyches of the heroes. If it were not for Raimi and his Spider-Man, Blade

2 and some X-Men, Marvel would have to give himself up already. defeated. Although we are not naive and we know that what is sent

here is the box office and not the sound quality. If it were not for the digital Silver Surfer (powerful character if

there are any) we would be talking about a unhappy movie. But Silver is. Even if it's just that.

" 0

" Nothing that we have not seen before hundreds of times, and although originality does not have to be the

main strength of any film, at this point it is already a bit tiresome and repetitive .

The overwhelming delay with which Wolf Creek (2005) has arrived on the Spanish card has served, among other

things, to raise expectations about what was initially defined as one of the the most

outstanding horror films of recent years, a jewel from Australia that promised to be one of thepieces

wildestof survival horror, with scenes supposedly so "strong" that it was forbidden by law to

show them in their advertising material. All that apparently has gone to hell, because the truth is that this

first long of the Australian Greg Mclean is finally between the mÃ © stpico and seen that we have fallen. The good

job with which many of his sequences are shot makes it stand out a bit from the mound, but not

enough to justify all the praises that have fallen on him even before his premiere. Pertaining

to the increasingly defined sub-genre of the "dead" tourists, "Wolf Creek tracks three young

backpackers lost in Australia's endless grasslands and dams of the madness of a psychopath who has

decided to use them as a piece of home, nothing that we have not seen before hundreds of times, and although originality

does not have to be the main strength of any movie. At this point, it is already a bit tiresome and

repetitive. What differentiates this tape from Mclean is the fact that we have a prologue of almost

forty minutes in which literally nothing happens, and we only see the three youngsters behave like

authentic garrulos and gloating in their bland love triangle. The creation of an environment would not have a

single problem if at least this one was dedicated to building some tension, but almost none of this

first half has something to do with what we see afterwards. In fact, the moment in which the killer finally

appears marks a total break with the rest of the film and almost makes us believe that we are watching another movie

instead of the soporifera indie road movie from before. From here we witness how (once again) a young

director tries to emulate The Texas Chainsaw Massacre (1974) so ​​as not to leave so gracefully (by the way, the

comparisons with the film Tobe Hooper's films are no whim, they are more than obvious). It is during this

"second part" that Wolf Creek gets his most interesting moments. Having only three

protagonists, the story is forced by balls to give some relevance to each of them, which is at

least appreciated the absence of cheap resource according to which several members of the cast are there only

as meat to gut. The plot is jumping from one character to another and, although it seems that at times it is

a particular character as a hero of the action, very soon it is responsible for varying the point of

view to avoid leave this so clear. The other point to consider is the presence of the veteran actor of the

Australian television John Jarratt (who has returned to work with Mclean in his new film), without a doubt the

acting engine of the film and that here �� is that it overflows in its role of the most usual and endearingclichÃ

Australianof all time, with touches of humor capable of pulling a smile even in the

moments of These two details, however, are the only ones that have captivated me in the film,

since everything else is the same story always told of the Same way as always, and nothing

justifies the disproportionate compliments he has received. Maybe if it had been released about ten years ago it

would have had a better evaluation, but in these times when each horror film aspires to be more

beast that the previous one and types like Alexandre Aja, Rob Zombie, Eli Roth or Neil Marshall are the names that most

sound in this genre, a film like the one that touches us today is little less what redundant, and remarkable

Only for not coming from the Hollywood circuit. Still, its almost unbearable prologue, the blatant

exploitation of the mania and demag���gica phrase of "" based on real events "" and the one that falls foolishly in the same

clichés of the slasher and parodied to exhaustion (how will the victim make sure that the murderer is

really dead? ���ndo?) Subtract many integers. And it is that a change of accent in the actors and the joke

about Crocodile Dundee are not enough to enthrone this when a lot of effort called Wolf Creek.

" 0

" Transformers is an acceptable action film, which despite its failures will delight

lovers of this genre.

There are some people who are sin��� success, and in Hollywood nobody discusses the ability to attract the public

that have both Michael Bay and Steven Spielberg. Both have made some of the biggest bells of

recent years, and their first collaboration promises to burst the box offices of half the world. So confident are they of

the good results of Transformers, that even before being released, its sequel is already announced. The

Autobots and the Decepticons have been waging a civil war for millennia, and both groups are looking for the Cube, a

artifact of unimaginable power. Thousands of years ago, the Cube crashed on Earth, and now the only

hope for humanity resides in Sam Witwicky (Shia LaBeouf), who holds the key to finding the artifact.

The most curious thing about Transformers is that when it comes to a film about transformers, worth the

redundancy, they have so little prominence in it. Themuch more important and minutes on screen

characters of the American soldiers, for example, are. And it's not because of creating any diplomatic conflict with the

United States, but the film exhales a cheap jesting whistle that throws its back. And we do not want to delve

further into the wound, but what a coincidence that these coincidences happen, in most countries it

opens on July 4, which In case anyone does not know, it's the national holiday of the United States. Let's be honest,

the script is not exactly a marvel of cinematic prose; is full of the typicalplaces

common, incongruities and crude jokes, as usual in an action film, come on. The film takeslong

atime to start, the first forty minutes are nothing but a tedious introduction that somesoul

charitablemust cut in the editing room. It seems as if that first part of the film was a mere

excuse for Michael Bay to recreate himself in the figure and curves of Megan Fox's heart attack. Maybe it's not

clear enough what kind of public he's going directed the film. Once theenter the scene

transformers, the panorama changes radically. And Michael Bay can be criticized for many things,

but we must recognize that he is a great director of action stories. While it is true that there are some

sequences in which it seems to be more pending to look for impossible planes than to make a coherent narrative

and to show the public in an appropriate way the action that develops. The transformers are very well

achieved, thanks to an excellent work of the team of visual effects. Transformers is an acceptable film

of action, that in spite of its failures will make the delights of lovers of this genre. The best advice you

can give when it comes to watching Michael Bay's new work is that you do not have to take it very seriously. If not, the

exasperating start-up and the continuous failures and incongruities of the script would traumatize anyone.

" 0

" Life and death are never as particularly represented as when Tim Burton does it,

granting him a spermatic treatment, criticizing today's society.

Return to a world apart, the world of Tim Burton where he directs with Mike Johnson the new delivery of this

universe of his own, where the dead are not so much and the living do not seem to be it. Tim Burton continues with his

aforementioned own universe, in the line of nightmare before Christmas, recreating now an old Russian legend,

that fits perfectly in that obsessive style to look for refined and impossible forms within that

characteristic atmosphere sombre Fantasay phantasmagoric, that already showed us in works like Bitelchus or Eduardo Manos

Tijeras, but away from the colorism of some of his latest works such as Big Fish or Charlie and theFactory.For

Chocolatethe recreation of this Russian legend Burton uses a previously used technique such as

stop-motion, for the creation of the characters and the story has served as a great team of animators,

including two Catalan brothers s, the Grangel brothers who have managed to make their

creations looklike their benders, among which are Johnny Deep who puts the

a lotvoice to Vctor Van Dort, Helena Bonham Carter who gives the voice to The Bride cad ���ver, and Emily Watson to Victoria

Everglot, endowing their respective characters with their own lives. In this legend, Van Dort Family Victor,

rich but without cach��� and Victoria of the Everglot family arist� ��cracked ruined, are two young people belonging to

the Victorian era who are going to marry without having met before, is a marriage for convenience

but fast spark arises between the two, in the trial of the wedding V���ctor is not able to pronounce his vows,

so he dies of fear and rushes out and practicing in a dark forest fits the ring on an old

branch that turns out to be the finger of a deceased woman, dead in the ���a of your wedding, dragged along the world of the

dead, making his fiancee wait desolate in the world of life and death vivos.La neverestn so

represented asparticularly when it is put Tim Burton, concedindole treatment esperp���ntico,

criticizing the current society. In this new film two worlds are proposed to us the world of the living and

the world of the dead. The world of the living distils hypocrisy, conventions and interests, which causes

a sad society that is dull and without any color, while the world of the dead is simpler,

giving importance to the feelings of their inhabitants watching for their happiness, which provokes aworld

colorful, spontaneous and sincere fun, proof of this is the warmth with which they receive the new

guests. Intelligent use of the music and the songs included in the film, having the exact time

and without getting tired, are in their right measure. Splendid film that catches you with all its tenderness and

spontaneity, making you feel part of the journey of its protagonists towards the achievement of their love,

providing exquisite touches of love and nostalgia that enchant their fabulous staging.

" 1

" These times of reconversion of political ideals require that a film like

Schindler's List exist for life to triumph.

The experience of one generation is not transmissible to any other: the details are transmitted, the symbols,

but History does not regenerate, it is integrated, corrected, so that the future learns from its mistakes and allow

a hope. It could be reflection serve as a starting point to understand a film like ���sta.El

cinema is not a silent witness of History: it is History, inventory of fashions and cultures, of ethnic groups and of

religions. Schindler's List is a formidable film and it is a page from a history book. The

spectator is taken away from his ambiguity: he is commanded to take a stand and the images area

suchbrutal simplicity that thereno escapatoria.Oskar Schindler (Liam Neeson) is opposed to the Nazis hiring

Jews as saving his life. This is, very succinctly, the storyline of the film, but there is more.

There is the horror of war portrayed as seldom: with cold objectivity, with demolishing grays, with

absolute asepsis. Spielberg wants not to involve his eye in what he films: he limits himself to framing, to moving the

camera where the action requires it, but he does not allow himself to be contaminated by what he sees, which is (I insist ) the

stupidity of man, the fear of man, the war that man interposes between his happiness and his

destiny. These times of reconversion of political ideals require that a film such aslist

Schindler'sexists so that life triumphs, and what I just wrote is not a sentence ofphrasebook

rimbonbantes: it is the most efficient way to express the feeling that remains in the soul after that we have

seen his exciting plot. Schindler's List is a song to life from the absence of life. Apoem poem

three-with rogue rhyme in the pairs and pain in the odd. Count Oskar Schindler in a scene of

bombastic tenebrism to the Nazi office at the helm of the Field how power is recognized by the benevolence and

flexibility of whoever exercises it. He tells him that the accused knows himself dead before the execution and that he recognizes the master

because of the possibility that he has to resuscitate him or to postpone his death. On this conception of authority,

in times of war, Spielberg erects a monument of tenderness and crying with a black and white (

ignored only in the flame of the beginning and end of the film) exquisite, precise , beautiful to the absence of

words that can express it. The very genuine system of American life, so friendly to veer to one side or another

of prudence and justice, commits from time to time the peccadillo of pampering movies like this: beacon

of light that should illuminate the blindness of man, prayed in a publicity of the time of its premiere.Ben Kingsley

and Liam Neeson, even protagonists, do not carry the weight of the film, despite Den that their dramatic capacity is up

to the very serious circumstances they represent. There are no actors: the character erases the actor.

Spielberg left behind his childhood myths (the alien, the hero with a beetle, Peter Pan, the dinosaurs) and he

made an account with History. His recent Munich can not be contemplated from all this perspective, although it

has undeniable similarities with Schindler's List.Curiosities in the film: 1.- Acustom

Jewishis to deposit a stone in the grave of a loved one. The eternal thanks. At the end of the

film, you see how a procession of Jews is leaving stones in Schindler's tomb. They are the Jews whohimself.2

were saved in real life by SchindlerSteven Spielberg could not get permission to

sign inside Auschwitz, so the scenes of the extermination camp were actually shot in a scenario

that pretended to be an exact copy of here.3.- The script of the film went through the hands of Martin Scorsese, who

was ech�� � back because of their Jewish ancestry and not knowing if they would undertake the company with sufficient

objectivity.4.- Tom Hanks and Kevin Costner also aspired to be Oskar Schindler , but Spielberg allowed the

most novice and least known Liam Neeson to play the role of his life. We do not have here the best Nazi movie or

the best film about The Holocaust: it is one of the best films of recent years and, without a doubt, the best

(in my opinion) of Steven Spielberg. And the most adapted soundtrack (along with that of Michaelpiano

Nyman's) to the object that orchestrated. John Williams is, no doubt, a teacher.

" 1

" Essential movie about overcoming, respect for elders, tenacity and other values ​​quite

forgotten by society. It may seem a little pastel, but at the time it certainly marked a generation.

There are many people who say that television is crap and that they never give interesting programs. I do not think

so, although it is true that the amount of ads makes me think long before

venturing to see a movie on TV. There are good programs and many times we can see films that are already out of

order from all the sites. And one of these was Karate Kid, who at Christmas took me to the little one, and

what was on his roll, I saw Larusso for the longest time and to the Miyagi giving wax and polishing wax. Yes,

the final scene saw her acquiring knowledge to defend herself in the nursery. The film is about aboy

teenagewho moves to a new city with his mother. Total, that in its eagerness to make friends it approaches

the most beautiful girl in the area. Of course, this is already being courted by the coolest pimp in the

town, who coincidentally is a bloodthirsty teenage karateka, with which his back is tanned. In these,

when poor Daniel is about to collapse, he discovers that the waiter of the tasks of where he lives (he is not

less than 60 years old) knows something about karate, so he starts teaching. ��anzas, without much faith. What am I going to tell you about

a movie that you have re-made a thousand times? Well many things. To begin with, regardless of the

quality of it, it created a very interesting trend and that many other titles have followed. The films

of the cut of "" new boy approaches bad girl, this curte and the new one has to fight against all to

achieve the girl and save the skin "". On the other hand, this film caused a great impact on our

teenage lives, who has not said a word, dala cela? Or who has not repeated to the nausea the gesture of

the heron with disparate results? There are many things for a single film. Resuming, essential film

about overcoming, respect for elders, tenacity and other values ​​quite forgotten by society. It may

seem like a little cake, but at the time it certainly marked a generation. Moments to remember: When

Miyagi explains to Daniel San, in front of a huge row of cars, the concept "" give wax - polish wax "" When after

leaving the floor nickel house, explains to him that it has served all.Miyagi curti���ndoles the back of the

Cobras. "" Knee " "indicates the bad teacher. The healing that Miyagi does to Daniel. The kick of the crane in

the final scene.

" 1

" If you have insomnia problems go to your doctor to prescribe itNew and unnecessary adaptation to the cinema of the famous Dickens novel. He already did in his day, among others,

David Lean and now it's the turn of Roman Polanski. The truth is that the good of Roman has nothing new to

offer us, and David's work is eaten in almost all aspects. The film, in general lines, is

disappointing. Here there is no trace of the first Polanski that astounded with works such as "" El

Quim���rico Tenant "" or "" The Dance of the Vampires "". We can not even glimpse any detail that reminds us

of the Oscar-winning "" El Pianista "". "" Oliver Twist "" stands out as simply one of the director's minor films.

Adaptation is really faithful, and the formal and technical aspect is, without a doubt, faultless. The

photograph, at first precious and then electric, is of a great level. As well as the ambience, the

sets, the set, the costumes and the music. There is nothing to object to about it. But the problem comes when

confronting the story and the way of telling it. The narrative is excessively repetitive, cold and

aseptic. The story gives the sensation of being told in an absurd and almost ridiculous way, with nothing that catches our

attention and with a lack of claw that is too evident. There is nothing that makes us part of the story of

Oliver Twist, and any effort to move remains in the attempt. The truth is that, due to the memory that

the book offers, we see that Oliver is a child. Io (one of many) immersed in poverty and has to

face the hypocrisy of the wealth of London of that time. A child that they force to steal against their

own will, out of sheer need. But also a child who lives in his own flesh betrayal,

trust in friendship and forgiveness. A forgiveness that he, in spite of everything, will offer. And that's where we

woke up. There is only one scene that stands out, that is able to take us out of the absolute doldrums, and,

curiously, that scene coincides with the end of the film. Very significant. In the cast. one of lime and

one of sand. Ben Kingsley is dazzling, but Barney Clark, the boy who plays Oliver, remains for

most of the footage too stiff. It does not help, precisely, to transmit and, therefore, to get closer to your

situation. The film is safe, it does not risk anything, and, therefore, it does its job well. But, being

too correct, it does not stand out at all. Everything is too typical, predictable, flat and bland. In

short, Polanski does not meet expectations and disappoints. Create an irrelevant work that has nothing to do

with other adaptations, such as the aforementioned by David Lean or the musical by Reed, or with other films of his

own filmography. I do not think anyone loses the dream Or if he runs out of sight. It is more, if someone hasproblems

insomnia, go to your doctor to be prescribed.

" 0

" In the film itself we witness the process of creating the same script, it is an impressively well-script

tiedand built in a very intelligent way.

Adaptation is directed by Spike Jonze, but the real star of this film is the screenwriter, something

unusual, but it is not any screenwriter, it is Charlie Kaufman, screenwriter known for films like

Forget about M���, Like Being John Malkovich or Human Nature, all of them uniquely original. Kaufman was

commissioned to make an adaptation of the book "" The Orchid Ladder deas "", and from then on the film begins, we see

all the difficulties it goes through to make that script, until it decides to ask for help from its brother, and it

includes � He himself and the aforementioned brother in the gui���n, then, we see him narrating the beginning of the film,

which has been the beginning of the film that we are seeing, so � that we see him write the script of the film

that we are seeing and it is a real madness !!! There lies the genius of this film. This is much more than cinema

in the cinema, it is an impressive turn of the screw, it impresses with the ability it has to tell the

different stories: that of Kaufman and his brother writing the script, that of the writer Susan Orlean

writing the book and that of John Laroche that is the account the writer in his book, could have been a

real gossip , but it manages to keep the viewer from getting lost. Nicholas Cage does his best performance since

Leaving Las Vegas, playing Charlie Kaufman and Donald Kaufman, his brother, they are two opposite characters,

and it should not be anything f��� easy to play two characters so different in the same movie, sorry that Cage is

dedicated to make films as interesting as the ghost biker or other action movies. nfcilmente

olvidables.Meryl Streep is always great, and here is no less, playing writer Susan Orlean,

whose character takes a turn along with the story, from being a writerlove with flowers, to be a

adltera, murders and drug addict! It seems that the author found it very original as they had adapted their book and it

did not bother her at all to present it in this way because all this did not happen in reality. Chris Cooper,

that he took an Oscar for this performance, he's also quite a good actor and he usually chooses thevery well

films he works, in American Beauty he was really impressive, here he interprets the Ladder of

Orchids that gives title to the book, a character, according to my very interesting opinion and that is much better understood

when explaining certain aspects of his past. It is a real privilege to get into the mind of Charlie

Kaufman and be able to attend to his ramblings and thoughts when faced with a gui���n. And what to say about the script?

In the film itself we witness the process of creating the same script, it is a script that is impressively well

tied and built in a very intelligent way.

" 1

" An outstanding story about the bitterness of forced solitude, an interesting confrontation rich in

nuances? between two types of morals and a curious point of view about relationships understood as aobject

precise, and coveted therefore, to fill the emotional void.

The inflexible professor Barbara Covett (an exceptional Judi Dench) portrays herself when she opens the film

with one of her terrible annotations in her diary of summary judgments about everything she observes. While he

looks with disdain at the entrance of the teenagers to the classes, his stern voice-over, disseminated throughout the

footage, comments as it is now the custom to requisition white or cocaine weapons among the students, when

years the most that came was cigarettes or pornographic magazines. "And that's what they call

evolution", rivets the sarcastic voice of this teacher back from everything she predicts, for the future of her

students, a black oscillating panorama between unemployment and terrorism His lonely life has become a

grudge and bitterness to those who gives free rein when, pen in hand, raises minutes of the mediocrities of the

lives of others. But his opportunity to get out of his isolation will come with the incorporation of Sheba Hart

(great Cate Blanchett) to the faculty of his conservative center. She, and the breath of fresh air she

seems to represent, will also go through Barbara's relentless filter. She describes her as a bourgeoisie of easy life

, morally dissolute and indecorously frank about her private life., the transparent Sheba will

Neverthelesscome to captivate Barbara. Little by little, the veteran teacher will see in her innocent ward an opportunity to

get out of her social seclusion, to find a confidant that, with time and her weak management, can

attract to the fold of a deeper relationship than mere friendship. At this point in the film,character

Barbara'sbecomes more and more terrifyingly manipulative to the point of approaching the film (a slip

that, if consummated, would have diminished the credibility of the story) psicothriller terrains. With these wicks

, Diary of a Scene, an adaptation of Zo popular Heller's popular homonymous novel scripted by

Patrick Marber (Closer), offers an outstanding story about the bitterness of forced solitude, an interesting

confrontation? rich in nuances? between two types of morals and a curious point of view about relationships

understood as a precise object, and coveted therefore, to fill the emotional void.

" 1

" It is worth nothing to take so much care of that design, if you forget the most important thing; Take care of your story and give it

a minimum cinematic interest. Slow and eternal. In short, a waste of 24 million euros, to

achieve very little.

has supposed me the viewing of what wasto be the great saving production of Spanish cinema

So much sopordestined, "" Alatriste. "" Also, drowsiness, numbness, heaviness, lethargy, Boredom, boredom or boredom, as you

want to call it. And it was not something personal, judging by the opinions and faces of the rest of the spectators at the

exit of the projection. What there is no doubt, is that "Alatriste" is a superproduction n. One of the few

that dares to do Spanish cinema. And on this occasion, given the formal invoice, we could think that finally,

our cinema, had achieved what it had never done; approaching Hollywood with a film of adventure and

action, without skimping on expenses, with an international protagonist and an ambitious production.

Because, as far as production design is concerned refers, "" Alatriste "" has nothing to envy to the American superproductions, or

without crossing the pond, to the French, who also take great care of the visual aspect

in their works m�� �s caras.El seventeenth century Spanish, is magnificently recreated in "" Alatriste "". His scenarios,

locations, his costume design, that Madrid of the Golden Age, coat and sword, with the valid of the

kings and the monarchs themselves. All this is the best of "" Alatriste "" and the only thing that represents an advance for Spanish cinema.

But that is not enough. It is worth nothing to take so much care of that design, to dress the film with a

plasticity typical of a Vel dezquez painting, if you forget the most important thing; Take care of your story and give it

a minimum cinematic interest. "Alatriste" is excellent in the formal, but simply null in the

background, with what ends up being a resounding failure, a disappointment and a sovereign boredom. The

director of the event is Agust� ���n D���az Yanes, "" Tano "" for friends, a director who stayed on promise.

Pleasantly surprised with "" Nobody will talk about us when we are dead "" but evidenced serious doubts about his

talent in the unclassifiable "" Without news of God "" in which, the best was the song ���n Bob Dylan that opened

the initial titles. In "" Alatriste "", D���az Yanes is unable to provide a narrative coherence to the film. It

does more than wander. It presents sequences, characters and contexts and closes them, so as not to open them again. Then he

does the same. And in this way the time is running, without having told anything in particular. There is an

alarming lack of storyline. It gives the feeling that Yanes (director, and at the same time, scriptwriter of the event)

just wanted to make a fresco of the XVII Century and not transfer the stories of P���rez Reverte to acontext

cinematographic. ��fico, which is what is missing in this work. The spectator of "" Alatriste "" wait "for

2 hours and 20 minutes that the action appears, that the adventures arise, which after all, is the expected

of a superproduction of this style. I'm still waiting. And now let's analyze the actors? That's another

story. All the clothes are great, but only Javier C���mara as the Count Duque de Olivares and

Juan Echanove, like Quevedo, are able to take advantage of them. His, are the best interpretations of the

tape. Something difficult to achieve in a film in which your director tries to make you appear as soon

as you make yourself disappear. An important galimat���as of characters come together in "" Alatriste "" It is true that all

belonged to that time. But? Will they all be necessary? Does anything contribute to the development of the Fraystory

Emilio Bocanegra? And was it necessary to make poor Blanca Portillo shave her hair and play a

man? Hardly appears endos sequences. Eduardo Noriega? Has anyone told you that he is not a good actor? What does not

transmit anything? ��� He painted something fairly transcendental, his character, the Count of Guadalmedina,

better not to mention Ariadna Gil, whom I have always considered "an inexpressive concrete block" ". Antonio

Dechent and Eduard Fern�� �ndez, save your little papers. Pilar L���pez de Ayala has two sentences. And Enrico Lo

Verso, is the closest thing to a villain in this movie. Not to mention the romantic relationship between

I���igo Balboa and Ang���lica. Abrupt, nothing cre���ble. Why is she so bad? It gives me the sensation that the

moments when both have fallen in love and have shared moments together, have remained in the editing room.

Yes, D���az Yanes puts you two seconds of each of these mutilated sequences so you know that between both

court and swordsmen walk the two enamored pipiolos. Regrettable. And as for Viggo Mortensen, a good

actor as well demonstrated in "" A History of Violence "" and a magnificent hero of adventure ("" The Lord of the

rings "") is, in appearance, a perfect Diego Alatriste. But his forced Spanish, at times incomprehensible,

nullifies all his good work in the composition of the character. "" Alatriste "" is a superproduction without ,pica, without

adventures, with multitude of unnecessary sequences, of zero contribution to the plot development. With badlycharacters

treated. And few action scenes. Slow and eternal. In short, a waste of 24 million euros, to

achieve very little. The Spanish superproduction is a light years away from the worst of theblockbusters. A lot of

Americanhype is being given to "Alatriste" (there are a lot of people involved to share the cake) something

that in the short term, will be counterproductive for Spanish cinema. The one that is presumed as a possible hope

for our cinema, is but another sign of the deep creative crisis in which our country is. A

frankly disappointing tape. The most disappointing Spanish cinema.

" 0

" I was about to fall asleep, and I swear I was afraid that the extraterrestrial creature would invade my drowsiness and end up

waking me up completely. However, I have seen much worse, of course. And when there is a dream, it is not worth the trumpeter

of Haydn nor the direct of Ac / Dc.

Perhaps (I say only perhaps) the cultured science-fiction, with intellectual depth and mythological

needs, requires a low budget, a B-series profile and, above all, a complete treatment disconnected from the

pigeon-hole cinema, of cars that make spinning tops on a banana shell and post alien aliens, who invade

like those who do not want the thing and, in a few days They dominate the planet Earth and even have shares in Dow-Jones and

eat hamburgers with Coca-Cola at the exit of a movie theater. The pandemic that sneak into us is, in reality, the

mirror in which man must look at himself, once the twentieth century has closed its death toll, itsaccount

injusticeand its inventory of wars, guerrillas, riots and cultural suicides of varied fur and

formidable propaganda. I say that this version of Thieves of bodies (Don Siegel, 1956) remains, does not contribute anything. And

this strictly personal appreciation (like all the reports by this chronicler of his vices) does not inform

that the film is bad or mediocre. I will not even risk expressing that, at times, he kept my attention

and made me enjoy my seat. Everyone knows that illusions are marked cards and there is always

a timid bastard with the face of an incendiary p queker who discovers the trick and puts you in evidence in front of the

mob of thugs. From there to the alley and the alley to the hospital or to the sky. I do not think we deserve

hell for riding, head inside, a booklet different from that offered by life. Writing (and writing

about film still more) is a tiresome enterprise, which rarely compensates, but which provides thewho

perpetratorperpetrates unspeakable joys, jimbles the size of the head of Charles Laughton. Nor should we go for

those branches that we like so much. Let's go back to the body thieves: Invasi���n is a tape with pretensions. The

producers (Joe Silver to the anguished head) pulled Oliver Hirschbiegel - reputed, very reputed, after the

convincing and devastating biography of the last days of Hitler called the sinking -. They thought that it would

impregnate the project of that intellectual air so useful to convert commercial products intoproducts

cult. Marrado: they put too many opinions in a simple story in excess. There has been a hybrid between

thriller without a shaft and art cinema and rehearsal with the spit of open inspiration. The message: man is a

wolf for man. The aliens, the invading bodies, bring a kind of nirvana in which there are no

enlightened, or disturbed, or heterodox, or memos, or geniuses: all clustered around anconcept

univocalof sentimentality, all abalconados to the decontaminated air. And here it is that the heroine Kidman,

neat in her role of courage mother, does not embrace the speech of the invading bug and goes through streets and squares,

laboratories and supermarkets, to find her son and, on the way, save the world. In this case, I'm sorry,

there are no cheerleaders, but that's another movie and tonight it's Invasion. I'm not going to be the one to give the lecture

about the benefits of science fiction when it comes to witnessing the fragility of a society, but we must

admit that the film fulfills that function with an honorary registration. We have the impression that they areus

sellinga documentary about the dangers of technology or the excessive moral apathy that plagues our

consciences. Mine, at the moment, is safe, well entrenched in my laptop, listening to music by Bill Evans

and delaying a long drink (that was said before ) while outside the streets do not exhibit any sign of an

extraterrestrial threat, but let's focus again. Invasion: the argument is an action of some gui���n hired

at the last hour and, apparently, poorly paid. Ah��� is where the individual, lacking in narrative ingenuity, but plenty

of business malice, has sprinkled the body of history with poison. There is more of an inconsistency and there are

more than two dramatic gaps that leave the viewer out of the game, if he has ever

really felt part of the game. of entertainment. Not to burst the possibility that the kind reader gave

him an opportunity, it is not a matter of giving any brushstroke, even a slight one, about the end, but it is very difficult for me

, really, to shut up and not gloat in arguing with hairs, drool and viscous bodies ofspace

outerthe botched end they have mounted. I swear that until that end I was reasonably happy. Inot

didexpect much, so the disappointment was not going to be symphonic. Not even operatic. But the end came and with it

the relief of the abandonment of the room - which was, for others, empty: I saw the film with my wife, it is already ��� - and the

certainty that these Hollywood people get into swampy land and then have no exit and end up with

mud even at the very tip of work pride. It's a saying. Now one can understand that the scriptwriters of

the Mecca of Cinema have gone on strike. Or I do not understand it at all. At this point, it is better to understand

little and let yourself be carried exclusively by the sensations. Moms, in this obvious remake of the stupendous

Original Body Thieves, which deserves a separate critique, are easily accommodated in the box of

failed experiences. There are so many. Last night, without going any further, I sat in my favorite chair with the legitimate

pretense of watching an entertaining television and gast�� time. � Almost an hour of my life in contemplating slop. Another

experience failed. Not even the invention of DTT, which has just entered my town, compensates me for the beating of

outrages that means to keep entertained in front of a television set. That's why movie theaters are a refuge and a

warm maternal womb for those wounded by the sweetness of the always loved frame. I am afraid that I have left a

harsh review, without the usual technical deployment. It will be that a strange body has slipped through me andfall

waits for me toasleep to become one of them. Even so, my criticisms are cold and hallucinated. By

the influence of the galaxies and blessed quosars. The history of collective fears told here badly

convinces: it joins the inertia of having already seen similar messages in very identical tapes and then the

effort is less. Both the one who makes the film and the one who contemplates it.

" 0

" The pity is that such an educational film (I have at least learned that to cut someone's head it

is necessary to give him three axes in the neck) to remain in an irrepressible succession of t� Absurd tips.

The truth is that the idea was slightly interesting. If we already saw nocturnal creatures terrorize Riddick

by ending up landing on the wrong planet, that is, one of those that when they turn around they go completely

dark and the anthropophagous bugs come out to eat, yes It was a matter of time before anyone

realized that our Nordic countries can also be great for these situations of invasions of

various monsters, in this case ���pteros of the worst kind, of those that when they bite you or tear you half a

neck or you become one of them with teeth that cry out to go to the dentist. The pity is that such an

educational film (I have at least learned that to cut someone's head it is necessary to give him three

axes in the neck) to remain in an irrepressible succession of absurd topics. I do not know the comic on which

the film is based, I have not read it and I do not know if it is as incoherent as the film itself but if they dare to

plan such a corny and at the same unlikely end Tampocomil is not among my absolute priorities either. Not to

mention that for narrative issues the vampire can attack in a nanosecond or move slower down

the street (only this case will occur if the guy who wants to attack is the leading and leads the ready ax). Not only

the little cre���ble end if not the rest of the pieces of the puzzle, starting with Josh Harnett, ex ��� dolo of

young girls and stale actor where there are, that possibly has decided to remove the title of worst actor in

history to Ben Affleck imitating all his bad moves; the rest of the cast and in some cases the

dialogues more typical of a comedy than of a pseudo-gore horror movie like the one we are dealing with. Of course, it is

not advisable at all.

" 0

" Disturbed vision of the deep America, not overly inspired, but sincere. He is foreseeable, he

lets himself be carried away by reasonings already learned in lots of similar films. Video store resource forafternoon

rainyat home. That is something.

A disastrous childhood can mark a whole life. Sigmund Freud said it and they tried it on their own meats

Maculey Culkin and Drew Barrymore, Joselito and a friend of mine who, still in his thirties, has not seen the

light of good sense and the glowing little bulbs of sanity. Killing America rests its disturbed breath

on this evidence of psychology manual. The story of the two brothers who fatigue secondary roads

with the perseverance of the greedy psychopath of corpses is contaminated by a story of a nihilist position more than

evident, but we are not faced with any No treatise on human behavior or Douglas Sirk is behind the

camera. These times of relativism and moral turmoil allow revisions of classic patterns filled with

the simple, obvious and legitimate way of making cash while the staff is scandalized. I very much doubt that

Killing America is a profitable experiment. It is a temperamental road movie, a quality telefilm programmable

at night, safe from prudish minds or flimsy constitution spirits, and not because the casket

of its content offends or affiliates with boldness to gore so fashionable but because they are taken for granted, for

acquaintances, for accepted, ways of living and behaviors that are not sufficiently justified. The

violence that the brothers protagonists do not argue with enough weight. The flood of dead people who are

throwing the footage is unhinged at a point where we are no longer affected by another body or the way in which the

murderers get rid of the evidence and the feeling of guilt. There is not. Hard, to his benefit, little: seventy

minutes well taken. Cansa, against him, the stubborn collection of disasters that pearl those (few) minutes.

The pilgrimage to the nirvana of redemption has, in the final section, an ethereal descent, an incursion into

the epidermis of love, but even love acquires macabre letters and we attend, between amazement and

indifference, in equal parts, to the spectacle made in the USA of the decline of his empire. Or is not that what the title

implies? I do not have them very clear: it seems to me that one always remains half. With desire to have

seen more and with desire of not that this feint of premeditatedly avant-garde cinema ends, we stopped the player

(yes, it has been a domestic session caught of video store) and Let's go out for a walk.

" 0

" An excuse of 4 types to get lost on a motorbike for the more garrulous American. With a more than curious presentation of characters, we went, somewhat surprised and excepted to this

meeting of old glories, where Travolta, Tim Allen and William H. Macy, look like the parents of Martin Lawrence,

perhaps the "" youngest "" of the 4 protagonists of this, a tribute to the current cinema, where you play over and over again

with the typical topics, which sometimes get tired, angry and bored to the staff. And it seems

that for a while now, it is fruitful. ��fero (at the box office), that of honoring and remembering genres, although

this film seems more the excuse of the 4 actors to shop around the States, than a gui� ��nsllido of

a comedy. With a soundtrack full of successes, and is that, a tape of these characteristics without

known music would be a disappointment, s i is that it is not already, by the way, curious the deep American American, with its

competitions of chile, its Madrid and its stick Sheriff. And where actors like Ray Liotta or the winner appear besides

of a curious Oscar, I mean Marisa Tomei ��� For this girl do not spend the years? It is clear that the film will not

go to the history of cinema, but if it has achieved that these 4 almost " "grandparents" "have a great time at the expense

of filming the tape. PD: Travolta pulls his hair?

" 0

" If you had to compare Shrek Tercero with some story, this would undoubtedly be the story of the milkmaid,

because so much goes to the source to the source that in the end It breaks

If there is a place on the face of the earth where all the stories are known by heart, surely it is

Hollywood. The movie mecca is a great factor that spreads the pastry message of the "" and they lived happily and

ate partridges "". Not to mention another of his specialties, the Chinese stories, which sell to the world with no

less enthusiasm. But if the stories have taught something to Hollywood, it is the philosophy of the goose that lays theeggs

golden, and that we must exploit the successes to their ultimate consequences. All this It has a good reason, andis

thatthat it returns to the screens the most sympathetic, transgressive, green and computer-made ogre that thehas given

entertainment industry. On this occasion, before the death of King Harold, Shrek will leave in search of Arthur, the only

legitimate heir to the throne of Far Far Away. However, the Enchanting Prince has his own

plans, and will try to take over the throne, recruiting all the villains of the fairy tales. Shrek Tercero

is a new and unnecessary twist to the world of stories, which attempts to repeat without success the keys to

the success of the films that preceded it. The ingenuity of the previous scripts hasdisappeared

completely, and is replaced by a series of easy jokes and jokes that, in addition to having no grace, cross the

line between irreverence and what chabacano and coarse. The characters have been worn out over time, and in this

third part we found them stiff, without the spark that characterized them. Only the inclusion of the group of

princesses pijas and some sequences in the institute show freshness and originality. This Third Shrek

becomes an indigestible film, which immerses the staff in a deep lethargy, boring children and

adults, whose end is not peeled to reach. But not all are bad news, since at a technical level it is a

feat of digital animation, who does not console himself because he does not want to. Shrek supposed a real revolution

in the cinema of animation, since his sentidocido sense of humor looked for more to the adult public that to the infantile one.

Shrek 2 was shown as a worthy sequel, but this third installment is manifested as a new attempt by

Hollywood to extend a story that no longer gave more to get good dividends. If you had

to compare Shrek the Third with some story, this would undoubtedly be the story of the milkmaid, because so much goes

to the source to the source that in the end it breaks.

" 0

" A "" poo-ass-fart-pee "" of gazillion million dollars that elevates the category of masterpiece to its

predecessors.

Absurd, it has neither feet nor head; they could sell it to us as the Epic Movie of the Shrek universe, which would colar���a.

The bad milk that was breathed in the first part vanished. All the gags are repetitive, the jokes

have not a minimum of grace (the falls, the blows, the belches and the flatulence do not make fun: they give

pity), and it is full of useless and embarrassing moments. I could count perfectly on half of the fingers

of one hand everything that has made me a little grace of the whole movie (the princesses, the end, and

the credits) . ���If even little children have said little! EIndeed, for what lasts (an hour and a half), it has

been very long. And to top it off, final morality silly, easy and shameless, falling into the same typical

Disney who scoffed so much at Shrek 1.A "" poop-ass-fart-pee "" of gazillion millions of dollars that elevates

the category of masterpiece to its predecessors. Absolutely expendable.

" 0

" An almost mythical title in the history of the western. It is a story of marked anthropological tinge,

which describes the true customs of the Indians portrayed in history.

"An English aristocrat is captured by a tribe of Sioux Indians, who subjected him to various tortures to

ascertain his value. Once proven, he will become his boss in his fight against othertribes

enemy. "" An almost mythical title in the history of the western. It is a story of markedtinge

anthropological, which describes the true customs of the Indians portrayed in history. The film is

interesting only because of it. But there are also other elements that must be taken into account to explain the great

success that this film entailed. On the one hand there is the interpretation of Harris: insurmountable. On the other, the beautiful

landscapes and action scenes, very successful. Maybe it's not as good as some said, but it's worth it.

Unforgettable is the scene in which Harris becomes a full member of the tribe. A

hard, violent, cruel, shocking scene.

" 1

" A pity, because the actors -except for Elijah Wood who still can not get rid of his hobbit mask-

do their work with ease (Julie Cox stands out in a paper that Hitchcock would applaud), and the camera fits

with success.

Can we have any certainty? Thus begins the last of an unknown Alex of the Church. Yes, we can have

the certainty that you can do better, Alex, much better. And so it seems, if you recover even a little

of the bad (black, not white) that distilled your previous achievements (except the insufferable

800 bullets and his indecent daughter, Muertos de risa). It does not sit well with you to become cold like Eastwood or

intellectual to Allen, or at least that's what this experiment shows (���espero!), A boring

simulation of mechanical philosophy. ��fico with Cluedo dyes, seasoned with the salutary presence of Leonor, that if itnot

doesget to raise the temperature with your apron we would have died of freezing ���. Please Alex,

what bad gui���nm���s! One ends up caring a damn if a dead man appears and how thatwill occur

unfortunate incident. And it is that in The Oxford Crimes the viewer is forced to get around thegear

narrativewith the weak illumination of a caustic and forced logic that ends up by reveal yourself as what it is, pure

smoke. It is not that Oxford Crimes wants to make metaphysical chance thesis -which also-, but that it itself

becomes indeterminate through constant exercise. of fidelity to that inconsistency. A pity,

because the actors -except for Elijah Wood who still can not get rid of his hobbit mask- do their work

with ease (Julie Cox excels in a role that Hitchcock would applaud ), and the camera fits perfectly. But

that suggestive soundtrack by Roque Ba���os (heiress of a Hitchcockian Hermann) does not deserve such guiltless

disproportions, no. Perhaps the fidelity to Guillermo Mart���nez's text (Premio Planeta 2003 in Argentina with this

novel) is the essential reason for such a disaster. What on paper will surely be an intelligent exercise in

intrigue woven by the seductive falsehoods of labyrinthic logical fallacies, when passing it to celluloid the thing

fades into a pretentious fangal Di���logos that more than look at the seat, we sting without emotion.Alex

slips when he is carried away by the excesses that populate his imaginary cin���filo, whether it does transiting

the underworld freak as if he decides -as this is the case- emulate the labyrinthine intrigue of the cinema angrosaj���n of

the seventies (La huella). That is why the community is still his best creation, because without betraying his

imagination, he offered us a contention that denoted maturity without losing his nontransferable style. I suppose that

everything is having patience and wait for your next.We will always be the Watling.

" 0

" Technology will never be able to compensate for the failure that occurs in the adaptation of a cinematographic

guide. Air battle episodes were always filmed by authentic pilots

? and the Oscar-winning Tony Bill is-, is not it too that his stereotyped and anodyne gui���n, lacking in

verisimilitude, turns Flyboys into an amorphous hybrid between the Pearl Harbor of Michael Bay and the Legends of

Passion of Edward Zwick. An irreparable blunder, which takes her away from mythical titles she could overcome. It's scary

every time people like Michael Bay or Dean Devlin (producer of Godzilla) determine that it's been a long time

since a blic movie ?. The first one, already played the hen? in his particular Pearl Harbor; whereas, in this

case, Devlin's intention was none other than to pay homage to the legendary Lafayette Squadron,

which, with more courage than resources, fought against the Germans in the First World War. Of course, the result

leads us to the conviction that it is fortunate that no member of the glorious Squadron can see the

film. Let's say that the tribute is lost in the production notes, without reaching beyond the screen,

because of a bad gui���n. What, without a doubt,? C? Est a dommage!?, That would say the beautiful Luciana.With

his ambitious pretensions, not exempt of goodwill, Flyboys is dedicated to seek references in the

classics . It is a significant and meritorious fact that the direction of the project is entrusted to apilot

professional, as were the physicists William Wellman, Howard Hawks and Howard Hughes, who left us titles

like Alas (first Oscar-winning film in Film History, in 1929), The Dawn Squadron

and Los Angeles of Hell (widely recreated by Martin Scorsese in The Aviator), respectively. A few years

later, Welman would shoot another film with the title of Lafayette Squadron. Having Tony Bill behind the

scenes guarantees a technical virtuosity in the air space that does not find continuity on the mainland. It is

necessary to highlight the subjective planes that she gives in this film, the choreographies that the airplanes draw in

the air, the close-ups of the pilots, that remind us so much of the silent film scenes, and obsess n

to show the precariousness of those flying kites that must have been the first warplanes, as

Howard Hawks always did. The truth is that more minutes of flight will be added to the footage. On the other hand, it would

not be fair to fail to mention his important historical advice, apparently, as well. Bill's work.

The Knights of the Air, as the historians agreed to call these Indian rabbits, were the

last to show a code of honor on the heights, in those last medieval tournaments, which are so well

reflected in the film. If we add to both aspects the spectacular Trevor Rabin soundtrack, the

perfect picture of Henry Braham (we just have to remember the reflection of the squadron in thewaters

transparentof the river. )O), its unbeatable sound effects, good work on the interpretation of Martin

Henderson, the acceptable artistic direction; and, in addition, we take into account that the air and the planes of the

First War never achieved great works of art in movies, we realize that this is what could be the

great tribute that he deserved the noble Squadron. However, it is not. The technology will never be able to compensate for the

failure that occurs in the adaptation of a cinematographic guide, and Flyboys violates the great message that derives

from the best productions. ���licas, the one already promulgated by Wellman in 1929, the one that ratified the master Kubrick

in Paths of Glory, the one that Lewis Milestone issued in No News in the Front. Is the heroismuseless

that implies losing everything along the way? Instead, we find a modern light version of the

facts, which justifies participation in any war when you are victorious. Thanks to it,

the goals that were always dreamed can be achieved. Neither more nor less than what usually happens when a story

set in the France of 1917 becomes an Americanada. Independence Day type.

" 0

" Frequency of predictability and is that, to little that one is moderately attentive is perfectly aware of the

mystery that very tiptoe, the tape hides, and it is easy to know who is threatened and threatening.

Curious police thriller, written by one of the writers of one of my favorite series (The TV series

"" Las vegas ""), where we see an Al Pacino, already in years (fix your face regretful when it's up to you to

run), Alicia Witt, Deborah Kara Unger and Leelee Sobieski, the latter in such an extremely fleeting role that you

almost realize little of her presence. The action takes place in real time (passionate). ��aa the fans of the

series "" 24 "") but. Real time is not always perfectly coordinated and while in some moments 37 min.

it seems that they fly by, in another 10 min. they give for almost half an hour of footage, on the other hand, theplanes

quickflawless please make it to the vision of it, and make it impossible to notice clearly some

details. You notice that Pacino arrived � to cast almost bouncing, since little is understood but the vast majority

of female characters, drool fall with Al, when they are just around the twentieth and Pacino is already

a grandfather, for very sexy that can be for some films (I do not deny it). The film sins of

predictability and is that, to little that one is moderately attentive (it is not necessary to be with the eyes like plates)

is realized perfectly of the mystery that very tiptoe, conceals the tape, and it is easy to know who is the

threatened and the threatening. In short, a co-production USA-Germany, that without having triumphed in thebox office

North American, either he will do it in Spanish (when it is released) and if not, time will be.

" 0

" A story of cops, mafiosi and mafioso cops, of excellent bill and recommended viewing, with a

Denzel Washington as the best afternoon.

American Gangster is the story of the birth, rise and fall of Frank Lucas (Denzel Washington), the man

who managed to form an empire with the heroine until becoming the owner of Harlem , and Richie Roberts (Russell

Crowe), the honest (to the extreme) police officer who toppled Lucas's empire, taking him to jail,

and uncovering all a network of corrupt polices that comprised 75% of the staff of thedepartment

narcoticsof New York, in the early 1970s, in a story that happened � in reality. The film, despite

its duration (more than 150 minutes), has a more remarkable bill, and although it may stay a little short

in its drive to the category of film, it earns a lot of good movie etiquette. Very much the

work of Denzel Washington in his role as mobster, diplomat mético and kind on the one hand, but with a very

dark and violent face when the situation requires it, managing to create a very charismatic character. It does not get to be

as great as in "" Training Day "" but it gets closer. On the other hand Crowe's character stays a little behind, and although

his work is not bad, it does not reach Denzel's height, Going into a kind of Elliot Ness come to less,

but eye, I do not say that it is out of tune. It just stays a little behind. And it is fair to say that the few

times they manage to match on the screen are precisely the best of the Australian. The tape tells the

story from both points of view, mafioso and police, two stories intertwined in which hunter and prey

they just coincide until almost the end of the film (the interview between them being one of the mostscenes

interesting) with all the elements of a good gangster movie. And visually it is also very

successful, with a very well-taken care of aesthetic, and the only one but of a persecution at the end of the film that

seems shot by Danny Boyd a day of drunkenness. In short, it is not "" The Godfather "" but it is a film more than

correct and worthy of being considered CINEMA.

"1"

We are probably at the best movie of the trilogy due to the effective mix of intrigueaccine

dramtica

JJ Abramsopens the world of feature film with a film of action very much in line with theseries

Americanthat are currently triumphing. Probably we are facing the best trilogy tape

due to the effective mix of dramatic intrigue action. The way of driving the viewer throughout the

plot is very well structured which leads us to be able to enjoy unexpected twists of gui���n,

technique that had disappeared in the second installment. The role of Ethan Hunt (Tom Cruise) is very successful,

giving him a much more human approach, because he is carried away in many situations by emotions and

feelings, yet thus his secret agent instinct takes control of any situation as if it were

a reflex act. The Impossible Mission on this occasion is nothing less than rescuing aagent

captured IMFwhile spying on an international arms and information dealer (Philip Seymour

Hoffman), lacks conscience and remorse. The agent in question was the ward of Hunt who, even

though he is retired, decides to carry out the mission because of everything that she means to him. This time it's

personal. JJ Abrams says that the writing team put a special effort into creating a bad guy worthy

of Ethan Hunt, one who was up to the hero. "This is the first time that Ethan Hunt has confronted an

adversary as terrifying, intelligent and mysterious as the character played by Philip Seymour Hoffman,"

says the director. I forgot to emphasize how familiar it is to return, once more, to see

Ethan and Luther work hand in hand with each other. The chemistry and the good friendship that exists between them is one of the most humoristic points

of the whole film. It is likely that the director has not created a work at the level of the one carried out by Brian

de Palma, partly due to lack of trade, but what is worth noting is the fact that he has managed to

appropriate the essence of the Saga much better than both of his atheists. Three times you can see the movie's cinema movieFinally,

with a tachycardia.it should be noted that all the action scenes have been done by

Tom Cruise himself without the help of doubles. "I consider it part of the challenge of making a movie," says Tom Cruise. "" You do not have

to take a risk for no reason, but if you can train yourself and do something that brings credibility to the film - well

, does it really? - the spectators have a better time. "

" 1

" The god of small things, that little god who does not subscribe to any religious doctrine, guides

this secular catechism of irrepressible vital breath. A masterpiece, an absolute masterpiece.

This was a boring man, a taciturn bourgeois, sincerely bored with life, proud that he had not

missed a single day of his work in 30 years of work. He was a man with no options, no desires, no desire

to meditate or to consent to any novelty that wobbles that precious, unalterable routine, oblivious to all the

great and small pains of the world. He was a man without priorities, always surrounded by mounts of papers, in

a monumental crisis, which he does not know, because he simply does not reason the lamentable state of his gray

existence. This is a man who receives the news of his cancer. And how that revelation inflates life'sof life

precariousness, its lamentable abandonment and its monotonous passage through the days. This is when Watanabe,

the revitalized patient, decides to "" do his social work "" and builds a park in his neighborhood. To learn to love

cinema, you have to see this film and get the hang of perfection. The formal and lyricism of the swing scene (

and the sad song) or the concatenation of the subjective plane of Watanabe himself and his son seeing how a

wagon takes the f���retro de la madre.���Live! is also a Kurosawa film, full of veryflashbacks

brief, fragmentary notes of the plot, which seems, at times, an Italian film of neo-realism

full of Japanese. � that whoever thinks that Kurosawa was Rashomon or The Seven Samurais or TheFortress

Hidden, here also has a jewel to the Capra, an absolute song to life, in spite of thesadness

enormousthat populates the long footage of the tape. Masterpiece! (And to be the first classic Japanese film

that this scribe has seen, the thing has started with an excellent foot) Mañana more and better.

" 1

" Excellent new movie lesson of the best American director of the moment. With 'Death Proof', Tarantino does not do more than (re) influence their commonplaces from the beginning:characters

ambiguous moral, when not delinquents; action measured with dropper (except 'Kill Bill vol.1', of course);band

ambientacinsound and refer to the 70's, without actually locate the story in this decade; and most

importantly, the banner of his cinema: the di���logos. Endless, inconsequential, banal, "" cool "", bizarre, and of

course, essential to understand the characters that shoot them. Do we know anything about Joe Cabot who does not

reveal his authoritative quarrel to the Reservoir Dogs? Would we be able to understand that Jules Winfield spares

the lives of two half-hearted thieves if we did not learn beforehand of his intention to abandon everything? Would the

Bride's revenge have the same magnitude if we did not hear, from Bill's own voice, the reasons he had to

destroy his life? The argument of 'Death Proof "It's true, it's summed up in one line: crazy from the steering wheel lurks

young unsuspecting and pursues them to death. This annoxic synopsis allows Tarantino to do what he

wants with the Slasher's genre, and unlike his colleague Rodriguez avoids cloning other references of the

genre. It breaks the initial premise of 'Grindhouse' (deep down, first, and later) and it makes

almost two hours of references to all the cinema that he is interested in, but in the same way what he likes: through

the di���logos. That yes, they are endless, inconsequential, banal, "" cool "", bizarre and essential

to understand the characters that shoot them. Can they be shortened? Clear. But to do that is to renounce his

main feature as an author. Or can not you cut the conversation about Madonna at the start of

'Reservoir Dogs' and the movie "" would be perfectly understood "" Regarding level t� Technical, Tarantino, simply

does not know how to make a vulgar film. A first part according to the shabby spirit of the project gives way to a

much more stylized second part, but both show the power of the cinematographic vision. of the

director. And without the need for CGI, or flat planes from a helicopter. It involves staging, using

the color and originality of the points of view that you choose. The pursuit of cars is a good example of the

visual ability of Knoxville, but not the only one in the film. Notable high in the debut of Tarantino as a

director of photography And in regard to actors, excel a huge Kurt Russell, able to give both faces

of his character without problems, and the almost-rookie Zoe Bell, double action Den by Uma Thurman in 'Kill Bill'; both

give a tremendous charisma to their characters at key moments, mission is not easy by thenature

contradictory(and by pathetic moments) of the first and the fierce competition of the rest of f ���minas of the

second. Very large, also, the usual Michael and James Parks in a small but important role, since

with their fun dialog (again the dialog) they close all the the main plot of the film and allow

Tarantino to rethink the exciting game that he has proposed from the beginning, but with new cards.

And I know that to many it seems empty, and many it seems to them a self-homage, and to many others that Tarantino is no longer

what he was. I left the cinema excited, humming the song of credits, laughing at the excellent end,

remembering me the dance of Vanessa Ferlito, trying to retain all those details for which I still like

the movies of this guy. Mainly, the di���logos.Excelente new film lesson of the best American director

of the moment. a 9'5.

" 1

" A film that only stands out for its visually narrative work and staging by its director,

with a gui���np���simo and an irregular narrative rhythm, not to say insultingly decompensated

A��� n recent the premiere of his previous "" Silence from Evil "" (a film partially interesting but

failed due to a very bad script full of genre guys), the director James Wan returns to offer us an

irregular work, again failed, in which he shows once again his visual capacity, but also a

lack of criteria to choose his projects through a solvent guide. and narratively fluid. Previously to

the aforementioned film, this Malaysian filmmaker had surprised with a great work like Saw, that despite being

accused by certain sectors of cheat (obviating that the cinema itself is a cheater art, the art of

making us believe what is not there), is convert by own merits to a thriller of those that endure and

maintain their effectiveness (although not reach reached the magisterial quality of the film on which it was

based, one of the best seen by a JAMS server) In "" Death Sentence "", we find Nick Hume, an

exemplary father of a family, with an analyst job and a perfect wife, two lovely children, thebeing

eldesta young promise of hockey. His whole life is idyllic until the moment in which an illtimed visit to

a gas station after picking up his eldest son becomes the greatest tragedy can imagine Nick,

being murdered Brendan by a group of gang members in a rite of initiation by one of them. The person in

charge is identified, he is a 23-year-old boy and is taken to court, but surprisingly, Nick

declares against the identification of the person responsible for the death of his son, with the intention of He will create

his own justice himself. Wan's work behind the scenes is the only outstanding aspect of this mediocre doubt,

creating an effective staging (which does not effect, on the contrary that his argument) and that allows to

pass the narrative with a lot of nerve and a visual production style, demonstrating once again, that his

visual capacity is out of all shocking. This contributes to certain scenes of the film being

tremendously bright, especially those that concern a couple of top moments in its drama, the

pursuit through the streets ending in the car park, leading to out the group of gangsters with the

intention of ending Nick, and the final scene, in which the work behind the cameras of the Malaysian filmmaker,

reaches its absolute height with camera movements nervous and full of claw. One of the big problems

of the film, comes from a script (or as I always say, what has remained on the screen of the transfer of the script

written to the final result) too unbalanced, that does not help much to make certain attitudes believable, and

even manages to create a narrative decompensation in the story. During the first 25 minutes we witnessed

the creation of the base of the story through the family description, murder and trial, all being

too much hit and counted in a superficial way, to immediately pass to the development of

revenge, with a third final act where history already falls into the absolute vacuum. This decompensation does

not create a human drama from the murder of Nick's son, or develop thoroughly the

moral approach that can lead to the act of revenge, being all too gimmicky and debtor of

a cinema of the 80s where revenge was shown in its political and reactionary version, in the manner of any

Charles Bronson and his "" I am Justice "". Term which by the way is sometimes used

quite erroneously, although not so for the film that concerns us, being revenge something timeless and not

therefore likely to be considered a reactionary attitude, not Be behind that revenge are justified

certain political or ideological approaches alien to a liberal and fair vision of things. In "" Death

sentence "" the reactionary term it hides in several of its passages, being especially revealing the

id���lica vision of the affluent family in contrast with the difficult life of the group of gang members, in avision

rather Manichean and falsifiedof the reality, a reactionary vision we go. It is only necessary to remember theinitiation

gangsterand its paroxysm vision of the world to which they belong. In addition, all the elements of history have a

whiff of moral hypocrisy in the message, endeavoring to make a denunciation of violence as a creator of

violence, but at the same time resorting to rejoicing in violent scenes and lacking amessage. The work

hiddenof the actors can not overcome such manipulative gui���n , and only Kevin Bacon gives samples, in rare

occasions, of a solvency that can not surpass the r quemora that supposes a personage described in a way so

manipulative, but that at least shows worthy in its performance. The rest of the cast emphasize that

each and every one of them are typical and archetypes already seen until exhaustion, and that also does not help the

credibility of the story. In contrast to the excellent "" El fire of revenge "" (where Tony Scott showed

that you can delve into the soul of a character moved by the desire of revenge), James Wan does not know how to overcome

the commonplaces of such a gimmicky genre , and where even, he resorts to copying scenes or attitudes offilms

infinitely superiorlike "Taxi Driver", that masterpiece about the descent into madness, in ascene

finalwhere he photocopied that extraordinary ending. In short, a film that only It stands out for itswork

visually narrativeand staging by its director, with a gui���np���simo and annarrative rhythm

irregular, not to say insultingly decompensated, in addition to a message of doubtful morality and playing on the

edge of the actitu more reactionary. Worrying about the path that this promising director undertakes as

his filmography progresses.

" 0

" A lot of visual work that unfortunately remains empty. . Handsome guys with little clothes sunbathing,

girls swimming in the pool or dancing in the rain. But here everything stays in effect.

It can be summarized in one line: at the beginning it is sunny and in the end it rains. The visual style evokes nostalgia, but

all the beauty remains on the skin. Handsome guys with little clothes sunbathing, girls swimming in the pool

or dancing in the rain. But here everything remains in effect, in the typical and does not transcend. If you want a

film with a refined visual style at the same time as fresh it is better to see "" You, me and everyone we know, "" the

film of the last year of Miranda July. The protagonist of "" El Camino de los ingleses "" is a boy who tells us

many times that he wants to be a poet, but he does not see any sign of passionate blood. The characters here

rather than conversing are thrown into insufferable pedagogical monologues. All very symbolic and very hurried to be

literary. He ends up staying in the air, and does not say anything. Even the symbols with which he pretends to

break the narrative line are typical: a dancer, who serve you your guts on a tray and thescene

final(which I do not think reveals anything) of the barefoot boy crossing the zebra crossing. Would it be that he became

one of the Beatles? Well, she does not deserve it. When Victoria Abril appears she is a delight, and she even impregnates

sweetness and a drop of complexity to her character as a typing teacher who has played

seductress for years. But I'm not sure it ends up getting out of the caricature. Everything is hyperbolic, very hyperbolic,

too hyperbolic. Oh, and repetitive. It is too literary not to say anything. Now, if they

do merchandising of the design objects that appear in the film: clothes, glasses, typewriters, pianos

and desks; I buy everything. A lot of visual work that unfortunately remains empty.

" 0

" The glaring error of the In gus Par���s script is to focus on Leonor, the real protagonist, and forget

for too many minutes the two authors, who act as secondary c� ��micos, of comparsas of a entrem���s

throwing to vulgar.

Miguel de Cervantes, born in 1564, died in 1616. William Shakespeare, born in 1547, died in 1616.

'Miguel y William', Spanish production that starts in London in the year of grace ���1500? Anyway, maybe

I was wrong. Or perhaps In���s Par���s, its director and screenwriter, wants to make clear in advance that the

proposal is to play the obvious anachronism, as it was done with the same character in 'Shakespeare in love'.

What matters is that the starting point is interesting: Will Shakespeare travels to Castile in pursuit of his

love Leonor, promised to the powerful Duke of Obando. There, he will fight for his favor, nothing less than with Miguel de

Cervantes, in an event that will serve so that both give the best of themselves as writers. And taking into

account that the film ��cula strives, and very much, to disengage from the tawdry tone of Spanish comedy in recent

years, one would expect a duel of wit between these two central characters with the excuse of the lady in

question. But the glaring error of In gus Par���s script is to put the focus on Leonor, the real protagonist,

and forget for too many minutes the two authors, who act as secondary c��� monkeys, of comparsas of an

entrem���s throwing to vulgar.As���, what starts as an entertaining attempt of anacr���nica comedy withpersonages

modernin an ancient world, finishes being developed as' Celeste is not a color ', much less. Leonor (soft

and very weeping Elena Anaya) is the independent woman and owner of her destiny, but who protects histooth and nail

virginity(?); Shakespeare (Charger Will Kemp) is a guffand buf���n who only wants to write comedies, and spends

his time declaring himself in love with Leonor and, meanwhile, throwing the yews to half female cast. Miguel

de Cervantes (off Juan Luis Galiardo) is a tax collector married and disenchanted with writing,

who falls in love with Leonor when he hears some verses that he believes in her. The Duke of Obando (gui���olesco Jos��� M��� Pou) is

the jealous and unpleasant fiancé, who welcomes in his castle the two suitors of Leonor (??). The others,

then filling: Malena Alterio makes her Belon de 'Aqu��� no quien viva' d��� a leap of 400 years in

time and it seems Cinderella's sister; Geraldine Chaplin, buf, how bad the thing will be for her to do what she

does here; and the only one that deserves special mention is Miriam Giovanelli, the child of the unforgettable short 'not

canwalk' by Luiso Berdejo, and here wins the others. s by a landslide, with a role of the most absurd, so

only based on screen presence. The best of the film, without a doubt. Then there is the presumed strong point of

the film, the literary references. Some are subtle and work within the narrative. Others are hired

to shoehorn so that anyone who has read 'Don Quixote', 'Othello', 'Much ado about nothing' or

'Ricardo III' will recognize them and say "" ha-ha, I know where that comes from, "" without bothering to integrate them into the plot.

In my opinion, it is the other weak point of the film, not to fully exploit this resource. Finally, so much

pretension of sophisticated comedy and there are so many details of fat brush as in a movie of Ozores (two

turkeys trodden, one fart, two lovers frolicking and a third woman under the same bed, a dwarf, a girl

bathing.) . The difference is that Ozores with absolute conviction, and In���s Par���s does it because if it does not

start the smile of the staff. In the technical section, correct ambientaci���n (although they notice the limitations,

especially at the start in London and the horrendous paintings of the time), shooting at normalita and

typical music (flamenquito / medievo mix). without giving signs of intelligence above the average in the country's

chemical genre. Let's see if with 'D���as de cine' (the movie, not Antonio Gasset's showcase vehicle) we take

off. A 4.

" 0

"More vampires, more fine casserole for a film that does not add anything to anything. By God, what do you think of that girl who has been put on the billboard? because then he has a bad

milk that seems to have inserted a chilli in saved be the part, he would ask for an eye donation. The

film is about a girl who lives in a secluded circus Because of his strange abilities, one day, due to the.Then

vicissitudes of fate, he escapes from the circus by killing half of the shooting (adjusting the budget)aappears

group, belonging to the Brimstone society, which liquidates To those who are left and they start looking for the supposed

vampire who has bundled all the chicken in. In the end it turns out that she is a Dhampir (human and vampire flogging) and they

want her in their group. vampire more powerful of the moment, and then there is a thing of collecting

pieces of vampire that is very funny. s before us another vampire, with the novelty that water

kills them (they must smell blessed glory). Taken from a comic, the film does not add much to the genre. We have a

protagonist who wants to kill a super vampire for logical reasons, a group that also wants to do it and in the

other part, the vampire who wants to dominate the world. New? Any. With what we have a script that we already

know, with characters that do not kill and a final resolution surprising but absurd. Theaesthetic

darkfits pretty well with what you expect from a comic, as well as the soundtrack. But to tell you the truth, it's

pretty bad. Resuming, more vampires, more fine casserole for a film that does not contribute anything at all. If you are a

fan of the genre possibly the adores, but, let it go as in the mus.

" 0

" Removing the first ten minutes and a couple of somewhat decent dialogues,? Timeline? It is a film to see

and forget.

Although the idea of ​​a journey in time is always attractive, cinematographically speaking (although it has

already been very exploited, it still has that attraction that, well thought out, can lead us to spend two hours quite

entertaining), in this On occasion we find ourselves with a film that begins in a very promising way, but

which, as it advances in its development, becomes a tedious spectacle. The director, Richard Donner,

responsible for movies like "" The Goonies "", "" Lethal Weapon "", "" The Profec���a "" or "" Superman "" (films that in his day �� They

enjoyed a warm welcome among the public), offers us a tape without more transcendence than being the

adaptation of a well-known novel by Michael Crichton. What could be a good approach (life in the

fourteenth century, the temporal space paradoxes that can be created by altering some past event) becomes

a Performa production, made so that the public does not stop eating popcorn and not think for two

hours. We can see how the characters and the argument itself, are diluted to reach the l��� limit of the

anodyne, of the foreseeable (from the moment they appear in the fourteenth century, any moderatelyperson

intelligentcan guess 80 percent of the film without disheveling), with aninterpretative depth

almost nullon the part of of the actors, making it totally comical for a group of young people without preparation to

journey into the past and confront and defeat the stout English army officers with 5 kg swords, bows and

other military paraphernalia. Even the siege of the castle does not offer moments of action and spectacularity,

like soldiers of props who act, as if we were seeing the worst chapter of some series

B. ten first minutes and a couple of somewhat decent dialogues, "" Timeline "" is a movie to watch and

forget.

" 0

" This from the Alianza del mal is a Harry Potter spent in the twists and turns: a hodgepodge of cliches picked up with the

fingertips and mixed in a state-of-the-art blender to deliver adolescent public.

This of the Alliance of Evil is a Harry Potter spent laps: a hodgepodge of topics caught with the

tips of the fingers and mixed in a mixer of last generation to deliver to the p�� Teen audience a

film of powerful visual appeal, but hollow inside, weighed down by an argument already seen on many

occasions and condemned to pass through the digital chains or the greedy shelf of the cinema club of

neighborhood. To say that the subject entertains that is to say already a lot, and there will be someone who lays the time in the armchair of the cinema and

leaves proud of his scarce level of demand because, written brutely, What we have is a carambola

meticulously planned, properly filmed and generous budget pieces of a puzzle that never

gets to assemble at all. There are four guys already talluditos, although we get the idea that they are less than

eighteen years old, that they have some powers that diminish them as they use them, that they are also addictive and that they

use to raise the skirt to a blonde bomb that turns out not to have panties. It's as if Lucius Malfoy, the

bad-tempered little blond in the Harry Potter series, had won an extra bad milk prize and, stuck in another book,

oblivious to the childhood swings of an innocent mind, fell into the account of that is God, but without religion or

metaphysics, to the donkey, with a plus of spells, spiders, witches and bostonian mansions of not menees.No

superh���roes , but they paint as if they were. The girls that come out are not soft porn flesh, but there are scenes

more moved to the ignition and lubrication of the pubescent mass that look like it. The music (Tomandandy, thethe

artifact ofmess) is noisy, accidental and hardly dramatic. My friend J., always so attentive to the

details, led me to the idea that, sometimes, the film reminded him, in parts, The coyote bar and, in

other, hidden youth. The mishmash explodes in many frames, squeaking. That Renny Harlin directs (his

are Deep Blue Sea, Cliffhanger or Lethal Memory, decent titles all) does not solve anything: he smears everything by

trade, he tries to raise a gui�� Medion mediocre throwing bad or bad approaching deplorable and wicker so

insubstantial can not build a cathedral of taste.

" 0

" It is a very intelligent and vibrant redesign of the character, in addition to an entertaining film thatyou

leavesstuck to the chair for two and a quarter hours.

Daniel Craig must be a happy man right now. After all the campaign orchestrated against him for his

choice to play the most famous secret spy (curious contradiction) in history, the swords

were up and the expectation was greater than the previous changes of the character's face. And the resultnot

hasdisappointed, it's more like it and a lot. A lot has been said during the last year about the

saga being exhausted, that the character was already tired so what I have always been curious about

this debate because the previous film, Die Another Day (Die another day), starring Pierce Brosnan, was not

only a failure but it was the highest grossing film of the whole saga. So strictly speaking, the

change made was not so necessary from an economic point of view either. Although it is also true that the

scale of the last project at all levels, it made it difficult to overcome. Cassino Royale was the first novel

written by Ian Fleming about the character of James Bond, and already had two previous adaptations one for TV

and another in the form of a parody shot in the sixties that had five directors, a cast where they appeared

from David Niven to Peter Sellers through Woody Allen, and It is one of the most expensive follies ever

financed by a large studio. The plot recounts the confrontation of Bond, recently obtained his license to kill

(his double zero), with LeChifre, a banker who manages the revenues generated by gangs of drug traffickers and

terrorists. The plot is quite simple and easy to continue to be the point of the poker game that takes

place in the casino that gives the film its name. The new James Bond adventure presumably, and in the absence

of watching Tony Scott's Dej��� Vu, the best action genre movie released this year. It also maintains all

the constants of the saga: imposing women, multiplicity of scenarios, luxurious environments andscenes of

showyaction. The changes, that there are, are not as spectacular as it has been said. We have

two Bond women, a vase (and dispatched quickly) and another intelligent one that accompanies the hero in his

adventures, as in other films of the saga, does not It is necessary to go far, in the films starring

Brosnan women were more than simple throwaway objects. Quiz���ss��� has gained in realism in the action

scenes, not too much that after all it is a Bond movie, but it has been reduced

drastically the use of spectacular Gadgets or elements more typical of a science fiction movie than

one of spies that takes place today. Where you notice the change is in the main character. The film

designed in the style of a James Bond Begins supposes the redefinition of the character, counting its origins to

begin a new saga. So we attended his first Martini mixed, not agitated, his first Aston Martin and a

long list of details that will delight fans of the saga. This idea extends to the

musical section, which makes slight notes of the theme written by Monty Norman and immortalized by John Barry, and that

can only be heard in its entirety in the last scene of the movie. �cula. In this sense the film is reminiscent of

Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade, where we discovered the origin of many details of the character. The Bond

played by Daniel Craig is credible, hard and ir��� unique, capable of falling in love and suffering. He looks like abeing

human, something that had disappeared after His Majesty's Secret Service (film with which he keeps

more than one point in common) . The choice of the actor has been perfect because it gives a charisma and apresence

physicalto the character surprising. But the rest of the cast has also not been neglected, starting with an

intelligent and sensual but close Eva Green, and following by a great Judi Dench as M or a Giancarlo

Giannini very suitable. Maybe the glue in terms of character is found in the bad guy, a

character devoid of charisma and strength, which is not taken advantage of its physical peculiarity (cries

blood ) .Matin Campbell, who was director of Goldeneye and La M���scara del Zorro, returns to show himself as the

effective director he is, although not brilliant, he does not know how to take advantage of the filming of the poker game where a

better director, like Richard Donner or John McTiernam, could have done wonders. However, in the action scenes it

shows all its potential, although we should not forget the work of the seconddirector

unitand, above all, Stuart Baird, probably the best film editor in the world. action that thehas today. The

American cinemascript is easy and fun, with some surprise and with some great dialogues between

Craig and Green, fostered, no doubt, by the chemistry that is on screen between both actors. However, the

multiplicity of finishes and the long duration of the film make it lose some of the bellows in the last

third. The photograph is very correct, highlighting the use of a magnificent black and white in thesequence

pre-creditthat opens the film. Arnold's music is functional in the film, ostentatious or romantic as

appropriate, but not particularly remarkable, far removed from the scores written by Barry and inferior to

his own. as El Ma���ana never dies. Bond returns and comes back to stay. Casino Royale is a very

intelligent and vibrant redesign of the character, in addition to an entertaining film that leaves you stuck to the

seat for two and a quarter hours, so it meets your goal with more. Long live James Bond.

" 1

" It was without a doubt a turning point in the director's career, a necessary turnaround to adapt to the new

cinema that was gradually being implemented.

In 1960 nobody expected Hitchcock to go to make a movie like "" Psycho "". The full English director

had for more than 20 years at the top of world cinema with his elegant suspense, with hisplots

persecutoryand with a personal cinema with a basic constant clear in each tape that directed. Just

before that year, Hitchcock was in its most mature and great stage. He had just directed masterpieces such

as "" The indiscreet window "", "" V���rtigo "" or "" With death on the heels "", in which both Paramount and

MGM, had provided Hitchcock high budgets to meet their requests, that is, the

presences of actors of the likes of James Stewart, Cary Grant, Grace Kelly, James Mason, Kim Novak or Eva Marie

Saint, precisely favorite actors of the director, or to be able to shoot in the best locations and with the

best technique. (Hitchcok would achieve in these three works an overwhelming mastery of color and camera handling,

there is more to see the high investment What Paramount did for the "Vigort" steeple scene. For all

these reasons it was surprising that Hitchcock noticed a small mystery novel, written by Robert Bloch,

for make her his next movie. In addition Hitchcock, decided that "" Psycho "" was in black and white, without

glittering stars, with purely television technical equipment. Drastic changes that a priori were not

too understood by the producer and Hitch's environment, but that a posteriori were confirmed as the

id���neos, for a history of similar characteristics. "" Psychosis "" It could have been anchapter

extendedof the series "" Alfred Hitchcock presents "" great success at the time, however Hitchcock saw

something else in it, saw a terrifying story that I could take advantage of to give free rein to a newvision

cinematographic. Because "" Psycho "" does not look anything like everything Hitchcock had shot. If in all his

career, English was lover of the suggestion, here he preferred to show, if he liked the select, the luxurious, here he

preferred the austere and with everything Hitchcock managed to establish a new horror film model, a

film that would be the mother of the well-known "psycho-killer" or cinema of serial killers, as well as away of

radically novelfilming that increased the restlessness or the terror of the public. It could be said that there

would be "" Henry, portrait of a murderer "", "" The silence of the lambs "" or "" The Boston Strangler "",well

asas all the subsequent horror films if Hitchcock had not done "" Psycho "". "" Psycho "" told the story of

a woman (Janet Leight) who stole a large amount of money from her own company with the intention to be able to

start a new life with her boyfriend (John Gavin). In his flight, he would stop to rest in a lostmotel

roadrun by a mysterious mother and son (Anthony Perkins). That arrival at the motel would precipitate some

macabre events, with tragic consequences for the thief. Hitchcock made full use of each and every

decision of the film. The black and white dotted the film with an additional terror, which came as a glove when it came

to getting the gloomy of the motel or the house Bates, or the ease to be explicit

when showing blood spilled. The choice of the actors was impeccable. A half-forgotten Anthony Perkins

composed a memorable murderer, shy and complex ed���pico. Janet Leigh debuted as "" Hitchcock blonde "". The

director was right to think that being she the most famous actress of the cast, his hasty death on the

tape would make the staff go crazy. As far as the secondary ones, Martin Balsam, John Gavin and Vera Miles

were id���neos for their respective papers. Once again, Hitchcock used its famous technique of the Mcguffin,

endowing a main importance to the theft carried out by Marion Crane (Janet Leigh) to suddenly

divert the story to the really interesting thing, the Bates motel and its tenants.Hithcock put the fear

in the body to the staff, who believes thatwas a new and persecutory film director, and

sbitamente was found with an explicit murder and a surprising asesino.La shower scene had the

l A logical impact on the viewer, which is still fresh today, when reviewing the tape. Three were the keys to

the excellent functioning of this sequence, which has established it as the most popular sequence in the

history of cinema, as the most famous shout. On the one hand, the string music of Bernard Herrmann, themusical

usualby Hitchcock and responsible for the greatest impact of many of the works of the English teacher. Initially,

the scene of the murder in the shower would have no more sound than that of the knife and Crane's scream, although, when

listening to Hitchcock, what Herrmann had composed gave more than the approval to the Use of this music in

the scene, On the other hand there is Saul Bass, creator of the titles of "" V���rtigo "" and "" With the death in the heels "" and

that I designed, hand in hand with Hitchcock and plane to plane the sequence of the shower. Ultimately, George

Tomasini, Hitch's usual editor, set the difficult sequence to perfection. The great planning of the

entire sequence would already do for yes famous to "" Psycho "", but there were many more findings in the film

to be displaced by the fame of this one scene. No less spooky and great is for me the

murder of Detective Milton Arbogast (Martin Balsam). Showing off, Hitchcock, of his handling of suspense

during the undue entry of the detective into the house of Bates, the director finished the scene with a flat shot

of his murder at the hands of Mrs. Bates, who sincerely puts Losa the hairs of punta.A as well as his

screenwriter, Joseph Stefano, "" Psycho "" is important because it lacks everything predictable in Hitchcock until then

"". "" Psycho "" was unexpected, nobody thought that such an elegant director was going to show us for the first

time in cinema a v���ter, a cad���ver, the nudity in a shower and first of all a clar��� Sima coolness in the

protagonists in terms of the macabre, the sexual, the forbidden. It was without a doubt a turning point in the

director's career, a necessary turn to adapt to the new cinema that was gradually being implemented. And

again, Hitchcock came forward.

" 1

" Pretends to play the trick of the surprise ending, but you can sense too soon what is going to happen.The number 23 is the story of a man's obsession with the number 23 , he believes that he is persecuting him and that he is

everywhere. This obsession becomes quite burdensome, everything adds up 23 and if not, we multiply it and divide it as many

times as necessary until it goes out 23? Jim Carrey is not bad, but it is a pity that it does not end Succeed as

a serious actor, because he has talent, as demonstrated in The Truman Show and Olv���date de M���, but with films like

Number 23 will never take him� They are serious. The secondary characters are empty and very badly constructed, some do not

contribute anything to the story. The script is very bad, full of gaps everywhere. There are reallysituations

absurdand a dog that pretends to cause restlessness, but what it provokes is laughter. He pretends to play the trick of the

surprise ending, but he intuits too soon what is going to happen.

" 0

" Again without leaving the parameters of the amateur the director returns to give a master lesson of

cinema sick, degrading, filthy but at the same time beautiful in his obsessions with poetry in his narrative.

Unpredictable, brilliant, dazzling, imaginative or simply a genius with a camera, four hard and

amateur actors is removed from the manga magnificent works with the ease of who is different or is endowed by the

gene of the gift to tell stories I am really exhausted by the adjectives to describe all the emotions that

ANDREW PARKINSON produces me every time he decides to bring out his enormous talent. If in his outstanding

previous works he tackled the subject ZOMBIE from an optics totally different from the usual one,

developing the phenomenon under the prism of characters who must confront their illness and stop living

as human beings to transform themselves into monsters.I ZOMBIE and DEAD CREATURES fused the drama with the gore

taking advantage of quasi-amateur budgets to achieve surprising effects of makeup, music,

photography really excellent where the author did everything. Repeating with some interpreters of hisworks

previous, he leaves the ZOMBIE phenomenon on his side to immerse himself in a monstrous relationship that seems to come

directly from the head of the once terrifying DAVID CRONEMBERG. new without leaving the parameters of the

video amateur the director returns to give a master lesson of cinema ill, degrading, filthy but at the same

time beautiful in his obsessions with poetry in his narration Nn.We complain about the lack of ideas of the current terror, because

while SAW 4 triumphs in cinemas, other European authors get wonders like NEXT DOOR or DEAD CREATURES without

anyone noticing them, hopefully this film arrives. It's at least on DVD because in cinemas I see it as impossible.

" 1

" Set in a moment? Mafia? From the old Boston, The Infiltrates is taking hold on our screens with

considerable success. One of the best films of this unfortunate? Cinematographically? talking 2006.

The powerful Warner BROS, brings us a talented remake of the hand of the master Scorsese (There is nothing left to

say about this man, that just by mentioning his name the foundations of cinema are already shaken) and with acast

sensational: Leonardo DiCaprio, Matt Damon, Jack Nicholson and Alec Baldwin. With so much popularity in between it was

downright complicated to screw it up. At one point "" Mafia "" from old Boston, Infiltrados strengthens on

our screens with considerable success. One of the best films of this unfortunate

"" cinematographically "" speaking 2006. The boy who was a handsome Hollywood kid (Dicaprio) is shown as aactor

versatile, demonstrating that if it is a star it is not only for his musician, something that I am very happy because

this boy is a crack of the interpretation, regardless of who he is. Accompanied by a sensational

Nicholson and a Damon at the height of the circumstances, they create a thrilling mafioso triangle. In this film, the

gui���n takes center stage, thanks to William Monahan (The Kingdom of the heavens). The verbiage with which

the characters defend themselves becomes so complicated that you have to take a breath to follow the

dialogue (In VOS). Little or nothing can be said against the Infiltrados. Highly recommended even if you do not like

mafia movies, it is worth seeing and living that tension that is created and maintained throughout the

plot.

" 1

" Very meticulous and aesthetic work that inherited many things from the silent cinema, incrediblygags

absurd, absurd entanglements, misunderstandings and confusions, reinforced by such well-worked dialogues

It's hard to forget them.

Shot in 1938 and starring two movie greats, Katharine Hepburn and Cary Grant, "" La Fiera de mi ni���a "

(Bringing up Baby), was not a huge box office success. In fact, Howard Hawks was fired by the RKO and Hepburn,

which at that time was considered "poison for the box office", after having invested in the film and

waived the charge for the film ( conditions set by the producer when they agreed to make the

film), she was forced to buy her contract. Although in the end it did not turn out so bad because, the tape was

reporting benefits until the day of his death. With "" The beast of my child "" were already two times that Grant and

Hepburn worked together. They had already agreed on "The Great Adventure of Silvia" by George Cukor and would

come back together in other funny comedies like "" Live to enjoy "" and "" Historias de Filadelfia "" del same

director. But this time, the two would be part of another example of films that go unnoticed,

even to fail at the box office, but eventually become fundamental pieces of the

history of cinema This, of course, is one of the most famous of the time in its genre. Okay, it's a comedy (or

to be exact, a "screwball comedy" ", name that was given to the crazed comedies of the

30's), a genre that is currently devalued, and that is black and white, which will provoke more than one

an allergic reaction and a sudden attack of drowsiness, but this, is not a comedy either. For me, it's

humor with capital letters. It tells the story of David Huxley (Grant), a paleontologist who is luckily smiling: he

just found the last one Bone that she lacked to rebuild a brontosaurus and a millionaire spinster

is willing to donate a million dollars to her foundation. He's also about to marry his secretary

Alice Swallow. But suddenly there will appear Susan Vance (Hepburn), a crazy young woman who will put her life backwards

(with the help of a leopard named Baby) and that will prove to be the niece of her possible patron. Apparently the

story has nothing great and we have not yet forgotten that it is black and white xD, butis

Howard Hawksthat I knew how to make pel�� �culas and to check it you only need to take a look at his

filmography that has great titles in genres as disparate as comedy, the western, film,

science -fiction, black movies or musicals. All of them characterized by the unmistakable personal touch of

Hawks, who used to say things like: - "" I have ten commandments to make a film. The first nine are: ��� not

boring! .- "" A good movie is based on three good scenes and no bad "" All this makes it not difficult

imagine what we are going to find in this film, behind its simple appearance hides a verywork

meticulous, a static that inherited many things from the silent film, some incredible gags It's,entanglements

hard toabsurd, misunderstandings and confusions, reinforced by such well-worked dialogues that it's hard toNot

forget themforget them.in vain did Hawks have worked as a scriptwriter and knew from whom They will surround themselves. Another reason why

he is considered an exceptional director is the unbridled pace of his films. He himself used to say

that they developed 20% faster than the other productions of the time, something that we can appreciate in "" La

fiera Of my girl. "" Finally, we can not forget the masterful interpretations with which the film

counts, which is by far one of its strong points. Katharine Hepburn, after proving that she was one of the

best dramatic actresses of her time, changes registers and proves that she was also afilm actress

first-rate. In addition, he combines perfectly with the charismatic Cary Grant, who despite having had a hard time

thinking about having a scene near the leopard (in fact he refused to appear together )L), did not use doubles

getting to perform some acrobatics in the final minutes of the tape and starmoments

unforgettablewith Hepburn. Surely everyone who has seen it remembers the song they sing to the

leopard: "" I can give it to you all except love babyyyyy. "" Maybe someone can put some but the ""effects

special"" or to shoot some scenes with a stuffed leopard, but come on, it's nothing that can not be

forgiven considering it's a movie from the 30's.

" 1

" Comedy of flat encephalogram, of lumpy humor and of doubtful taste. Seeing the trailer that they put on the TV told me my intelligent part of the brain "" this we do not see it or of

co���a "". But as in the end the irrational part of it, for ale, to see patochadas of a gentleman of

reduced dimensions that makes the baby ugliest of the world. The film treats of a tiny jewel thief who

comes out of prison after a long stay. Nothing else to leave, with his partner of normal size but of reduced brain, they

rob a tremendous diamond. But something goes wrong and they have to hide the diamond in a girl's bag.

Coincidentally, this girl has a boyfriend who is eager to be a pap���, so the two absurd minds think that the

little one will turn into a grotesque baby to recover the jewel. And it's gone. The creators of Scary Movie

bring us this film of grotesque humor, in the style of the previous four, but much less funny. I have

to admit that I laughed a lot, especially with the faces of the baby, but the thing is not to be cut. The

idea is very absurd, and it does not give for a whole movie. But hey, if we regain the fright of seeing theLord

reduced(I do not know if it's really a dwarf or special effects) we had a good time. To highlight the little

suits that they put on, which are to die for, and some scenes, especially those of a sexual nature. The end

could have been saved, which detracts from the final product. Resuming, flat encephalogram comedy,

lumpy humor and doubtful taste, which will not prevent we laugh happily. Yes, leaving the brain at

home and forgetting what is a coherent and interesting guide. Rating: 2 out of 5 (and whatever God

wants)

" 0

" American gangster gives us both views, both worlds, so close but so distant in

reality. For me, one of the best movies of this year.

Directed by the now Sir Ridley Scott, director able to give us true wonders (

Duelists, Alien, Blade runner, Thelma and Louise) or infudable clunkers (Lieutenant O 'Neil, Gladiator, Hannibal,

The Kingdom of Heaven), arrives American Gangster, a film co-starring Russell Crowe and Denzel

Washington, which also has some luxury extras such as Josh Brolin, Chiwetel Ejiofor or

Jon Polito among others. located in the Harlem of the seventies, where the ch���fer of the

main mafioso in the area decides to monopolize the heroin market in the neighborhood, extending its networks

along and wide of the United States becoming one of the largest drug dealers in history. For

its part, a not too popular police will try to uncover it and unmask it, and thus uncover the network of

police corruption that makes any attempt to end the tr��� impossible. drug trafficking of the country. With a

duration of little more than two and a half hours, American gangster is the second incursion of Ridley Scott in the

dark and profitable world of the mafia after Black rain. And that is that American gangster is a mixture of the great

titles of the genre, as if the Tony Montana of The price of power ended up becoming the Michael

Corleane of The Godfather, in a game of the police And the thief in which the characters of Heat and Srpico recreate

French Connection. So, after saying this, American Gansgster may sound rehashed, but sirs,

often rehashed. In the absence of watching films like It's not country for old people or Sweeney Todd, I think that this time the

Briton deserves the statuette once and for all. Going to the film itself, it can be said that

American gangster ranges from the origins of the mafioso Josh Lucas to his arrest, covering aof

fairly long periodtime, perhaps not as much as in Zodiac, but considerable enough to justify

its mastod���ntica duraci���n. So, a server just will dare to eliminate a couple ofscenes

inconsequential, taking into account that the assembly of the film is simply perfect. On the other hand, the

interpretive duel between Denzel Washington and Russell Crowe is noteworthy, even though the main

blot on the Ridley Scott film lies precisely there, in a possible lack of nerve, in the lack of

moments stretched along a marathon footage, but so and all in no time American gangsterus

allowsto detach from the screen. With a taste of göngsters cinema between the classical and the seventies, the film

takes time to show us both the anime and professional evolution of both characters.cross

finallytheir destinies, although, as in Heat, it will be quite complex to see them sharing a plane. So,

American gangster gives us both views, both worlds, so close but so distant in

fact, constantly playing with that inherent duality, offering us in a single film a duel,

so to speak, between Tony Montana and Frank Serpico. A wonderful movie to which, as I said, maybe it lacks

something nerve (it's bad milk), something from Sidney Lumet or, why not, from Sam Peckinpah, but no less

round. For me, one of the best movies of this year. I give it an 8.5 out of 10.

" 1

" Juan Diego act He's so naturally that at times he seems to be continually improvising. A

simple and close story, based on a script with good rhythm and magnificent interpretations.

On the one hand, we have a son, played by Juan Diego Botto, who, at thirty-some years old,

has only done the great life at the expense of his mother's money. On the other hand, we have his father, who is played by

Juan Diego, a theater actor in the twilight of his career who, at sixty years of age, lives a quiet life

with his partner. One dawn the son is encaloma in house of the father after many years in which hardly they have been

seen. From there, a relationship is renewed that never really existed. This is what Vete de M��� tells us. Not

more, not less. There are other actors in this movie and they do it very well, but the two Juan Diegos are the ones who

send on the screen. It does not matter if they are in the father's house, in a bar or in a brothel, this opera is

written for two characters and they could be talking about the time does, maintaining the interest of the viewer.

But, in addition, they say things. They do not deal with big issues, they just talk about themselves, but with an

interpretive force that does not matter. Without detracting from Botto's work, the tables ofare noticed

Juan Diego, who act so naturally that at times it seems that he is continually improvising. When

this happens, it is because the work of the actor and director borders on perfection and thus it is in Vete de M���. Among the

luxury extras, aside from Jos��� Sazatornil Saza, there is Rosa Mar���a Sard���. With a discreet role that barely

has three or four phrases, the Catalan actress shows that she is still in shape and we are already looking forward to seeing her in a

leading role in her category. In short, Vete de M��� is a simple and close story, based

on a gui���n with good rhythm and magnificent interpretations. It combines humor with great success withmoments

more dramatic, which reach pathos. Undoubtedly, a great work to be the first feature film

directed by Victor Garc���a Le���n (son of Rosa Le���n, the mouse I found Mart��� n). And above all, it is more

proof that Spanish cinema has nothing to envy and that there is life beyond Alatristes and Torrentes.

Curiosities: Juan Diego's work has deserved the Silver Shell in the last edition of theFilm Festival

San Sebastian. Recommended viewer: This is a film based on the interpretation and the gui���n, with

zero percent action. You know where you get, although it's worth it to dare with something different.

" 1

" The interpretation of the actors fails, maybe that is why the characters do not excite the viewer, no matter

what happens to them, and therefore, I think that those characters are not well constructed, they are very shallow and

even cold.

I was not disappointed because I knew it was the weakest film of Charlie Kaufman and Michel Gondry, so I

expected the worst, and, maybe because of that, it did not It seemed so bad, but it is not up to

Gondry and Kaufman. When the film is over, I tried to think what is wrong with it, maybe it's the

script? I do not think so, although it's not the best of Charlie Kaufman, but it could have made a

more interesting film. It's not easy for the actors to perform, Maybe that's why the characters do not excite the

viewer, no matter what happens to them, and therefore, I think that these characters are not well constructed, they are very

superficial and even cold. Patricio Arquette does not I like it, I've never liked it, I do not think I'm a good actress,

although it looks quite natural in this film. Tim Robbins acts well from time to time, but thisnot

hasbeen one of those times. And Rhys Ifans does not do it badly at all. It has some moments that I liked like

when you see the mice eating with cutlery, I liked the music of that moment. But little else is worth

noting, it is an original story and the courage of Gondry to dare to take it to the movies.

" 0

" A round divertimento from beginning to end, deliciously well written and interpreted. 'Bill Bill: Volume 1' is the perfect example of the admirable and incredible talent of Quentin Tarantino. It is not his

best work of his short filmography as a director and writer, but it is one of the best. It turns out to be a clear

example of the ability of this man, not only directing and writing, but at the time of the staging

, which 'Kill Bill: Volume 1' turns out to have the best and more brilliant of all the filmography of the

North American (followed by VERY closely by the others, of course), resulting in a film with arhythm

fresh, light(thanks to the division into chapters and to jumbled temporal jumps very well written) and

even disproportionately frantic, replete with the extravagant black humor and violence explicitly,

exaggeratedexaggerated and sometimes unpleasant, tarantiniana house brand. As if that were not enough, the first volume of

'Kill Bill' turns out to be a delicious homemade cocktail of the rich styles and cinematographic genres. Tarantino's

favorite characters, who fortunately does not make the mistake of trespassing the finest l���ne to between the

tribute / gui���oy and the most blatant plagiarism, by efficiently and without complex adapting his -part of the- exciting and

typical story to some audiovisual styles not his own, from Sergio Leone's films , Akira Kurosawa, Bruce Lee and

of course the action film made in Hong Kong. Another of the innumerable virtues of 'Kill Bill: Volume

1' and Quentin Tarantino is that it does not need grandiloquence to describe the characters (except

Lucy Lyu's. but that is what he needs / deserves). It only needs a visual aspect of its own that serves as the only

movement on the chessboard to describe the personality of the character being treated, although it

runs the risk that its characters end up being a considerable emptiness. The only defect, if it can

be considered as such, is that 'Kill Bill: Volume 1' is the film "" less Tarantino "" thathas given us

this man. There are no dialogues of those that make you wonder what the hell Quentin Tito smokes, and wish him

xD, like the mythical ones. "" You know what it's like to virgin ? "" of 'Reservoir Dogs', or TODA 'Pulp Fiction'. In short,

a round divertimento from beginning to end, deliciously well written and interpreted (enorrrrrrme Uma

Thurman). Not recommended for the delicate ones of est���mago and gafapaster���a cindorafila conservative.

" 1

" Lights of the North, the first book of the trilogy The Dark Matter, would have deserved an adaptation to the

big screen that was much more accomplished and accomplished than the one we are dealing with, so � that, seen as seen, I will buy

the two remaining books and I will sit down to read them on my sofa, which certainly will not disappoint me as much as the

planned second and third part.

From the beginning we wanted to sell this La Br���jula Dorada as the trilogy that was going to pick up the

witness of The Lord of the Rings, a spectacular fantasy trilogy I was going to break the box office and

to marvel again. But there are several factors that may not have taken into account and that are obvious once

seen the film, and the first is that Chris Weitz is not even Peter Jackson or this project is something

coveted and searched for years as ESDLA was for him, but rather looks like a custom film. Another

reason is that Northern Lights (as the book is actually called), despite being a good and entertaining

fantasy book, does not even reach far from the level of ���pica and grandeur of the work of Tolkien.La Br���jula Dorada

does not situate in an alternative world to ours and quite similar except in some things. The humans there are

always accompanied by a daemon, a kind of personification of the soul in the form of an animal that comes to

represent the character of each one. Our protagonist is Lyra, a young girl who awaits a great

destiny. Everything will start when someone starts kidnapping children and Lyra has to leave Oxford school

where she was raised to care for Mrs. Coulder, who is really behind the mysteryof

desapariciones.Lucesthe North, the first book of the trilogy His Dark Materials, have merited

adaptacina the big screen rather more successful and achieved the hand. After a year of

waiting for the film and being painted so well, they put it back in a film that is not

at all the height of the novel. Although the plot is following the thread of the book, everything seems to happen

so quickly and accidentally that even seems to be in a hurry to finish or skip at least the

first part of the book that is undoubtedly the m�� It's heavy, since it's not until Lyra's trip starts when

things really start to get interesting. The film is getting snippets of book here and

there leaving aside to delve into the characters and moving from scene to scene quickly and in a hurried way

, summarizing too many situations. The final colof���n happens in the last half hour of

film where the licenses taken are clearly alarming and without any sense. SPOILER You'll tell me what I was doing with that

bear fight in the film, qu���tala and the film is the same, it does not have the least sense , on the other

hand, in the book it is perfectly justified and it happens after saving the children, not before, since it is

the bears who have Lyra's uncle and where they are going to rescue him END OF SPOILERE As for the

actors, the great protagonist is Dakota Blue Richards, who can be just as charming as irritating

in a few minutes of difference, but who generally holds up pretty well, Daniel Craig, Eva Green and Sam

Elliot are They are correct in the little paper they have, and Nicole Kidman takes the cake, she gets the character

of Mrs. Coulder who in the book is a beautiful and refined lady, but in the background evil and with the power to

influence in the people it is totally disfigured and even ridiculous at times. It gives the sensation that Chris

Weitz has not been played with the film, as if Jackson did with his trilogy. You can not explain a book as

complex and full of nuances and fantastic elements as it is Northern Lights in an hour and three quarters, this

movie with half an hour or more would have been much better defined . Anyway there is a severe problem of

adaptation of gui���n that is the great inconvenience of everything and that I hope is improved in future deliveries, although

seen the seen I will buy the two remaining books and I sit ��� to read them on my sofa, which certainly will notme

disappointas much as the planned second and third part.

" 0

" The labyrinth of the faun is the masterpiece of Guillermo del Toro. A lesson in narrative wisdom in

cinema; the quintessence of imagination; and some masterful interpretations.

It must be said already. The labyrinth of the faun is the masterpiece of Guillermo del Toro. And whoever subscribes

recognizes that he got bored with The Devil's Backbone or disappointed with Hellboy. So, Cronos a

parte, the list was not too high, a��� and admitting that the Mexican director has that so-called universe of his

own and a very special touch. He had his possibilities this story, hybrid between horror and poetry; and between the

harsh environment of reality, that of the post-war Spain of 1944, and the world of internal fantasy of Ofelia, the

young protagonist. Especially after his triumphant passage through the past Cannes festival where,

unfortunately, he did not win any prizes. And what? Instead, I got a standing ovation from the audience of.

More than 20 minutes! And expectations are met. or rather, they are not met for the better. Because, ladies and

gentlemen, I agree that the best thing would be for anyone interested in seeing the film to discover it for itself,

but it is that we find: a lesson Den of narrative wisdom in cinema; the quintessence of

imagination; and some masterful interpretations, especially in that brutal captain who plays an

incossible Sergi Lopez, the face of Evil incarnated in fascism; but there is also the girl (Ivana

Baquero), the doctor (���lex Angulo) or a housekeeper who helps the rebel militias (Maribel Verd�� �); a good

fist, not just two or three, without ten, fifteen, twenty, of absolutely extraordinary scenes and moments; and a

montage and rhythm that does not decay at any time. Anyone who loves the fantastic genre, and the cinema, is

now, right now, before a work that will be �� for reference, with numerous guides to classic stories, especially

"" Alice in the Wonderland "". It manages to take advantage of trifles, archetypes and stories that seemed a

thousand views, spent. And yet, del Toro reinvents it. A baroque tale, sinister and obscure as

defined by its author, who also emphasizes, with sharpness, that his is a fable in favor of disobedience

within of a social framework in conflict and repression. In this case, in the framework of a divided and lost Spain,

with an oppressive and decisive power, anyone who breaks the rules. In El laberinto del fauno is a

13-year-old girl who flees from the sordid reality that surrounds her. Hu���rfana of father, with a mother (Ariadna Gil)

forced to a marriage of commitment with a doctor and vain character, the captain Vidal, to whom only he is

interested in son of his who waits for the wife, and of whom he does not doubt that he will be var���n. Deep down, a poor man whoman who

only knows how to kill, or a bittermakes life impossible for those around him, "" Let's go Serrano, this is away

very worthyof dying! "" He yells at one of his officers when they chase the maquis hidden in the forest. For

example, one of the fragments of the genius of Del Toro is in the same presentation of the character of

Vidal. He shows it with slight, but accurate brushstrokes: looking at a broken clock (a memory of the obsessions

inherited by his father) to complain about the incommensurability of his wife's arrival; and shortly afterwards the hand of

bad manners to Ofelia for a slight mistake of ���sta. And it is this rural and isolated framework propitiating

Ophelia's evasion, unique way to comfort yourself and maintain the purity of your innocence. Therefore, in such aenvironment

black, Ofelia dreams of bugs, with pale men with eyes in their hands, with giant toads, screaming mandr���goras, unattractive

looking fauns or fairies. -insect. The viewer asks what will be real in

all of it. Without revealing anything, the answer is given by the film itself. The fantasy, the poetry, the imagination is, of

course, before anyone who can see.

" 1

" I am up to the eggs of films that end badly because there is no talent to devise a final in

conditions. And I'm up to the eggs of the shitty critics, who in their fucking life have seen a

horror movie, and who exalt this little shit as if it were to be a new classics.

The orphanage is a Spanish horror movie of a haunted house. That yes, despite having acast

virtually Hispanicin its entirety, the story that narrates is very American, imitating the style of scares

based on raising the volume of special effects as necessary. As a friend of mine would say: the same

shit with different packaging. Says the director, Juan Antonio Bayona, who was hallucinating with the media response he

had with his first job. . And it is not for less. I also find amazing the exaggerated

support he has had in the media. Newspapers and televisions that treat like garbage (I recognize that often

deservedly) to the genre of terror and fantasy, have drooled exalted in front of this minor story, that will not

happen. to the history of cinema, neither in general nor Spanish. And it is that we are facing a story of ahouse

haunted. that we've seen a million times already. Hell, it's not even particularly well shot.

It works well as a low-budget experiment, or it would work better in a short film format, but it shits

like a long film. The story is 100% predictable and the scares that it is giving us are the classics of

the b-series: monster covered by a mask and they keep telling us how horrible it is and above all, raise

the volume of the music at the peak moments. And this does not strain anymore. I've put zeros to movies with more hearth

than this one (and they were well deserved, huh?). Once again, deceived, I went to the cinema hoping to find the

classic breath of fresh air, a work of low budget but original and sincere, an attractive andstory

absorbing. Well, no. The same shit. Of course 'The Sixth Sense' is the film that has harmed the

genre of terror. I'm up to the eggs of ghost stories that mix with humans and in the end they're

all dead. I am up to the eggs of films that end badly because there is no talent to devise a

final in conditions. And I'm up to the eggs of the shitty critics, who in their fucking life have seen a

horror movie, and who exalt this little shit as if it were to be a new classics. Fuck, if only onecomes

guyout every 5 years, and that's lucky. People leave the theater saying, 'Fuck, I'm scared.' Andsay

I: "Fear?" When? When they suddenly pull you out of a shattered face, or when theythe doors

slam, or when the aunt turns around, they turn up the volume and see a child ? But, man, I've seen this aalready

thousand times. At the end of the movie I thought. They have not taken out the cellar yet. and in effect, they take it out. Only a bit

of country music is needed to have it all. The story goes of an orphanage (obviously) to which awill take charge

couple. The girl (Belen Rueda, another drama behind her) lived there as a child and wants to return to take care

of children with problems. Immediately we know that there are ghosts, the couple's son can see them and as always

(bufff) the parents do not believe him and think they are the typical invisible friends. Then the child disappears

and the parents search. The mother investigates and learns that there was a deformed child who died in a

joke of the other children. The mother of the deformed child poisoned the rest and so the curse of the house was mounted. In the

end, everyone dies, the child of Belen Rueda turns out to be in the dead cellar (he had fallen without more) and the

mother herself commits suicide to keep the ghosts. Well, all this counted with great ups and downs in the

volume of the music and with very little dexterity on the part of the director, who skips several narrative phases

of the story, causing that in the end it does not finish all the tru�� �o. There is a constant obsession to give

scares to the viewer, which ends with the respectable sending the shit to the aforementioned director. Then, the roll

of. how ugly I am I'm going to show you my face. Well, I did not show it to you. Fuck, it's okay, we've seen all of it

. In the whole movie there are only two good moments: when the medium tells us what happened to the

children and when the mother is playing chocolate English with ghosts and every time she turns around there is

one more. that is achieved, but you can not base two hours of film on a continuous scare. The actors: Bel���n

Rueda is the personification desolaci���n. Let's go that the whole fucking day desolate, sad, shattered. the joy

of the garden. Difficult to judge the work of someone who only shows a record throughout the film. I think it is

misdirected and that in more expert hands it could have given more of itself. Let's see if he stops doing dramas that

bore a little, it's that everyone dies. The rest simply pass by. I read about Geraldine

Chaplin, who plays a very funny role. Fuck, funny compared to the Belen Rueda, and compared to her

anything is funny. It leaves 5 minutes and is limited to walk around the house zombie. But take the opportunity to

tell us what has happened with the children and this is original, resolves very well the lack of effects with an

agile and exciting narrative. But go, endure the two hours just for this scene, it will be that no. For being his

first film, we could think of being condescending and putting a good grade, but no. Now is when you

can and should risk. Later on it will be subject to a budget, producers, need for a good

box office, etc. But now it can be original and groundbreaking. If you do not want or can be better, do not dedicate yourself to

this genre, and go to make romantic films that tend to have better criticism and acceptance. For my part:

zero.

" 0

" For lovers of cinema understood as an art, for those who are fed up with the beaten track and the

gimmicky visual treatment that is not creative, it is a mess that will best be fled as it runs away from a plague

Look at what they have converted us. With this sentence ends the search for Bourne and a trilogy about the origin

and identity compressed in a film format of action and espionage, three films for to count almost the

same the three times, with which we have one of the most blatantly stretched products that have been seen.

When we reach the "" the end "", the tease is as irritating as it is predictable. In fact, we are facing

one of the worst trilogies in the history of cinema. The story itself does not offer anything original, and this

is especially striking in the last minutes of a film that should ��� to close the circle with anote

higher or complementaryto the one already mentioned in its two precedents, and not to reiterate the implicit ideas,

because what is done is to say literally what is already knew (what any viewer who had

paid a minimum attention knew). If the schematism already made a dent in the previous delivery, here is a `problem

fundamental: all the action scenes, - of" "here you hide and here I catch you "", of "" you think I'm there but

I'm here "", etc. - they are exactly the same, the writers always use the same structure to design

situations, and the �� The only goal pursued is to create spectacular scenes represented with thepulse

bombasticof Paul Greengrass' camera, which gives rise to a merely gimmicky visual impact devoid

of authentic narrative sense; a narrative is configured with the advance towards new emotional and / orand

ideological states in the characters, or with the discovery of new data that oblige to reinterpret the twiststurns

that sustain the story. That is to say, that each sequence devised establishes a progression

with respect to the previous one. There are many ways of constructing a narrative, but what can not be done is to limit

oneself to a chain of scenes to each one m� It's spectacular and extensive (you have to see how the

sequences of action get longer, a clear symptom that screenwriters do not know what to occupy the footage), and leave all the

essential information for the last ten minutes. And above, to know what we already knew. Some filmmakers and

screenwriters need someone to explain that narrating consists of synthesizing and progressing towards the outcome,

not in dispersing and schematizing. In short, and if it is a matter of looking for a moment of entertainment,

the film can satisfy the hardcore of the genre. For lovers of cinema understood as an art,

for those who are fed up with the beaten track and the ghostly visual treatment that is not creative, it is a

mess of which it would be best to flee as one flees from a plague.

" 0

" The Nanny Diaries (Diary of a Ni���era) is a clamorously failed attempt to combine thecomedy

gaudywith a serious analysis of New York high society.

Let's see, raise your hand those who have never dreamed of having Scarlett Johansson as a child, and here is not worth

anyone to escape. Such a plebiscite would get a crushing and sure majority that they are the ones who would

love it while they themselves grew up. No doubt this is a film that will give a lot to talk about

all the jokes and enso���aciones that generate��� around this issue. Even though already in the first scene

Nicholas Art (one of the most envied children on the face of the earth by more adults than kids) is thrown

over to poor Johansson, then radically changes and literally receives her kicks The poor kid should not

be aware yet that due to that strange dichotomy he should spend the rest of his life lying on the divin

de alg Codn greedy psychologist. No less extraordinary is the blindness of the character of Paul Giamatti (why in

his first appearances the directors want to hide his face and then unveil it without more?), That until

the last third of the film does not notice the innate qualities of Johansson as a child. We strongly recommend that

these great mysteries of humanity be investigated thoroughly by experts in the world of the paranormal,

because they exceed the capacity of the human being. The film does not lack even the usual final speech, and

this time the Johansson plays as an interlocutor a helpless teddy bear, which must suffer as the

poor spectator such a disproportionate. As if that were not enough, and despite the fact that they have sold us the film as

a hooligan comedy of post-adolescents, it is not at all, and it is that it is proposed as ainvestigation

fieldin the terrain of anthropology. And well, The Nanny Diaries (Journal of a Ni���era) has both

anthropological research and Big Brother sociological study of human behavior. The Nanny Diaries

(Diary of a Ni���era) is a clamorously unsuccessful attempt to combine the gaudy comedy with a serious analysis

of New York high society. And it also serves to see where two great actresses likecan reach

Scarlett Johansson and Laura Linneywith such bad characters and such a nefarious guit.

" 0

" Realization is quite sober and relies mainly on a good and funny gui���ny andcharacters

well definedand magnificently interpreted throughout the cast.

Almost every year a low-budget film that no one counted on rises up

with the favor of the public and some nomination to the Oscars. This year it seems that he has to play that role to

"" Little Miss Sunshine "" (Little Miss Sunshine). The film tells the trip that a family something problematic. ��tica

has to perform, in her truck, to take the little girl to the Miss Sunshine contest. As

in any good movie, and this is it, the physical journey will turn into an interior journey that will

evolve the characters (a few m ���s that to others) and will change the family forever. "" Little Miss

Sunshine "" is the debut in the realization of feature films by Jonathan Dayton and Valerie Faris, successful

directors of advertising spots and video clips. I can not give them a better compliment than saying that the film

lacks the typical defects of the directors coming from these artistic areas. In fact the realization

is quite sober and it relies mainly on a good and fun gui���ny and well-characters

definedand performed magnificently by the cast, consisting of Greg Kinnear, Alan Arkin, Toni

Collette, Steve Carell, Paul Dano and Abigail Breslin and it would be difficult to highlight some member. Thanks to

them we laughed and got excited during the 100 minutes that the film lasts. It could be reproached that

some situations are somewhat forced and their (voluntary) character small movie and unpretentious. But,

fortunately, the history of cinema is full of good and small unpretentious films, of those that

we like to see one year after another. Time will tell if that is the final destination of "" Little Miss Sunshine "".

" 1

" The search of a decent film becomes the topetazo with an insult to the human intelligence of

which being very generous we can say that in some moments it becomes entertaining, and thanks.

Benjamin Gates is a great treasure hunter, member of a prestigious American family, but one day a man

appears and brings evidence incriminating his great-great-grandfather in the Lincoln murder. To prove the

innocence of his ancestor, Gates surrounds himself with his buddies and goes around the world in search of the

legendary golden city of the Olmecs, all very normal, while the bad guy, who is none other than the guy who has

stained the name of his grandfather, and who also wants the treasure, is dedicated to follow them, the most purestyle

villainof Willy Fogg. And well, with this argument we put a film of adventure, but I I ask. Is it

necessary for an adventure film to be for all the public, which is an insult to

human intelligence? Because, let's see. One thing is that the character of Cage is the hero, and that he knows how to do

everything and everything well, that he is able to sneak into Buckingham Palace, in the White House, at a private party

of the president of the USA. but there are things that I'm sorry but not, I'm chattering too much. What about "I jump

a semaphore to take a picture of this tablet of centuries old, throw the tablet and if That already

hacked the files of the police to get the photo and translate the tablet from there "" is one of the things that

killed me. One thing is that realism makes its concessions in pursuit of dynamism, but this movie is

excessive, since there are situations that have neither feet nor head. The newspaper itself referred to by

t�� �tulo, it is the mythological book of the presidents of the USA, where a lot ofis supposed to come

secret information, so to read it, nothing like sneaking into the the president's birthday, kidnap him,

make a colleague of ���ly and get the information out of him, and it does not matter that they throw the entire FBI to look for you, since a

pivot is all the security measure that you're going to find. The argument, in addition, has some other thing

quite absurd (without having to enter the dozens of cutreclich���s that it uses) being the most fat the one that

serves as the plot thread . To refute the evidence that incriminates his ancestor he has nothing else to do

but search for a treasure and prove his innocence. To me, of course, the only thing he shows me is that there was

a treasure, not that his great-great-grandfather was innocent. Then there's the issue of the kicks to History, inevitable in

this kind of films, being that the city of Olmecas is located in Mount Rushmore, which

is like planting a Sumerian city just outside of Oslo And what about that great cultural pearl,

when someone says "happy" that is pre-Columbian, it must be at least 500 years old? "" Someone please

explain to them that pre-Columbian It does not mean "" before Colombo. "" In short, this film is a skid and

leaves many riddles open, the most important being "" why I have paid to see this? ""

" 0

"? When does he call a stranger? it becomes, therefore, an elongated version of the Scream phone scene

but not as effective.

I have a rule that I always try to fulfill, it's about not seeing a remake before watching the original movie in

based. I usually comply, although I must say that in this case I have not complied with this norm. Anyway,

I do not think I valued the original in a different way after seeing the remake that I'll comment, and that is "" When you

call a stranger "", as I understand, so s��� he takes it from the original the first minutes to lengthen them

for an hour and a quarter. In the nineties, "" Scream "" had used for its spectacular initial scene the idea of

that film of the The seventy homonymous to which we comment. But that scene in which we saw Drew

Barrymore being telephoned by a psychopath until she was finally massacred, only lasted

ten minutes, and her effectiveness was absolute. "" When a stranger calls "" it becomes, therefore, anversion

elongatedof that scene but not as effective. In any case, we are not facing a film as bad and

dispensable as they have been. Endeavored to say many. The first thing that surprised me was the photograph of Peter

Menzies Jr, especially in the first fifteen minutes, which also highlights the planning of Simon West after

the cameras , more solvent than expected. After these first minutes the thing is divided into some

moments more or less disturbing, several scares and no surprise since they already gut us all in the

trailer. "" When you call a stranger " "It is far from being a remarkable film, but it does not hurt its

viewing either. In fact, whoever writes this has had a good time seeing this "" slasher "" with hardly any deaths or a drop

of blood, and that is something to be taken into account, since a "" slasher "" without These two aspects may have a

rather small interest. Simon West is a mediocre director, but within what can be saved the ballot without

excess, without pretending something more than we see a screen, that is, a "" teen movie "" soft and accessible to

all tastes , which looks as fast as it is forgotten and where you do not have to look for anything more than an

entertainment. The interpretations and the script have not been mentioned throughout the cr�� Ethics, as you would

suppose because you do not have to give them the least importance. The few interpreters who come out alone are there

to put gestures and, from time to time, drop some phrase that could be avoided and the wording puts in the mouth of those

interpreters those phrases that could be avoided and, for the rest, it is a mere excuse to set up an

approach and extend it to a duration "" "I will try to get the" "When you call an

original" "strange and I'll give my opinion about it, although I doubt it has great similarities with this remake.

Anyway, "" When a stranger calls "" the remake, suffers greatly from this "" noventero air "" so clean and

well checked that does great favors genre film, or at least to the "" slasher "" series b thatso much

gavejoy to the fan there by the seventies and eighties. That is to say, in this filmthing is imposed at all times

the politically correct, being all well-known prefabricated to leave kitchen and to be served without problems.

The final result could be worse.

" 0

" Loose Spanish comedy movie. Santiago Segura and Jos��� Corbacho do not guarantee laughter, you have to work

more on situations. Or was it not for history?

The home cinema is a curious way of defining a type of humor that is only liked in Spain. That kind of

joke that nobody else would understand, if not us. They are the films of Pajares and Esteso, of Segura, of Chiquito,

etc. They are the jokes of this last one, of Marianico el Corto, of Ar���valo, etc. Muddy humor that is known. And

I usually love it, that's it. The film is about a group of kids that come together to participate in the

national contest of the dance machine, a recreational where steps are taken of dance. The motives are

disparate and are commanded by Jonnhy, a crippled "" chief "" of recreational who in his time was a great dancer

(amn of other things). Also the owner of the recreational, some legionnaires andEastern

MiddleBuddhists appear there. And little more. The home cinema, a world to be known. Look, I wanted to see her with good eyes,

trying to laugh, but no. The beginning is very good, with a couple of good jokes that made me

laugh. But as the guideline stabilizes, the jokes lose interest and you do not know very well if you are

facing a parody of the American films of team overcoming or it is simply a bad movie

of that type. Regardless of this, the movie has very little. Corbacho does something funny, especially with

his tape recorder, Segura does very little, and the rest of the cast of actors does not make or half (the legionaries if). And

since there are no nudes, well nothing. Resuming, loose film of Spanish comedy. Santiago Segura and Jos��� Corbacho

do not guarantee laughter, you have to work more on situations. Or was it not for history?

" 0

" Perhaps it does not reach a masterpiece due to the lack of greater cohesion between the stories, but the advantage of

the film is that it suggests that we are dealing with a promising director time to dive into the

most intimate emotions of each one.

Anyone has a story to tell. In this film, nine stories are told: nine lives. In

each episode, the end is like an impact on the stomach, hits the conscience and leaves thereflecting

viewer. It is the narrative, filmed in a single sequence, of nine stories, nine fragments of life of nine

women of different ages, conditions and personalities, but in essence they are the same. Each one goes through

a different situation, but that becomes its own emotional crossroads. Life beats of just

fifteen minutes each that make up a universal portrait of the feminine essence. Such a deep immersion in

the personality of the woman could not have been captured better than, as in this case, with short shots thatus

bringcloser to the characters, with a camera that accompanied them. And he follows his movements and turns the spectator into

direct testimony of what happens there. Sandra is an immigrant who spends her days locked in prison and lives

with the impotence of not being able to go out and hug her little daughter. Diana (Robin Wright Penn), a pregnant woman who

sees her emotional stability faltering when she meets a past love. In the emotional scene of the

reunion in the supermarket, the affection seems to be reborn between the couple, it is more, it is a

feeling that never left them. Another piece shows the state of anxiety that a woman suffers in

the antechamber of a surgical operation, an intense moment that even manages to snatch a nervous smile from the

viewer. Love, pain, sex, death and loneliness are mixed in these stories being the

expression of life itself. Although the set of stories is somewhat irregular, due to the fact that some

stories are more developed than others, it manages to keep the rhythm without barely failing throughout the

tape. With an apparently sober but impeccable staging and a soft soundtrack like a caress, the

director of Things that he would say just by looking at it and the son of the writer Gabriel Garc���a Marquez confirms himself once more

as a wise connoisseur of female psychology and that has a special sensitivity to translateinto

human feelingsimages. Perhaps it does not reach a masterpiece due to the lack of greater cohesion between the

stories, but the advantage of the film is that it suggests that we have adirector

promisingwhen it comes to diving. in the most intimate emotions of each one.

" 1

" The Tarantinian segment is confused, disconnected, repetitive. Because one thing is that you do a tribute to the

Z-series cinema of the seventies, and another that you roll as if you did not even have the idea of ​​what thejob is

filmmaker's.

The second segment of the project "" Grindhouse "" that reaches us, after "" Planet terror "" confirms that we are facing a

"" revival "" nostalgic perpetrated for the refocilamiento of its authors, but not, of course, of the spectator.

This "" Death proof "" Quentin Tarantino has shot with obvious pleasure on his part, however we fear that

it has not had the same effect on the public. Man, it can be understood that there are a certain number of people

affected by the seventies syndrome in the USA, que that, apart from getting into the meninges, makes one

wear elephant pants, it looks like a head of impossible curls, they eat pinches burritos and drink

tequila like the one who drinks a fanta. One can even laugh at the prefabricated cuts of the film, in the

way in which those prehistoric tapes, exhibited "" ad nauseam "" by theatrical cinemas, were constantly

spliced ​​by the projectionist on duty. But, Quentin, son, at least give us a fairlystory

decent? Because what tells us the not so "" enfant terrible "" (at least by age, which is already talludito) of

Yankee cinema is no longer a meme probably conceived in a trip I do not know if lis ���rgico or after watching one

of Ed Wood, a nonsense that tells us the unlikely story of a former specialist who likes to crashwho are tongue-tied

into girlsand pulling profanities, not the fact of correcting them (��� we are in 2007, to see who

dares to correct someone ?!), but for the exhilarating pleasure of transferring a certain dose of his blood from one

part of his body to another, physiological question. Reman topped with certain deliquescent emissions (yes, I know, it's

a literal circumlocution of the fuck, but do not ask me to be more clear, that this page also Does the children read it

?). But when the imbecile as a doctor appears the shape of his shoe in the curves forms of

three pictures of weapons to take, the hard one is no longer so much? "" Death proof "", it is true, is funny in

its excess and in its majader���a, as it was "" Planet terror "", although this, being totally Martian, had

some unlikely logic that amnestied her. However, the Tarantinian segment is confused, disjointed (and not

by the cuts of the "" ad hoc "" montage, which at times seems like a homage to Godard's "" A bout de souffle ""),

reiterative, with so much persecution In a car that ends the dizzy spectator, and is even awkwardly

shot. Because one thing is that you do a tribute to the Z-series cinema of the seventies, and another that you roll as

if you did not even have the idea of ​​what the filmmaker's job is. As for the artistic cast, Kurt Russell

strives to compose a tough character for which he does not need much: the coryceous face

his many years have given him is enough, helped by some touch-up of the makeup department. Among them I am left

with the always wonderful Rosario Dawson, the emerging star of the black actresses, which so well suits

this mannerist update of the phenomenon "" blaixplotation ""; but the one that eats with potatoes to the rest of the distribution

is a new girl (not in the office, but in the running), the New Zealander Zoe Bell, coming from the hard land

of the specialists, that is splendid , not only as an actress, but also as a double of herself; It's the good

thing about being accustomed to breaking your chin instead of others: when it's your turn to do it to yourself, do not you

need someone to replace you?

" 0

" It fails sonoramente in its attempt to emulate the classic ones of the black cinema, offering a history that in

spite of being based on real facts nobody is able to believe.

If there is a genre that could be qualified as a symbol, as the best exponent of classical Hollywood, it would

undoubtedly be the black cinema. Some of the greatest films ever made belong to this genre, such as

Casablanca, Perdicion, The Malt���s Falcon, Cayo Largo or Sed de Mal. Not to mention the filmmakers who directed

these productions (Welles, Huston, Wilder, Hawks, Preminger?) And the great actors who worked on them.

It's hard to find a great classic Hollywood star who did not make at least one of these

movies. Go over these lines as sincere and meaningful homage to an entire ��� little of the cinema and agenre

special, now practically defenestrated. It is not only because he hardly comes back to it, but because many of the

recent examples are embarrassing, such as the ominous Black Dahlia. But let's focus on what concerns us,

which is Todd Robinson's Solitary Hearts. The film is based on the real crimes committed by Ray

Fern���ndez (Jared Leto) and Martha Beck (Salma Hayek) at the end of the forties, and in the capture of these

�� Last, in which played a crucial role Elmer Robinson (John Travolta). Coincidences that life has, it

was the director's grandfather. The film has a serious error since its inception, and is the approach that

has in the form of flashback, showing before the end that the outcome. As if that did not hurt enough to

the story, Robinson narrates it in a very deficient way, without sense of rhythm, slow at times and run over

in others. Admittedly, the guide does not lack anything to be full of common places and topicazos

typical of the mediocre shows of film noir. The characters are mere empty casings, and as it could not be

otherwise, both the protagonist and the villain live tormented, each suffering his own cross. Of the

best interpretive work, better not to speak. Solitary Hearts is a film that fails sonoramente in

his attempt to emulate the black cinema classics, offering a story that despite being based on

real events nobody is capable of believing.

" 0

" The title will not deserve the absolute repudiation because (I insist) has other cinema ways. Telefilm worthy,

small movie, video store entertainment, in any case.

I saw this Quo vadis, baby? with some reluctance: I did not enter the title, more indebted to the comedietas ofhumor

crudeand eroticism casposo of an Ozores that of what the tape intends, a thriller or an intimate drama, that of

both there is. The disappointment was late in arriving, but he went to his appointment: one can not harbor good feelings,oneself

letbe carried away by intuitions and suspect, between the morass of European cinema, light or heavy. ���simo, a

film of interest that reflotes my opinion (lately negative and to a great degree) of the Italian cinema, thatgave

onceme so many good times when one in this to see movies with some assiduity and with a lot of

passion. Quo vadis, baby? It is an odd hybrid between the detective story, of careful detail andoverwhelming

predictable, but, and the depth with pretensions of the drama of characters, where I get

carried away by Cassavettes or by Ivory and not by Salvatores, who wants to give a lot in a lot of field and is in little in a

few meters. It seemed (that impression I had during the last half stretch of the film) that the director has pulled

some It is a problem solver and has been cut off by the shortest route, which usually coincides with the worst and

the most obvious. It saves the start, which is braided with more personal strands and where the

most earthly concerns of a director are overly moved by the telefilms, a valid school for a

certain cinema. small demands and short courses. The title will not deserve the absolute repudiation because

(I insist) has ways of another cinema, which we would like, but we do not see. The argument could have been stretched

to round a pure noir and obviate any dramatic intent: we already know that the detectives are hard and

tender at the same time and that, as Rub said Blan Blades in his immortal Penknife, "if you were born to hammer from heaven

your nails fall." These nails leave the coffin half-closed or half-opened, but the body is not he touches himself too

much: he lets himself be loved, he worries about loosening his devastated body and causing the spectator (with a healthy

Samaritan spirit) to leave the cinema confident that the next time (the There will be no opportunities for

such disastrous events. There is a lot of cinema to see: tonight, without going any further, I shot to see Babel, that everyone has an

opinion of the film and I, with two candles, I can not enter the conversations of coffee with friends.

" 0

" One of those little movies that Allen likes to do from time to time; light, entertaining and

fun. Adjectives that are, being sincere, of the best that can be said to a comedy.

After the enormous satisfaction produced by "" Match Point "" (link to the critics in Moonfleet),was waiting with

the following Woody Allen filmdesire to see if it continued a in the same line of the previous one or changed of

registry. To the expectations, Allen has decided by a light comedy of those that he does with the eyes

closed and that it can that part of the p Public leave, unfairly, disappointed. The film tells the

investigation that, based on a peculiar tip-off, is made by a journalism student (Scarlett Johansson)

to discover if the well-known aristocrat Peter Lyman (Hugh Jackman) He is the tarot killer. The rookie

journalist will have the help of a second-tier magician (Woody Allen). With such an argument you can not

expect anything other than a light comedy of entanglements in which Woody Allen offers the best of himself. Himself and

shows that he has not lost an inch of his vision. Each of his appearances on stage is a gift

for the viewer. A m���, only to see how it moves and I laugh. Beside her, Scarlett, clumsy and amusing

without losing a touch of her attractiveness. The other characters, much less worked than in other films of

Allen, act as mere comparsas although it is the height (especially Ian McShane). As I say the script

works as a clock in both its comic and intrigue although, as in any good comedy, whatless

we careis the identity of the murderer. If we add that to the rhythm that Allen knows how to give to his films and the

ease he has to tell a good story in an hour and a half, we will have a projection that passes in a

sigh. It is evident that the comparison with films like "Mysterious murder in Manhattan" would be

quite unequal and unjust because, it seems evident seeing it, that Allen did not intend to to make a movie like that.

We are, however, before one of those small movies that Allen likes to do from time to time; light,

entertaining and fun. Adjectives that are, being sincere, of the best that can be said to a comedy.

" 1

" An excellent film, which despite being intimate and conventional in certain passages, does not prevent

the subtle and brilliant ability of Cronenberg to show us light notes that intuit more than they show, they

place the film in the olimpus.

Throughout the history of cinema, we have constantly resorted to describing, with greater or lesser fortune, the

different ramifications of organized criminal groups throughout our planet. The fact of

describing the dark and free of moral and social ties of these groups organized by elements

that even extolled certain principles among the members of such groups, has created in the viewer

a certain attraction and empathy with these immoral characters. From the much exploited choice of themafia

Italianin any of its ramifications (with the masterpiece "" The Godfather "" Coppola as obvious reference),

through the Irish mafia, even the Chinese triads (which they are a recurring breeding ground in

Hong Kong cinema until exhaustion, with results in most notable cases). But other diverse

groups were never the subject of an accurate analysis or, failing that, worth mentioning beyondcases

specific, as in this case the Russian mafia (perhaps Debidos due to the secrecy that the extinct URRS always inculcated in

its members and the disinformation given beyond its borders). For this reason, a realisticseemed opportune

and close approach to such an unknown organization, but the truth is that assigning such a project to a filmmaker who has been trained in the

field of fantasy such as David Cronenberg, seemed In principle a risky decision. Nothing is further from

reality, as the Canadian director had already demonstrated in his last project, "" A history of violence "",

which unfolds with great ease in the nearby stories , with secrets that hide around the

corner, hoping to resurge with vigorous force. The work of Cronenberg as director, already known by every

lover of the seventh art, stands out in its beginnings for what is called �� the theory of the new flesh,

in which an indissoluble relation between physical deformation and its moral consequences developed,

being even applicable to a certain tendency to merge the human body with the technologies in a certain

stretch of his career. So much in his beginnings with films like "" Rabia "", "" Cromosoma 3 "", "" Scanners "" or "" Videodrome "" (his

most disturbing film maybe in his intense beginnings), as he once achieved author status through

what was probably the best moment of his career as a director, with essential films such as "" La Mosca "",

"" Inseparables " "or" "The naked lunch" ", Cronenberg became little by little the palad���n offantastic cinema

transgressiveand with a point of dissection both physical as moral of the human being. The final stretch of his career

seems, in the view of a server, highly unsatisfactory, with three films as "" Crash "" (with a legion of

fans, but despite this tremendously irregular), " "Spider" ", and above all the mediocre" "ExistenZ" ", in which

Cronenberg seeks to take his obsessions further, becoming too obvious and foreseeable in his

approaches, and for that reason , moving away little by little from the constants that made him a vital creator of

recent fantastic cinema. But curiously, when one least expects it, the Canadian filmmaker offers us

another turn in his career, in which he aspires to seek more an amorality in close and common characters, as

demonstrated in the espl�� �ndida "" A history of violence "", already more pronounced and satisfying in the film that

concerns us, the no less brilliant "" Eastern Promises "" History shows us Like Anna, a descendant of

Russian emigrants who works in a clinic attending births, she finds herself at night in the morning caring

for a baby born of another immigrant from the eastern countries. , already deceased. Through her diary, written in

Russian, and that little by little she will be deciphering, Anna is entering a dangerous world, that of one of themafias

most importantof all Russia, in this case, settled as immigrants in a current London, the same in which

Anna lives with her parents after a sentimental break. The appearance of a driver who knows more than What she

looks like, and the threats she suffers for her life by having in her possession the diary of the deceased girl, and that

suffered a terrible event in her own flesh, are the basis for creating a story full of nuances and in

which nobody is what it seems. From a good beginning, with that murder that opens the film, Cronenberg makes clear

that in spite of being an intimate story, at any moment it can flourish from it the most baser

instincts of human beings, through a careful staging and hyperformal perfection, we

mue the daily facts of this faction of one of the most implacable mafias that exist, with an

impeccable characterization by means of light details in appearance, but tremendously effective as a

description of a unknown world for Anna, to cite as an example the localist humor used by Viggo

Mortensen in his role as chauffeur Nikolai (splendid on paper, with a characterization full of gestures and

sublime looks) in the scene he exercises of such with Anna, when his motorcycle is lying in the middle of the street.

Details that reach each and every one of the characters of that family of criminals, described as

discussed above through a subtlety out of the ordinary, with small pieces of cotideanidad

(scenes like the one of brothel with Nikolai and Kirill, a no less splendid Vincent Cassel, or thethreat

tremendously effective and distantmade by the head of such organization in the maternity hospital to

Anna, are revealing in that regard), with the intention of perfectly describing the intentions of

Cronenberg in this small story in time but powerfully charged withnot

nuances. The film isleft behind, with an accurate parallel narration as a constant revelation in the footage, which

is the dual development of events through the eyes of Anna and the narrative. through the very

words of the immigrant and deceased through his diary. Tremendously powerful in its buried and rich intention

to transcend, "" Promises from the East "" shows that not always a minimalist film with a close story must

be flat and monothematic, the eternal confrontation of Nikolai of his duty against his own conscience, the

violence contained after a disturbing scene through family reunions of the Russian mafia (as a way of

effective and brilliant tension release) ), all this contributes to make the story credible, working a

specific scene as a catalyst of all that violence that is intuited but not

fully shown, perhaps the descriptive climax of this history of violence as was its previous job. This scene,

which takes place in the sauna, is the point of Cronenberg's intentions with the story, everybeing

humancarries within himself the duality that leads us to be unpredictable beings by letting ourselves be carried away by

emotions (Whether part of a charming appearance as the mafia boss to become the demon

inside, as starting from the superficial caused by that frightening aspect of Nikolai, but that

involves a man of pure heart), and in which the filmmaker of Ontario unleashes the hyper-realistic and

vindictive more violent scene of the film, with a stark struggle to survive naked from all coraza

(literally Nikolai is in that position, in a scene metaphysically powerful as it is devoid

of any defense) in the bathrooms of that aseptic sauna. Both the work behind Cronenberg's cameras, and the

exceptional performance from part of the deal or, above all, those who interpret the members of such charismatic

organization, contribute to create a quasi-perfect film, in which only small details could bewrong

considered, as the shallow description of the people on foot who make up Anna's family,

devoid of any kind of nuance and interest on the part of the viewer, beyond the purely anecdotal ���tico. The

character of Anna is perhaps too old for the role, maybe the decision of

having chosen a younger actress is more successful, which will give It made much more sense to that rebel and nonconformist, not to say

insanely risky, attitude to face one of the most powerful mafias in the world. The innocence of

the youth would have justified that attitude and would have given even more sense to the feeling of overprotection

that Nikolai exerts on her. Still, Naomi Watts unfolds with ease in the role of Anna, being

somewhat limited his performance, that if. In short, an excellent film, despite to be intimate and

conventional in certain passages, with a gray London as a hopeless story as the future of

those illegal immigrants who survive guided by the traffic of people, does not prevent the subtle and brilliant

ability of Cronenberg to show us light notes that intuit more than they show, they place the film in the

Olympus of the best films of the year. Essential, without a doubt.

" 1

" Mario Bava directed in 1968 this adaptation of the character, a classic of the Italian c demic of the

sixties. The first 25 'are great. I want to be Diabolik.

I had a bomb with Diabolik !!! Mario Bava directed this adaptation of the character in 1968, a classic of the

Italian comic of the sixties. John Phillip Law is Diabolik, thief and criminal (terrorist) with theeyebrows

cooleston the planet and Marisa Mell is Eva, the most stunning woman I've seen in a movie in a long time.

Michel Piccoli is Inspector Ginko, the man who must catch the masked thief. But that will not be easy:

Diabolik has all kinds of gadgets and the ones that called me the most. attention were the "" Gas of laughter "" and the

"" Anti-gas pill of laughter "" that I imagine come in the same pack. The soundtrack is of one Ennio

Morricone and the rhythm is great even if the movie has neither feet nor head and look like three episodes a

television seriesJovenes pop druggies of the sixties and an exemplary traveling on a joint are more ingredients

for the salad of eccentricities that would delight many if those responsible for Grindhouse

resuscitated the story instead of Barbarella. The first 25 'are great. I want to be Diabolik.

" 1

" The script has no where to grab it even if it leaves with the best predisposition, and if that were not enough, the

tape is extremely tricky. And if not, eye the patch with that end, which will leave with the open mouth of

a spectator.

The day an executive came up with the idea that he could use the expression "" inspired by? "" Instead of

"" based on? "" Was a great day for Hollywood. An ideal subterfuge with which to cover the backs before the

public by the infinity of tropel���as made with novels, plays or even real facts and

hist���ricos.La science fiction has been one of the main victims, since there are innumerable cases in which

a good idea becomes a film of vulgar action. This is the case of Next, which is freely inspired

by a free story by Philip K. Dick entitled The Golden Man. It turns out that a magician from third of Las Vegas,

which puts his musician Nicolas Cage and little m� ��s, you have the gift of seeing your future with two minutes in advance. This

quality makes an FBI agent, played by Julianne Moore, ask for help to avoid acatastrophe

nuclear. But alas, the poor devil just wants to live a happy and quiet life with a woman, to whom

Jessica Biel's vase puts her curves, with which she is obsessed. Whoever expects to see a work of science

fiction that deals with transcendental and philosophical topics can already forget about Next. On the other hand, those who are

looking for a film in which the plot is a mere excuse to make way for an endless sequence of

action and visual effects would enjoy it with Next . The gui���n there is no where to grab it even if it goes

with the best predisposition, and if that was not enough the tape is extremely tricky. And if not, look at the patch with

that end, which will leave the mouth open to a viewer, and these, in a vain attempt to find a

reasonably reasonable explanation, mark the screen without leaving your astonishment. Who had the gift of seeing the

future as the character of Nicolas Cage. With such capacity, we could save ourselves many hot flashes

that we endure in a movie theater or on the sof��� of our house.

" 0

" A tape, which, although excellently well set and with a pretty good development (and short, I do

not forget), ends with a very bad closing. Menudo tost���n without head or tail ...

Lately the lack of ideas in Hollywood left me quite hallucinated, to start an article in a

magazine came out the saga "" At full throttle "" , also in this way appeared on the screens the film "" On the edge of

the waves "" Well, this tape that brings us today comes as a result of a phone call. Unique, yes, of a call, neither

more nor less, a "" ring "" What is it? Who is it? And Zas! Film to the song. A tape, which, although excellently well

set and with a pretty good development, (and short, I do not forget), ends with a very bad closing, and is

that the film starring Robin Williams, Toni Collete and Sandra Oh, do not know how to take us to the end of where they

should do it, since their simple end-point harms the promising start of the story; adrama

gimmickyof those that we can see any day on a TV channel (in the after-dinner, of course). Perhaps, the

problem that I see the tape, is that the narrative rhythm, is infamous, try, in small doses, very badly

administered, put all the meat on the spit, and leave (with small traps) that the viewer has one of

lime and another of sand in those 75 minutes. of footage (that of which lasts 90 min will be with the credits), so thatfolder. Resuming, I prefer

from a "" simple """" we can finish the projectiona phrase that one

of the people who accompanied me in the pass said: often tost���n without feet or head.

" 0

" Toro is riding it very well for a legion of unsuspecting people to value his film, but El

Laberinto del Fauno is no more than a telefilm that dreams of be a work of art.

In the exercise of cinematographic criticism there is a basic difficulty: what refers to the artistic value of

a certain aesthetic expression, or of an idea of ​​the story , the story or the concept to develop. Valor

value depends on the one hand on the sensitivity and the subjective scales of each individual and, on the other, on the

consideration that is taken of the different theoretical currents concerning philosophy. the aesthetics and the

narrative structure. If something should highlight Guillermo del Toro's film, according to the criticisms -very

favorable- that have been published in the last days, it was because of his visual imagery and a lyrical sense of

the charming with sinister tints. However, for a server, the only scene of the film with itsentity

ownis the one that is represented in the frame that opens today's comment, a spooky onerous pyrus

starring for a creature that even in my worst nightmares I could not even guess, eyes in the hands that

prey on metal fairies that are devoured by this creature with a remarkable load of bad milk and

sense of the grotesque. Apart from this passage, explain to me -in terms of the different ways of valuing

a static product- what kind of visual imagery manifests itself in the faun, the labyrinth, the lugubrious

aesthetic of an enchanted forest or the amantis of metal. Particularly, in that stratum of the film, creativity

is null. That they explain it to me. In the globality, del Toro wants to offer us a story - quite trite - about

the violence and tribulations of the Spanish post-war period, backed by a framework of childhood fantasy,

embodied in the Protagona protagonist, which aims to combat misfortune by resorting to the magic of his

fantasy. Therefore, we are facing a story that combines reality and fantasy. The conclusion is quite

illustrative of the intention of its author; in the tragic outcome, the last instants of the agony originate the

last fantasy that will turn heroine into its protagonist. But that only before the last breath. In the end

there is only death in the harsh reality. That is to say, del Toro is mounted very well so that a legion of

unsuspecting people can positively value his film with formulas of the type of "" It is a wonderfulfairy tale

sinisterthat beats from the underworld of a sinister reality "and things like that that can be read these

days. Indeed, what it shows us is an underworld inhabited by fantastic creatures that only exist in

imagination, but the problem is the absence of a connection between fantastic events and the real facts, and

the result is a disconnected film in that mixture evident even for the most profane. On the one hand heus

tellsa story about the fantasies of a child and on the other a violent history in the social andreality

politicalof the historical moment. It lacks a structure that articulates all that set. It was the only way

to achieve a product aesthetically and narratively commendable (singular, meritorious, as you prefer), since

each of the two stories, separately, provide little or nothing. Only in the end, when the child dies in

reality and is proclaimed a hero in fantasy, can we see some light in that sense, despite the paleness of the

whole. of everything is the abuse of clichés and common places: the military facha (what a grotesque

character, my god), the pregnant woman and victim, the revolutionaries hidden in the forest, the traitor. The

realization of this rural drama in the postwar period, both at the level of gui���n and visual representation plays with

some bases and elements too trite; Let's be honest, there is no difference between the execution of del Toro and

what would give any telefilm or Spanish series that addresses the same theme: there is no single frame or

sequence of montage that makes any genuine meaning emerge that proves that there is an author behind the camera.

And that is what I find unforgivable: that "" The labyrinth of the faun "" pretends to be an original film, lyrical and Inot

doknow what else, and what ��� Only there is conventionalism and insubstantial cliches. The free use of

violence and sadism is the icing on the cake: what function does the blood exercise and the detailed (exaggerated) description? Den ofacts

violentin the global tonality of the story? Apart from being of doubtful taste, it is unnecessary: ​​one thing is to

show the violence in a sad, raw and violent history and another the morbid and cheap exhibitionism. Where is

the difference? Let's compare it to Sam Peckinpah and the matter will be quite clear. In the end, I was

told that this movie was a work of art, but it's just a telefilm that dreams of being a work of

art.

" 0

" Many inspirations and varied notes deserve and distil the viewing of this impeccable film by Sam

Peckinpah, an impressive construction of a social conflict of ideas and forms, of principles against the

instincts and of the that leads us to let go of all conventions.

"" Straw dogs "", bullet to the convictions of the enlightened conscience and to centuries of "humanizing" effort ""

(Why we exclude violence from our psychological and biological baggage as a species if this has always

shaped our humanity?), a narrative earthquake in pursuit of sharp consequences in superb

development of a specific atmosphere of indeterminate hatred, dehumanization in a loop ofencounters

unfortunateand sponsored by a climate of tense ambiguity. Like when you see the wolf hidden in the

shadows and just wait for the sequence of events to explode into a terrible truth. Urban nightmare, the

story of an unsuspected hero, radiography of violence. Many inspirations and varied notes deserve and

distil the viewing of this impeccable film by Sam Peckinpah, an impressive construction. n of aconflict

socialof ideas and forms, of principles against instincts and of what leads us to detach ourselves from any

convention. The idea starts from something like a western in an urban setting, profiling a choral film in which

different model-characters meet: the American and his wife living in a secluded home, the band of

villains, the mafia boss, the representative of the law, the victim and the innocent executioner. It is amazing to

see how, even basing the typology of characters in clichés very hackneyed, manages to overcome and

enlarge that dimension to a spectrum of human gestures, thoughts and emotions of enormous breadth. The

central character, the puny American played by Dustin Hoffman, firm defender of the law and

rationality, is endowed with an enormous complexity, complexity built with an ambiguous look, an

indetermination in the confrontation against the adversities that progressively leads to anmetamorphosis

almost horrifying, generated by an accumulation of violent events that force an improvised

restructuring of the mental schemes. The most frightening aspect of the matter is the path taken fromrestraint

initialand coldness (correction in attitudinal forms and avoidance of conflicts) to a final climax of

authentic insanity (value and destruction, giving free rein to the impulses). What is significant in this regard is

that the structure and construction of the story are so precisely defined that it gives the impression of

predestined inevitability from what in the beginning was already a potentially destructive situation (whose

conclusion is outlined in a premonition after the death of a cat and the first taking of weapons to go

hunting, representing Den of a hidden but latent violence), and here the complexity of thecharacter is reinforced

central, since it is difficult to determine to what extent their actions respond to a mere impulse according to

or exceptional circumstances are fruit of the repressed and ultimately released with a bad

smile of satisfaction. In a film like this, violence is not only the basic ingredient of the action, it is

also a formal sustenance; the assembly used to assemble the sequence of the first frames already serves as a

warning in the face of what is coming in the last section. And the same assembly is already, from the start, avowedly

violent (a tomb, the cemetery, children playing in the cemetery, a dog surrounded by children, tenseglances

and furtive, insinuated sex, etc.) . In the final section, this frantic assembly of faces, blood,grimaces

grotesque, weapons, transmits what was already latent at the beginning and that is also manifested in a corpus

of images, planes r� ��pidos, faces, looks of hardness and uncertainty. The overlap that occurs between the

assembly of the first instants of the tape (in which a potential development about theis insinuated

subsequent sexual and violent skirmishes) and the assembly in its final section is what confers the meaning

Of the same; what is first outlined in potential, culminates in fact. The contention is what inspires life and

dynamism to the deployment carried out between part and part. The secondary cast, far from being a mere

"" filling "", thanks to a masterful construction exercise. of characters, it extends to ahumanity

pungent and realas life itself; see the scene of the rape, mix-happy redundancy-rape

sexualand true act of love, in which the same instigator of the act, for a moment, he feels

compassion and appreciation for and the situation of anguish suffered by his companion, asking him not to force him to

make use of brutality, which will end up give in and bend to a relationship that goes way beyond a

forced sexual act. And let's not say the dubious malignity of a drunken little prince motivated by the disappearance

of his daughter. There are no topics, but a humanity that covers the entire radiography of truculent acts . Here, neither the

bad ones are so bad, nor the good ones are so good, and for that reason we are faced with a superb film in the

realization, rhythm and montage, in the creation of an atmosphere (Sphere (rarefied) of concern sustained from beginning to

end, and, in addition to all that (which is enough), a fund of enormous complexity, open to many readings and

interpretations in relation to the law , the order, the defense of the oppressed, the taking of justice by their own

hand, the debate around a possible legitimate use (?) of violence. It is not a film that tries to justify

the violence. Nor does he intend to denounce it. As already noted, the film goes far beyond fixing his

eyes on a thorough and careful exposition of facts (with a detailed chain of causes and effects of

l Quite forceful logic, without denying that it can always be discussed if the final transformation of thecharacter

centralis credible or too forced), pointing to many directions but without manipulating the point of view of the

viewer in favor of any one in particular What does that final smile and unconcern for thepath mean

unknown? Peckinpah's look is atonal rawness: things, simply, are as they happen. There

everyone with their conscience. And without losing sight of the fact that it is thesense of responsibility to

protagonist'sface the danger of being beaten by his injured guest, which leads him to use violence to

protect him, in the name of reason and after the murder of the only representative of the law. Or is that just an

excuse? Devastating. To finish, a reflection on the part of a desperate cin���filo: "" Dogs of straw "" iscinema

commercial, in spite of its intellectual maturity and ambiguity of its meaning � Last. He tells us a story that

in its most superficial lines can be understood by all kinds of public and that maintains the suspense withoutand

upsdowns. And there I wanted to go to stop; It is a perfect example of commercial cinema of great artistic quality, something

very difficult to find on the current billboard. And from here I ask and demand the god of cinema that punishes the

instigators of the current conformism and banal mechanization that guide the process of creation and productioncinema

of today's, lacking intellectual or artistic values. Interesting stories are told, but they do not go beyond

the typical. "" Straw dogs "" is built with stereotypes, but managed with ease and

multidimensionality. Is it so difficult? In our days, when you go to the movies, you have the impression that

you are always telling the same story with the same cliches. And I'm fed up.

" 1

" It does not surprise in almost nothing, but it does not bore either thanks to its vertiginous action shot. The impact of the first film starring Bruce Willis as John McClane was such in Spain that it

replaced it n of the original English title, Die Hard ('Hard to Kill'), by that of The Crystal Jungle has

remained in the subsequent sequels. The terms 'jungle' or 'crystal' had a certain fit in that tape

whose action was developed in the skyscrapers Nakatomi, while its presence in the titles of the

continuations it only obeys a mere association with the successful film by John McTiernan. In any case, the

perpetuation of the Castilian title of the first film exemplifies the indelible imprint left by it. Since its

inception, McClane had many ingredients to make a niche among the m��. They are famous heroes of action cinema

. His nefarious gift of ubiquity, his rudeness and forcefulness at the time of getting rid of the villains or his

phrases of 'sobrao' and chop made him an atypical hero with ease to empathize with the p� Public.

As the sequels follow, McClane's prominence grew to the detriment of the film's arguments

, clearly at the service of the reedition of the actions and typical features of the police. Nea neoyorquino.En The

Jungle 4.0 does not change this drift. McClane is presented again as a good cop with a private life

made a���icos. Divorced and with a daughter declared in rebellion, our protagonist does not seem to have served

much his heroic record of services. Nothing new with respect to previous chapters. But the public already knows that their

veteran cop instinct, tanned in a thousand battles, will take little time to make him resurface. And he does it in the same way

as in previous adventures, suddenly picking up the most inopportune circumstances. He again confronts

terrorists who, political claims on the sidelines, only persecute fill your pockets full hand. This

also does not change with respect to previous deliveries. Logically, what they do change are the methods of the villains

that McClaine now faces. The Castilian title already tells us that about some computers and bytes will go this

new action proposal. But against the 'hackers' dominating cyberspace there is no better remedy than the

usual medicine of McClaine: the mamporros right and left. The gun of this hard cop beats the

sophistication of the terrorist parapetado in some screens of computer with which, nevertheless, is able to

sow the majors cat���strofes. In order, that this fourth delivery directed by a The technique of Len

Wiseman is not surprising in almost anything, but it does not bore either because of its dizzying action shot. It is the best and

the worst that can be said of the fourth installment of this action franchise led by Bruce Willis.

" 0

" M of Monster, M of Macguffin, M of Lie. I do not quite understand the impact of criticism and

public of a film that does not reach the height of the shoes to the best samples of the fantastic genre.

Alfred Hitchcock said that if you start big, with a big Boom !!!, the audience will not get up from the

seat and you will have them throughout the film looking at the screen. Well, Joon-ho Bong has done exactly that: a

great Boom! and then. then a succession of nonsense about a dysfunctional family (and van.) and everything but

a monster-movie. I do not quite understand the impact of criticism and public very well from a film that does not reach

the height of the shoes to the best samples of the most recent fantastic genre, be it The Descent, or The

Hills Have Eyes or the Cinema of Rob Zombie.And I'm not worth the "" is that it is not a monster movie to use ""

because on the cover, among other pearls, appears "" the best movie of monsters in history or first was

Tibur� " And then Alien. " Let's see. Tibur���ny and Alien are two of the best horror movies in Film History and

The Host, to begin with, does not play in the same league. This is absurd humor, which I think is very appropriate for

a movie about a match seller, but not for a monster movie. I specify: if there can be humor

(there must be, the monster movies must be, before everything, fun) in this type of movie, but

maybe I do not understand the yellow humor, I do not know. The monster, by the way, does not seem to exist for the other

characters, m��� I'm worried about the virus (another Macguffin) or the contaminated family. I leave the end to the

end, with random deaths for those present at the time of the yellow smoke. So much for howends

the move? I was more afraid seeing Rosa de Espa���a in Manos a la obra.

" 0

" I am left with the sensation of having seen an exceptional, original feature film (although it sometimes goes through

the typical branches) and with a heartrending pulse, in the case of second film by Joe Wright, a director

of which I am sure he will provide us with a true masterpiece very soon.

There are films that, despite their detailed visual elegance, do not reach the depth that would touch them

to become great. Atonement: Beyond the passion (go added title so admirable that they have put

here) has an absolutely impressive visual section , with a truly outstanding photo and

a setting of the most successful, but also has one of the best scripts seen in time (despite being

based on acclaim). Ian McEwan's best novel), incredibly deep and with some touches that end up

rounding this captivating story. While we review everything said, we could assume that this film

seems a masterpiece. Pity of some excesses on the part of the director Joe Wright, that in spite of this, it manages to

carry out scenes before which we have to take off the hat. Probably where it is most lacking in passion

this expiation is in its middle part, when the protagonist is in the war, his girlfriend waits for him and

while the child of the discord, already of age, is dedicated to caring for wounded war. This part, in addition

to typical, is where the filmmaker is led by impulses hitherto never seen, showing

us scenes that we know by heart (with the exception of the masterly flat blic sequence and the visit of Briony

to the seriously wounded) and somewhat boring. In spite of this, Atonement: Beyond the passion contains afirst hour

brilliant, intelligent and majestic, which leaves the viewer with a tremendous desire to see what will happen

a posteriori. A complex, intertwined and ambitious plot of love, fidelity and jealousy starring some

great Knightley and McAvoy, while overlooking the vision of an imaginative girl, excellently

played by Saoirse Ronan. And after those slow and practically inconsequential three-quarters of an hour,

Wright returns with his heart-rending expiation of faults, with several magical and memorable sequences such as

Briony's visit to the Your sister's apartment or the epìlogo with an impressive Vanessa Redgrave.

Unfortunately, this last part is the shortest one, which leaves us with a somewhat irregular film,

although it never becomes bad, just the opposite. Possibly my opinion is not the same as that of others, and

perhaps what I found great to others would have seemed incredibly tedious, and vice versa. In spite of

everything, the film is full of emotion and complexity, it is adult at all times (no, it does not treat us like

naive children) and it contains one of the final Sad and yet brilliant never seen. All of it, can not be

forgotten, accompanied by a melancholy and wonderful soundtrack by Dario Marianelli. So, this magnificent

film deserves to be acclaimed and seen by everything here that appreciates, not only the technical, but also the writing

and the nuances in which it is necessary to be fixed to finish understanding the abysmal final sentences. I'm left with

the sensation of having seen an exceptional, original feature film (although sometimes it goes by the branches of the

typical) and with a heartbreaking pulse, when it comes to the second film. Joe Wright's album, a director which I'm

sure will provide us with a true masterpiece very soon.

" 1

" Formally effective and precise in the realization, perhaps the guide suffers from schematism, logical

consequence of the obvious speech, without it supposes a r���mora in its paradigmatic condition.

Raoul Walsh directed in 1945 this paradigm of the bílic cinema, representation of the essential manifestations

of the war devoid of the valuables excesses so usual in other products of the genre, be it the

Patriotic phrases or the anti-war proclamation. Perhaps, the genre in question finds its state of purity

when the material material is limited to show the war and its obvious attributes. It is a story of

hierarchies, of how those in charge of a superior hierarchical order use a group of subordinates to

clear the way and initiate the invasion of Burma at the time. and the best place. The subordinate group

- chaperoned by an Errol Flyn too tight in its military-paternal role - advances through the Asian jungle

without being aware of all the intricacies of the operation, develops a Survival process

punctuated with moderate drama, and without falling into sentimental excesses. War is a collective strategy

and an individual drama, and Walsh puts the emphasis on the permutations of the soldier in battle (the various

attacks on villages or control centers in Japan) and the idea of ​​strategy, Repeatedly describes the

joint movements, with a visual composition that spares no patience and tempo in recreating thedetails

appropriate. In the end, an army of air appears to save the suffering heroes, at which point theplot

hiddenreveals the manipulative character of the hierarchy. The high command congratulates Errol for having fulfilled

his mission, to which he replies by showing the plaques of the dead soldiers: "here is the price to pay".

Was it worth it? The essential question, and about which Walsh does not do more than suggest and open the question

without leading the viewer's consciousness towards the ideological terrain (unlike Spielberg in his "" Save ").

to soldier Ryan "") Formally effective and precise in the realization, perhaps the script suffers from schematism,

logical consequence of the obvious discourse, without it implying a r� �� Mores in its paradigmatic condition.

" 1

" Incomprehensible rolls of honor, impossible amulets and killer codes. There are dead and action, but

very soft and seasoned with chats that kill with boredom.

Honor in Japan is the host, and it makes it hit a lot in Western culture. For example, if you screw it up

at work, you quickly look for a thousand excuses before recognizing the mistake, kicking, insulting, biting, blaming someone

else, etc. There they are even capable of committing suicide by mistake, by washing their image and their honor,well

asas that of their family. In Spain, politicians could do that, could not they? By the way, this had a prequel as a

game of recreational, of remarkable success, in spite of how complicated it was. The film is about a Japanese Romeos and

Juliettes, which are two different villages that do not get along too well. To the amusement of the

emperor, or of the king, or of the chief of not wanting, they have to catch their five best warriors and kill each

other. So coincidentally for each side one of the members is one of the lovers (of Teruel, silly she,

silly ���l). And come and jump until there is only one standing. With this argument we imagine a film

of action, of flying japs ​​and things like that. To my great regret, I say no, that the movie is full ofrolls

incomprehensibleof honor, impossible amulets and murderous codes. There are dead and action, but very soft and

seasoned with chats that kill with boredom. And then there is nothing chicha, the thing is very linear and

the end scares of how gilipollesco is. By the way, I remembered another movie of the genre, which right now Inot

doremember what it was. Resuming, roll, rollae, which would decline in brass.

" 0

" Very good film, from a director in brilliant rise to glory, who will possibly be among the

best of this year, but who has lacked a boil to be a masterpiece .

This is one of those few films that moves along such unconventional paths in theindustry

Hollywoodthat it needs to be analyzed and matured once the final credits have passed. The conclusion that is drawn

after the shock it provokes? Children of men? is that Alfonso Cuar���n has shot a visually

spectacular and realistic film, with a tragic moral, although with a hopeful ending, which forces you to reflect

seriously. It is possible that we will reach such a decline, and that Does this lead us to such an apocalyptic world?

Will there be any salvation in that chaos? Despite the continent's plentiful film cula, this has a series of

deficiencies in the content that makes it lose the qualification of? masterpiece ?. It stays in? Very good ?;

although that is already remarkable considering the numerous cinematographic disappointments that we are suffering

in recent years. "Children of men ?, based on a novel by the writer PDJames, reflects a future

scary. And it places it too close: in the year 2,027; in a hardly recognizable London and in a time in

which the human race has lost the capacity to procreate and faces its extinction fighting between the

deepest miseries.The only v�� �a of survival seems to be lost when the youngest person in the world, a

boy of 18, dies. However, there will still be a last breath of hope for the planet: the surprising

existence of a pregnant woman, an immigrant to whom by different circumstances Theo Faron (Clive

Owen), a former activist emotionally dejected, he will have to help to get her safe from the anarchists and

from the guerrilla groups that want the baby for pure political interest. It is evident that the photograph , the

sound, and the scenic and musical ambience of the film are impressive, bordering on genius. Will not

see anything likesince? Saving Private Ryan? .Cuarn masterfully displays imagesfuture,

disturbingly real with devastating and shocking visual references of the most terrible fen ��� less

socio-political of our century (terrorism, immigration and environmental crimes), whose effects

we see daily, and insensibly, in the television news of the entire planet .All that realism

contributes the way of shooting the scenes, with long sequence shots, camera on the shoulder, a resource that at the

beginning of the film can be dizzying, but which then becomes vital for narrate the

agonizing journey of the protagonists. The maximum expression of that reality is achieved in a slightlydetail

disconcerting: a splash of blood in the camera as a result of a street confrontation between the

brit�� army Unique and the guerrilla. A very gimmicky license that has one drawback: it takes you out

of the scene (this detail is supposed to happen in the event that a reporter is

recording the incident with the protagonist). It isfull of chaotic and frantic agony.

grateful for the fact that during the film there are small intermingled moments of peace and rest, with

scenes that arethey take place in places represented with clear, clean and quiet images. Evencurious

Cuaron'sinsistence on keeping Theo's character tormented with shoes and feet during his

escape evades you from the harsh reality that is shown. As you can see, the words "realist", "real

", realism ? and? reality? they happen throughout this criticism. However, it is a qualification that could only

be granted to the visual part of the film. Almost the rest of its components, say, some

fragments of the script, certain dialogues and practically most of the interpretations, are equally

artificial, foreseeable and absurd, that the footage of any thriller of low category. In that fails the

tape, unfortunately, fact that makes you lose a step on your way to immortality.Centr���ndome in the

cast, the only one who is saved is Michael Caine who embroiders his role as Jasper, a past hippy friend

of Theo. The other main actors are mere vehicles of the set, including Clive Owen, who

shows in this film a dramatic load less than his previous roles. Julianne Moore is passable as

the leader of an illegal organization that defends the rights of refugees. And Clare-Hope Ashitey, thewoman

pregnant, fulfills her role without bragging. In short, a very good film, from a director in brilliant rise

to glory, who will possibly be among the best of this ���o, but it has lacked a boil to be

a masterpiece.

" 1

" Polymetric cinema, singular���simo, intelligent, constructive, genial.Pel���culas with seemingly scattered plotlines that converge in the end have never been holy of my

devotion ���n cin���fila: sometimes, the director ends up surrendering with greater enthusiasm to the formal pyrotechnics than to the

refined and coherent natural thread of things.Pulp fiction obr��� the miracle of my reconciliation with that cinema of

divergences, of intersecting looks and revoked destinies that end up affiliated with the samestructure.

narrativeChristopher Nolan makes a recommendable rewind exercise in Memento so that we know, at the end

of the movie. ��cula, what happened at the beginning. Far from this excessive resource, probably unnecessary, ballasting the

final result of the film, here catapults it to levels of absolute dramatic depth so thatis not conceived

Mementowithout everything being so � so in atropellado.Esta abolici den of the temporal line is based on the very

nature of the character protagonist: Leonard Shelby (a delivered Guy Pierce) suffers a disease thatit

makesimpossible to remember the facts m�� Recent This fractured reality in Leonard's mind is the

fractured reality of the film: his obsession to dismantle the chronological plane and fatigue the spectator (blessed

fatigue) with a puzzle of Cartesian aesthetics m� It's closer to Cort���zar's literature than to the

more utilitarian Hollywood script. To approach the topic of narrative lapsing, to insist too much on his amnesia as

a research engine. n criminal, is to subtract successes, underestimate a well-worked compositional exercise

that leaves the obvious open fields, the necessary doubts so that no evidence is blunt and everything

accrues to the frigid territory of speculation. :N: we do not know for sure if the murderer (John G.) dies every

time Leonard hits a John G., although it's better not to reveal more of the plot, which is sufficiently sharp,

intelligent and perverse to catch our attention (and then our surrender without conditions) during

these two more than recommendable hours of cinema.Film hybrid between the eighties music video and the black cinema of

school, Memento is the critic of a moral mismatch, the story of a revenge (Leonard's wife is

murdered and raped). It was shot in a scant month and in spite of receiving an excessive number of bad reviews (

the fact that the argumentative hubbub prevented acquiring a knowledge n� was remarked). I understood where thewas going

story, what I considered an obstacle to take the film seriously, as I wrote at the beginning of this review

), gan��� the battle of the public and is today's adieu, so scarce years before its premiere, cult film for the very

original of its approach. It is our what we lost, writes Jorge Lu���s Borges masterfully. Leonard

possesses the physical object of photography, the epidrmic writing that counts as a record of actions:

routine as a method of composing reality. And that inventory of resources must, in addition, guide you through the

mara���a of the investigation (bizarre, poli���drica) that leads to reveal to us why we have at the beginning

of the film a man with an open head and qui� He was the murderer and rapist of his wife resulting in the end

(or is the beginning) warned that maybe (and I'm not telling anything relevant) everything is a baroque puzzle

in which the editor knows in advance that the The missing piece is not on the table but in your pocket.

" 1

" One of the best scary movies of the last times. The genre has given so many masterpieces that

we must be content with correct products like this one, fed with a deep respect for the patterns in

which it digs. I hope many come like this. The fans, we are many, we miss them among so much

slop.

That the last step is based on a story by Richard Matheson is an absolute guarantee: The incredible man

waning or I am a legend are bedside books for any fan to the fant�� �stico of the twentieth century. Comparable

to the overrated Ray Bradbury, although more contaminated by the mass culture industry. David Koepp,

scriptwriter of Parque Jur���sico, Behind the news, La habitaci���n del p onico o Spiderman, and director of El

efecto Domin��� o La ventana secreta adapts Stir of echoes, a tale about ghosts, although here they are not interested in

the abrupt blows of effects managed by a comfortable checkbook. Koepp prefers to wonder what limits

exist between the supernatural and the everyday, which doors connect both worlds and which people have

enough sensitivity to see those doors and perceive the interference of a world in other.come to my

The othershead or The sixth sense, great films that stir up similar reflections. Unlike

these, the last step prefers a more minimalist tone, free of the usual paraphernalia of the genre. There is

terror so spent, there has been so much dementia in the exploitation of patterns that are so well contrasted,

absolute machines to make money, that they miss out on certain arguments. It stings so many specters

wandering around. Mutilated children clamoring for revenge. Half-rotting women who fatigue corridors ofmansions

ghettooutside an industrial city. Start one and do not stop. The list of films that obey this

claim fills an encyclopedia. The last step (abominable translation of Stir of echoes, Revuelo of echoes)

goes to material well known by the fan to the genre, but respectfully, without squeezing the t�� Spikes up

the same parody. The photo of Fred Murphy gives an ocher tone, rusty, very coherent to articulate the madness

to which Tom (splendid Kevin Bacon) thinks to get up after being left in a session. Hypnosis, at the time

causing their terrifying visions. There is fright: well filmed fear, without falling into slashing musics that

tear the silent veil of the air. The very specter of the adolescent who claims, from the limbo, justice,

although now the Church is redefining all that trash of words with which she has submitted the will of her

fascinated parishioner for two millennia, was chosen in a rigorous casting since they were looking for a girl who

walked very slowly or knew how to walk very slowly with harmony without ever appearing to be still.

That or record it at six frames per second looking, in the words of the director, "" that the actress

skipped like a frog "". The suspense is gradual: the murder that underlies the visions of Tom is

assenting to the plot with slow slowness. A more interesting film, well above the average of

tapes with arguments stitched to it. Everything is written, everything is published: the viewer has stopped

looking for news in the cinema that he sees. He prefers to sell him stories that he already knows, but that he manages

to make them look like, what crazy, new. Only for that reason, this commotion of voices, this echo of the dead, is a

stupendous movie

" 1

" I am glad that there are still people like Miyazaki who without feeling insane Useful and just doses of love

and pain dare to tell a story outside the usual streams of horror and tragedy without meaning of

many films.

Lately it is difficult for us to be surprised by books, movies or art. It seems that the only way to

innovate is to be more and more hard in the arguments and that only new things can be said frompain

deepand stories plagued with rapes, concentration camps ,N, repressive dictatorships, incest,

fustrated sexualities and other horrors several of humanity. It is necessary to write about all that if someone

needs to do it, because literature should not have limits or restrictions and provide intense views about

the human being, but let's not forget that art and poetry have distinguished themselves by their diversity and ability to

express the different ways of thinking of people and the immense colors of the world. Apart from

horror there is compassion, will, friendship and. the imagination. Throughout history,have been created, such

wonderful worlds such as Middle Earth and extraordinary adventuresas the Endless Storywhich

,, without being real, have taught us much more than some less fanciful novels time to face life

in this complex world. That's why, the other day when I saw the Spirited Away, two things happened to me. The first

lesson is that manga, cartoons, can bring great treasures to art and cinema if they are well

used. You have to look at everything above topics, because maybe I contributed more to this film than

certain books of intellectual brains. The second was the recovery of the hope that

there are still people who invent and make art with all their weapons, making use of the imagination and the creation ofworlds

newWatching her reminded me of certain stages of my childhood and those eternal nights wondering what wasgingerbread

thecake that the Five were taking. I am glad that there are still people like Hayao Miyazaki who

useless silliness and with just doses of love and pain dare to tell a story outside the

usual streams of senseless horror and tragedy of many films, books and modern art. I will not tell you

anything about the movie's plot. The living room of your house, a soft sofa, a television and a DVD will give you

many more answers than I do about it. Happy Holidays!

" 1

" The cinema of a myth like Curtis Hanson, is increasingly falling over, and its stories do not reach the

public or even scratch the surface of the viewer's awareness; hard, but real.

The first thing is that I threw a good part of the promotional period of the film thinking that the last movie of

Curtis Hanson was a romantic comedy, and that I can not help it, is see Drew Barrymore on the screen and

think that we are facing the worst tape of these characteristics starring the unique "" ruby ​​ET "",

but no, this is a Poker tape, game that I do not know , and of which, as much as I have played the Mus in

my life, I do not have the least interest in learning and / or knowing. Especially when the tape, as in those long and

heavy judicial films, based on the dialogue on the table, a good part of his "" action "", thank goodness

Eric Bana, actor who I have in great esteem from "" Chopper "", "" Hulk "" and "" Munich "" (where Idazzled myself

completelyand show me that I will be one of the BIGGES, so, without me �s), and Robert Duvall, who is one of those actors who are

only appear a few moments on screen and amortizes one invested (time / money) to see it there

acting, even makes someone normalucha as Debra Messingaqui shines with its own light as sister of the

co-star; antecedent to the cameo of Robert Downey Jr. (which we will not know much like "" Iron Man ""), in

addition to that promising title of credit to the son from The Boss Springsteen. The landscape of Las Vegas, which

we have become so accustomed to, both in the series and in the movies, is a character here, and, in addition, we have

the an incentive that much of what is told, is already known in advance by the viewer, from the

sources of the Bellagio, through the streets of the city of Nevada (in Aragon they propose to open something similar) The

problem that I see the film, which, even with an exceptional plot and a fairly well-integrated cast, is

the sensation of knowing too much ahead of time what is going to happen in the development of the film. Andis

that, that so recurrent hand that has now fall again and again in common places (recognizable by

all) are brilliantly and, after the presentation of the characters, the tape will

deflate and lose interest, in addition to emotion and getting , in 2 hours of footage, the story

gives some surprise Why this way of lengthening stories that can be perfectly told in lesser

footage? Summing up: The cinema of a myth like Curtis Hanson (his they are "" LA Confidential "" and the underrated "" 8

Mile "") are increasingly falling over, and their stories do not even reach the public they scratch the

surface of the viewer's consciousness; hard, but real.

" 0

" In spite of the successes (that have them), it is obvious that he sins of an undoubted lack of hook. The main

reason for this is the plot.

There are not a few occasions when films with an overwhelming promotion turn out to be a real fiasco. And

the goal is simple: attract the masses to the movie theaters. This translates into a significant

box office fundraising. But also, although not always, in a true disappointment: is this the result

we find this time? It depends a lot on the previous expectations of this production, but

probably for many it has been like that. Superproduction, the most expensive film in the history of Spanish cinema

, actors with international prestige. 'Alatriste' was presented to us as an epic film and called to create

a before and after in national cinematography, but it is undeniable that it has not been so: it has not been known neither to

take a history of adventures, nor to impress him with emotion. And it is that in spite of the successes (that

have them), it is obvious that he sins of an undoubted lack of hook. The main reason for this is the plot,

lacking any line of argument: everything is based on capturing scenes, often without any determination,

on the comings and goings of the 'Capiton' , in a futile effort to summarize the five books of Arturo

P���rez-Reverte in a story that has no beginning, no knot, no ending. And although this should not always be a

problem, in this case it becomes an inconvenience, with the result of a failed product for

many, or even worse, a failure of Spanish cinema. ol actual.El portrait ofgolden age, this little 'golden, dark'

in our history, is probably the most prominent of the film: scenery, photography, maquillaje.eltone

somberQueo that permanently wraps around the tape is fantastic. But in the rest, the vacuum is obvious. Quevedo,

Count-Duke of Olivares, Philip histricos IV.personajes that, although not entirely wrong portrayed,

lacking any depth in their papeles.Viggo Mortensen, one of the main attractions that are

counted a priori, it does not disappoint: although its accent hits a little at the beginning, one ends up getting used to it.

In fact, the weight of the story (and the whole film) falls on him, and despite making a

praiseworthy interpretation, fails to make the film take off. The rest of the actors, better or worse

, do their work correctly, or at least mostly: Javier C���mara, Juan Echanove, Enrico Lo

Verso, Elena Anaya, Ariadna Gil, and Pilar L� Depez de Ayala (in a very brief paper) they fulfill, although she could not say

the same of Blanca Portillo, who does what she can in her masculine role; and Unax Ugalde and Eduardo Noriega,

who are too "cool" for the seventeenth century. The soundtrack and the sound effects seem a true

reflection of what the viewer finds before him: good ideas and props. ���sitos, but totally

untapped, which have as a consequence an inadequate positioning of the music in the scenes of struggle

and a lack of emotion in the rest of the passages of the film. So, we find ourselves with the fundamental problem

of this title, and that well serves as a summary: an attempt to tell something great and not know how to do it. This

time you can not blame the failure to the lack of means, because 24 million euros give for something more. More:

Agust���n D���az Yanes, has been halfway through, possibly collapsed. Not even the battle scenes

have strength: why not some better exploited planes, or bigger ones? What happens with the emotion? ���is that you could not

count on more extras? Good luck for the next one.

" 0

" Blockbuster well assembled, plastic perfect, very wild and entertaining. Intachable as a typical andtape

special effectsand that will undoubtedly open up a new path of pigeon cinema, more so if we take into account that

its box office collections are being large ...

The aesthetic transformation of the cinema, the last of which has behind it the figure of the

dramatist of novels gr��� ficas and also screenwriter, Frank Miller. His works are "" Sin City "" and "" 300 "", for which he

has also participated very actively in his versions for the big screen, co-directing, writing,

producing or simply supervising these adaptations and first of all trying that the essence and appearance of

his works, were reflected with scrupulous resemblance in the cinema. For this endeavor in moving the images of a

comic to the seventh art the most textually possible, Miller and Robert Rodr���guez in "" Sin City "" and now Zack Snynder

(responsible for that zombie revival that was "" Dawn of the dead "") have needed to carry out an original

use of the effects special, not so much in order to surprise the viewer (although later they have

achieved that effect) but with the intention of coupling to the maximum images and viñets, with the evolution Cinematon

cinematographic and visual that entails.Thus, both "" Sin City "" and ah ora "" 300 "" are the tapes

responsible for a new evolution of the cinematic blockbuster, a new way of understandingcinema

popcorn, which bets entirely on chroma (that is, that green background on which theact

actorswhich is then transformed into sets infogrÃ���fically), something that George Lucas already tried in his

recent episodes of the saga "" Star Wars "", certain passages of "" The Lord of the Rings "" or "" King Kong "" by Peter

Jackson or those responsible for "" Sky Captain and the world of tomorrow "", but apparently these adaptations of

the worlds created by Miller and his attempt to be a faithful reflection in movement of the graphic novels, have

endowed this new cinematographic use, (radically opposed to the conception of cinema as such) aalibi

perfecta justification for this absolute use of visual effects todetriment of classicism film

qu We all know. Whether we like it or not, "" 300 "" is already part of the history of special effects cinema. His

proposal is radical and we can not deny that his influence, like the one he is having "" Sin City "", is going to be

decisive for the future of the cinema, that big budget cinema that no longer is unable to

show us the most unimaginable universe, the most unsuspected situations or the most unlikely creatures

. "" 300 "" uses a piece of history to compose his fantasy world. The battle waged in

the Greek Term���plas between Spartans and Persians in 480 BC and with Le���nidas at the head of an army of 300

valiant men fighting against millions of soldiers of the opposite side, is the an argument with which

Frank Miller created his graphic novel and that now Zack Snyder has been able to portray on the big

screen. As it happened in "" Apocalypto "" by Mel Gibson, the Historical rigor is the least. The battles, the

protagonists and the places written in the annals of history, are only taken from inspiration to

reinvent history in the most lavish, colorful or showy way possible. In short, to create a fast and

fun entertainment. Because "" 300 "" is precisely that, an effective tape of action and adventures of new

generation, made by trade by Snyder and full of violence, testosterone and golden colors. It is undeniable the

visual power that has "" 300 "", like the rage and strength that it gives off in each of its moments. With ascript

rather smallthat focuses on battles from very early on, Snyder bases the interest of his film on the

powerful figures of Le���nidas (Gerard Butler, ���tico in his role), Xerxes (a very poor Rodrigo Santoro)

and Lena Headey (great as Reina Gorgos) who focus the interest of history in their different points of

view. of battle, they are well made, they are clean and they avoid that endemic evil of thescenes

b escenaslicasof the current cinema, in which nothing is appreciated and everything is confused. There is also some abuse of thecamera

slow, which is recreated in certain situations, but ultimately, "" 300 "" has the bestsequences

battlesince "" The Lord of the rings "" which is again a clear reference on this occasion. As for the

palace intrigues, they hardly have any consistency, and it is a very weak point in the whole of the story, despite,

I repeat, the good work of Lena Headey as Queen Gorgos.Resumiendo, "" 300 " "It's a well-mounted blockbuster,

perfectly perfect, very wild and entertaining. Intachable as a typical and special effects tape and that

will undoubtedly open up a new path of pigeon cinema, more so if we take into account that its box office

collections are being large , that comes to be the main thing for the producers of this cinematographic genre that

needs so much money to be able to be elaborated. One of the tapes of the season.

" 1

" It is even unpleasant with an end skimming the gore, a very poorly shot film, technically sloppy but

curious in his argument.

The corrupt TITO CHINCHAN one of the most outstanding critics of much cinema reminded me of this film that I did not even

remember. It's the same morning down to the dusty detour where I still keep a very dusty collection of VHS

and I discover for my happiness that the eyelet is in it.JESUS ​​FRANCO and LINA ROMAY is one of thecouples in

most hornySpanish cinema, the most prolific director who worked with his muse many times from

the grave of the undead or sex is crazy, also producing and working on various aspects

of Lina's own fantasies that she directed mostly pornography. A whistle for three or the chuponas do not leave room

for doubts of the arguments, without a doubt the most bizarre of all is this parliamentary eyelet that leaves you totally

speechless before such occurrence, showing that the adult cinema of the �� ���poca had an imagination far above the

current. Of course the filming is very bad, the penetrations are not seen and the hand of JESUS ​​is seen with the

fucking hand to put the ZOOM to each scene. It is even unpleasant with a skimming end the GORE, a veryfilm

poorly shot, technically neglected but curious in its argument.

" 0

" I do not know if this Moon is going to continue in the movie business for many years or if it will make us change our mind

when it undertakes a project of greater fortune. Perhaps. Meanwhile, zero.

There must be a Crypt 2.0 type program that generates Moscow-type arguments. I have no doubt after

having wrecked my leisure in this unbearable demonstration that the cinema can also a factory of scams. The

lamentable and laughable guignol of catacombs, shadows that move, verses of the Bible andghosts

prepubescentcan not rescue us from the impression of being attending something painful, absolutely pathetic.

One of those rare times when you want to have the courage to give the player stop (in this

case the beloved Windows Media 10). As I have not had it, I have endured like a brave this blunder oftunnels

infiniteand marginal beings who live, that is to say, oblivious to the daily routine of mortals, that is, to make

the purchase, to hang clothes, go with the children to school, walk in the parks, drink coffee with friends or get

excited with a melody by Joni Mitchell, for example. Perhaps what happens is that we are fed up with this

already exhausted fashion of resorting to the well-stocked store of religion, of hell and of salvation by prayer. .

Not even Val Kilmer, who should be throwing belly in his Californian mansion instead of going cold in

these European apparatuses, manages to raise the whole to a dignified level. O Vincent Gallo, another actor with chimes

that crashes into a simple plot, reduced to a soporific underground rescue between children of the turn

of the century and shameful theories about hell and the brimstone of the wicked. Now the voiceover of the orthodox

starter, a view of the monumentality of the Russian churches, a warning that everything is going to turn around its

mysteries and its enchantment, puts the skeptical spectator in check: who speaks, tells how the underworld has been

opened because of the sins of the human being. That God and the Devil touch each other: that blah blah blah what Dan Brown,

that he should ask for royalties for the extremely rich filmy that his shadows and archangels have opened,

his diving interested in the myths of Christianity. Anthropologists, priests, mercenaries make up thefauna

absurdof this silly tale that will only please the bland public that does not stop, nor does it have to do,

in the end, to think what bazofia is inoculating you via ���ptica. I do not know if this Moon is going to continue in thebusiness

filmfor many years or if it will make us change our mind when it undertakes a project of greater fortune. Perhaps.

Meanwhile, zero.

" 0

" Another boring production halfway between the desktop drama, the fantastic comedy and the drama of

three to the fourth.

The career of Sandra Bullock years ago, enough already, that entered into a spin. It is not that he has less talent than

most of his profession colleagues. In fact, she is a better actress than many of those who consider themselvescows

sacred, although that does not mean much either. The question could lie in the unfortunate choice of

their roles, always aimed at recovering the lost box office pull, rather than vindicate herself as the

successful actress who, unsuccessfully, pretends to be. Premonition is halfway between the after-dinner drama,

the fantastic comedy and the suspense of three to the fourth. Grossly, her story is centered in the existence of a

young woman who leads the ideal life of the American, with her little garden house, a handsome couple and two cherubs who

fill their home with joy. Suddenly, she receives a call announcing the death of her husband; When he

wakes up the next morning he finds him at his side again, but soon the same thing happens again.

After an initial state of confusion, he realizes that the days go by disordered. And that's all. The

film suffers from a lack of brutal rhythm, excessive monotony and a serious lack of narrative resources,

which in a principle could be attributed to the little cinematographic experience of its director, Menna Yapo (which by the

way is German even if the name does not look like it). But once it is viewed as a whole, it is

concluded that this grotesque has as many culprits as there have been intervening in the different phases

of filming, editing and post production. When a film is produced with the sole purpose of entertaining, the

least that can be asked is to do so. If not, it has no reason to exist.

" 0

" A very decent show to watch but for fans of Scott can be a disappointment, as is my

case.

Ridley Scott (sold insultingly as "" The director of Gladiator "" as if the great public did not know

the director of Blade Runner or Alien) has chosen an interesting story with an anachronicallytreatment

modernand with a totally repellent character from Orlando Bloom. With the excuse that the

original set was 3 hours and 40 minutes and that it will be released on DVD next year, Scott has released the version in theaters

and it gives the sensation n precisely that there are mounting problems: too many things in a short time. And worst of

all, many nuances of characters that would enrich the story are sure to be in the hour and a half that

we will see next year. Except Bloom (his presence it gives good on the screen and in the character, but not its

interpretative capacity), the rest of the actors are very well. Special mention to Eva Green (you have to be more

lavish on the screens!) Although Scott has the healthy habit of recreating realscenarios

gigantic, some digital plans sing. The music, another element of which I expected something outstanding,

remains in an anecdote, since the main theme of Gregson Williams "" adorns "" several sequences, leaving the rest

of the movie " cula in incidental topics, some subject with choruses (very good), and with the "" incomprehensible "" inclusion of

a theme of the BSO of "" Hannibal "" and another of "" The warrior n��� 13� ?? by Jerry Goldsmith. It gives the impression that

Scott was not too satisfied with the work of Harry Gregson Williams. In short, a

very decent show to watch but for fans of Scott can be a disappointment. ,N, as is my case. It

stays in a movie of apicas adventures without "" chicha or limon��� "".

" 0

" I will not say that I expected more, given that I would lie vilely, that's why I will not be cruel to the film.

It can be seen but without much pretension.

The castle game that of the Nazis that you were killing I liked (I think it was escape from wolftein).

Then came the Doom and I was hooked a lot, but with speakers began to scare. Later one came out that

was Duke Nuke (more or less) and I did not like it that much anymore, given that I was afraid of seven old women together.

Finally (for me) the second part of Doom came out and already directly passed to play, those sounds through the

speakers ended up twitching me to become the being that you now know. Neither theexperiments.

geneticThe film is very direct. It's about a group of elite soldiers who enter Mars (with two

balls) because some excavations that we have there have given problems. So at 10 minutesalready

we areat work, without even introducing ourselves to the protagonists. So they take the pistols and

kill everything they can. Not like in the game, but more slowly. Let's see, things that I

liked. The protagonists are professional soldiers, we have no scientist who is given a weapon and

looks like Rambo. A point in their favor. The time when the protagonist takes the view of the game is between horny and

silly, but very achieved the effect of the game. Another point in his favor. And the rest is hell. My little girl says

that she lets herself be seen, which means that the level of disgust is low and that she is scary. I say that you give me

a piece of Alien, a piece of Resident Evil and a crushed brain and we have a film with this saga. I'm not going to

say that I expected more, given that I would lie vilely, that's why I'm not going to be cruel to the film. Resuming, it

lets itself be seen but without much pretension.

" 0

" Simplona tablecloth, where neither the presence of Salma, nor of our P���, saves the film from the

disaster

I was not interested in the least film �cula, menci���n apart from the "" auto-hype "" promotional that have been given

in countless media (promotion that they call it now) and that makes you go to see it almost forced, waiting

and praying that from that stupid way to cease once and for all the heaviness to which the media submit us. In

honor of the truth, I will say that the final push towards the cinema Salma Hayek gave it to me and it is that the curves of

the beautiful Mexican help the most reluctant towards the farthest cinema of the planet, just by watching her wiggle on the

screen. And after the excuse, that is not such, we go with the film; a simple desktop tape, where neither the

presence of Salma, nor of our P���, saves the film from disaster, suitable forscreenings

television, and sustained in the "" girl-power "" that so nefarious results is having on screen, try the

tape, not without certain doses of lack of originality, take the viewer to the garden, and where a Steve Zahn

works as a vase man, so they can say later. It's funny, like a tape Franco-American, tries to exploit the

cool side of Mexico and the bad guy of the "" gringos "", but if the film is shot in France! Sere

distributors, producers and other elements whose position ends in -ores, do not make lose to the public their valuable

time in these films. We will thank you for filling your coffers at the box office.

" 0

" The ending is one of the most beautiful of his entire filmography, as definitely the great analyst Andr���

Bazin: Chaplin makes us witnesses and part� Ices of the death of the great Charlot, at the hands of a society

already disinterested by the fate of the former, ���dolo mass.

As if to keep hitting hard after a political film predecessor, in addition still pained by the

advance of the sound film, Chaplin stripped of the character of the Tramp, plays to be face washed on this occasion

a murderer of women. Of course with the style and good taste expected. A kind ofbeard

modern blue, skillful and seductive. An original idea of ​​another great one like Orson Welles that Chaplin would birlarate with hisUsing

consent.the ellipsis as simply and beautifully as possible in the successive murders, and

sometimes, with only a subtle opening and closing of doors. What happened to your own family? . Only Verdoux

knows. The political is provided by the inclusion of the true-then-falling bag, and how a

simple criminal is judged with all the force of the law when a murderer masses - Hitler by case - is

completely ignored. The finale is one of the most beautiful of his entire filmography, as definitely the

great analyst Andr��� Bazin: Chaplin makes us witnesses and part���cipes of the death of the great Charlot, at the hands of a

society already disinterested by the fate of the former, ���dolo de masas.Ok, Chaplin "" kills "" the Vagabond and all fall

on him - it is by far, his most criticized and rejected film-, but they do not realize that now he is no longer

shielded in the myth, entering into another "reality"; doing for it a much more personal and risky work.

Perhaps the best film by Charles Spencer Chaplin? In my opinion it is, followed very closely by The Great Dictator.

That is to say, imperdible.Summary: Verdoux marries successively with rich women whom he then murders to

keep his money, helping with it his son and invalid wife. His false names and simulacra

culminate when he is recognized by relatives of his victims, and decides to surrender. Film "" black "", advanced

several years in his time.

" 1

" "" Fatal Weapon "" is responsible for denying the fact that when we find a parody about a genre as hackneyed

as the action cinema, it must be treated with slovenliness or contempt towards its own origins.

Sometimes it is a complicated decision to give a shot to movies like "" Fatal Weapon "" ("" Hot

Fuzz "" in its original title), and to have the initiative of approaching to the rooms and go through the box probably even

more. During the last few years we have received, above all from the USA, a multitude of films that parodied different

genres, from comedy to horror, and also through the action genre. Which, by the way, has the

gift, or call it what you want, to be tremendously popular, and remain in the collective imagination, not

only argumentatively, but in the form of coletillas that everyone has present after Des to have seen much

of them. "" Fatal Weapon "" is responsible for denying the fact that when we find a parody (subtle,

yes, but no less parody) on a genre so like the cinema of action, it must be treated with

neglect or contempt towards its own origins. There lies precisely the great virtue of "Fatal Weapon", part of the

respect and the admiration that provokes in its director and scriptwriter (this last work with four hands with hisactor

habitualSimon Pegg) the genre of action, to give it a twist and Through subtlety create arecreation

perfectof English humor, with an evident but at the same time subtle cynicism in its transfer to the screen. Theteam

creatorof such a remarkable film is the director Edgar Wright, also a screenwriter with the

aforementioned Pegg), and a cast of actors usual in his films, especially Simon Pegg and Nick Frost, always

protagonists of their misadventures. Wright's talent for this type of comedy was evident three years ago

with the no less wonderful parody of zombie movies called "" Shaun of the Dead "" (called "" Zombies Party "" in his

absurd Spanish title), which, like the film in question, showed us some common places of that type of

cinema, to subvert them and take them to the parochial terrain, always with respect , as in "" Fatal Weapon "".

Prior to that proposal, its popularity had already been remarkable, especially in the UK, for a series that dates

from the period of 1999-2001, named "" Spaced "", and that already contained the constants basic of his cinema. His most

recent works, after "" Fatal Weapon "", are about one of the fake trailers for theGrindhouse

Tarantino & Rodr���guez(named "" Do not ") "), and the already announced production" "Ant-Man" ", about a biochemical that

can communicate with ants. The plot of the film places us in the skin of Nicholas Angel, a mod He is a Londonofficer

policewhose perfection and high number of arrests creates envy in his own

police force, starting with his superiors. Nothing better than sending you to a small town called Stanford, which is

considered the most idyllic town with fewer cases of violence and social disturbance of the place. Once there he

has as a companion, after a revealing first involuntary contact, an inept cop

named Danny, who will help him to try to show that so much perfection �n social is not possible, and that underneath

all this lies a latent evil and causing several incidents considered fortuitous by the majority���

Wright's work behind the scenes is worthy of all praise, As he showed in his previous proposal, he knows how to

move the camera with ease, and above all, how to create tension from the comedy, something usually failed by

the majority of directors, who either dedicate themselves to remain static in the staging, or fall

into the most absolute mediocrity in that sense. With a simple and simple guideline in its development, but without

ceasing to be effective, the constant allusions to certain tics of cinema action, or even a certain

burlesque vision of the life of provinces, follow each other at a slow pace and narratively impeccable. Nothing is

safe in this film, from a parochial view of the typical buddy movies (or films ofpolice colleagues)

American, to one's own vision of the British society very bloody. With constant allusions to this type

of productions that come to us from the USA, always subtle as I commented previously, the film itself becomes

a voluntary tribute full of love and understanding. ,N, without for that reason to stop being ironic, to the cinema

that parody. As an example of where the shots go in this British production, an enlightening scene in

which Nicholas Angel (Simon Pegg), the policy destined to the small town of Stanford , and his partner Danny

(Nick Frost) get ready to watch a double session of action movies, as much as the latter is fond of these

productions. The double session is "" They call him Bodhi "" and "" Two rebel policemen "", afterexcited

Danny gotwith scenes from the first (and try to analyze Nick from the realistic police point of view) the film),

when the second one arrives, we see a shot in which, at the moment of maximum tension, they fall asleep, as a

vindication of the cinema of action from before and a certain cynicism with the sights set on the hypervitic cinema

of Michael Bay. All this treating the viewer as it deserves, without the need for absurd explanations or

obvious jokes and therefore without the slightest grace (more or less like all saga of the style "" Scary Movie "" and

substitutes, always so mediocre). The vision of certain aspects of British society is not left behind, and the

British way of life receives attacks on all sides in this production (carried out by brit�� Only we do not

forget it). From the stupidity of the town police, to the quarrels provoked in the British capital between

Nicholas Angel's own companions, being this the best exponent of the perfect police, without forgetting

that everything prototype of social and cordial relationship in that, apparently, idyllic town, is seen with very bad

grape (obligations on the part of the sergeant to attend to stupid acts p�� Public, suspicious intentions to

hide any behavior out of the common so as not to disturb the peace of the locality, etc). A great

example of contention from which they should learn in certain places, some of them not too far away with

prototypes of fascist police and bad taste, of how to look with iron���a certain aspects of a society without

falling into the f balmica lowness.The great work of the actors helps a lot to the plausibility of the characters, Simon

Pegg is great in his work as a hard cop who hides an incommunication and overwhelming loneliness , while

Nick Frost does not stay behind in an interpretation of a pariah from the police station, an incompetent companion who,

yes, will teach him� �� to your new friend from the capital the value of small things. The appearance of Timothy

Dalton in a self-reproducing cartoon paper (do not forget that this man was one of the absolute paradigms of the

action genre for a time with his intervention as James Bond in the 80s), is histrionic in its

concept of ancient icon of the genre. In short, a remarkable show of cinema par��� Doctor, although that is, subtle and

intelligent in most of scenes, a film that a server recommends going to see without waiting forhistrionics

unnecessary, however contradictory it may seem, to be able to appreciate it in its fairness. measure. It is to be

admitted that the last minutes of the film have nothing to envy to any American production of action films

, in which nothing is safe, nor oldies in bicycle (Do not miss that flat please,

sensational), or friendly sellers, not even the village priest. Although the film may be little

transcendent and does not become an enduring film show, if it meets its objective in a big way, with

dignity and a remarkable pretension to have fun. Highly recommended , definitely.

" 1

" Tape loaded with disproportions, that start with a bad gui���n, crowned with worse di���logos; they reach a

new director, who is not served by the short shots; to result in some lamentable

interpretations.

Between the "" Rue del Percebe "" and an episode of the last season of "" Here there is no one who lives "", the writers of

this free adaptation (and final) of the c���mic of Rafa, they forget that the creation of Almodovarian characters

can only be born of a manchega grace that they do not know. The director, meanwhile, forgets to direct.

The actors, to interpret. The spectator, of what the cinema is. How is that of the new Law? For each

Spanish film that they impose on us, we will have to see three American films. so as not to forget what the cinema is?

Will someone guarantee the quality of the products imposed? These will be at the height of the Spanish public. �ol ?,

what criteria will govern the granting of state subsidies ?, what the subsequent releases?. It is true that

a good movie Anybody can see it, and only the very talented are capable of swallowing any

mess and, in addition, of writing about them; but, even so, it is convenient not to fill the glass with drops of water. There may come

a time when also the "very cin���filos" "we leave the screening room, a fact that I did not see in

the cinemas since my youngest childhood , where I started with titles like New York under the terror

of the Zombies. For different reasons, Chuecatown is the typical film from which it can be said that it seems to be a

lie that "" finds someone "is something that is not the desire to run away. ���, the thing did not look

bad at a remote beginning. Fun absurd situations, with a touch of black humor,

accompanied by punctual and effective blows of laughter. Characters that struggle to leave the marble thatthem

surrounds, and that could have been attractive for the viewer. The fruiter with literary aspirations,

the aggressive executive to the "" Spanish Psyco "", or the police inspector who accumulates all thephobias

unimaginable, were inside the perfect mold. An original and coherent argument, away from the

typical comedietas bed and tits to which we are accustomed, which tends towards the unusual andthriller

curious. A proposal that dared to make hilarious allusions to the cinema of Hitchcock, with the animadversi���n

of Marnie (the thief) to the red color and the change of name of Anthony Perkins (Bates for Foster) in Psycho, of

which also parodies the famous shower scene. A technique, in short, that would have become

a discreet and entertaining film, especially recommended for a double session of DVD. However, the

l��� traced line will not be known to keep beyond the first fifteen minutes of footage, proceeding to the

resolution of the plot with pantomimes derived from titles m��� Ticos of the best Spanish cinema. I refer, of

course, to the famous phrases of El Liguero M���gico (Antonio Ozores, 1980), to the cleverjokes

politicalof El Cid Cabreador (Angelino Fons, 1,983) and, as it could not be otherwise, to the great

performances of Crist���bal Col���n, De Oficio Descubridor. These last two, belonging to the historical genre,

que are that our cinema is very and very well cultivated. Titles, all of them, with a common denominator that remains

impert���rrito in the history of Flahn, which gives different characters, equal records. Theresult

final, we discover a loaded tape of desprop���sitos, that start with a bad gui���n, crowned with worse

di���logos; they reach a new director, who is not helped by the short shots obtained through the

mirrors (typical in the filmography of Don Pedro, Almod���var); to result in some lamentable

interpretations. Those of a cast condemned to the worst direction of actors, of which only survives,

and not in all cases, Pep���n Nieto. Arrived at this point in the that the mess is beginning to break out in all its

directions, the only possible solution to avoid the disaster would have been to resort to an effective and

deceptive publicity, which would pass by the owner the product "" The Mystery of the Dark Room "", offering anthriller

eroticwith integral nude by Pablo Puyol. American cinema would have done it. They do not have the healthy

habit of lying a lot, but badly. But, since that would not work either, we came to the conclusion,

fellow filmmakers, that the only effective remedy so that the public does not jump out of their seat in theminute

fortyand eight and exclame something as Spanish as ��� What a movie shit !, is none other than to get to

work. It's already time.

" 0

" It is made with an exquisite taste, because despite dealing with a subject such as sex, I assure you that at no

time there is rudeness or coarseness.

One of the most promising chemists of the American Saturday Night Live quarry, Steve Carell (seen in the

first part of "" C���mo Dios "" and future protagonist of his sequel, " "Bewitched" "and" "melinda and melinda" "). We are

undoubtedly one of the comedies of the year, not only because of the blows of humor, which have them and also great, but

because I think for the first time after a long time we can enjoy a comedy that in addition to having

humor has a good script, and is that with this movie not only enjoy the typical joke, but you enjoy

during the hour and 50 minutes that lasts the film. And is that films of these come from time to time. I could

even compare it with great comedies that we all know as "" Bachelor Party "" or "" Gigolo "", because this

comedy is sincere, there are situations with which any boy feels identified, because he has elegance,

because It is sophisticated, and because it is made with an exquisite taste, because despite dealing with a subject such as

sex, I assure you that at no time there is rudeness or coarseness.

" 1

" A valuable title stolen by the Franco regime. An important, stimulating, curious and

interesting work that was hurt in a time past but always threatening.

"" The elections for President of the United States will take place. And in them the candidateis going to be named

of one of the parties. The chosen one is an honest and honest man who seems to be the most indicated one. However,

an opponent of his party, who wants the position, will initiate a smear campaign based on slander and

lies to destroy his reputation "". "" He has all the character of a dog, except loyalty. "" Very good

tape, which did not get to be released in the Spanish commercial halls due to the fact that democracy is spoken of, with

may��� sculas, at a time when this political system shone by its absence in the Spanish State. But leaving

this aside, the film is very well narrated, with impressive interpretations, especially Henry Fonda,

Cliff Robertson and Lee Tracy. It is interesting, entertaining and, moreover, has an enormous value to know the

intricacies of the elections in the US Very good black and white photography, great direction of Schaffner,

remember director of great works that have gone down in the history of cinema, such as "" The Planet of

the Apes "", able to achieve very estimable and difficult scenes with many characters and many extras (all

the m���tines, for example). An important, stimulating, curious and interesting work , that we were hurt in a time

past but always threatening.

" 1

" A devastating orgasm, a potent erotic bomb, however so modest: a quiet beauty, a

delicatessen for cin���filos, a pr���stina work of art.

Cesc Gay continues to grow: with "" Hotel Room "" it became known, a small, almost "" underground "" film, which

discovered a talent in the making; with "" Kr���mpack "" confirmed his ability to tell stories related to

love and sex, with a certainly striking sensibility; with "" In the city "" he demonstrated his ability to talk

about everyday issues to various bands, always interesting, fascinating frequently. Now, seeing this little

jewel of the recent Spanish cinema that is "Fiction", one inevitably remembers that beautifullove story

orientalthat was titled in everyone "" In the mood for love "", and in Spain it was distributed as "" Desiring to love ""

(see critique in CRITICALIA), by the Chinese director Wong Kar-wai . "" Fiction "" travels that same space, although in

a totally different way; It could be said that the Chinese film is the inspiration, but the Spanish story has

its own way: two human beings, man and woman, both reasonably happy in their respective relationships ,

He with his wife, she with his partner, will live a few days of coexistence in the beautiful landscape of thePyrenees

Catalan; in that relationship, of theoric friends, it goes colluding, as without waiting for it, a love that unsettles them.

But both do not dare to take the first step, afraid to break their daily lives, the smooth routine of their

days with their respective companions. When both are on screen, which is almost always, the tension,

subtle, is palpable, transcends from the screen in a way infinitely more disturbing than if the couple

( who does not dare to be) gave free rein to his unbridled passion. The only physical contact, the last kiss

of farewell, will be like a devastating orgasm, a potent erythmic pump yet so modest: a

quiet beauty, a delicatessen for cin���filos, a pr���stina work of art. Chapeau for the actors, all

splendid.

" 1

" Sensational staging in this tribute to the world of radio and a program m���tico.Sensacional staging in this tribute to the world of radio and a program m���tico. The alwaysgaze

critical and, on many occasions, corrosiveof Robert Altman falls on the last show in America, the last

broadcast of the WLT. The last film of the last rebel. The farewell of who knew that could not convince

death. "It was the last show. Everyone knew, but nobody said it. The people of the Midwest believe that

if they ignore the bad news, they disappear. But I'm not from the Midwest. "" Somehow

, possibly, from this - Robert Altman said goodbye to the moviegoers. He did it by working on the preproduction of a

new project that would never see the lights of the shoot. Also, how could it be otherwise, with this phrase that

is extracted from a context that attacks frontally against the vain and meaningless use of voice-overs.

Impossible to resist the temptation to criticize a type of cinema, the one of the last years, in which any

narrative technique, argument and even genre are v ���lidos to introduce the happy little voice. Paradjically, he

employs it with meticulous precision, in a timely manner, to put on the lips (on off) of the famous

radio serial detective, absurd observations about the enigma. ��tica femme fatale of his plot. Actually, a

gesture that does not surprise a born provocateur. Recall that only he dared to frivolize about the

Vietnam War when this issue had not yet become fashionable; to question thehealth system

US, in Health; to demystify the legendary Philip Marlowe of Raymond Chandler, in A Long Adi���s;

slapping the central axis of the film industry, in The Hollywood Game; break with theaura

romanticthat surrounds the players, in California Split; satirize country music festivals,

Nashville; show the superficiality of the celebrations, in A Wedding Day; destroy the magnetism

impenetrably jazz magic, in Kansas City; to capture with a cynical and accurate objective the American way of

life that so many times caught his attention ... to earn a rebellious qualification. It is possible that A Prairie

Home Companion (real t�� Onlytitle of this film and the name of a real program that has been broadcast since 1974.

the perfect excuse to gather on stage, for the last time, the great passions that paid for his, the

filmography���a. The delicious country-style songs. The cross stories that feed his marked

vocation towards choral distributions. His excellent qualities in the direction of actors. The long

shots-sequence that pursue the frenetic activity of the different characters, to reach them, sometimes, in

impassable circuits. The run-down dialogues, which overlap to create a false sensation of

improvised naturalness that has never existed in his cinema. And the continuous pictorial references, that

recreated the scene of "" The Last Supper "" in MASH, or the nude portrait of Madeleine Stowe in Crossed Lives.

A constant that, as a museum picture, lovers of Art History will easily find in The

Last Show. Precisely, the fascination and admiration that Altman felt for the painting, made him

decide to direct a biography about Van Gogh, Vincent and Theo, which was framed in the section of "stories

rare and minority" "in which are other of his films, such as Tres en un Div���n, which included the

collaboration of Glenda Jackson, or Quintet, in which Fernando Rey intervened. You know that only God and he

understood. The essence of a manifest cinematographic irregularity that was presided over by its desire to

monopolize multiple and varied fields, and by its obsessive intention directed to the destruction ofideals

preconceivedthat emanate from the very universe that weaves the celluloid. On this occasion, the exquisitenumbers

musical, which are offered live, alternate with the disparate advertisements of Garrison Keillor, who

publicizes the multifunctionality of the insulating tape, the incredible properties of Prncipe pizzas, in antone

operatic, and praises the sponsors: powdered milk cookies that go in a blue box . The

truth is that any stupidity sounds like glory, if it is sung in English. The culture of the show (only

known by the Americans) displays its charm. Behind the scenes, in a warm family atmosphere,

we begin to adore the protagonists (all principals) who only seem to attend to the script dictated by their

own thinking. Inputs and outputs an���rquicas. Delirious moments Mixed conversations.planes

Endless. That's Robert Altman. The filmmaker of situations, not of moralizing or profound messages,

which offers its last function. The discoverer of actors such as Robin Williams (Popeye), or Clive Owen (Gosford

Park), who surrounds himself again, as he always did, with a cast of extraordinary quality. The possessor of a

unique style in insurmountable, unmistakable and unique that can only be admired.���Alan Rudolph? Paul Paul

Anderson? Luis Garc���a Berlanga? No. I said: unique and unsurpassed.

" 1

" "" Cold Mountain "" is a pleasure for the eyes as well as the ears because there are precious dialogues of great lyricism,

although they alternate with the brutality and cruelty of the war , of any war.

Could Mountain is a small but beautiful place in the South of the United States. Everyone is very

close there. One day a new pastor comes to the place with his daughter, a beautiful woman. He falls in love and is reciprocated by

a handsome and hardworking young man. He barely speaks because he is not good at it. When he is about to arrive, he

must go to the war that has taken place. between the North and the South. Before leaving, she gives him a book and a

photograph of him. I will always carry it with him. Wounded in the war, he will desert to return with her, who is going

through economic hardships because of the damn war. "" You told me that after a few days it's hardly possible.

I would remember his name. Oh, Inman, more than three years have passed and I remember his name. "" Beautiful and inclementfilm

anti-warframed in times of the American Secession War, although well Renee

Zellweger fell in love with Charles Frazier's book because there were so many things

to make a great movie. and he makes a bomb paper by adding it. And Anthony Minghelladone

hasso. Directed with a master hand, with a spectacular staging thanks to beautiful

compositions with great depth of field, a superb picture that highlights the wild places of Romania

where the external shots were filmed (most of them), and some brilliant interpretations, especially

those of Jude Law and Renee Zellweger, without forgetting Nicole Kidman. The film walks with a firm hand at all

times, par� Going when you have to stop and being intense and agile when the situation requires it. Thus, one

might think that it has an irregular rhythm, but it is not true. It has the rhythm that the various events

that happen to the protagonist ask and even demand. And if it is long, which is the biggest defect that can be

found, it is because the long and difficult journey of a Hanno being is narrated until arriving home, and that requires

time to tell. "" Cold Mountain " "It's an excellent western with elements from different genres within him, which

reminds us a little of the hero's quest Ulysses on his trip to his beloved Itaca, where his belovedawaits him

Pen���lope. In addition to all this, we appreciate the large number of excellent actors / actresses involved in the

film, even in very small roles. "" Cold Mountain "" is a pleasure for the eyes as well. There are

precious dialogues of great lyricism, although they alternate with the brutality and cruelty of the war, of any

war (in this sense the episode of Nathalie Portman is especially significant). excellent film that continues

to be an impressive story that leaves a deep impression.

" 1

" Without becoming as fascinating as "" Eduardo Scissorhands "", I think the story that Tim Burton presents us

is a well thought out delight, well created and that does not leave us indefensible ...

The universe that usually presents Tim Burton in his films he always has that strange mixture of sadness and

joy, and in "" The Bride Cadaver "" is very well defined both in the sets and in the expression of his

characters. In the "" mortal world "" everything is gray and dark; the faces of the men who inhabit it are sad or

angry; everything is monoton���ay and move to the comp���s of the "" tic-tac "" of a clock. In contrast, the "" world

of the dead "" is inhabited by skeletons and corpses that seem not to have lost their lives; the colorsboth

ofthe decorations and the costumes are clear and vivid; its inhabitants smile and sing jovially,

welcoming the newcomers so that their long stay does not become "eternal". "The story is about asubject

very trite," "true eternal love" ", and introduces us to a couple of young people, Victor and Victoria (played

by Johnny Depp and Emily Watson respectively) who are forced by their parents to marry for the pure economic interest

of these. The two young people feel apotic and cold before a marriage that they do not even know

their respective partner (how to marry someone who is not Enamos in love !! - they ask). By an

equivovo, the young Victor "" undoes "" the spell of Emily (Helena Bonham Carter), a woman who was killed

just as she was about to get married. This event will change his life and that of the rest of the characters in theThe

film.film includes very funny turns and gags, such as the references to the movie "" What the

wind took "", as well as joking a taboo subject like death. And, of course, there is no lack of thetouch

macabrethat characterizes the films of its director. I loved the care of the details in the film: it

could be said that each drawing or each scene serves, to a greater or lesser degree, for something that is going to happen. The

duration of the tape is just, perhaps too much to explain such a sudden change in the way of thinking of theWithout

main characters.becoming as fascinating as "" Eduardo Scissorhands "", I think that The story that

Tim Burton presents is a well-thought-out delight, well-created and that does not leave us untouched.

" 1

" The story, unfortunately does not give much, and is quite linear. Palomitera, in the broadest sense

of the word.

Enzyme adaptation of a Marvel comic on screen, which has an excellent display of special effects

(as a curiosity to point out that this film was thought to be made in the 80s, there is still a few nicetests

makeupon the net, but there were no effects as advanced as those of now). Nicolas Cage and Eva Mendes (this

last more pneumatic than ever), give life to the protagonists, Cage, as always, in his line, contributing

just and little more, Mendes exhibiting his mountain body (seems sponsored by Wonderbra), on the other hand we have

Peter Fonda, and Sam Elliott, which is becoming habitual in this type of film. The story, unfortunately does not

give much, and is quite linear, it is true that for those who have followed the adventures of the Ghostrider in the

world of comics see n some things that prove their family (including his alter-ego in Western), but

certainly not pass the history of cinema, because it is pure entertainment swallows popcorn and Coca cola.En

soundtrack highlights the theme "" Riders in the Sky "" famous for being one of the songs msmticas of thecinema

Western. The rest of the songs, as always a musician ca���era (usual in this type of cinema). By the way, because

noses will not be the behavior in places p��� public a subject to study at school? Every day I like

less to go to the cinema at times where the "" pipiolos "" can go to shout with their colleagues.

" 0

" A crude attempt to touch the sensitive fiber of the spectator by resorting to typical prophets and arguments of a deified

fool

The Way of the English is one of those films that is called author, which is supposed to They transcend the

purely aesthetic to try to explore inside people and bring out feelings that

invite reflection. Nothing I have against it. But if the entire product is coated with apetulance

repellentand a lack of absolute style that only seeks the director's self-promotion at the cost of ridiculingin a

his countrycertain way and portraying it in a insulting way, then I know it bothers me. I am Andalusian and

I can assure anyone that the social portrait that Banderas intends to make does not correspond to what it

was or is Andalusia, and that the alleged sensitivity that it tries to transmit remains in that, a simpleattempt

pretentiousof a a man who constantly needs to demonstrate that he meets all the stereotypes that are

expected of a celebrity who combines luxury and successful life with leftist ideals that in general he

only remembers with advertising campaign paid by the Board I do not intend to

judge him as a person, because among other things, I do not have anything against him, but it bothers me that

the feeling of a people already punished by hurtful stereotypes. If it is done with a

slow, boring and at times grotesque casta���a, even worse. I expected more from Banderas in every way, as a

director and as an Andalusian. Although if you look at their trajectory, you should not miss that the result

was this spawn.

" 0

" A round film in sum, with the quality in terms of realization that we have used to

Loach. If you want to spend a good movie, with history and social background, do not let this film slip away.

Ken Loach has always been known for telling stories with a marked social trend and in this his

latest film will not disappoint his most acrimonious fans. In this case, she tells us the story of a woman

who hired immigrants as temporary workers in England and her story serves as a

pretext to narrate and delve into another, more important and more real issue. the one that many people have

immersed in today: the one of the immigration, the illegal immigration and all the subjects that surround this

sad social reality. Numerous small dramas are those that narrates Paul Laverty, that has become one of

the scriptwriters with whom Ken Loach collaborates lately (his was the gui���n of the previous films of Loach

like " "The wind that shakes the barley" "," "Happy sixteen" "or" "Bread and roses" "). Loach's gaze does not only focus

on the characters, who follow and describes with the dissecting precision of a surgeon, but also

covers the city of London in which the story takes place and which turns into another character more,witness

silentof what happened . Loach focuses on this case in the London that the tourist does not see, that of thealleys

dirty, that of the caravan parks as a home and that of the dirty factories with the dangerous works that

nobody wants to do and that s Loslo poor poor people who come seeking to improve their situation dare to carry

out. And as the protagonist says "It's a free world." A free world in which some receive

full-fledged benefits from the sweat of others while most survive working too many hours

a day in jobs that are ethically questionable. Ken Loach addresses the issue with sincerity, and the viewer understands

that although the reality shown by the director is hard and complicated, the real world is sensed even more thorny and

conflicting. In this case, as in other films by the same director, the plot of the story is

important, but the role of the characters is also relevant, and we can see how �� These evolve. As in

other films, Loach works with the actors looking for naturalness and realism to compose

real and veritable characters. In this case most of the acting weight falls on Kierston Wareing, a

little-known British actress who had worked on some video clip before and in somerole before this film

secondaryin small television soap operas. So bad was the view of the actress who was thinking of

retiring from the world of interpretation when, as they say, Ken Loach knocked on his door with this role

and trastoc��� their plans and their world. Despite being his first leading role Wareing supports thewell

pressureand every time he appears on the screen full ���sta with the truth and the character of his character. They have been slow

in discovering it but surely it will not be the only role as protagonist that interprets (and it will not have to leave the

world of the interpretation) in fact soon we will be able to see it in " "Rise of the foot soldier" "by Julian

Gilbey. The rest of the cast has also been chosen with great success and achieve such a credible composition of their

characters that in many cases you forget that you are watching a movie and it seems that you have immersed yourself in a

documentary, or in life itself. The fact that most of the film is narrated also contributes to this.

camera in hand, with a hard and realistic photograph of Nigel Willoughby who does not get lost in embellishing the

image. This is appreciated because it is not a beautiful story. It is about shouting to the four winds

that what is being told is real and is happening. And the preciosismo here does not have place. A round film

in sum, with the quality as far as realization that has us accustomed Loach, and perfectly surrounded

by the soundtrack of George Fenton, another of Ken Loach's latest collaborators (his are the

soundtracks of Loach's latest films, "" The Wind that Shakes the Barley "" or "" Happy Sixteen ""). If

you want to spend a good cinema time, with history and social background, do not let this film escape.

" 1

" It is a film that is worth watching and that will eventually become a cult film. Tim Bekmambetov director of Soviet origin, attacks again after his ��� success with "" Guardians of the night ""

(Nochnoy dozor) releasing "" Guardians of the day "" (Dnevdoi dozor). If the first film of this saga was good,

this is even better. Particularly the way in which the director has captured this Russian legend about the

balance of the forces of light and darkness seems fascinating to me. It gives you a totallyoptics

realisticwithin the fantastic context Hollywood will serve you to place yourself safely among one of the

most talented men of the moment. Bearing in mind that it is a ���n Russian, and the "" limited "" means and

budgets with which these productions count, "" Guardians of the day "" is an authentic achievement and success, in addition to It

's a matter of pride. Two and a half hours of footage that has made me enjoy it as a dwarf and not only because it is a

faithful follower of this genre, but because it is a film in which good special effects come together, good gui���nSpeaking

and excellent interpretation.of the actors, as I said the direction of these seems fantastic,

I can not put any but, since I can not find , all the characters from the fantastic point of view are

aptly built and each of them has its own internal drama, which enrriquece the

plot of the film NO SUITABLE FOR ALL PALADARES.Aleksei Chadov is the great discovery of this saga. 25

years and 15 films made since 2002, has an unstoppable career since he jumped to fame thanks to

"" Guardians of the night "" (Nochnoy dozor). At the moment it is limited to Russian productions, but I am sure that the

talent of this Muscovite will not go unnoticed by the Hollywoden industry. His freshness and naturalness when

giving life to kostya the vampire, make his face unforgettable.Muy remarkable also the

interpretations of Mariya Poroshina (Svetla) and Konstantin Khabensky (Anton) both of Russian origin and like that

Aleskei focused on the cinema of this origin, although in the case of Konstantin has already made the leap to

Hollywood (thanks to the director of the saga) and currently films with Angelina Jolie and Morgan Freeman "" Wanted ""

, directed by Timur Bekmambetov and that will see the light in the Spanish cinemas on April 4, 2008.To be able to

enjoy this film you have to understand it within its genre and context, in addition to to know the worldliness of

each of the beings that make up the legend. The inexplicably critical eyes or the earthly public can

get to find it maybe strange or even boring, but this is not more than a sample of a little

capacity of adaptaci���ny and knowledge before what is being seen. "" Guardianes del D���a "" is a film that

is worth watching and that will eventually become a cult film. The scenes referring to thebattles

past, are very well shot and there are really beautiful general shots. I want to mention the moment "" Shower "" of

the two girls, which I found absolutely original and exciting. The soundtrack can sometimes be

eccentric, good is typically Russian and as we do not have the usual sound as it grinds a little.

" 1

" Not even the poorest special effects manage to spoil some scenes born to make

fillings.

The girlfriend of a young medical student dies in a ridiculous accident with a mower. The boy,

afflicted, keeps his head with the hope of being able to give him back some life. For this you will need a

new body and what better way to obtain pieces than women who sell your body? The formula is simple:

"" Frankenhooker "" = "" Re-Animator "" + "" Frankenstein's girlfriend "" + "" An explosive girl "" + the Henenlotter touch,

"" Basket Case "" director. "" Undoubtedly the most accomplished thing in the film is his thin (or thick, depending on how you look)humor

black, flavored with touches of teen comedy ochentera. If we also add the brand of thehouse

director's, the result is nothing short of curious. On the screen we will see scenes as crazy as the

"" whores-bombs "", the selection process of the raw material or the healthy hobby that Frank has to relax:

drilling his head ( you have to be a donkey). However, among all of them stands out the final,

so bizarre, rebuscad���simo, "" Tales of the crypt "", that you have to re���r, and in which the shadow of

"" Baseket Case "". Not even the poorest special effects can spoil some scenes born to

make fillings. It's a shame that in an effort to reach a wider audience, they are so scanty in

hemoglobin. I'm sure that with a little more "substance" the film would have possibly become

a small class at the same level as the opera director's cousin. Little more comment fits on such a

simple and modest film of intentions as this one. And as it usually happens, in the end the simplest are those that

most effectively achieve it: fun.

" 1

" What would that film have that made my dad, the bravest man in the world, come outterror

of the room inas a soul that leads the devil?

My first memory of Psychosis is vague, but also shocking. I remember that we were vacationing the whole

family in Almu���ecar, and while my grandmother took care of me my parents went to see a movie at thecinema

summer. When they arrived, I heard my mother say what I have kept in mind since then: "Daddy has had

to leave the cinema". What a childhood trauma, what would that film have, I thought at the time, that would make

my dad, the bravest man in the world?leave the room as a soul that thecarries

Would Idevil? When I think of Psychosis, a word of difficult definition comes to my mind: art. And

also comes to mind one of the best definitions that I have given on this word. It does not matter what

it is or what form it has, when something awakens an emotion in you, that is art. That's what the director oftold

my schoolme, aye. And this film fits perfectly in this definition, without a doubt a polished jewel of the ornate and

convoluted Hitch, pure art of the master of suspense. It's hard to talk about scenes, actors and

plot, because the of Psychosis are well known to all. All you have to do is encourage everyone to

see her with a clear mind, like the people who in the 60s went to the cinema to enjoy

"another" movie. The teacher's school, as if the years had not passed and we still believed in the virginity and

magic of the seventh art. An art that is immersed in the deepest and darkest aspects of the human mind without

neglecting the purest entertainment. What they now call Hollywood.

" 1

" Painful to exhaustion, is completely made for the children's audience, and we go again and again

for the same "" modus operandi "" that we saw in the 80's cinema when we were small. ��os

We now have this mediocre sequel to another mediocre tape, although, I admit that the 1st delivery

came to entertain me and entertain me, this 2nd delivery is nowhere to get it, although , for my own disappointment, we will

get a 3rd part, since this tape has raised what it cost in just 3 days of on-

screen display , part "" of guilt "" has it that was qualified in the USA "" For all the public "", so parents with their

tender challenges populated the movie theaters to see the vicissitudes of " "Los 4 fant���sticos" "The tape, painful until

exhaustion, is completely made for the children's audience, and we go over and over again for the same

" "modus operandi" " that we saw in the 80's cinema when we were little, and that is, so predictable, bland and

badly made that the tape is, one can not stop thinking that they are tom I walk my hair and that theexecutives

Marvel, have given up the rights more thinking about the fortune of $$ that are going away to take by the sale of

merchandising, that so that the tape is or not a Success (if it has been). Few things I can highlight as

"" good "" or that it is worth contemplating, perhaps, the excellent CGI realization of "" Estela silvery "", position

that the rest, as much argument, as scenes of action, as soundtrack, as performances, are tremendously

bad, and, although I always qualify as a grateful est capazmago able to envision anything , in this case, it's

not like that, and I've thrown myself "" snorting "" and cursing for a good part of the footage. The argument is foreseeable and

ill-considered, the action scenes useless and bland , the soundtrack falls into the same chords as the first one,

although who cares about its dubious quality? Entos in

humor of "" golpe y porrazo "", almost always made for "" the nanos "" to enjoy what they see on screen, in short

, a debit tape of other MARVEL successes such as "" The Punisher "", "" Daredevil "", "" Elektra "" In short

, the tape would enchant me if I were 6 years old, I'm sorry it's almost 25 m��� s.

" 0

" A film that brings something new to science fiction, demonstrating that the genre is not only made to

display special effects. A masterpiece, futuristic but realistic, painful but very enjoyable.

There are many and many different visions of the end of the world, from nuclear catastrophes,epidemics

deadly, to the most improbable ones like extraterrestrial invasions and robotic rebellions. But the one that

proposed in Sons of man, is one of the most realistic and chilling I've seen in a long time? And what

if the man is his own executioner? And what if one day the human species loses the ability to

reproduce? What is it that the youngest person in the world is 18 years old, there are no more babies or children across

the globe and the schools are abandoned buildings and a thing of the past? What if you lived in a world where thereno

ishope and you know that every day you live humanity is dying? ���Terror���fico no? Much more if we

consider that history develops in the near future, 2027, and the world is in crisis with outbreaks

of generalized violence; One day like any other, humanity mourns the death of Diego, theperson in

youngestthe world, Theo (Clive Owen) walks desolate without hope, until his ex-wife comes in contact with

� He asked him for a very important favor: to help him get permission to transport a young woman to

a city in conflict? a young woman who is miraculously pregnant. A concise, direct, intelligent andguide

brilliant; It takes us into this panorama of desolation, concentrating only on the human point of view,

where scientists do not appear to explain why women can not get pregnant, nor the tests

they carry out to resolve the crisis, nor the military that explains why most of the cities in the

world are involved in endless conflicts. On the contrary, we see through the eyes of normal people,

like us, who are not interested in listening to medical explanations, who prefer to avoid the subject and try to

forget it. An exact guide that by small doses reveals to us the complete situation in which thefinds itself

world, that gives us a moment of joy before, with a cruelty infinite, rub us in the face

that this is not a happy movie. The photo is run by Emmanuel Lubezki, one of the mostMexicans in

talentedthe field of cinema, who has accustomed us to beautiful images, this time is responsible for

portraying chaos, with all the expression of the word, recreated by an excellent design of production, which

masterfully details both the time and the state of the tape; Every street is clogged with garbage,

each wall is scratched and ready to collapse. This year, the three most renowned Mexican directors

worldwide have premiered a tape, Guillermo del Toro (El Laberinto del Fauno), Guillermo Arriaga (Babel) and

Alfonso Cuar���n (Children of Man), and based on these three films, I can assure you that the s talented of all of

them is Cuar���n, who with this excellent staging is reaffirmed as a director, who along with the

brilliant technical aspects endows his tapes with an emotional depth and tem�� Ethics Realizing this time, a

film that brings something new to science fiction, showing that the genre is not only made to display

special effects and that it can address serious issues such as hope lost of humanity,

symbolized by the lack of children in the world. When I was a child, I got sick and they had to inject me, my

Mam��� brought me a pillow and She told me to bite her very hard so she would not feel so much pain, there were

several moments in this tape, in which I wanted to have a pillow to bite her, as in the nightmare and

long, long sequence, in the that the protagonists have to cross a city in war, in which the camera

almost flush with the floor advances, just like the characters, hiding where possible, where even the blood

splashes the screen and far from "" correct "" the detail, the drops of blood remain there to make us more

painful l at sight.

" 1

" Movie failed at several points: it is not entertaining despite being of the action genre, without any political

message and never transmits the despair or dramatic tension needed.

When I previewed the poster of the film with the dragon flying over and threatening a whole city in flames,

I got excited and said to myself: "At least guaranteed fun! But he missed the pulpit by far. Film failed

at several points: it is not entertaining despite being of the genre of action, without any political message or perhaps

null-an Anglo alliance -americana is nothing new at the moment- and despite being set in afuture

medieval / apocalyptic, it never transmits the despair and dramatic tension needed. �� Theare achieved

battles between humans and dragonsbut they are too few to sustain the whole film (and nobility

obliges, the animal model is the same as Corazon de Drag���n but without the voice of Connery). Filled entirely in

Ireland (special country to search for castle locations), tells the almost disappearance of the human race at the

hands of these giant and fearsome mythological bugs being the only hope a handful of men without

heavy weapons and fighting against hunger and l elapsed time Chata, with stereotyped characters (the

good is sooo good and the bad at the end becomes), without humor except a simple theatrical parody of Star

Wars, with correct performances especially of the innocuous Matthew Mc Conaughey (unrecognizable with his new look

Simil Conan) and the secondary Christian Bale (American Psychopath, Batman Begins). The film begins by promising

in its initial half hour and then begins to fade, reaching its non-existence in the final part and

becoming a hybrid between adventure and suspense reaching the yawn. The biggest flaw that can be

blamed on a director and his work, is not being able to put into practice anything that was proposed, given the

poor results.

" 0

" I could have aspired to imitate one of the comedies of Spencer Tracy and Katharine Hepburn, but it lacks

class.

The problem of "" Separated "" is who tells the story of the separation. The account, and gives us the version of the

American male unable to grow, which is something similar to the Spanish male, but with more purchasing power. That's

why I'm not interested. I was only interested in the girl's version, that of Jennifer Aniston. His version on the

pool table, a boyfriend who only knows how to play video games as a quinceañera, who does not step on the kitchen if he does not fall on his

way to the bathroom. I'm interested in the version of the girl because the story breathes true, one feels that what theyhim

tellhas happened. The bad thing is that one also senses that they are being told badly. The last time they told me

a story so badly told was in "" The man of time "". There Nicolas Cage says that his wife left him because

he forgot to buy t���rtara sauce. Vince Vaughn, in an insurmountable prodigy of introspection and analysis,

concludes that their relationship collapsed because he bought three lemons instead of twelve. Of all it is known

that the woman is unable to forgive such things by nature. However, although it is difficult to

understand, the character of Vaughn is proud of how shrewd he is. Forced to live on the same floor, she

seeks other appointments, but he does not fall into the trap of jealousy and cajoles the candidates, which should be worthy

of applause. This man leads his life like one of his video games, scoring points. The film could

have aspired to imitate one of the comedies of Spencer Tracy and Katharine Hepburn, but it lacks class. Also

missing comedy, if we except the first sequence in which they are known and he plays everything for the whole to

get an appointment. The end points a brushstroke of good literature, it seems a final written by Quim Monz���. The

bad is everything in between.

" 0

" In an effort to be cool? They do not realize that they criticize everything they have done so far: The

other side of the bed, Days of soccer and The two sides of the bed.

This new film from the Telespan and David Serrano factories aims to make cinema the main theme of this

film. But the cinema of the 70's. More specifically of the year 77. And of course, Cu���ntame como pas��� has created a

style that marks both these productions "" nostalgic "" like the disembarkation of Normandy of Spielberg to the

later blic productions. Only in this last case the message is clear and acceptable. Federico Sol���

(Alberto San Juan) wants to direct his first screenplay at the cinema. The producer, Jos��� Mar���a Culebras (Miguel Rell���n)

gets a folklore (Nathalie Poza) for the leading role. The production, from that small

imposition, becomes a disaster. A film about the world of cinema can be a great acid portrait,

as "" The Hollywood Game "", by Robert Altman, but when it comes to triviality and keeping in mind a

pseudo-artistic and quasi-political discourse, there is a comedy in which you do not r ... It is a pamphlet that

nobody can create. The background of this film, apart from giving a stereotyped image of the world of cinema, of its

sources of funding and professionals, tries to tell us that cinema commercial is a garbage. A garbage that we

end up liking, but it is not art. Come on, the campaign that of Resines and the "" caracoles "" of the baseball game. But

what the "" creators "" of this feature film, in an effort to be "" cool "" They do not realize that they

criticize everything they have done so far, that is, "" The other side of the bed "", "" The two sides of the bed ""

and "" Days of f�� " �tbol "": commercial cinema, without chicha or gui���n, superficial and tontorr���n but that generates a lot of money and

applause from the public.

" 0

" Well directed, better interpreted, and with some bittersweet moments that they like, and a lot in the

stalls. a more than remarkable Thriller, that reconciles me with the director of Italian origin.

I did not think to see "" The aviator "" is that, with all those who spoke and the times that I have met her

on satellite channel, I have given up, even having a DVD copy of the movie, I ventured to see her, and I say this

and I begin my comment of "" The Departed "" (I refuse to call her for the title in Spanish), that

my small fight with the director of Queens is noticed. It is, this remake of "" Infernal Affairs "" all a bet of cinema, well

directed, better interpreted, and with bittersweet moments that they like, and much in the stalls (for a

long time I could not find a room where no pin could fit), on the other hand, both Damon and

DiCaprio perform more than considerable performance, and see that not one , nor another are holy of my devotion,

although, as we well know, the one who takes the cat to the water is Nicholson, who with his presence on the screen, from

the first minute of footage, one enjoys like a child with a candy of each one of his histrionic

stellar appearances; the most lazy, perhaps, because of what little appears in the footage is Mark Walberg, and it is

difficult to assume his role on screen, without emitting a loud laugh, a face, beautiful by the way, to

discover, I found Vera Farmiga, the girl in the movie (complicated its role in a film where

"the prevailing macho" leads the way). On the other hand, and as the only negative note , would see the excessive

violence, with which Martin narrates the events that take place in the 2:30 H. of footage (that at

no time suffer from heaviness, that other directors learn.). In short, a more than remarkable Thriller, whichme

reconcileswith the director of Italian origin.

" 1

" Computer viruses that spread, ghostly apparitions, a future in danger: a whole pulse of the

viewer's patience.

Enseima terror tape influenced by Asian elements that comes to the billboard of our country, and

once more from the place where stars are born with dreams They move indreams. As long as they

starrycontinue to generate benefits, as they currently do, they will continue to make sense of the

phrase labeled on the forehead of the Duracell rabbit. "" Pulse "" is Another clear example that terror is condemned

to be extinguished in its true sense. You are classified in that genre because you do not knowwhere to

exactlyput it. Maybe suspense, a Macedonian full of tension maybe. But nothing of terror, nothing of

turbulence. They do not leave space for the fright anymore, simulated beforehand and with annoying

recidivism. It is not going to be a server that contradicts that the film thatcomes to distract an

Occupationempty afternoon, but, as evident suspicion, the spectator in search of cinema (not mere hobby) immense, or,

being more indulgent, cinema as an artistic medium, You will not find any filin here. It's more. If we are invaded by an

afternoon with accumulated tasks, with some previous irritation or we are forced to pay their entrance,

surely we will throw all kinds of expletives (and not without reason) against the mother who gave birth to Jim Sonzero. Says

the adage that patience is the mother of all sciences, and we are not going to be, in all thatpeace

spiritual and humanthat floods us, those that rectify its message. Breathing deeply everything acquires

better dyes. Because we are all perfectly aware that "" Pulse "" is not just another film to fill

the pockets of some while (without modesty, of course) they go uninhabited those of others. Come on, the law of life

itself. This remake in the form of a byproduct (nobody has said that the original is not either, although

the intentions of both are very different) drinks a bit of everything, and in the end, obviously, it grabs an

amazing cogorza. A sip of "" Resident Evil "", another one of "" 28 Days Later "", another one of "" Silent Hill "" and, not to be

left with so little, several long drinks of all the oriental ribbons that occur to us: "" The Ring "",

"" Missed Call "", etc. And that many of those cited, in turn, were clones of others already iluminadas.Quiz��� with

"" The Curse "" the thing had its spark, but, at this point, no longer surprised by the ghostly apparitions, the

girls whose mothers do not know the concept of cleanliness when they see their filthy nightgowns (ok, here what we

see are blurred and blinking specters, I recognize their great step towards the singular) , the dripping of the taps,

the solitary baths, the blows preceded by volume rises, the phantasmagorical cameras, the motors that

do not stop sounding: very f� Easy, all the topics accumulated during the last decade in this kind of movies.

Pretending to surprise us thus shows no more than a clumsy and ridiculous presumptuousness. We could, without major

setbacks, work as editors in your team, since we know better than the director himself. at

which time a cat will jump, a shadow will come out or a neighbor shout. And for more inri, a certainis glimpsed

moralistic / critical message towards a societyin which the computer science, the piracy and the technology advance at a

terrifying rate, being able to generate insurmountable conflicts. Who the hell is the scriptwriter? In effect: the

ineffable Wes Craven appears in the course of the credits. Of course I am. Nor does it lack the fatalistic,

deratic, chaotic ending that characterizes films like some of those cited at the beginning of the text. But there are days in

which one rises ben� ��volo, and instead of engendering a simple and direct explanation that defines the film

as a monumental garbage (fruit of the loss of time suffered), it is dedicated to finding its favorable points.

Surely in "" Pulse "" there will be none if what we examine is cinema, but, without meditating it more, it will point two: its

evident character of hollow entertainment, and the atmosphere Dark sphere, perhaps apocalyptic, but always achieved and

consistent with the intention of the film. Nothing more to review. Nobody loses anything, so we are going to stop giving

rise to truisms. That's why "" Pulse "". The rest, each viewer is perfectly aware of what they are

buying and what they sell. Everything leads us to the cinematographic commerce of the present: some work,

others launch themselves to the pragmatic. Some win, others lose. But, who has said that this is the game we

all play?

" 0

" I have contradictory feelings. On the one hand the film has things that fascinate me, but I think that

the story gets out of hand.

I have highly contradictory feelings about this movie. Who has read me enough here or

knows something about my cinematographic tastes knows that I consider Julio M���dem the best director of thecinematography

current Spanish. I am fascinated by his first two films, Cows and The Red Squirrel, fallen to Earth and I

consider it one of my favorite films. The lovers of the polar circle and Luc���a and sex are both exercises

of style and mastery, and even their documentary-interview The Basque ball seems to me a tremendously

courageous and sincere film , that although it failed intentionally at the time, is one of the best portraits of the fucking Spanish

tension of the last years and a shout torn from requesting dialogue at a time when

no one was interested in the dialogue, and that's why they charged him. Yes, they loaded it. The right rancid Spaniard

crucified him as a radical, and I imagine that from the nationalist left they do not see it very well either. The

documentary had to be a preface to his fiction film Aitor, which he never did and that I imagine

was in the film library. never finished. To make matters worse, his sister Ana died in a traffic accident

. After six years without a M dedem fiction film and as a result of all these events

, Ca���tica Ana, one of the �a escape with regard to the issue of the Basque conflict and an emotional discharge at the

root of the death of his sister. Or so I interpret it, that for something the films of M���dem are subjective and intepretables

, and for that reason better or worse according to the state of ���nimo.Dec���a that I have contradictory feelings.

On the one hand the film has things that fascinate me: the images, the music, the camera movements, the

division of the movie into an account regressive ?, all the narrative magic of M���dem is there. Then I love

some characters, the same Ana, as we are presented at the beginning of the movie (which then changes and ?, I do not know,

then try to delve into it), Linda, the character of Bebe, Klaus, the German father of Ana ?, Then the

landscapes, the sea of ​​Ibiza and the streets of Madrid, the use of art (Ana's paintings, painted by the sister

of the director Ana M���dem) as a more narrative element? But I think that MÃdem the story, the argument itself,

it gets out of hand. It is not new that the director works his films in several narrative levels; that

causes an intelligent complicity with the spectator who participates in his game. But here something fails me, the

pieces do not fit. Or maybe they fit, but a part of the resulting picture is ugly, I do not like it, and thatme

saddensbecause of my favorite director I expect wonders, but you can not always have everything. I will try toI

explain.like the film as a tribute to the dead sister, as the portrait of a woman who through

art expresses her inner chaos and her fear of dying. I also like the portrait of Ana's character through thec desting

excellentwork that has resulted in the choice of the actress Manuela Vell���s to interpret it. It is

the csting of a gaze of multiple greens, of an expressive smile, of a voice, a laugh that connects with the

���ngela of Earth or the Bel���n de Luc�� Elay sex, and, of course, a beautiful body. I like theso much

characterat the beginning of the movie that it makes me very angry how it degrades as the footage progresses,

especially at the end, to end up being a ghost of what it is at the beginning. I really like

the subject of death in some dialogues and I like the history of women in the supposed ""lives

previous"", but I do not like that everything is explained from of hypnosis and reincarnations. I like the

treatment of sex and man-woman relationships, and even the theory that these are all whores and

we are all rapists, but I do not like anything that serves as a metaphor. A political issue about empires and

stateless countries, and much less with that absurd ending that spoils the film, because it gives importance to

the less interesting topic that we have seen in the whole movie so far. Total, I felt that I was

watching a very scattered movie, that it does not know very well where it wants to go, and that when it arrives it does not tell me anything

interesting. That yes, meanwhile, narratively is so poetic, magical and with scenes as emotional as only

M���dem knows how to make his films.

" 1

" It is the one I liked most of all I have seen so far, so we will give an excellent, because

I think we have overtaken the Madagascar philosophy.

This feature film by Sony Pictures brings us the interesting story, about the misadventures of a bigbear

brownraised among humans, and a famouse deer, rejected by all. The film tells us about veryway

funnyhow important it is to take care of friendship above all things. Throughout the film,

we find a lot of funny scenes that will start the loudest laughter from the mouths of

our children. The rhythm of the film It is perfect, neither too overwhelming for the young minds of the

audience to which it is addressed, nor slow enough to make them lose interest in history. As

for the bad, bad enough to know that it is, and ugly enough to

identify it with the bad, without the need to scare too much. The best quivers for adults will

find them in discovering to what extent our little ones They are able to react to the jokes that

the story raises, how simple and elegant they are so that they leave the room having spent

a time full of good laughs in company of their pap���s.As it could not be otherwise, he qualifies: "" It's the

one I liked most of all I've seen so far "", so � that we will give an excellent, because I think we have

ousted the "" Madagascar "".

" 1

" David Lynch raising the real David Lynch: the new cinema has been spawned. There are not a few who say that David Lynch can not be left alone in front of a project: he will unleash the box

of thunder, har ��� everything your mind and your intuition dictate, the universe itself will turn into a chaos

where ordering the smallest piece will become a threat , the spatial-spatial logic will disappear from the

dictionary, even a new concept of cinema will emerge. That is, neither more nor less, what the genius has done of

Montana. It has completely destroyed the celluloid, considered according to "a slow and heavy dinosaur", and has

reinvented all typed judgments creating a new stage (necessary and future) "cinematographic" ".Thefreedom

digitalthat the prolific filmmaker loves so much is noticeable, and in what way, in" "INLAND EMPIRE" ". Hisfeatures

personal, his non-transferable elements, everything that characterized the Lynch cinema is here transported to

its maximum expression. He does, for the first time, what he really wants to do.M���sa���n. Overcomes all limits of

expressions. Transforms all classifiable (which was already little part of his cinema) into unclassifiable. Theborn

metacine is, the cinema within the cinema, the films within the films. Cinema is life, life is cinema. And there

comes a time when it is impossible to discern which one is cu.l.Therefore, this new film will increase to a greater

extent (if possible) the gap between the followers / analysts of Lynch's films and those who do not understand his

behavior or despise him: those who will see in his recent work an antichological tease or an

obvious insertion in the world of hard drugs. That abyss is now insurmountable. Freaks or wonder. This

is the end. But at no time has the good Lynch's head gone, and he does not intend to tease us either.

Maybe the only thing he does is parody himself. And, in the same way, it embeds numerous details that

serve as a reference to its previous cinema. It gives the impression that he says goodbye to something, probably from his 35mm,

to give way to a new life: the digital life. One era that begins very unevenly, even with

hope, joy or joke. There are allusions, as I said, to "" Lost Highway "", to "" Mulholland Drive "", to

"" Twin Peaks "" , even necessarily deepened moments like those of "" Darkened Room "" or "" Rabbits. "" It is going much

further than "" Mulholland Drive "", to enter fully, through a huge Laura Dern. , on Hollywood Boulevard

to horrify him, to break him with his reality and his fears. Across narrow, dark, oppressive corridors (

reminiscent of those of "" Lost Highway ""), the b Search for oneself The actress in search of

the person. The person looking for the actress. And, without knowing how or when, both will merge, making it

impossible to return to reality or delimit it. There are certain issues that seem to remind"Videodrome"

Cronenberg's, but here �� all those details will be swallowed up by Lynch's universe, understanding the mystery

better than Hitchcock himself, taken beyond the borderline between good and evil, between madness and

sanity: ficciny between the sustantividad.Sin influence the Guin (or relativity thereof), making

Lynch here is killing the cinema, killing a little in the one that does not exist complicity between director and spectator, between

dream and life, between mystery and outburst, between death and rebirth.Surge what was before, what should

have resurfaced a long time ago. The path to the real sense of the big screen. You can sit down, overwhelm yourself,

stop the heart with brutal tension, try to find the mystery and the meaning, fade away, let yourself

go, interpret, let go of make, cry, illusion, bend over, terrify you. You can look at that huge

screen and see yourself reflected, discover the new life in life, know that the protagonist is only you

and that salvation will be contingent only on you. , in effect, what happens to the cinema. Everything depends on

us, that we are not mere guinea pigs subject to easy laughter, waiting in the purgatory

of the fíbula, discreet hiding place of hell. To be or not to be? Have or not have? Blasphemy. David Lynch,

ignoring those who mark the work as complex madness, gives a new meaning (lost until "" INLAND EMPIRE "") to the

cinema. It gives life to the cinema. He sacrifices it with a fist in his stomach, forcibly vomits it to engender the

modern (and ancient) seventh art. David Lynch, the only genius in life, creates the first Masterpiece latent on

our big screen: its artistic culmination.

" 1

" Good movie of love, revenge and deceit. Especially if you take into account that it has ansetting

unbeatable, since it is set in Vienna.

Magic and love are two closely linked concepts that are impossible to separate. They say that when magic is

over, love transforms into love, but that is the subject of another film. The one that occupies us, The Illusionist, touches the

two sticks but with a prudent distance. The protagonist is a magician, an illusionist, who lives by? Cheating? to

those who pay to see him. It entertains them and makes them see things that are not on stage through tricks

that we have all seen at some time and we have tried to decipher in vain. But not only this illusion is what

feeds the film directed by Neil Burger, which also draws from the one that arises from love. A beautiful

story of adolescent love between a peasant who likes tricks (Eisenheim) and a noble who wants to

escape from his fate (Sophie). However, the cruel fate will force them to take separate paths until they

trip again on a stage. He, as a professional magician and of renowned prestige and she, as the

fiancee of the evil prince (Leopold, a result Rufus Sewell, to which the fri You will remember by Dark

City). From that moment on, a series of encounters and disagreements with a love triangle emerge, including the one that gives

rise to the old love that is reborn, the resentment of the cuckold and the fear of what will come next. Illusionist,

whose argument is what it is, is fortunate to have in the lead role with Edward Norton, one of those

actors who only with his presence fill the screen and capture the attention of the viewer. At this point in his

professional life (he already has 37 springs despite his youthful face), Norton has little to prove after

films such as American History X, Fight Club and La �� Last minute Although it is true that the paper is

not too complicated, since it only needs to put a face of mystery to leave in the dressing room the

secrets that no one should discover, despite the fact that one of the emissaries of the feared prince Leopold, who is brought to life by

a cheating fan Paul Giamatti, try it. A full hit in the cast as part of them two,

the evil prince goes round to Sewell, who is enough with his usual look to put fear in

the body. And then there is the girl, Jessica Biel, whom we have seen in some television series and who is

on the way to becoming one of the most desired, when the whole world account of his talent The

Illusionist is a good movie of love, revenge and deceit. Especially if you consider that it has

an unbeatable setting, since it is set in Vienna, a city that contributes to the mystery that surrounds the whole

history in which the browns and blacks of the time predominate. The illusionist also enjoys a

careful aesthetic to the maximum in which the viewer can accept the invitation a trip through time in

which to be deceived ���ar by a skillful make-up artist of reality like Eisenheim. A wonderful invitation thatnot

shouldbe refused by the regulars of the strange and Norton. But, perhaps, the best thing of all is the gulp

that is left to one after having seen it. Something similar to what was experienced after seeing The Beat (that wonderful

work of art cinematographic) or The Score (not so good, but almost). Those who go to the cinema to see it will

understand it.

" 1

" Beyond all controversy, it will be carried in the hearts of many people. Why do you so much scan it for a movie? two gay cowboys? Will it be that we are not as liberal and open

as we presume to be? I think I know. Especially considering that the much-worn and traduced film is not so much

about homosexuality or about the males that are the cowboys of the American West; it is, simply and in front of

all these things, a sincere love story. Ennis and Jack are hired to guard a huge flock of

sheep in a mountain remote from all civilization, there � in the middle of the solitude, they initiate a romance that

unknowingly will last for all their life. A love that they will have to hide, knowing that homosexuality, in

those places, is punished even with the death penalty. Since the initial scene one realizes that this is not

a "gay" movie "", a few simple shots on a simple stage accompanied

with just a couple of chords from the minimalist but effective music. We are facing a simple and realistic tape,

which does not require large elements to tell your story. The main feature of the film is the

economy, in all its aspects, the music, the scenography, the costumes, the shots, everything is simple, at least

in appearance. Like the performances, especially that of Heath Ledger as Ennis Del Mar, who enters

a character that speaks little, but with his silences expresses a lot, the pauses, the gestures, everything helps

to build a tormented but realistic character, that I believe, will be remembered for a long time. The script, equally

sober and simple, narrates without much trouble a story that lasts for several decades without any

embarrassment, skipping days, months and even years with just one cut, which makes it easy to follow the story

with a rather unique rhythm and detail. That's why when it almost reaches the end and the events take place moreslows

calmly, itdown a bit the slowness, which in other moments of the film was more enjoyable. Ang Lee,

an accomplished artist, builds an excellent film, which beyond all the supposed controversy will be

carried in the hearts of many people, both gay as heterosexuals without distinction? as it should be in

everything.

" 1

" Atypical psychological thriller: a masterpiece turned into a cult tape or vice versa. Expugup

metaling������stico, a revolution of ideas without excessive rational seating and a surrealist parade of characters

tronados.

Julio Cort���zar handles a Remington or a Contax. The typewriter and the photo machine. Blowup, the desire

of a summer morning is the film of a story that does not, in any way, inform about any

story and simply runs impassively through the always fallible vericuetos of language and mechanisms

orthodox about how to tell a story. The conclusion is that the story can not be told because

reality is not apprehensible or because Cort���zar admits that his settlement in the world is accidental and subject to the

vague concourse of chance. What is questioned is the fidelity of what is narrated, the veracity of literature,

which is as much as solving the substance of time or the suitability of language. In all thisof

imbroglioentirely philosophical or semiotic or critical nature, Antonioni makes a thriller and a lasting document

about the London of the 60s that, today's adieu, let it handle without any loss of contemporaneity, converted

into a modic set of images more than a film. Antonioni films a delirious city: a

moving, intriguing, strange London. All the characters that go through it seem unreal or are about to

enter into some unreality more in tune with dreams than with life. And it turns out that the only

truly real thing is a photograph or a series of photographs that have recorded a murder. The purpose

of Cort���zar / Antonioni is to investigate the real in order to reduce it to verismo. The whole film is a continuous

manipulation. The colors of the buildings are subject to the fickle states of mind of Thomas, the

carefree, frivolous and unique fashion photographer who, in his spare time, On the shoulder, it subtracts

reality from its fringes, its threads, translatable into photographs. What is a photograph, after all, if not a

theft of reality? The invisible crime is a perfect mcguffin: an excuse to sustain for an hour and a half

a reflection on the automatisms of the senses and how we trust it to the point of not submitting what theyus

offerto filters m�� They are demanding that can reveal the true meaning of the seen or the figurative. The camera

of photos, the Contax of Cort���zar, becomes deified object that is able to reliably inventory the ca���tico

world offered to our eyes and that we accept without questioning its essence, its v� ��rtigo.Blowup has been

justifiably turned into a cult film for a certain sector of film criticism and perhaps also

justifiably turned into a misunderstood film for a certain sector of the audience that sees in it a

meta-artistic outburst, a revolution of ideas without excessive rational seating and a surrealist parade of

thunderous characters that, at that time, in the cultural boom cerniente, found in the rock, in sex and in

rock, an incentive to find happiness. I do not doubt that they did it. Cort���zar himself saw it in Amsterdam

and admitted to having enjoyed the translucency in images of his story (Las Babas del Diablo) . He said that the

cinema is a Stakhanovist machine to make money: he received a few thousand dollars for consenting to the use of his

story and Ponti, the producer, collected it. �� several million. As an added detail it is always curious to see some

young Yardbirds (Eric Clapton made a big boy) liven up the statuary assistance that does not bother with the

sound tear to which they are being objects . Jeff Beck breaks a guitar in the purest Who style and Jane Birkin

appears for the first time in a film.

" 1

" This is one of the most profound and po- litical analyzes of war ever seen. Although more than a

movie is a film of heart, with deep wounds and a very wise moral background.

Just as the Japanese of Letters from Iwo Jima speak in Japanese and not in English, even if it is an

American film, its director, Clint Eastwood also speaks another language. : your own We all know that the

director has a classic style, perfectionist and more minimalist. It's the Eastwood style, which little

resembles that of many other directors. His last and acclaimed film, the one in charge of collating the dialectic about the

battle of Iwo Jima during the Second World War, is called Letters from Iwo Jima, and we could say that it is

his best film After that other masterpiece entitled Million Dollar Baby. I have not seen the first part of the

aforementioned dialect, the most irregular one, according to the critics, Flags of our parents, but I assure you that Inot

dothink it is necessary to have seen it to see the second. It's more, I think it's better to start with the good and

continue with what is not so good, although maybe I'm wrong, and the last Eastwood film is a

wonder, like some they say Well, better stop comparing and get to the point. Iris Yamahsita and Paul Haggis

are responsible for gui���n the film in question. You could not expect less from the director of Crash and

screenwriter of Million Dollar Baby, although if only he had written it, I suppose that Letters from Iwo Jima would not

have had so many references to Japanese cinema. ��s. And it is here when you notice the presence of Yamahsita, in the

most intimate scenes (you can not miss the sequence of collective suicide) om���s ownculture

Japanese. So, the combination of each of the writers makes this a film with one of the most

famous scripts seen in years, absolutely believable, well coordinated, made to measure. But as you know, a

good cinematographic guide must be very well directed so that the result is a masterpiece, leaving of

band interpretations. And there is our Clint, able to improve while aging

(great, by the way). It is incredible to think that a man starts acting in spaghetti-westerns of the

most mediocre and end up winning more than one Oscar and making several masterpieces. For more than credible is this

fact, which happens to Mr. Clint Eastwood, who adapts with extreme sensitivity the script of Yamahsita

and Haggis and makes de He, an authentic prodigy called Letters from Iwo Jima. Along with the solid gui���n, the direction

is one of the strengths of the film, carried out with absolute mastery and authentic respect. It isfilm

Eastwood's, closest to its own intimacy, to the personality of the victim and the victor (I am not

referring to the Japanese and Americans, respectively, but to all the soldiers in general), and not the good

and the bad. In short, let's say that the director has made his second job more intimate, personal,

poetic, human and above all with respect, although they will not let him film on the island of Iwo Jima, which I

find reasonable, however much one comes with good intentions. There are many scenes during these 141

minutes that are irremediably memorable. So as not to look heavy, I'll just name a couple or three, maybe, the ones

that have seemed the brightest. The first could be when the Japanese take an American soldier

named Sam to kill him. But since they see that it is too bad, they decide, instead of ending their lives, to try to

save it. As this, predictably, does not happen, one of the Japanese soldiers finds in Sam's uniform

a letter from his mother. He reads it aloud, so that his companions hear it and, inevitably, they feel

weak and strong, and they take courage and fear at the same time. And, precisely, the phrase that concludes the letter is

repeated later by one of the Japanese to encourage their own. The second best scene would be, for

me, the one of the flash-back that the general (played by a wonderful Ken Watanabe) remembers during a part

of the film, where he sees himself together American politicians who give him a weapon throughout his career.

When he returns home by car, he feels an enormous loneliness, no matter how much he has been awarded prizes for his honor.

This is probably one of the scenes with the best phrase that has been seen in a movie. And finally,

after highlighting the courage and loneliness, it remains to highlight the honor, for which Eastwood chooses to

use it, principally and not only, in the last scene of the film, the most tremendous, the most terrible that

has been seen during the footage. Once General Tadamichi Kuribayashi (Watanabe) is about to die in

front of American soldiers, who have just defeated the Japanese on the island, he looks like Saigo

(a splendid Kazunari Ninomiya, the from the photo below) comes with the shovel with which he has just buried all

the letters belonging to his companyeros by one of the mountains. When he arrives at the general's side, he

tells him to bury him. And once he does, more American soldiers arrive to snatch Saigo,

who is terrified to see that one of them carries the weapon that the general was always on top (the one of the scene

mentioned above) . Here is when you can see the absolute mastery with which Eastwood has tackled the

film, leaving, as a final shot, one of the beaches of the beautiful island of Iwo Jima. Ladies and gentlemen,

we are, once and for all, before an absolute masterpiece, made to measure, made with honor and courage, made

with an innate sensitivity and talent. Clint Eastwood rolls his second best film, after Million Dollar

Baby, with a slow, beautiful, and at times noisy poetic rhythm. And it is that, in conclusion, it will come to say that

Letters from Iwo Jima is such a marvel because it is imperfect, which makes it even more personal. This is one

of the most profound and po- litical analyzes of war ever seen. Although more than a movie is a

film of heart, with deep wounds and a very wise moral background.

" 1

" Stallone has returned. Rambo has returned. Who can not enjoy the news? Who can not enjoy

a movie from before? As violent as it is entertaining. Stallone remains for a while.

Against all odds, Sylvester Stallone is going to become an artisan of those who no longer exist. I say

against all odds because from Copland, which was not the perfect movie, more than ten years have passed and

Sly seemed in danger of extinction. They are like their countrymen of gener-action. And Rocky Balboa arrived, an emotional tribute

to one of the most beloved characters of the cinema. With the return of the boxer there were many who took a

fat surprise, but bigger still �a is the return of another classic character but much darker: John

Rambo. In this fourth adventure, less than ninety minutes, we return to the cinema to see one of those movies that are no

longer shot and that leaves in place for example, the disappointing and also fourth adventure of another old John:

McClane. Now Rambo, who is still locked in his interior and oblivious to all the shit that lives in the world, must

rescue a group of volunteers who travel to Burma to collaborate in a humanitarian mission. If La Jungla

4.0 loses the identity signs of a classic saga superior to that of Stallone, in Rambo its director and

protagonist (and screenwriter) gives a pu���etazo At the table and screams at the top of my lungs, I'm here, we're going to stain with

blood that can be seen with pleasure. Because there's so much blood in the movie that it could be the episode m� It is

violent of the four, with rapes, tortures and killings as we did not see from the frikadas of the Cannon,

all with an enviable narrative pulse in which there is no time for the median���as in a colossal all or nothing that

leaves for the memory a colossal cl���max of those of before. An exercise in nostalgia and style that should not be

taken as a joke. Rambo has returned.

" 1

" A mechanical scare movie, recommended for all those who have already seen and liked it.

The villains of horror movies and a lot of fright have always had a mark, an object, a sound that makes them

characteristic, and announces their presence when it suits. Freddy had his long-finger glove, which he dragged

through the most annoying places: blackboards, glass, Johnny Depp's guts. Jason had his hockey mask and

Leatherface another type of mask more in keeping with his name. The bad guy from "" The scream 2 "" to scare his victims

seems to grab a bottle of soda, because their appearances are announced with a sound that I swear to

me reminds me of a belching , that of terrors do not have much, unless, of course, it has been eaten in a

Mexican. "" El Cry 2 "" belongs to one of the last great franchises in the world of cinema. Great because it

seems to lengthen without end. So summarizing, and without adding books, comics and other paper derivatives with which to

clean up, there are two Japanese films out there, "" The curse "" and "" The curse 2 "" which in turn have their

American versions, "" The scream "" and ���sta, in charge of the same director of the originals, but without sharing more

that the characters and rancid special effects. And for 2008, the third part of the American branch of the

saga, with which "" The scream 2 "" threatens its end (which by the way, more than a final seems a tr��� iler).

All deliveries more or less share the lightness of the story, and this is no less. Of course, in this case,

instead of lengthening it by repeating the same scares over and over again, you can fill one hundred minutes

multiplying it by three. The film details the lives of Karen (Sarah Michelle Gellar) and his sister Aubrey

(Amber Tamblyn), who went to look for her in Japan after the terrifying events of the first part. On the other hand

we have Allison (Arielle Kebbel), Miyuki (Misako One) and Vanessa (Teresa Palmer) who have nothing better

to do than go the damn house to hang out, and finally we have Trish ( Jennifer Beals), who, after

thirty seconds of projection, wears aon her husband's head (Christopher Cousins) and then

frying paneats some fried eggs. Evidently, all the frames are related to each other and to thedeliveries

previous, as we are shown hastily at the end, with a thousand cuts, flashback, flashforward, Flash Gordon

and others. The rest of the time they are quite waterproof between them, and they could have turned them into three

manageable chapters of a series, instead of a film that becomes more The viewer is longer than the

characters; after all, half of them are killed in half. Each one of these chapters is quite

poor, argumentatively, with characters that are more than nothing at all. that the spectator has something to

entertain himself between scares. In addition, perhaps it is the saturation of similar films, but "" The scream 2 "" has

moments that seem completely copied from "" Ringu "", or similar. The biggest contribution of this installment to the

saga seems to be that it deepens something in the origin of the curse that feeds all the films, for the rest, it

comes to be like a chapter of "" MacGuiver "" or "" Team A ""; we all know what the characters will do and

how it will end, the only question is how and when they will be locked in a hardware store. Visually

it stays within the style of the saga; Although the years pass and the budget increases, it still

seems that the fearsome revengeful ghost is the director's son in his pajamas, although it is true that he has

uneasy moments, they lose a bit in the great number of intentions of scare to beat of orchestra and

creaking noise, which end up tiring. The interpretations are quite routine, typical of this type of

cinema. A lot of racing, a lot of shouting, a lot of hyperventilating. Stresses on the other Matthew Knight, who plays

the son of Jennifer Beals, and that the day they do a biopic of Gary Oldman could well interpret it. In short, a

mec��� only scare movie, recommended for all those who have already seen and liked it.

" 0

" When everything pointed to the fact that 'Munich' was going to be the new masterpiece of the already master Spielberg,

the premiere date arrived, and not only was it confirmed , but I super���ed the qualification

It is difficult to criticize or think about a film when it has just left the cinema, but with the clothes still wet

from the flood that was waiting for me at the exit I write this, because of course it is a film worthy of it,

of this, and of much more. When everything pointed to 'Munich' was going to be the new masterpiece of the already by his

teacher Spielberg, the date of the premiere arrived, and not only was it confirmed, but it far surpassed the qualification

of "masterpiece" and happened to be something much bigger. A film about revenge is a veryproject

risky, and a movie about revenge, and that in addition to Israelis and Palestinians could easily

be considered a 'bomb'. watchmaker. ' But there is nothing impossible for Steven Spielberg.honest, nothing

Beinghe says about this director will be new, nor will it be comparable to what he has given us with this

film. Spielberg is, quite simply, immeasurable, great, masterful director who gives this

film a visual strength and a formidable pace, three hours glued to the chair without pestaear not

achieved with any camera shot The film is a slap in the face of every morallyhuman being

sane, a song of peace, a criticism of senseless violence, and above all a touch of attention to thebeing

human, the only animal that stumbles twice on the same stone. By the way, Eric Bana's scene with

Louis' father ('You can call me Papa'), is very similar to the conversation about the socks between Morgan

Freeman and Clint Eastwood in 'Million Dollar Baby', cornerstone of the narrative, which reveals great

characteristics of the two characters, and the collective they represent.Kaminski acquires, with this

Januszwork, the category of teacher, showing photography as dispares (what can dislocate at the beginning) according to

the settings of the film, but all, and I repeat, all, worthy of the absolute masters. I already

showed it with 'The War of the Worlds', showing us desolate landscapes, somedestroyed cities

really beautiful, but the photography of this film gives the narrative an atmosphere A really intriguing sphere, in

the most pure style of black cinema and intrigue. John Williams is another faithful to Spielberg's projects, and since

it could not be otherwise, it shows a score that, Although she is discreet in the story, she is very effective

and really beautiful. The music appears when it is needed, and collaborates to the rhythm of the film with cuts worthy

of the best films of intrigue, the best thrillers and without a doubt, the best Williams. Special mention

deserves Rick Carter, the artistic director of the film, also collaborator of Spielberg in other projects,

which makes us come to believe that Spielberg has had this film. It was hidden for 33 years and it was recorded while the

events took place there for the year 1972 and later. In short, a masterpiece m�� Dels of the teacher Spielberg,

accompanied once more by Master Williams and that with the collaboration of the great Janusz Kaminski and an

artistic direction that make a dent, bring us a film that will not leave anyone indifferent. A

mature film, a committed film, a courageous film, and in short, a necessary and

indispensable film. When I left the cinema I thought about it, and I write it to you here After having seen what seem to be

the two clear favorite to the Oscars (the cowboys for the criticism and ���sta for me), I must tell you that if of

m� �� depend, 'Munich' would be the big winner of the night, then, in none, and yes, I said well, in none of

the nominable aspects, can even 'Brokeback Mountain' overshadow a movie like this. This is

risky, this is transgressing the minds of the American academics, and not what the Taiwanese Ang Lee

and his cowboy partner dubious sexual identity pretends to strain us as a masterpiece.

" 1

" In synthesis and with simplicity; It is a film with two faces or dimensions of meaning. The one of thehorror

deep, and the one of the funny and fren���tica s���tira.

The so-called cinema "" gore "" is inspired by stories that refer to the macabre aspects of human existence,

such as blood, ulcers, and the flesh subjected to all kinds of violence that causes vexation. n of the

human being in its material dimension, which can originate a whirlwind of images that affect the sensations,

specifically the disgust, exploiting a subject as universal as the fear of death, but from its

purely morbid manifestations. Consequently, we can affirm that the "" gore "" creates the most primal sense of horror

of all, almost the primordial suffering; the prehistoric hum who sees his flesh torn by the

paw of the beast or contemplates terrified how the jaws of that beast decapitate the body of one of his

fellows. Stuart Gordon directed this masterful gore film exercise based on the intention to speak

of the fear of death and the desire to overcome it, that immutable skull of terror that, in this case, is expressed

through a sharp look that agglutinates with skill tonalities such as s���tira, cynicism, iron���a,

macabre humor and sadomasochistic sensuality. In spite of moving on an "underground" terrain, "the filmmaker and

his writers demonstrated the due concern to narrate a story, without falling into the error - so usual

in this type of cinema - of subordinating the significance of the film to a mere and uncontrolled show of hemoglobin and

suppositories . No. In Stuart Gordon's film the beginning and the end overlap to articulate the discourse

around a basic story line, represented in the character we see in the first sequences

trying to revive the body of a dead person, followed by the subsequent discouragement by the sensation of impotence

induced before the fact of coexisting with death. In the last sequence, that same character returns to

face death, a new failure, this time reinforced by the loss of his beloved film, which

motivates the � Last action macabre, the deserved colof���na the suggestive org���a of the dantesco. I think it has already been

said, it is worth repeating it; in the cinematographic language, the image - or images - that opens the story and

the image that closes it play a fundamental role. Re-Animator is pure and perfect structuring and

articulation of the story, without going around with unnecessary detours; simplicity and precision. The other great handicap we

see materialized in the figure of the mad scientist, characterized as a doctor Frankenstein coarse and

clinical, which has an excellent counterpart in its competitor in profile aguile���oy and repulsiveexpression

caricaturesque, and who we will see holding his own head in some of the film's most delirious passages

(in truth, in this film, science and the scientists are represented with an eloquentsense

satirical, and good doses of bad grape). The miraculous serum is the one that provides the metamorphosis and the step that goes

from the conscious humanity, or already dead, to that of the pure aut���mata, that gestural m���mica that characterizes the figure

of the zombie and that induces a a sense of horror embedded in the primordial fear that we referred to at the

beginning of the text: the repugnance that arose from those automated movements, those gestures of pure madness

without conscience, the no- death but that is not life either. To be more concise: the human being interrain

unknown, devoid of soul, slave to the cactical reflex movements of the nervous system, whereanymore

nothing makes sense. The zombie trait is the that removes some very deep fears, and the film that we aretoday

dealing withexploits with ingenious and overwhelming sense of the grotesque the zombie characteristic that we have just

described, and thus, sustained with disturbing elements of great relevance as far as psychological impact is

concerned, the sensations of horror flow as they walk on tones of macabre comedy, through an

intelligent use of narrative dynamics and of all the springs that they fall within the possibilities

of the cosmic-sinister story. In synthesis and with simplicity; It is a film with two faces or dimensions of

meaning. The one of the deep horror, and the one of the funny and fren���tica s���tira.A whole, an incontestable work

of art, perfect example of which the kistch and the "" underground "" are not exempt from being material from

which to represent cinematographically ideas or stories full of ingenuity and a penetrating andgaze

provocativeon the same kistch universe in which they move. It would be good for Robert Rodr���guez to learn the

lesson, if he wants us to consider him an artist. This is art. His movie is rehashed.

" 1

" Example of how a good address can camouflage many defects, but not save a project when things

as important as the interpretive quality or the gui���n, play against.

After Alatriste arrives the other Spanish historical production of "" great "" budget: The Borgias. The big

budget is a say of course, because little more than ten million euros for a historical film is

very little thing. I had some hopes in the film for its director, one of the best and least recognized

in Spain, Antonio Hernandez, director of Lisbon and In the city without him. ���mites (also El Gran

Marciano, but that is explained because he was one of the creators of the innocent TV program Inocente). Although

I also had my misgivings because the film is a reduced version of a miniseries that A3 will release

next. The result is gray. The Borgia narrates the history of the saga of the Valencian family since the

appointment as Pope of Alexander VI until his death. A story full of palace intrigues, violence and

sex. Today would be a Venezuelan culebr���n, come on. For more than two hours we witnessed the intricacies of

corruption, of power, carried out by the Borgias, but more specifically in one of the sons, C���sar Borgia,

played by Sergio Peris Mencheta, a character who served as a model for Machiavelli to write "" The

Prince. "" Against a film of these characteristics, the comparison with his Alatriste is inevitable and

plays in his favor, because the film, as a whole, of Hern���ndez is superior to Diaz Yanes. Also, perhaps, one

tends to be more condescending towards a product that has had less than half the budget of the

other. Thus, as a positive and outstanding point, the management of Antonio Hernández. It is accurate, with manyideas

visual, is not content to put the camera where least bother. Scenes like the dinner at the Orsiny's house or theaerial

death-nomination of the new Pope (with thatshot) show that the filmmaker has been involved in the

film, which is at the height of the best our country, although unfortunately it is a stranger to

the great public. In addition, sections such as costumes or artistic direction are also very successful, although

the fact of having shot in the city itself also helps. from Rome. The photo is functional and little more to

add, in this case "" Alatriste "" was more successful (despite, as I already know) �� in his commentary, some

scenes). The music of ���ngel Illarramendi is present during almost all the footage, and although it is remarkable, it is

not up to other works of his as El Celo, he also suffers to resemble other works of his, if not

for the melody, for its orchestrations and other elements. But even with everything, it gives packing to the images,

also helped by the fact that the scenes have not been traced, destroying the music, as it happens in

Alatriste. On the negative side the fact that the reduced version of a television series is treated, so that

several threads of the plot remain unfinished, although and this is a detail in favor, the plot it does not seem episodic,

due above all to the direction of Hern���ndez that endows the narrative with an enviable fluidity. The

performances of the cast are the most diverse. On the one hand, Llu���s Homar who makes a veryapproach

riskyto his character, bordering on madness but without exaggerating (although there are moments that remember the

characters played by Leslie Nielsen in their parodies), it is difficult to catalog and perhaps for that reason cause

politics; On the other hand, Sergio Peris Mencheta does not go badly off the set, his performance without being modÃ © lica, or

spectacular, is not disdainable either. Secondary like Antonio Dechent or Roberto ���lvarez, they are always good.

But the rest of the young faces prove to be the big mistake of the film, in fact, many of them are

dubbed by dubbing actors. Special mention for Mar���a Valverde and her Lucrecia Borgia, a character that sheto

managesget rid of all her legend, making her look like a daddy's girl ���ay silly, although at least,

she has not been dubbed. The rest of their distribution companies, except ���ngela Molina and Paz Vega, have

been. Perhaps they were looking for beautiful bodies, since female nudes abound in the film. On the other hand,

the script does not delve into the plots or the characters, being more oriented to the side of the story

plot than to delve a bit into the characters. The film, a Despite Hern���ndez's praiseworthy effort, he would

need a larger budget to have a package, a much better visual bill. In short, it is an

example of how a good address can camouflage many defects, but not save a project whenthings such

importantas interpretive quality or gui���n, play against. The funny thing is that even with everything, it's a

pretty decent movie. PS: I would give it two and a half stars, I think it's better than mediocre, but I would not

consider it a good one. movie

" 0

" The joke, hard to say because it lasts two hours, and because it is also a bit philosophical, is that

love, that thing that we like so much , it's a lie. Nobody will ever love us, because the only thing that others

can perceive, experience, desire or love about us is our perfume.

When someone talks about a book that you did not like, it tells you that it is well written. Whenever I heard

someone say that a book is well written, I think it has been done forcibly. The books that I like are

not well written, they are just great. "" The perfume "" I thought it was a great book, that's why I hated to

hear it was well written. I hated especially when someone said that S���skind knew a lot of smells. ""

Perfume "" is not an odor manual. If it were an odor manual, it would not be a great book. The smells for

S���skind are an exercise in synesthesia, something like talking about colors to describe a music. In fact, the

film uses music so that we understand the emotion of the protagonist. The smell is that indefinable thing that makes

some people like us and others are indifferent or unbearable. Perfume is what everyone

looks for when they undergo aesthetic surgery, buy expensive clothes, take courses in speaking well, good

manners, or read books on how people like them. The wonderful perfume, the one that everyone likes is what we

all wanted to find, but the only person in the world who knows how to make it is Jean-Baptiste

Grenouille. From Tykwer's film I like the reading that you have done of S���skind. If someone does not like it, Inot

cansay that it is well written, but you can talk about the photograph. What S���skin intended, in the end,

was to utter absolutely evil sarcasm. Once the sublime is achieved, all the characters do not care about

justice. Probably, too, to all the spectators. The joke, difficult to read because it lasts two

hours, and because it is also a bit philosophical, is that love, that thing that we like so much, is a

lie. Nobody will ever love us, because the only thing that others can perceive, experience, desire or love

about us is our perfume.

" 1

" The essence of his mastery resides in an original argument transmitted through a good gui���ny, something that

makes him even more meritorious, is not ��� based on no novel.

I know it was released more than a month ago, but due to a series of job changes, I can not go to theanymore,

press premiereswhich is why, like any other mortal, I must place myself in the conventional movie theaters, at the same

time that I organize my time, so I saw this film a month after its premiere and, honestly, it

seemed so extraordinary that it would be complicated for me not to speak of him. The essence of his mastery resides in an

original argument transmitted through a good gui���ny, something that makes him a���nm��� Meritorious, is not based

on any novel. That's why I'm not going to shed the magic of history and, what's more, I recommend not to see the

tr���iler. Directly, take risks and go to the movies. To avoid being selfish, I will give you some clues,

���rebounded with "" Truman show ""?, ��� enjoyed with "" ���Olv�� �date of m���! ""? If the answer is yes, and yet, you have not

seen "" More strange than the fiction "", run because, as often happens in many rooms of cinema, the good does not

always last long (in Madrid there is only one room that exposes it, in the rest you will know).,

Anywaywe will always have the legal vacuum when the bad distribution prevents us from paying for what we want to buy (which

I will tell you, after several weeks looking for a CD of a band sound without any kind of result, I

was forced to type on my computer and ���voil���! Then it appeared?) I only have to do One more note, doknow

youwhat I liked about the movie? Something very simple: the protagonist realized that he was alive and,

then, he became a hero. I would like to try to explain that feeling to them different

little gray men that have happened throughout my life (co-workers, ex-boyfriend, acquaintances?) But it

would be impossible , And do you know why? Because most of them are zombies and want to continue being so; they prefer to have a

mediocre life but without frights. That's why I congratulate all the Harold Cricks who have the

courage to say what they feel, go for them.

" 1

" Another twist on a story that little more than can already give. A film for

El Can���bal fans, but little else.

A few years ago, the big studios found a new way to get great benefits

using a great success of one or two decades as a claim. If until then thewere styled

sequels of these profitable productions, suddenly someone came up with the idea of ​​creating films located

in a time before the original, instead of the usual continuation of the primitive history. Prequel

was the name given to these films, which reached their highest levels of expectation with the premiere of the

first three chapters of Star Wars. Ten years after the premiere from El Silencio de los Corderos we got

a disastrous second part, Hannibal, and only one year after the first prequel of the saga, El Drag���n

Rojo , that reached an acceptable success of criticism and public. Hannibal, the origin of evil recreates the childhood of

Hannibal Lecter, and seeks to delve into the facts that made him a murderous murderer. Among the

most notable changes in this last installment, the fact that Anthony Hopkins does not appear for the first time,

something logical if we take into account that what we are told this time is the childhood and youth of the character. The

film is less, starting from a strong beginning that gives way to a somewhatrhythm

tiredthat ends up getting a bit long. In general, it gives the impression that more to explain

is to justify the later behavior of the psychopath, pretending to create in the spectator affective ties

with the criminal. Neither interpretations nor any technical aspect are very remarkable. A film

for El Can���bal fans, but little else.

" 0

" It has been tried to do something in a mystical plan and the result is a shit worthy of producing the greatest

somnolence before its viewing.

The other day I had the great idea of ​​watching this movie and I almost did not die of fright when I saw such

trash. It is incredible how this type can be produced in Spain of nonsensical movies. Santi Amodeo hits the

skid directing a heavy film to say enough. Cut to despair and with a direction of

actors that make you want to vomit. Adriana who is a piece of actress (badly exploited) is far below

their potential and Juan Jos��� Ballesta, much to my regret because I love, hits the biggest petard of his career

playing this absurd role in plan " "I want and I can not" "be a mystical and profound character. So I get the

impression that something has been intended to be done in a plan and that the result is a shit worthy of producing

the greatest somnolence before his viewing. Comment also the absolute lack of feeling between the two

actors. Juan Jos��� does not help Adriana at all, it shows the league. Sometimes I regret thatcan not be given

negative scores, because this film is worthy of being punctuated with a - 5 stars. The light, the photograph ��a,

the gui���n, the locations, everything stinks loudly. Do not waste your time and ah���rrate anausea

deep.

" 0

" Manichean tape and a thousand times viewCinderella Man is like eating a Whopper with cheese. You know exactly what you are going to eat. To that you will know the

bread, the meat, and all the prefabricated ingredients. One knows what each bite will know. We

find a film that respects step by step and with academicism the a, b, c of Hollywood cinema. There is not

a single moment that really surprises or that escapes from merely standard parameters. A bad, very

bad, a very good good that will represent and carry the supposed spirit of struggle required to incarnate

once more an inexhaustible fighter to achieve the dream American.The ingredients are not included or mixed

with the intention of innovating or please directly the most tanned or demanding public, but to meet the

expectations desired by those who ultimately decide the distribution of the Oscars. The formularepeats itself

of "" Seabiscuit ""(repeating and thus copying its virtues and defects), but this time without horse race and with

the scenario of the great economic depression. American physics. Boxing as the main theme to "" Rocky "" and "" One Millon

Dollar Baby "", where the director and the protagonist of "" A wonderful mind "" is reunited. " It's not that I do not

like the Whopper with cheese, the other way around, but I can eat them with such gusto as with so much

boredom and the pleasure lasts uniquely and vaguely until the fourth bite. Russel Crowe acts very well, without

getting away from what we are used to, which is enough. Very remarkable the scene in which,

descending to the underworld, has to go to beg the Federation of which, in better times, had

been part being a recognized boxer. Russel Crowe I can not get rid of an

old film of his that I recommend and where is really incredible, "" Romper Stomper "" (1992). Ren���e Zellweger, well

, in short, with her usual face and that twisted little lip. She also does what we

are used to, although she is not a Saint of my devotion and I believe, moreover, that the couple does not work at

all. I liked her. �� a lot Paul Giamatti, who embroiders his histrionic secondary role. The setting, on the other hand,

is very successful, as expected of a millionaire production of the Universal. Although one does not stop

believing at all some dramatic excesses and we find situations and sweet dialogues and wrapped in

clichés of those that only Americans allow themselves to do again and again. Ron Howard, who tends to

draw us in his films with dulce de leche with added sugar and cream, performs a good

direction here and gets a movie. It's more than correct about bravery and overcoming, with some moments of great

cinema. The boxing scenes are really exciting, even knowing what the result will be. You

know, it's a bit like having fun playing a single Monopoli.

" 0

" Despite having interesting elements, you have half an hour and too many minor entanglements that

spoil it

Thanks to my cousins ​​Luis and Alfonso from viajarfacil.com for inviting me to the preview of the last director

Tony Scott , brother of Ridley and author or producer of always interesting action tapes and success of the

last times. His are among others Trist���ne Isolde (2006), The Fire of Vengeance (2004), Spy Game (2001),

Fanatico (1996) or the magnificent Red Tide (1995) or Top Gun (1986). ). Simplifying things is known that in

movies, either you have a good story or you can make it count for the way you tell it. Master Hitchcock was an

expert in it, more interested in the way than in what. An example, Psychosis. It would not have gone from

mediocre to a linear story of a schizophrenic who disguises himself as his mother to murder clients of his

motel. Hitchcock elevated her to the altars by her way of narrating it, hiding details from the public and resolving it in

the end. What can not be done in any way is to have a complex plot and walk around with the

viewer. If we add to this the peculiar visual style of Tony Scott (with fast movements, close-ups,

filters, etc.), once again, valid as spicy in poor stories, without being this the case, the result is that

in the middle of the tape you have more than half a room disconnected and without real interest in the resolution, since

anything is possible. The real protagonist is Keira Knightley, in a character too cool. I

dare say that the rest are secondary, including Mickey Rourke, who looks just as dust and finish that

when we saw him with sunglasses in the program of Isabel Gemio. The movie has its good blows, as the

theory of miscegenation or the stellar appearance of 2 of the members of the series Sensaci���n de VIvir doing of

themselves. The visual dominance of Scott (poor editor) and the ability to put the music is remarkable, but

this movie, despite having interesting elements, you have half an hour and too many minor entanglements

that spoil it .

" 0

" Captures the essence that Zemeckis and Spielberg were able to capture in the 80s and separates them from the increasingly

recurrent, parochial tone of computer animation films,

Robert Zemeckis has always been a guy with enormous curiosity about the evolution of special effects.

Successfully mixed cartoons with human beings in "" Who cheats Roger Rabbit? "", Evolved techniques in

the failed but appreciable "" Death feels so good "" or digitize old images in "" Forrest Gump "".

Zemeckis has always been fascinated by these means, managing to be one of the pioneers in the correct

use and progression of them and composing fantastic stories that use the t� Technique to give

huge results and excellent films of entertainment. In his last evolution of technology, Zemeckis

rod��� "" The Polar Express "", tape in which, For the first time, the director saw how the technique ate the content,

undermining the good Christmas intentions of this film and the hope of his company, Warner Bros. .

to collect high numbers with this product, something coming from a director like Zemeckis was, a priori,

Tom Hanks improbable.Con cavy, utiliz in Zemeckis' "the Polar Express" "technics performance capture,

which was based on "" scanning "" and digitizing literally the actors, thus achieving a film animated,

but captured from the real action. Despite this failure ("" The Polar Express "" was a film that was

technologically as well as boring), Zemeckis decided to continue putting this performance capture into practice with

"" Monster House "" , in which he gave the chevrons to debutant Gil Kenan. And with them Spielberg, in the facet of

executive producer. "" Monster House "" captures the essence that Zemeckis and Spielberg were able to capture in the

80s, and separates from the increasingly recurrent, even tone ���dico of computer animation films,

establishing itself as one of the most successful films of this genre in the last two years. The story of

"" Monster House "" is simple, but effective. An enchanted house inhabited by an old malcarado devours all

that or that which dares to approach it. A pair of curious children continually watch over the strange and

dangerous movements of this house. With this plot, which leads to a new land the genre of thehouses

haunted, "" Monster House " "He is leading us through a vertiginous Russian mountain of fun and joy in the purest

style of the cinema of the eighties. A film at times lyrical, luminous and beautiful and sometimes dark, dark and

evil. But always with an enviable sense of rhythm. The script of Dan Harmon, Rob Schrab and Pamela Pettler

contains well-described characters, such as its two small protagonists, "" DJ "" and "" Croquette "" (a

sort of "" Gordi "" of "" The Goonies "") that complement each other perfectly, with those fears of childhood and their affinity of

maturity, as well as its picturesque range of secondary ones like the old Nebbercracker (excellent name for a

character of a tape of these characteristics), the chick-a-girl or the boyfriend pasota of this one. And also, with a

beautiful "flashback" about Nebbercracker's wife, which is a true delight. All this, together with her

dialogues, to the succession of exciting and attractive sequences that give place to the full brilliance of the technique

of capture of movements and the good work of its director, Gil Kenan, make "" Monster House "" a wonderful

and joyous work. Debtor of "" The Goonies "" but also Hayao Miyazaki's cinema (especially "" Thecastle

traveling""). A film with personality, which uses creativity and ingenuity in its mixture of terror and

adventure, forming a product of the taste of small, older and above all those raised in between 1980

and 1990, which will find In the elements and the basic constants of the cinema of his childhood and adolescence in

the characters, situations and setting of this film. Technically, "Monster House" is an admirable film, and in

its bottom, really rich. It is one of the most original compositions since "Monstruos SA" and an

unstoppable diversion as it could be. Here there are no well-known actors or television celebrities in the dubbing,

nor does resort to easy parody. We are looking at the year's film in the field of digital animation. And the fact

that Steven Spielberg and Robert Zemeckis appear as executive producers is always pleasant

news.

" 1

" Something good among all this mara���a of vague attempts to reach our hearts ?. Yes. Asoundtrack

decent, certain hints not clear to get out of the script and some game without shaping the subconscious. And that's it.

We find ourselves, oh surprise, before a Christmas-loving hybrid and supposedly comical (?). The Holiday

is a soft, typical, foreseeable and dispensable production. With all the commas. And the most

unforgivable of all is that the talent thrown away is huge. It is better to know it from the beginning,

because although its appearance could be reminiscent of recent successes of the Closer type or even, in another dimension,

Love Actually (the marketing works wonders), the viewer You must know that you will not encounter any of that. Not

even in a tenth. To begin with, the script lacks novelty (something common, so it might not be so

serious). Two disgusted girls and wanting to get away from their undesirable ex-partners, one who lives in Los

Angeles -Cameron D���az- and the other in a small town near London -Kate Winslet-, contact casually (or

causally) ) through the Internet and decide to exchange their homes during the Christmas holidays. You intuit

well, an I to Boston and to California, curiously already in the filmograf���a of the director, in aplan

modernbut without the game of identities. Sin? Chicha? Come on. In just two weeks it will give you time to overcome

the trauma, to meet new people and, of course, to fall in love again. Even the pointer, the poor, manages to be

happy. It is the effectiveness of a script of something more than two hours that has been stretched without mercy. The iteration of the

crucial arguments also converts the story into a kind of merry-go-round that keeps turning on

itself. If the viewer has not heard the fourth or fifth mention that, for example, one of the girls

was cheated by her boyfriend, it is that she stopped paying attention , at least, in minute two. Something probable

thanks, among other things, to the overreaching burden of each and every one of the members of the cast who,

instead of getting into their role, seem to pass through it as if from a tr��. It will be treated. Theinterpretation abounds

light, and although that does not have to be pejorative, I know that certain gags tocompletely absurd

Bridget Jones are; absurd and unnecessary. If at least they had taken advantage of a serious tribute? to the

unforgettable classics (the phone crash), the catastrophe would not have come to be triggered. What a

waste. Or perhaps everything is a lack of global motivation aggravated by the cruel crossing of feelings: handsome

seducer -Jude Law- with beautiful millionaire and? Mona? maudlin with? clown? bonach���n -Jack Black-. Typical. The fact

is that these four actors have done more than acceptable work throughout their careers, but they

certainly did not have a good day when they started to shoot The Holiday. A shame As it is also that the

only salvageable plot, with many gui���os to the cinema, is put with shoehorn. It was not difficult, however, that the

worthy Eli Wallach was the most credible. We did not even believe the difficult situation.staff

Law, as we did not, despite the regrets, with Pen���pole Cruz in Volver, with a daughter who, of course

, does not look like hers. The general conclusion is clear: Nancy Meyers did not know what to do, if a drama, a

mess or a cake, so I mixed everything. It works for some of them, not for her, at least now. Something

good among all this mara���a of vague attempts to reach our hearts ?. Yes. A decent soundtrack,

certain hints not clear to get out of the script and some game without shaping the subconscious. And that's it.

" 0

" Tarantino takes a delirious plot and adds some original and personal dialogs, someplans

beautiful, a "retro" "wonderful" image, a fascinating protagonist, a great soundtrack and some women

who fall in love, not to mention the innumerable references for the delight of the fans.

It happened to me with "" Kill Bill "" and it happened again with "" Death Proof "". I went to see the latest films of

Tarantino convinced that, in reality, I would not like it too much and in the end I loved it. From that of the

avenging bride, I expected no more than fights and more fights and it turned out to be much more. Or not, but at least it was

very well made. Now, with the killer driver, I was ready to meet. Well, that's it, with a

killer driver. But no, that's only a fraction of what this half of the Grindhouse project offers.

We will ignore that now we all say "" Grindhouse "" as if it were a term that we had been using

throughout our lives -s���, as when we learned to say "" bounces "" thanks a "" Pharmacy on duty "" -. By

now we all know that Quentin Tarantino and Robert Rodr���guez set out to shoot two works in homage to

the B series films that were seen in the United States. double and that here in Spain they have set us

apart, and I do not have much more to add about it. The fact is that, without knowing anything about the genre-like

most of those who write these days about him, let's not deceive ourselves- "" Death Proof "I thought it was great. I have not

seen "" Planet Terror "" and I'm pretty sure it will be way below. While Tarantino is a great

director who manages to catch anything and get something bright, Robert Rodr���guez seems,

simply, a lucky guy. Anyway, I guess at some point I'll see it and see if I'm

right. For the moment, I'm staying with that of friend Quentin. The guy takes a delirious plot and adds some

original and personal dialogues, some beautiful shots, a wonderful "retro" image, aprotagonist

fascinating, a band great sound and some women who fall in love, not to mention the countless references to the

delight of fans, which surely I did not pill��� or half, and that I noticed a few. All

this in two very different parts -something key so that the footage does not become eternal-, in a very funny way

and worrying, I suppose, to maintain fidelity to the genre. The truth is that this last is what Ileast

liked the. I would have been able to do without the blood, although the truth is that it is not a minimum part

of what you would expect after the trailers and I promoted it. n, and I understand that it is a fundamental element.also

I wasnot particularly moved by the false faults in image and sound, which were all too obvious in a movie

theater "" last model "", but they were not at all as excessive as I had read in some places. And,

finally, I was annoyed that a couple of stories were completely interrupted and dropped, which I infer

that it must be another guide to this type of film, because it is somewhat exaggerated. No one was left wanting

to see the cheerleader again or to know where the suspicions of the sheriff lead? Special mention deserve-actually

both the characters and the actors, the actresses- who interpret them. If Kurt Russell

(Mike Specialist) embroiders a seductive psychopath, each of the girls becomes a hero with a

unique personality and unique beauty, the kind that can really drive you crazy To anybody. To Rosario

Dawson, specifically, I'm going to put her on an altar. She has never been so beautiful like here. She was convinced that

no one would be able to get anything decent from such a history of persecution and good times. He did not even think

that someone could maintain such a simple approach during the time a movie lasts. What error.

Tarantino does it, and great. It is clear that fame has not come by chance.

" 1

" You have to enter the game. If you get it, you will enjoy it as it did a long time ago. Fun but dense,

slow but fast, original but photocopy. Very good cinema today.

You have to enter the game. If you get it, you will enjoy it as it did a long time ago. If not, you may end up

leaving the room (that's about doubting between Brick and why are they rubbing their paws?) Brick,

Rian Johnson's first feature is a noir conglomerate Houston, Welles, Hawks, Chandler or Hammet and who

stars in one of the kids of Things of Martians, that is, an experiment. And the experiment turns out to

be a noir of the lifelong, with his fatal wife, his criminal in the shade, hishard private detective

rock-and his intelligent assistant and a constant Chinatown present throughout the film (v��� take the attack with a

knife and the bandages on the nose of the protagonist) In Brick there is also a bit of Elephant, with his insti (the

film school where the director studied) and with his teenage freaks and, above all, with its filming: 20 days

in duration. During that time Johnson prohibited the cast from viewing the gingers films, but if he

recommended the reading of Chandler or Hammet and seen the results the kids got into it

as much as their own director.I say above that you have to enter it from the beginning, because it can

be shocking (although I do not know the reason, anything can happen in a movie, it's not of that?),

because seeing the kids of American Pie acting like the people of Chinatown (for example) can catch you

by surprise. A great success of the film is to demonstrate that, above all, those characters, both those ( anti) heroes like

criminals, they are high school students who live with their parents and who, in addition to the obvious pressure for

narcotics trafficking and murder (they are criminals) have to worry about absences from

class, and that's fun, original and sorrowful The truth is that the only thing that has high school is the

institute itself and the students, because the di���logos and situations are 100% Noir, becoming at times

as dense as any other movie. of gender from fifty or sixty years ago. It is understandable that the film

could be seen in Sitges, because it is so pure (speaking of noir), that it seems to be scifi, those ways of speaking (Are you

sure you want to be sure?) And those m� ��all: the Brick universe is a particular microworld that the

director has invented and that is as real as it is absurd (the mother of The Pin serving milk to the "" friends "" of

her son, the head of studies speaking to the protagonist as if they were in a police station instead of in the

office of the school.) The actors are great, especially that revelation that is Joseph Gordon-Levitt, who

creates a Brendan that little has to envy to Sam Spade, a "" strips "" with the appearance of a weak wimp but

for resources and cabezoner���a is almost almost a killing machine, normal for another side, because

otherwise it would end up underground. Lucas Haas is The Pin, the man behind the crime, a

somewhat excessive, but fundamental character, represents a connection between the world that creates the director and ours in

a way that can not even the protagonist, of whom we only see the alarm clock of his house: The Pin lives with

his mother and in the basement he has a room where he represents the role of godfather of the mafia of the kids of-

twentythree years. Ravin (Lost, Hills have eyes) is the character that triggers the

events and Nora Zehetner is the femme fatale. Shaft, I mean Richard Roundtree plays the head of

studies. A fun but dense movie, slow but fast, original but photocopy. Very good cinema today

. A 8���75.PD: Very bad Alphaville theaters in spite of the "" remodeling "".

" 1

" Rodrigo Cort���s, who seems happy to have met, dizzies and confuses us with a varied visual style

but not excessively original.

His short film 15 days, an interesting story of a "" survivor "" of modern society, was a good

fan and a letter of presentation very worked for the next step: the film. However, for

all those with that short film and we also admire other directors, this debut has

become disappointing. Marton Circo Mart���n Medem), is the winner of the biggest

prize in a television contest. However, that stroke of luck will turn against you in the mostway. A

unexpectedpremise like this one could give a lot of play. However, Rodrigo Cort���s, who seems to be delighted todizzies and confuses

have met,us with a varied visual style but not excessively original. All

those who appreciate the work and style of Oliver Stone and Tony Scott can see in this film his long shadow:

montage, mixing of image styles (from 8 millimeter film effects to animated photographs through

chains) and verbiage that, in this case, does not define the character or make progress the story. Ah! The story, of

course. Well, although the story could be briefly summarized, what I doubt most about this film is the

message that the director and scriptwriter wants to give: We live in a society of chupatintas ? Is having a stroke of

luck bad? Is being rich a curse? Is there no way to change anything that surrounds us? I think that only one

of the questions has an easy answer. Seeing the end of the film gives the impression of wanting to tell a

drama with moments of comedy. We want to make you cry for a character that we do not know if he is greedy or

simply an economist. In short, a film that pretends to give a masterly lesson about how fucked up we are

in capitalism but with a protagonist (Sbaraglia ) who does not know how to wear it.

" 0

" Small, funny and funny production, with a peculiar and unusual sense of humor, and aMorgan Freeman

hugewho has a great time with a Paz Vega juggling with his accent.

In '10 Items Or Less' (sorry, I refuse to call it as "" translated "" by these parts), Morgan Freeman

plays a famous actor at low hours who is forced to accept a role in an independent film about

a supermarket manager. To investigate his character, visit a supermarket in aneighborhood

working-classof Los Angeles, where he will meet Scarlet (yes, with a t), the energetic cashier played by Paz Vega .

Between them there will be a peculiar relationship thanks to which they will learn something from each other. Letsay that this

usfilm is a kind of 'Lost in Translation 2' that It takes place in Los Angeles. Apparently they do not look like

anything, but in the most basic, the motivations and the relationship between the protagonist couple, could be

perfectly sisters. That is the least of it, since at least it has its own personality, and it is forgiven. The best thing

about this film is that it has no pretension whatsoever, it has a peculiar and unusual sense of humor, it is very

small and it is quite nice and fun, once you get into their game, of course. Because the way

it's told (the Gafapastis will love it) will be a pretty misunderstood movie, unfortunately.

In addition, the two actors are quite well: a huge Morgan Freeman who has a great time with Paz

Vega juggling his accent. And on the screen they have a lot of "" spark "" and they work very well. Recommended and

warm comedy, if only to listen to Morgan Freeman sing "" When passing the boat "" (in VOSE, of

course). In addition it is neither long nor heavy , because it lasts a sigh: one hour and twenty. Fair and

enough. something that, unfortunately, most of the filmmakers seem to have forgotten.

" 1

" Pleasant unpretentious surprise that does not even try, even if it seems, to become Clerks.

Marching (Waiting! 2005, Rob McKittrick) is a pleasant unpretentious surprise that does not even try, even

if it seems, to become Clerks. Because here they are governed by the vulgar joke (well, and in Clerks, but this one

is more American) and that, friends, I like it. It's a lot more fun than I expected, and above all, a

lot more bristle. Ryan Reinolds keeps rubbing his ticks too much, but now he has a great

group of professional misfits who give the better of yes, especially that cachond���simo (in all aspects)

Luis Guzm���n, who, as he said "" serious criticism "", is what Only worthy of a film in which everything

else is uncouth. But if the worst of the movie is it! It's from experience that a lot of the critics

who cover these productions write about them without seeing them. Critics in El Pa���so in his cool guide On de

Madrid prove it. Brrr, I'm warm. The fact is that if you want to be ninety minutes with a smile

on your face and not complicate much the evening the movie comes in but that very well. A 7.PD: Anna Faris, I love you.

" 1

" Another mediocre film for the exits, the animation is in the backcountry, few studies preserve the ability

to make good animated films.

Today will I analyze another animation movie? his title, Crazy about Surfing, and is the Sony Pictures alternative

to the proposal of Disney, Ratatouille. If we talk about artistic pretensions? in this film they shine by

its absence We are before a film that the only thing that it does is tear off a smile from time to time, with

an argument that is worn out ad nauseam? In an artistic competition, the main protagonist

becomes the best, after a long apprenticeship with a retired sufista who had lost hope and

recovers it thanks to his young apprentice. The moral of always? the one who follows it gets it as in so

many other films based on sports. That is, how he presents the story, it is very well achieved, since it is

a kind of documentary in which there are interviews the protagonists, interviews with children (children

penguins, of course), unfocused shots to simulate that the camera is inside the film, iteven

does notlack Any object that hits the camera? The characters are quite sympathetic and the central theme when

dealing with surfing (surf, beach, sun? ��� Pinging?), Makes it a refreshing film, ideal for these

dates summers, if you have already seen your Disney rival. Let's now go to the technical section? it is

impeccable, the animation of the water and the characters is very good, of that there is no doubt, but it takes much more

than a 3D animation to make a film? ,N, another mediocre film for the take-off, the

animation is in the backcountry, few studies retain the ability to make good animated films (and

when I say few? I mean Pixar and some Dreamworks). The kids of the house and I mean from 0 to 6 will

enjoy this movie? but for more than 6 there are other proposals more succulent.

" 0

" It remains in a brief sketch of the conflict in the Middle East where, unfortunately, and perhaps caused

by a more than atropellated assembly, everything is diluted just like sugar in the café. �

Benigni returns, after the hyper-awarded "" Life is beautiful "" and the failure of his "" Pinochio "" in real image,

tries with all his might to give him certain doses of comedy, mixed with bitterness, but falls into the repetition

is that the script resembles (in part) its successful film, in addition to the repetition of its "tics" "And

jokes of the other. Unfortunately, Benigni, parks the freshness he had in" "Life is beautiful" "and with a subject

as interesting as the conflict in the Middle East bíl, stays in a brief note, where, unfortunately, and

perhaps caused by a more than atropellated editing, everything is diluted just like sugar in the caf���.Geniales Jean

Reno and Nicoletta Braschi, the latter producer of the film (we must remember that she is the director's wife and muse

.) and a soundtrack; with a theme of Tom Waits in the background, which as in "" Life is beautiful "" comes to

tire in its repetition. In short, a film that will be remembered m� It's like "" Life is Bella 2 "" than because of its

original title.

" 0

" Paused, unhurried but without bumps like almost all French cinema, an intelligent thriller without even

excluding the public, with a hook in the form of a final twist.

The Frenchman Francois Ozon has everything to be a political director: Ignored by the criticism of his country

(unclassifiable according to them), a voluble and uneven work until almost marginal, and if it was not enough, homosexual

confessed. What is the real Ozon? ���The one of the interesting Sitcom, Regarde the mer or the one of the empty 8

women?. The Pool, on the other hand, is all virtues. It is an amalgam that mixes the best of its

director. Paused, unhurried but without bumps like almost all French cinema, an intelligent thriller without

even excluding the public, with a hook in the form of a final twist does not bother and only

reaffirms everything narrated, where other directors fail miserably. The holidays of a writer

(saturated, pacata and amoral as it is Sarah) and vacation in a weekend home, are the pretext for

confrontation Conn with Julie, the daughter of her publisher (fiery, also amoral and unprejudiced) and the encounter of

things lost in her life -or never found- like desire, freedom and sex.Excellent all the

protagonists, mainly the female roles: the great Charlotte Rampling (old acquaintance of the

director's filmography) with a beautiful nude including her more than sixty years. Thetakes the palms

provocative Ludivine Sagnier, which guides the whole story with its impudence and beauty. We will see if on his next move,

Ozon reveals his true self.

" 1

" Civilization against ignorance, the city opposite the countryside, roots that accompany us all our lives, fear of

the unknown, the other "" I "" hidden behind our t� " Typical face ... Straw dogs, a great job of

Peckinpah.

Neither Heaven nor Earth have feelings; they treat the things of the world as if they were straw dogs

(Lao-Ts���). Civilization against ignorance, the city opposite the field, roots that accompany us all our lives ,

fear of the unknown, the other "" I "" hidden behind our typical face. Dogs of straw, one of the mostfilms

violentof Sam Peckinpah (although most of that violence is not seen on screen) revolves around all

these themes and their interpretations can be very varied. Everything depends, of course, on the eye with which it is looked at. A

young American mathematician, David Sumner (Hoffman), moves with his wife Amy (Susan George) to the native town

of ���sta in Great Britain to escape the chaos and violence of the United States. However, their life will not be

as idyllic as they could have expected, and soon they will have to face the attacks and abuses of the people of the town.

Peckinpah knows how to build very well the image of a young man whom his wife accuses of cowardice,

then turn the character around. David is the citizen human being, is the civilization and the law, but wrapped

in a dangerous and hostile environment and under a limited situation will be shown as a predator that defends his

territory It is not by chance that your home becomes a fortress, a position of strength from which to

defend yourself. If David is the mind, Amy is the body, attached to life, and with a value system that will clash. Conn

with those of her husband. When attacked by Charlie, he will use his own methods and his own weapons to get out

of the trance. It also represents a kind of duality: he escaped from his village to look for another life, and he married

an intelligent man, not handsome, but on the other hand he could not escape from his past , of their own codes of

honor and their own education. I will ask David to fight for her, to face the thugs. In the middle of all

this blood, only one detonator is needed, and that will be Henry Niles (my dear David Warner), a kind of

psychic diminished who has had problems with the law for harassing some young girls, and whose meeting with the

daughter of Tom Hedden will end up provoking the siege of the Sumners' home. moments of new

emerge the confrontation between two different worlds, that of David and that of Amy. He will appeal to justice, to which

most of us would have in mind in such a case. She, much more pragmatic, is like a harassed animal, and

asks David to tell the Hedden what they are looking for. "You really do not care, do you?" Says David. But, to what

extent can you trust the law? Isolated from everything and everyone, it seems that the only law that can survive at

that time is the primary law of the Tali���n.

" 1

" Shooter: The Shooter is a new and horrific example of action cinema that Hollywood produces: a host of

visual pirouettes without rhyme or reason, with the sole purpose of dizzying and confusing the viewer.

Nowadays, making a decent action film, no longer good, is a real impossible mission, and not the

pigeon-hounds of pigeons. Tom "" sells-what-it-is "" Cruise. Therefore, each new byproduct of action designed

by the factories of Hollywood is a new experiment to attract a public already jaded with so manyAlthough itstrange to

photocopies.seemssay it of an action tape, Shooter: The Shooter is based on anovel

Pulitzer Prize-winning, which leads to a couple of interesting and profound reflections, which is more daring

. The first is "whoever can!" Because the film may be the biggest grotesque exhibited on a movie

screen since the withdrawal of Bud Spencer and Terence Hill. And the second is how low thehave fallen

prestigious Pulitzer prizes. Because, promotional machinery aside, and always saving the distances,

Shooter: The Shooter is a rough approach to Cornered, that is to say, to Rambo. After such an

approach, it is inevitable to think that Training Day was no more than an accident in the career of a director

who has in his filmography real cult jewels like Tears. del Sol, El Rey Arturo or the short The Call, a

pseudo-public mystery made exclusively for the internet. But we must be fair, the new work of

Antoine Fuqua has given us really essential scenes, because thanks to the tape we have discovered that

thanks to the cross stitch anyone is able to extract a bullet as the most painted. Not to mention the

rest of the pearls in the form of lapidary phrases, which leave Harry Callahan in a fervent pacifist militant. In

short, Shooter: The Shooter is a new and horrifying example of the action cinema that Hollywood produces: a

symphony of visual pirouettes without rhyme or reason, with the sole purpose of dizzy and confusing the viewer. Not to

mention the aura of American patriotism that surrounds the film, as burdensome as it is unbearable.

" 0

" A somewhat boring film that probably will please the book's stalwarts and three more people

. Recommended for those who poke their noses.

With "" Perfume: The Story of a Murderer "" a new hero arrives on our screens: Jean-Baptiste Grenouille and

his alter ego, the Pituitary Man, who is not steel like Superman, but neither does he need , because with his

portentous nose he can smell the bullets in the wind and avoid them. And if you do not believe me, go and see the film,

go on. Come on Patrick S���skind's well-known bestseller, "" Perfume: The Story of a Murderer "" tells the

story of Jean-Baptiste Grenouille (Ben Whishaw), from his imprisonment and death sentence, point at which the film

begins, until his accident birth and return to prison. A miserable Parisian orphan who was

born with a portentous nose, Grenouille can distinguish with it all kinds of smells, including

patchouli and vegetables that people throw at him. After numerous misfortunes he manages to start his career as a

perfumer under the protection of Baldini (Dustin Hoffman), and with it he discovers the existence of aperfume

perfectthat nobody has been able to synthesize. Nobody except him, of course. And so he embarks on a trip to Grasse, a city where he will

try to get the essence from its basic ingredients: the smell of damsels that Grenouille prefers

. Of course, the disappearance of these women is not very funny to Antoine Richis (Alan

Rickman), one of the councilors. In itself, the script is not necessarily boring, although it makes an

abusive and rather annoying use of the voiceover of a sexagenarian narrator, whose main objective is to

explain the feelings of the protagonist , since if these had to be guessed through the

performance of Ben Wishaw, the film would need subtitles. In addition, one of the fundamental components of the

story is the world of smells, as in the original book. But while in this the use of the word

allowed a certain slackness to the writer at the time of trying to transmit the olfactory sensations of its

protagonist, in the film Tykwer tries to do the own of visual way , but what for S���skind was a

slack, here becomes squeeze. All these moments are reduced to one or more actors with a face of

���xtasis while in the background the most peregrine and / or tacky things can happen, from pigeons cooing among

the flowers of spring to multitudinous org.as. Tykwer also has other problems, since it decompensates a

lot the rhythm of the film. While at certain moments he entertains by offering recurringplans

Grenouillededicated to the most mundane of tasks while a symphony sounds in the background, in others the story

progresses tremendously fast As if someone had suddenly realized that it had been two hours and

nothing happened there. And in one of these apurones, the film ends in the great final climax, at

which point it takes up the time line of the first minutes. At this moment, "" Perfume: The Story of a Murderer ""

offers the viewer an ending that in my opinion contains two of the three worst-riddled and most ridiculous scenes in

the history of the cine.Estamos before a tremendous European overproduction, with creative Germans and English distribution

, which undoubtedly will become a Spanish film candidate for many Goya. And as such

superproduction, the visual aspect and the setting are remarkably well cared for, in the line of thehistorian

current, which usually requires that everyone be very ugly and dirty. Again the white wigs and thepowder

ricecover the black nails and the dirt that in "" The perfume: History of a murderer "" covers everything. In addition, Tykwer

is recreated in the close-ups, so that we can all appreciate the decay of every living being that appears

on the screen. As for the cast, it is unevenly divided. While actors quite incapable as Ben

Wishaw (the protagonist) steal almost all the footage, great professionals like Dustin Hoffman or Alan Rickman are

left with the crumbs. Despite this, and especially the latter, they manage to raise the film a lot,

especially in comparison with Wishaw. It's not that the boy does not have expressiveness. He is a very expressive actor.

But the problem is that he only has one expression, and with it he has to endure the almost two and a half hours of

film, which is done uphill to the viewer, thus Imagine him. In short, a somewhat

boring film that probably will like the unconditional book and three people more. Recommended for those who

poke their noses.

" 0

" Film clean, sincere, you can not. Vega's cinema goes between daily life and the marvelous, and

its personal halo is not given to its characters: it lets them fly, free; he films them with enormous asepsis, letting them

triumph and make mistakes.

All emotions are predictable. All the hopes And the fears. The contradictions encourage anworld

imperfect, inaccurate, complicit in all the barbarities and all the prodigies that have been executed in their fragile

resistance to the turn, but the world keeps turning and the reticule of the turn (of the complicity in the good and

also in the bad, of that abstract concept of integrating pantheism) is useful to give some light to this

simple exercise of cinema very sem�� Unique, forged around the morality of necessarilycharacters

unstable, stranded in communication, made to say and to listen, even if they do not say or do not listen: perhaps a

sign of these times.Felipe Vega and the screenwriter Manuel Hidalgo offer a clean film, sincere and not so

powerless, a universe of couples that never fall into conflict caused by the abundant offer of this cinema of

personal relationships, of Woody Allen couples, that are delivered and rejected, that are rummaged to find

the cl bird that redeems them from their existential habit. The cinema of Vega (remember the wonderful summer clouds) goes

to horse between the daily and the wonderful thing and its characters are not given their personal halo: it lets them fly,

free; he films them with enormous asepsis, letting them triumph and make mistakes. The small generational drama raised

does not give a solution to the problems: it exposes them without frivolity, it brings them closer to the sensitivity of those who, astonished,

observe how everything is articulated under the cold. a layer of isolation, which sometimes comes dressed in arrogance or

hypocrisy of weakness. The actress Blanca Apil���nez is immense. Pity that the end, something ridiculous, away the

last impression of pure excellence. Nor does a certain formal eviction collaborate in scenes that we understand as key

(the scene of the bar with the clients that end up staying).

" 1

" In the City of Sylvia is a failed experiment to show the public the search a man takes

to find a woman, and along the way, offer the throbbing heart of a man. a city.

Scarcely a month ago the 64th Venice Film Festival concluded, the best edition of the Biennale that took place in

many years. There is nothing like feeling wounded pride to react and straighten the course.

Unfortunately, very little Spanish cinema could be seen at the festival, with honorable exceptions, having only one

homeland tape in the Official Section. That film was In the City of Sylvia, the new work by Jos��� Luis Guer���n, a

filmmaker who amazed and enthralled many for his documentary En Construcci���n. The Barcelona director returns to

his origins, a story of fiction, intimately linked to the face of a big city, its places and its

inhabitants. A boy (Xavier Lafitte) recalls the encounter he had with Sylvia six years ago, and decides to

start his search in those places he frequented, One day he thinks he finds her, and begins to follow her. It must

be said in advance that In the City of Sylvia is a type of film that seeks a very minority audience, and we

must go to see it with an open mind, without prejudices or preconceived ideas. However, it does not take

many minutes for the viewer to feel invaded by a terrible sensation, the one of what I paint?

The film exudes so much pretentiousness and pedantry that it can even with the most painted. It is not only that the complete

lack of dialogues is annoying, it is that Guerin spends almost all of the minutes trying to demonstrate his

great handling of the camera with impossible shots. , while trying to show an accurate reflection of what

the inhabitants of a large city feel and experience. It does not even have the support that two great

interpretations would offer, since Pilar L���pez de Ayala is limited to being, while Xavier Lafitte is rather soft

and very unbelievable. In the City of Sylvia is a failed experiment to show the public the search

a man undertakes to find a woman, and along the way, offer the throbbing heart of a city.

However, only get many viewers who come to see something different, flee in terror as

soon as they turn on the lights of the room.

" 0

" Cinematographically speaking is unclassifiable since, in order to tell its despicable and pathetic history,is

that dirty realismrequired.

"" Borat "", let's say it from the beginning, has absolutely repugnant moments and, in its endeavor to shake

the consciences and sensitivities of the spectators, spurring the lowest instincts of thoseYankees

ordinary, theoretically ordinary, Sacha Baron Cohen, putative father of the infected creature, will have no qualms

about behaving like a real pig, racist, rude and mis��� gino hound dog of the lowest grade

. And what do you get with it? Why do you do it? Supposedly, in order to drag in its

mud rolls to the gravest of American society: feminists, Baptist priests, the high society of a

southern town, university students, tough cowboys, sellers of second-hand cars,dealers

armsand, in the end, the very same retreaded Pamela Anderson. "" Borat "" is an atypical road movie that, attached

to the emerging g��� nero of the false documentary, is breaking the American box office, possibly, because it is

the ycido and cruel reflection of a contradictory and complex society. within the apparent simplicity, stupidity

and mental cretinism of a good part of its inhabitants, perfectly represented by that individual they have

as President. And there is no way to laugh at the miseries of others, when they are so close, to feel

comfortable and calm with oneself. Now, if as a pseudosociological experiment, "" Borat " "It can be

curious and striking, cinematographically speaking it is unclassifiable because, in order to tell its despicable and

pathetic history, it requires that dirty realism, its basic planning of a single c�. ��mara who chases

the alleged Kazakh journalist everywhere, his carelessness in the details and all the dandruff that oozes the

film. What is very clear is that the scholar Sacha Baron Cohen has managed to outline a character with

popular and very mediatic pull, that we do not know if he will have continuity (and success) in the future. We must recognize that the

82 minutes of "" Borat "" are spent in a sigh, that neither tired nor bored, that arouse reactions in the viewer

and that they give for a while of chat once the film is over. But, of course, they are not going to revolutionize either the

history of cinema or that of sociology. Music deserves special mention, a soundtrack replete with the most important

sounds. hot bands from Eastern Europe. You can listen to songs like "" Ederlezi "" and

tonadas of the famous bilingual voices in a lively ethnic-musical potpourri that puts the festive counterpoint to

so much cutrez and dandruff. " "Borat" "claims the power of humor as a tool of social criticism, is politically

incorrect and, as we said, provokes reactions in the stalls. It's not little. But neither is it like to

burst lockers, really. Will it be a symptom of a disease diagnosed in our country after the success

of Torrente? We will keep an eye on Borat and Sacha, to see what happens to them in the near future.

" 0

" The director of the curious Beyond Dreams experiences, without much success, in this exotic drama that

links warlike peoples who seek to impose themselves on others with b� Interior searches of all kinds.

If Australia is far, the truth is that its history is somewhat more known to us by the cinema than its

neighbor New Zealand, although not much more. Vincent Ward, who is a native of the country converted by Peter Jackson in

the Middle Earth of Tolkien, tries to do his bit to the cause making a historical approach,

not very contextualized the truth , the colonial past of these islands. It is certain that the actress Samantha Mortonthem

conqueredin Code 46, of a futuristic nature, and in the tremendous In America, where she gave life to an Irish woman who

emigrated with his family to the United States. Here he retreats a century and a half to arrive, also as a foreigner,

to a strange land that will wake up suddenly due to colonialism. Surrounded by other prestigious

interpreters such as Cliff Curtis -which we can see in Sunshine-, Stephen Rea? Who here lacks little- and Kiefer

Sutherland? Few know how to die like him-, succumbs to the pretensions of a director who is decompensated the

play. It is curious this trip up and we start from an idea: it is irregular in its story,

equidistant between boredom and frenetic rhythm, is say, badly leveled. Sometimes we are caught by action, we are

attracted to what is narrated and, almost instantaneously, we escape because of an abuse of the voice-over and

locations of unsurpassed beauty. They'll think I'm exaggerating, but sometimes my mindto El Piano and I

wanderedthought I saw Holly Hunter moving with difficulty with her dress between the brush and the mud, but the

detonations They returned to the scene of a stark (and partly fratricidal) struggle between the English army and

the aboriginal Maori tribes. The quest idea dominates all the footage : find the true identity,

persecute those who took your life, look for a better future than the present stormy. Whilecan

this mix of desiresbe interesting to meet, the rhythm to which the director submits comes to rub

extreme boredom, without forgetting the lack of depth in the profiles of certain key figures inWithout

history.going into repetitive turns and in the unbelievable love story of being built with

barely any data, River Queen, New Zealander luck from The Queen of Africa, only succeeds in puttingin its spotlight.

an historic episodeIt is different, but it suspends when it is notwith plot integrity andwith beautiful and

endowedadornedexotic landscapes and puerile reflections about beings condemned to live divided between two cultures.

" 0

" The biggest problem that arose during the projection, is that for almost an hour and a half (the film lasts

two) I did not know if before me a story was represented or a thriller

It bothers me a lot when a creator (called director, writer or screenwriter) confuses the fact of showing a

new perspective through calculated plot turns with changing the rules at will, without order or

justification. In any case, except for not having ideas or not knowing how to develop them. In the first case, the

narrative leap usually informs us about information that had already been shown but that wenot

couldinterpret (something that we could observe in a fabulous way in the fabulous work of Michel Gondry ���Olv���date

de m���!). However, in the second case the feeling is that someone is cheating to justify

a new element that has been introduced almost as if by magic. Well, "" Perfume: history of a

murderer "" could be classified in the last option, although, due to my literary shortcomings, I do not know if the

culprit is the author of the homonymous novel, Patrick S� ��skind or, on the other hand, the director who has been

responsible for adapting it to the cinema, Tom Tykwer, of whom he would highlight the beautiful but harsh story "" The princess and the

warrior "". Ethically from the figure of the narrator something that, on the one hand, gets

boring and, on the other, suggests the lack of professionalism at the time of making the script. This is not a

novel but a film and, therefore, we can not make an equitable use of the same figures. However,

this small error is pleasantly corrected if we consider the wonderful picture that usually surrounds the

chronicler. The biggest problem that arose during the projection is that during almost hour and a half (the film

lasts two) I did not know if before me a story or a thriller was represented. On the one hand, I saw the detailed exposition

of a brutal serial killer in 18th century France, however, there were components that expelled me from

the tangent reality (one thing is to have an exceptional olfalto and another, very different, is to be able to know by

smell that at the bottom of a puddle there are frog eggs, another important detail is that the smell emanating from

people no matter how pleasant it is murky with death ). In general, there was no clear exposition of the plane

on which the story unfolds. We all know that within a fantasy, you can establish a series

of rules that make it more real and, conversely, in the strictest reality you can establish a fantasy world. �a

parallel that offers us alternative dimensions. But, what you can not do is playand make a

cluelessnesshomogenous mix of genres in such a chaotic way. I have to say that, finally, all doubts dissipated

before me. ��� When I could see the final outcome: I had indeed witnessed a great tease

that had chosen the form of film of time, terror, police, fantastic and, all this, seasoned with

a scene that nothing has to envy to the images to which we have accustomed the photographer Spencer

Tunick.

" 0

" Tremendous in all its splendor, a film that leaves no one indifferent and that would have to be

compulsory viewing.

It is curious to see J-Lo in a role (and almost a record) deferential to which we are accustomed, leaving

this time outside the glamorous atmosphere of romantic comedies to which, luckily or unfortunately, we are

accustomed , joining with our "" Antoniou "" more international, in a film that could have gone

perfectly to the "" alternative "" side of the most serious and rigorous cinema, with this film ��cula, which touches a subject as real

as life itself, in which the hardness of it leaves us out of play during the second part of the footage. It is not

easy to play a song like the one that narrates the film of Gregory Nava, since there are many interests at stake, on the

one hand, the multinationals that have taken to M���jico their companies to produce better cheaper,

(those $ 5 that pay per hour of work to the "" maquiladoras ""), then seeing how M���jico does nothing to prevent

the systematic killing of women innocents; it is not something that has been invented for the film, it is something

sadly real, hundreds of women die raped in Mexico after leaving work, it is hard, paradjustical in

the times in which We are, but it is like that. Forgive the roll, but such an intense film can not be

missed, and even highlight the presence of our Juan Diego Botto, also on the screen, sharing images

(and ���s) with Jennifer Lopez. In short, tremendous in all its splendor, a film that leaves no one indifferent and

that would have to be mandatory viewing.

" 1

" A nostalgic review of a life stage in which the daily concerns revolved around thefor the

yearningloss of virginity and the planning of the next party aimed at the supreme end of the deviant From

time to time, the North American cinema opens acomedy with teenagers in heat, worried

gaudyonly by an existential binomial: sex and fun. They tend to 'throw away' a lot of easy cliche and moresituations

or less trite chemical. Supersalidos, being framed in this recurrent subg���nero, offers something more. First,

better-built characters; second, the humorous humor of fat stroke but sifted by finer ironies and

louder jokes; and third, the odd truth about the vital transitions that separate

carefree adolescence from adult responsibility. To all these additions of his guide to other

recent similar proposals, he is joined by a successful cast led by Jonah Hill and Michael Cera in the

typical roles of a buddy movie, a great musical selection replete with seventies classics and unparalleled pearls

like the hilarious character of Fogell / Mcgrory (Christopher Mintz-Plasse). Essentially, the plot is a

nostalgic review of a vital stage in which the daily concerns revolved around the yearning for the

loss of virginity and the planning of the next party aimed at the supreme deviant end. He

also remembers with affection that friendship with that colleague of the soul with whom he shared all the battles of

that waxed day. Seth and Evan are those two colleagues who are only a few weeks away from a transcendent change

for both with the arrival of the university and the consequent separation of their destinies. The imminent graduation

pressures them to reach the objective and the organization of a party to celebrate the end of the course will offer them

both the right occasion. Seth will play an essential part of the party by setting up, along with his

colleague and Fogell, the authentic outsider of the function, in the official alcohol suppliers. It is there that

what seemed like a relatively simple mission, thanks to Fogell's false adult card, will become

an odyssey adventure for the triplet of friends to arrive at the party with the 'revitalizing' liquid. TO

This plot will be joined by two policemen who, in their revival of their adolescent partying, will add a point of

challah to the film in order to result in that view. logic towards the high time of party immaturity. In the

epìlogo it will be clear that the closing of this stage usually comes by the way of the domesticated life in couple. Pera,

up to that point, should be the screenwriters of Supersalidos: to take away the dance.

" 1

" From the complete and careful gui���n to the ingenious di carlogos loaded with a brilliant sarcasm and subtle

irony that Alvy spits us out, make the tape an overwhelming statement of intentions

Annie Hall: excellent radiography on human behavior and sentimental relationships between man and

woman. Annie Hall was the catapult that favored the leap to fame of the today master Woody Allen in the seventh

art. Annie Hall turned out to be an unprecedented cinematographic jewel and for Woody Allen it was thesignal

startingof his long career and one of the most celebrated, awarded and acclaimed films of his filmography. to. For

Allen, he won his first Oscar as Best Director in 1977, in addition to the Oscar for Best Original Screenplay co-written

with Marshall Brickman and with certain autobiographical touches. Allen was also nominated for Best Actor

for his performance in Annie Hall. In spite of everything, Allen did not even go to collect the awards thatfilm had

hiswon, and he still did not attend any Oscar ceremony until 2003 because of a

tribute to the New York City. In addition to these two Oscars, Annie Hall also won the

Best Actress actress, thanks to the performance of a splendid Diane Keaton; and the Oscar to the Best Film of 1977.

Annie Hall, talks about the relationship between Annie and Alvy, their different stages of falling in love and passion, and

subsequent passivity and routine. Alvy is a forty-something, neurotic and sickly comedian, with thousands of

obsessions and a personal commitment to two frustrated divorces. Annie is younger than he is, she is beautiful and insecure,exactly

and she does not knowwhat she wants to dedicate her life to. Through different temporal narrative changes, we will

discover what happens with your love story. Woody Allen allows himself the luxury of playing and breaking the standards

established by the cinematographic and narrative code, introducing dozens of flashbacks,interactions

Alvy'sdirectly with the viewer, thus seeking the complicity, scenes of animation (homage to

Snow White), a division of the screen for the interpolation of messages between the protagonists, the

physical and spiritual unfolding of Annie when does not want to make love with Alvy, dreams, images with

subtitles etc. The truth is that all the viewing of Annie Hall is a delight. From the complete and

careful gui���n to the ingenious di carlogos loaded with a brilliant sarcasm and subtle iron���a that Alvyus out

spits, make the tape an overwhelming declaration of intentions. As always in the characters of Allen,

highlight the obsessions and tics of the human being. He is a genius in capturing all the obsessions andof a

neurismasmaniac as he is himself, and he knows how to perfectly combine that ironic and scathing humor to me. s purestyle

Billy Wilder, with the surrealism and brilliance of Chaplin's silent film. The work, narrates the difficulties of

personal relationships, moral obsessions about love, sex, friendship and fidelity of the couple,

the doubts before a reality that we do not want to arrive and therefore emotional immaturity. In Annie

Hall is reflected to perfection all the irrational relationships that can suffer

human beings, recreating with overwhelming sincerity the day of a loving relationship, with all its phases; because

love is not always beautiful as Hollywood paints it, and Allen traces it in Annie Hall with a forcefulness and

passivity that disturbs. After thirty works in her filmography, Annie Hall is called to be the

cornerstone of her entire career, the basic pillar and most important of her films , and a key tape of the 70's.

The film was shot mainly in New York and briefly in Los Angeles. It is well known to all,

the love that Allen gives to the city of New York and as always is reflected in his films. In

short, a romantic and dramatic comedy that will go down in history both because of its structure andresources

narrative and directingand because of the wonderful gui��� and the interpretations of the two protagonists. Finally

, I finish my analysis with the last sentences of the film, which I believe perfectly condense everything

previously exposed: Well. That's about what I think about human relationships, you know? They are

totally irrational. and crazy and absurdities. but. I guess we continue to maintain them because most of us

need them. Big Woody, great. Punctuation: 8.5 out of 10.

" 1

" A brilliant, deep, long and dense film, with an exceptional distribution and an incredible technical section. That's it

, who likes espionage, better not go.

Robert De Niro is the director, producer and supporting actor of El buen pastor. So it sounds a little, but I

assure you that his second film as a filmmaker is one of the most elaborated works of this beginning of the year. Yes, at

first glance it will look like the typical pe���azo of a man who left everything for his country, but no s���ores, no. Do not be

deceived. It will also seem boring, but the truth is that it is a slow and not less

magnificent film. This was one of the films Esperas expected of the year, at least for me, and I am content���simo of the

result that has given me, totally satisfactory. I lost hope with two criticisms that left her

rather bad, but luckily, I saw her and I was impressed. The truth is that it is not a film of

spies and nothing more. The good shepherd is much more: mainly, together with the subject of espionage, he talks about

human decisions and makes a deep analysis (��� too much!) About these English people, that end up with

hardly a personality of their own. De Niro makes an incredible speech about the human race, a speech that goes beyond

the unthinkable until reaching the final, absolutely terrifying conclusion, and not for that absolutely

disconcerting, since one is already waiting for what is going to happen. So we have left, the film by Robert de Niro,

as an authentic modern classical, that takes the odd reference of other (ancient) classics, such as The

Godfather . Not for that reason, the film lacks originality. ���Otherwise! Not only is it acinema show

good, but it is also a good and original film show (many of the plans are really

disconcerting, the script, of which to talk about). � right now, it's just brilliant and "strange", etc).script

Eric Roth's, as I say, is absolutely incredible. I can agree that the film is slow,

but I do not add to those who think that The Good Shepherd is a boring movie. As I said

before, the film is incredibly deep, and not boring. Only with the beginning, one is already

surprised at his complex way of portraying the world of espionage, since it begins with smallevents

fragmented(that's it, with the date included). Once you get used to this type of gui���n, messy, confusing

and bright, you marvel again and again at such complexity. It is a really satisfying experience to

witness a script like this movie, and I say it because it has been a long time since I saw one so prodigious. Another

noteworthy aspect is the amount of characters that appear, especially secondary. De Niro, or rather Roth,

not only focuses on Damon, the protagonist, but explores all the characters around him with an

exceptional ability, without leaving any in the middle without finishing it to perfect. Yes, some

of them may be somewhat diffused, like John Turturro's. So, in short, the film has

a prodigy of gui���n, millimetric, retailer and that stops the t���picos band. The same opinion with the cast. There

is no actor that is below the outstanding. Everyone, absolutely everyone, and see that there are many,

are incredible in their respective roles. Let's start with Matt Damon, the absolute protagonist of the work. It is

his, the most profound and detailed role of all, the loneliest and most human, or humanized, because he doeshuman

not have ahair. From the beginning to the end the character undergoes psychological transformations and in addition it

ends up being worse than it is in the beginning. Undoubtedly, it is one of the most unbelievablecharacter

mainanalysis of the last times, becoming really close to the viewer. Of the

secondary ones, it would be advisable to speak calmly. Not that they all appear too much, some even appear

as cameos, but the truth is that they are all magnificent. Let's start with Angelina Jolie,fictional woman

Damon's. Its role is not that it is the best treaty, it is more, maybe it is the worst, but the truth is that it is

interpreted quite naturally and is not a heavy character. Robert de Niro reserves a small

role, although very interesting and with a couple of really great dialogues, like Michael Gambon,

incredible English actor that appears more ��s twice, and three times. Maybe his role is the one that interests me the most, because he

has a hidden and intelligent personality that makes him the secondary highlight. Although the same can be

said of John Turturro and William Hurt, both splendid in their respective interpretations, full of charisma

and secrets (attentive to the scene of torture, carried out by the first.) Absolutely heartbreaking and

tense). Alec Baldwin proves once again that he is a splendid actor, offering us a masterful performance,

probably his best along with the one of Infiltrados, and Billy Cudrup Highlighting also n the small appearances of

Timothy Hutton and Joe Pesci, which animate the function in a gratifying way, since both are always

pleasant to witness, especially those of the second. Thus, the film gains a lot, but a lot, with its

incredible distribution, which perhaps, as the only defect, is somewhat separated from each other. ���, that is, that many of the

characters are not well connected. The good shepherd is, above all, a dark film, full of

secrets and lies, hidden in a world full of traps. And for that reason, nothing better than having asection

first-class technical. The picture is excellent, even worthy of an Oscar (look at the

close-ups, above all). The music is also excellent, with some notes that come to move and the

assembly, maybe not the best of the film, but it is not bad either. In addition, the setting is

impressive. The only thing about the film is that it is a bit long (lasts two and a half hours,

approximately). To me, personally, I was not heavy, but who does not enjoy spies movies will

be bored, and a lot, because the whole film turns on around them. Do not you think that now I change my mind and

I'm crossing out the film as deep. I only say that its theme is espionage. So, we have a

brilliant, deep, long and dense film, with an exceptional cast and an incredible technical section. �ble That's it, who

likes espionage, better not go.

" 1

" Blasphemous, sow, filthy, indecent, pornographic, Taxidermy agency is this string of sound epÃ © tetos and

even lampa by some more thunderous still. Underneath the casquer���a there is no bad cinema, there are no evil arts: what

is shipwrecked, and how, is the props, the impish display of animated, of thunderbolts of thundering .

If only he wrote that Taxidermy is one of the strangest movies that has given birth this 2007 he would be

doing a great favor because the fact of the extra ���eza does not always have in the viewer, sometimes,

rendered adherences and conceives the authentic cinema as a tour de force of novelties that will take him away from the lethargy

to which he has been led by hundreds of normal films (let's say) exempt nothing truly amazing and

conceived with the asepsis of a neat surgeon who uses the scalpel with majestic choreography without

needing any improvised movement that puzzles the public hypothetical that attends its function.Taxidermy

is strange because it exhibits own ways of the strange, that is, of the different, of the avenible to

the standard circumstances of the norm, but also Taxidermy is grotesque and also unpleasant. I do not know if thethe

gui���n hidden in the mind ofsupplier of this monster (Gyorgy P���lfi) was impossible to translate into

images without the integrity of our stomach being in question. The bad taste, the gross eschatology,

the painful feeling that the human being, at heart, is a viscerally primitive animal is

taking over the patience of the spectator until the vimit, in advance of mental anguish, begin

arcades in the vocal cords. Hungaria portrayed through the vicissitudes of threemembers

family(grandfather, father and son) is the decadent history of a countryman, slowly engulfed by the

charms of the country. capitalism that demonstrates the rigors of a gray communism that does not give the people any incentive

to cope with a dignified, noble and well-fed postwar period. Of all this comes to speak this award-winning work in

various festivals (���sa was one of the causes that moved my interest, damn time) that, altogether,

can be saved by the risky visual concept that its pyrotechnic artífices handle, by its deliberate

aberration, that is resolved without shame and oscillates between the pornographic (penises in ardent delivery) and the

unequivocally gore (the final part of the film is not recommended for sensitive souls). Going to the

dantesque to stage the moral deflagration and social devastation of an eaten country for theparanoia it

communistcan be a point of view among many, but not the only one. Taxidermy spends all its heavymachinery

narrativein the forcefulness of a captivatingly complex image because there are moments when one

poses (with seriousness, without prejudice) to leave the room or consider the show as an exercise in

cin mafilo masochism that is equally suitable to forge the spirit and to dominate all the taboos that we have been keeping

well in since, very small, Pap��� Disney inoculated his terrible poison in our natural way of seeing

the world. This film, ambitious as few, shameless and proud of its excremental feats, will have its

public addicted, its cater of souls well equipped with value and meaning of Art. I do not have that

sense: I left it in some chapters of Sal��� and the 120 days of Sodom of the poet Passolini or in some

titles of pure and hard gore that I have had the luck or the misfortune to put myself in a vein (the liar Holocaust

cannibal or the hooligans born of the factor���at���xica of Herz and Kaufman in his delirious Troma). That nothing remains to

the beautiful adventure of imagining and everything is violently thrown to our pupils, and, finally, the

certainty that over time (or just like that, what are we going to do to him) Taxidermy will become one of thosefilms

cultThey promote fiery, philosophical discourses and elicit the usual outbursts of fascination and

collective hypnosis that many "cult" films "inevitably procure for their faithful parishioners. More freaky

than the Jack Fisk of Eraser Head cast in a film by Jose Luis Garci, Taxidermy, in its disturbed

way, does not stop being a scathing critic to the conventions of the narrow Communist policy of a

strangled country and to which all jubilant capacity has been removed. That, I think, is the most cultured substratum

of this indecent whirlwind of characters that open up in the channel for artistic reasons or who kill themselves with straws,

do not exaggerate, or who vomit tutipl���n at the same time that between pushing and pushing they reason the deepest nature

of love and its clended symphony of colors. Blasphemous, sow, foul, indecent, pornographic, Taxidermy

agency is this string of sound epÃ © ttos and even lampa by some more thunderous still. Underneath the

casquer���a there is no bad cinema, there are no evil arts: what is shipwrecked, and how, is the props, the impish display

of animated, of thunderbolts of thundering Very fragile sustained by its unique charm (the exacerbated tremendismo,

the eschatological passion, the irreverent contumaz) Taxidermia is a rare avis in our billboard and will be a

Rare older, more sad and raw in its silence, on the shelves of the national videoclubs. Oh, I

forgot: your pass, even on tiptoe, by Cannes awakens all my astonishment. The curious fact is that the producer

that finances this tragicomedy of sputum, semen and pseudo-intellectual ventures is called. Fortissimo

Abstain, please, timid and sensitive.

" 0

" Bourne's Ultim���tum is an entertaining and fast-paced tour de force, a frantic escape and persecution

that gives no respite to the spectator, who already assimilates better than the Take it to Cassius Clay.

If the second part of the adventures of Jason Bourne touched me the balls was because I was surprised by

having discovered shortly before its release The Bourne case, the first of the three and the most classic So the

jump of the first (and great, although it seems that nobody remembers it today, it seems that only the

director of the boring Bloody Sunday had "" directed "" the forgetful esp��� " a), great entertainment

led by Doug Liman to the "" chaos "" of the second I trastoc��� a bit. But the thing is that Bourne's ultim���tum

is an entertaining and exciting tour of force, a frenzied escape and persecution that gives no respite to the

spectator, who assimilates and better than the camera Cassius Clay carries. Effectively and as the poster reads, Matt

Damon IS Jason Bourne , the work of the actor is fantastic as well as that of the rest of the cast, especially David

Strathairn and Joan Allen. The ending (the one of the film and the one of the ticket office) can assure the continuation of the

saga but, "the continuity of Jason Bourne ?. If this is a spoiler or you should not find out by paying the entry.

Worth.

" 1

" Ray Loriga returns to the back of the camera after ten years to offer us a correct portrait of

our most talked about philosophy . Portrait that does not excite and neither brings anything new.

Teresa, the body of Christ brings nothing new beyond showing us a few bleeding wounds of more

and the carnal interpretation (and not so much so that the Episcopal Conference has put the cry in the

sky and never better-as it has done-of the love, here passion, of the nun Teresa to a God incarnated

in the body of a Christ-young man. Warning: who goes with the intention of seeing meat, little will see - if you can guess -

of Paz Vega. Even so, the story of the adventures of this attic nun of cradle, since she enters as an

arrogant novice until she founds her own convent under the "" old rule "", is not tedious It is even

entertaining at times. For the rest, Loriga tells us that Teresa de Cepeda and Ahumada was a woman in love

until the death of God, intelligent, rebellious and fighter, and that, in part, he had visions and levitated. While it is

true that this last is more surprising, all of them are things that we already knew about the one portrayed. It is

missing, on the other hand, its facet as a literary creator, for which the director goes on tiptoe, not in vain the

work of Santa Teresa is considered a summit in the Spanish Golden Century lyric ��ol. My brother's

pistol had been the only incursion into the world of cinema by the writer Ray Loriga as director.

As the other (as a writer), however, he has written the scripts of El septimo d���a (Carlos Saura) and Ausentes

(Daniel Calparsoro), and participated in the Carne Tr�� �mula (Pedro Almod���var). In this production of Vicente G���mez

also exercises the functions of scriptwriter: what written by himself, he himself takes it to the screen. It can be seen,

however, in that transfer of the text to the image the magisterial help of the director of photography José Luis Alcaine,

as well as the art of the costume designer Eiko Ishioka , winner of an Oscar for Dr���cula, and support in the

music of ���ngel Illarramendi. Maybe it's all these elements that make this movie not

mediocre, but it does not elevate it, only for that reason, to the category of "" a good movie " " As far as the photograph

is concerned, the indiscriminate succession of pre-Raphaelite pictorial compositions can lead the

viewer to disgust. Succession of abusive paintings, suitable to see in a gallery, not so much maybe in a

cinema. Pag Vega as Santa Teresa is contained. This is what the paper requires. But it shows. Wea

attendcontained interpretation, forcibly contained. It is seen as unattractive in the skin of the mystic. The

rest of the actors that complete the cast of the film, mostly masters. Secondaries more or less

habitual of our cinema like ���lvaro de Luna, Jos��� Lu���s G���mez or Manuel Mor���n. They show that they have

trade and art. The part of feminine secondary ones leaves worse stop: Geraldine Chaplin and Leonor Watling, each one

doing of Geraldine Chaplin and Leonor Watling, respectively. As colof���n, I do not resist to rese���ar two phrases

of pel�� �cula that refers to Santa Teresa herself: "" Not demented, but all engulfed by God "", said

by herself, and "" is rising in prayer "", commented by the always masterful Eusebio Poncela (what a pity that his

role is so brief).

" 0

" By now you have all seen the film but if it is not so, go running to see it because it is, without a

doubt, one of the great films of the year. ��o.

After so much summer cinematic disillusionment, most of the moviegoers had entrusted us to Santa

Pixar in the hope that she would get us out of tedium. , the same day of the premiere and despite not

being in the best of predispositions, I landed in the nearest cinema in order to enjoy a good

time of cinema that would allow me to evade of the disgusting real world. It was all a hit. "" Ratatouille "" is a

project that came to the verge of disaster when the original director, Jan Pinkava, was stealthily

dismissed and replaced by one of the values ​​m�� He's sure of the company and, possibly, the most reputed

film director of animation: Brad Bird. We do not know what would have been of the film without He, but with the

tim���n the course taken could hardly be better. With the arrival of Bird it was modified. Many of the

elements that now make the film great. The two most obvious and well-known examples (I imagine that in the

kitchen of the project there will be many secrets that we will never know) are the gui���n, finally written by himself,

and the design ���o of (at least) some of the key characters (among others the protagonist). It's complicated to say

everything I like about the film without making too long a criticism. The aforementioned gui���n is an authentic

wonder and works as a watch mechanism. A guide in which everything happens at the right time and

in the right way. The dramatic progression is perfect and is worth the example of how to create

expectations around the character of Anton Ego and the great way to solve it with one of the most emotional

flashbacks of modern cinema.It is curious that in a genre like the comedy that I consider perhaps the worst treaty of

the present and in which they do not stop showing authentic badly written clunkers and worse directed, Pixar does not

stop to release a good film after another one although few of the quality of this "" Ratatouille "" that counts already

among the best of the company. Of course the rhythm it is frantic, the situations are linked to each

other in a perfect way and only a slight bajoncillo of rhythm can be attributed to it half of

function. As I say, I like everything about the film. That's why I would not want to stop mentioning the great

soundtrack of Michael Giacchino who returns to dazzle us after his brilliant work in "" The Incredibles "" (another gem

directed by Bird). In short, to these You will all have seen the film already, but if it is not like that, go running to

see it because it is undoubtedly one of the great films of the year.

" 1

" Juno is a good movie, different (although not so much), entertaining, fun, but we are not

facing the eighth wonder of the world, which is what many critics and nominations to the

Oscars.

A few days ago I said that I would go to see John Rambo, but I had to choose between ���sta and Juno, that the economy does not give

so much. The fact is that I thought that seeing the new thing of Stallone would suppose to make me a lobotom���a reason why it entered to

see the film that occupies us. Juno is a good movie, different (although not so much), entertaining,

fun, but we are not facing the eighth wonder of the world, which is what many critics

and nominations to the Oscars Even so, I'm sure that he chose the right film, if you keep reading I'll tell you. If not,

no.The story centers on Juno (Ellen Page) a 16-year-old girl who becomes pregnant with Bleeker (Michael

Cera) a classmate. Juno believes that it is more convenient to give the child / amoeba / bug with u���as toparents

adoptivewhen not being prepared for such a commitment. A simple story and at the same time complex, with good

intentions and interpretations more than credible. Even Jennifer Garner is more than acceptable. Since I

'm talking about the actors I would like to highlight Ellen Page for playing a more credible role, it is possible that its

nominaci���n as best actress is not as crazy idea as at first may seem, especially

after seeing the competition. On the other hand is Michael Cera, a guy who falls well only to see his face, here

seems to repeat the role of Supersalidos but the truth is that it comes to him that neither painted, much future I see in

both. Also to highlight Jason Bateman and JK Simmons, although they could have given a little more

prominence. If we stick to the nominations, the best movie. Lecula comes a bit big, at least when

comparing he loses. And the nomination for the best director. Well, more of the same. More understandable are the

nominations for best actress, as I have said, and the best original script, which is quite cramped. The

film leaves a good taste in the mouth, due, in large part, to the excellent soundtrack that accompanies it and, for

me, the ending is beautiful and very successful. a comedy of splitting the chest as they can

be Mortadelo and Filem���ny Donkey Xote (n latese the iron���a). It has good chemical moments, intelligent dialogues,suits

although sometimes they are "too smart", and a certain touch of drama thathim quite well. A

good film totally recommended to see throughout the week. For the next we must open a space

for the new Coen (Not country for old) and Tim Burton (Sweeney Todd).

" 1

" Host that embers me just gave The labyrinth of the faun, unbearable tale series b that will give all the

critical prestige of the world to its director, my dear Guillermo del Toro, but that has sopor���fera result.

Host that grilled me just gave The labyrinth of the faun, unbearable tale series b that will give all the

critical prestige of the world to its director, my dear Guillermo del Toro, but that has been

sopor� ��fera.I'm a fan of Cronos, Blade II and Hellboy, even of Mimic, but this version of the story is the

real one and with a couple of balls Terry Gilliam shortly before.Aburrid���sima . It seems one of thosevideo games

disappointingof Psone, those that a decade ago you hoped with desire and then it turns out that deep down they are

vulgar, boring and forgettable. Neither the photo, nor the music, nor anything except the Verd��� despite the accent, because

Sergi is clich���.And I do it brief, which has already spoken many people of this movie so embers. Let Hellboy 2 finish

once it sure is funnier. What ZZ Top is for the classic lyrics of sleep.

" 0

" My advice is that you wait until they take it out on DVD and rent it in full org���a Christmas the next year

to see it with friends accompanied by large doses of alcohol and organize a club to guess who

dies.

Of course, if we say that the normal thing is that when a psychopath murderer enters your brotherhood and is killing

everyone it is reasonable to leave the house by legs and call the police then we will We were left without a

movie in five minutes. Christmas is a funny comedy, no, I did not make a mistake, if from

the beginning it is laughable it is possible to spend an hour and a half with continuous laughter product of thesituations

patheticthat occur to this screenwriter who surely will be by now soaked in eggnog

. A sick doctor, a brother of the Sin City type, or at least as yellow as he was, in the 80s he killedentire

hisfamily after spending half his life locked up in his house that is now a residence ofstudents

solid college. ���Yupi! Let's do it in the 70s and this would have been the end of the seriesgenre

B, but in 2000 we pretend that putting money in the film has something more substance that's why we

miss this spectacle of painful deaths. My advice is to wait until they take it out on DVD and rent it in

full org���a Christmas the next year to see it with friends who rant about Christmas accompanied by

large doses of alcohol, try to organize a club to guess who dies before and who survives and ifdo

younot laugh is that you have no blood in your veins. If you want to take it seriously, then do not even see it.

" 0

" The Suicide Club is a vulgar, vulgar movie that has no fun. In short, it is a

perfect example of the state of Spanish commercial cinema.

We live in a world of madmen, in which we are all with nerves to, and in which reigns the

the surfaceorder of politically correct, lest someone be offended by a simple comment. Whereare most

these effectsnoticeable is in the comedy, where the authors themselves tie their hands not to disturb certain

groups. But, who decides what is really offensive or just an ironic or satiric joke without

bad intentions? Roberto Santiago's career, he would expect to findin ElClub

a rather crazy and crazy comedySuicide. Instead, you will find a fairly correct film

politically, which goes through the theme of suicide with feet of lead for not frivolizing with such a serious issue.

It would be necessary to remind Roberto Santiago of the last work of the master Billy Wilder, Aqu��� un Amigo, the

hilarious dialogue about the suicide that Woody Allen maintained in Todos Dicen I Love You, or the attempts of

a Bill Murray Trapped in Time. Perhaps this is the worst defect of The Suicide Club, although

unfortunately it is not the only one. Because of its ambivalence between drama and comedy, the film never ends up

starting, and at no time it attracts the interest of the spectator with enough intensity. The script does not help

at all, with characters that happen to be mere empty cartoons, and some dialogues of the movies of

brainless adolescents. All the care they have taken in not offending anyone with suicide is lost as

soon as they approach other topics, much more given to the easy and rude joke. But you know that there is nothing wrong

in offending certain groups in our society. As for the actors, little can be expected from

them with such characters and dialogues. Only Luis Callejo is saved from the burning, which contributes the few

really funny moments that the film has. The Club of the Suicides is a vulgar, vulgar film that does not

have any grace. In short, it is a perfect example of the state of Spanish commercial cinema. Maybe, if

Roberto Santiago had put aside the easy joke and had opted more for the crazy comedy,

the result would have been better.

" 0

" It may lack exceptional originality, or it may like it less, but it is a gift for the

good lover of cinema.

"" Letters from Iwo Jima "" has its own entity, it is autonomous. But it is inevitable to see it as the reverse, or the

complement, to "" Flags of our fathers "", the diptych that Clint Eastwood has made with so much

energy, despite his 76 years ��os.Now, that invisible enemy, those quasi-Martians who emerged from the underground with

their weapons, or appeared in the middle of the night to jump over their victims in "" Flags of our fathers "",

materialize and become flesh and bone, and also soul. Becoming also the contrast of thoseheroes

photographicwho raised a flag on Mount Suribachi.Unos, the Americans, used asicons

masswith which to raise funds for the coffers of the war. The others, anonymous heroes, whose last letters will

not even reach their recipients. And together, the two films, make up a recovery ofmemory

historical. Africa To Eastwood, during the massive presentation in Japan of "" Letters from Iwo Jima "", it seemed

unheard of that most of the young people were completely unaware of it. happened on the island of Iwo Jima inII

World War, where more than 20,000 compatriots lost their lives. We are all human beings. But, above all, and

it was not to wait for less, it is a story full of humanity. It shows that what should prevail is

the individual over the absurdity of the war (or not so absurd for those who obtain

economic, political or strategic benefits) , and even, if it were rational, above the concept of the

"patria" collective. "Of course, for someone who sets their eyes on the empire of the rising sun, Eastwood's gaze is

that of a western. Although she relies on the gui���n of a Japanese debutante, Iris Yamashita, after all, is

a Yankee in the Japanese court who dares to speak about characters and concepts far removed from their mentality and

world. However, his perspective is appropriate because, in short, what he tells us is exactly the

same. A baker from Osaka or Tokyo is what Eastwood wants to do, just like one from Oklahoma or

Kentucky; and everyone feels their fears, they have all left something behind or they are all fighting to prevent their

"" homeland "", or the future of their children, from falling into the hands of foreign barbarians. It is the battle of human beings with

the same feelings of doubt and fear, with the family, wives, children and that life that they had, and which they have

been forced to abandon. In one of those details that are more significant than they seem at first glance,

even the protagonist, General Kuribayashi (Ken Watanabe), professional, cult and fire, almost apologizes in

one of his letters his wife for the fact of having left things pending, as everyday, as fixing the

floor of the kitchen. The real triumph. Eastwood gives his vision of the Japanese perspective a character m�� It is

intimate, and far from the parallel montage, between the battle front and the media circus to whichwere

the American heroessubjected upon returning to the US. The music, by Michael Stevens and his son Kyle

Eastwood, is as minimalist as it is effective, and appeals directly to sensibility. And the monochromatism of the

photograph, adapted to the coldness of that volcanic rock that is Iwo Jima, grants the film a greater

physicality. It is also extraordinary, for elegant, measured and charismatic, the interpretation of Ken Watanabe,

as well as that of Tsuyoshi Ihara, as the bar���n Nishi, and "" hero "" ol enmpico en equitaci Pn.The content

of "" Letters from Iwo Jima "" may lack exceptional originality, or it may like it less, but it is a

gift for the good lover of cinema. And, like Mel Gibson in "" Apocalypto "", to highlight the author'sin

couragethat endeavor so that the copies are exhibited throughout the world in an original version with subtitles. This will dramatically

decrease the sales of popcorn and tickets in the multiplexes; but the cinema, and in a no

less splendid way, wins.

" 1

" De Palma has fallen into the same thing that a newbie would do: take care of the packaging too much and neglectaway

the inside of it insovereign.

How difficult it is to find a film whose ambience and climate is faultless. Just as difficult to tie it

with a good argument. Brian De Palma, who did so well in "" The Untouchables of Elliot Ness "" and

"" Trapped by his past "" has fallen into "" The Black Dahlia "" in the same way he will to a newbie: taking care of the

wrapper and neglecting sovereignly the inside. The black film returns from the hand of De Palma, and how he

does it. 100% effective in recreating all that sphere that reminds us of the great classics like "" Cayo

Largo "": the protagonists light one cigar behind another, the t� They are very hard, the girls are very

hot but demure, and best of all, Hartnett with a hat on the bed after making love. With an

unbeatable practice in "" Los Intocables "", De Palma embroiders a Master in how to turn Los Angeles into a murky

city ​​of 47 with all the elements of the black cinema in its right place, but I repeat, it's a pity that the script

and the story do not match up. Insane and sometimes stupid conversations break the magic completely.

Sometimesdo not know ifstop listening to the protagonists to expect that in the next scene remontaramos

thing. It is not like that, because it does not go back but everything goes wild until it reaches the end. The argument is developed

many times with obvious inconsistency, and you end up not integrating much in the coming and going of the

protagonist in the search for the culprit. Maybe a second viewing would make me understand the film in a different way,

but I do not know if I see myself with the strength to support Hartnett one more time.

that De Palma would completely awaken him, the performance of the handsome guy from Hollywood ends up confirming that this

actor is as linear as he is expressionless, and I blame him for the lack of connection with the history.

We could imagine a good bunch of actors who would have taken the ballot more gracefully, so

I do not understand very well what led the director to get the services of a actor who has not done a good

job in his life. If I wanted to surround myself with young people, I could have done it without that supposed

incompetence. Of the girls I do not have any but, although maybe I was wrong thinking that Johansson will be

cruel. I can not say that it is the interpretation of his life, which is sure to come, but he has notme at all

disappointed. Correct without more, although if I have to compare it with the role of Hilary Swank, it loses. The

multi-Oscar is the best thing about the film and I thought I would never see a touch of sensuality in this girl, until

her role as an authentic wolf covered the mouth. Impressive how the pearls are in bed. The

most notable side are Aaron Eckhart, who does it a thousand times better than the protagonist, although it was not

difficult, and Fiona Shaw, simply wonderful.Two scenes to remember: KD Lang singing in the club where a

chorus of vicious dancers leave you breathless, and the scene where Hartnett meets Swank's parents and

in which the camera is moves at the whim of its director, which reminds me of the best I had "" Eyes of

Serpent "." The health authorities will discover that De Palma has gone through the lining advice to avoid

scenes with too much smoking. In practically all the frames there is a cigar, the other greatprotagonist

silentof the film. What a bad time for those of us who needed a cigarette in order to support Hartnett. A great

filmmaker with two loose ends: his main actor and his plot. Next time will be, Brian.

" 0

" A documentary of short duration, very "light", exaggeratedly artificial and hastily recounted.

It is usually harder to make a film based on real events than on fictitious facts. Especially

because there is an implicit obligation to be as faithful as possible to them. But it is that if above thesefacts

realare something complex, the difficulty increases. In most of these cases it is necessary to make anwork

importantof synthesis to be able to summarize to the maximum the story of events that in reality have

lasted for years (the one that concerns us, about 15). So it is logical, and usual, that in any film of this genreare

wetold the inspiring story in a fast, almost frenzied way. And that is precisely what has happened

with? GAL ?. Throughout the entire film one has the feeling that every moment of the plot is told

quickly and running, without allowing breaks, so that time to treat the data immediately after and

not leave anything forgotten at the end. Part of the fault is the duration of the tape: only 100 minutes.

Surprisingly scarce. However, we must recognize that the material on which this film is based is

delicate: a sad episode of the recent History of Spain on the Anti-Terrorist Liberation Groups

that During the 1980s they waged a dirty war against the terrorist organization ETA. They had the

blessing of the Interior Ministry of the time, and were the authors of numerous murders and kidnappings, in

some cases even against people who did not belong to that terrorist organization. However, since it

is a complicated network, it would have been preferable to treat it in a more partial way, without globalities.

In this way, it would have been possible to enter more deeply into the most relevant events of that episode,

including, to polemicize, in the most rugged; as well as in the personality of its main protagonists. The

conclusion that is drawn at the end of the film is that we have seen a documentary of short duration, very? light ?,

exaggeratedly artificial and hastily reported. Miguel Courtois, its director, has fallen short of the

work. What of "artificial" is a qualifier aimed directly at the interpretations of the cast of the

film. It must be borne in mind that none of the real people of the History has been literally

represented in? GAL ?. All are more or less free versions of the characters directly involved in the case.

But it is that despite such freedom, no actor of the cast is saved from that lack of naturalness or

credibility, or even the star Jordi Moll���.Tanto Jos��� Garc���a and Natalia Verbeke, who give life to the

journalists who uncovered the plot of the GAL, are caricatures of these pens. I do not know what happens with

Garc���a, but his interpretation is really mediocre. Perhaps it is the post-production dubbing that is usually donemeasure up as the

in some films (if there is one) that does not do it justice, but does notprotagonist. In almost all

the scenes in which he has a text, he recites it as if he had memorized it a few minutes before, and with

very little naturalness. As for Natalia Verbeke, her majority participation in Spanish comedies ��olas make you

lose authenticity in a dramatic role. He makes a commitment, but does not convince. It would be necessary to chain

several works of this same cut, even more heartbreaking, to become credible in that registry. And the one thatme

lefthalf cold is Jordi Moll���, in his role of Ariza. In my opinion, it overreacts. Or, at least, that is the

impression he gives. It is not because of his attitude or his characterization, because that has only dominated him; it is because of his voice,

too forced and unnatural to want to give him a tone so serious, hard and torn. This detail makes

the character lose authenticity in most of the scenes. Even sometimes it is chemical. Without a

doubt, it is not your best interpretation. The only strong point of the film is its technical aspect, call yourself

photography, assembly, sound , soundtrack, etc. All together (except the flashbacks that sometimes

disconcert) builds a scenario very true to reality, and ideal to wrap a plot so sinister. Inot

didwonder why the film was moving forward with all my strength that no character

opened his mouth. For what ?; To spoil it ?. I'm still staying with? The Wolf ?.

" 0

" This barbased tries to be, and I think it does, a (deserved) tribute to the authentic freak.Napole���n Dynamite, Gigol��� and Finch come together to play baseball against ni�� Twelve years old. With that

argument, the most erudite will not see this movie or on television one morning drinking beer with nothing to

do, but look where, I've spent it in big. Dennis Dugan, director of the enormous Happy Gilmore

and other Sandlerian vehicles (by Adam Sandler, it is understood, that he produces here), in addition to the misunderstood and

amusing Evil Woman ( Three idiots and a witch, I bought it on DVD, "I'm a freak?" Gives him histouch

personal. (He has it, he goes beyond the Farrelly) This barbased tries to be, and I think he achieves it, a

(deserved) tribute to the authentic freak. I see how the great John Lovitz (I'm still

laughing at his ANTOLOGICAL gag hitlerian Rats to the race) gives life to a billionaire with a lot oftime

free. I liked it a lot. Not everything will be qualit���. I give it a 7.PD: Nick Swardson, the multifaceted brother

-of the character of David Spade, quite a discovery. We will see you soon accompanying the boss Ferrell in Blades of

Glory.

" 1

" An excellent film, which does not reach the viewer as much as it should. In some moments it loses pace, and in

the end it becomes excessively long.

Although the film is very good, I expected more from Eastwood's new approach to the cinema, (and more so whensoon

we willhave the other perspective, the Japanese), on the one hand we have a story that, although excellent, In some

moments it loses pace, it is true that Eastwood masterfully rolls the scenes of war, and at some

moments your heart is overwhelmed and your stomach tightens (in the press pass it has been remembered again and again

to Spielberg and the beginning of "" Save Private Ryan "") on the other hand, the movie loses rhythm in a few

bars, and in the end it becomes excessively long, well, I dare �aa say that there is almost

half an hour left. On the other hand, the acting ensemble is excellent, being the roster of known faces of the most

outstanding of the film, highlighting Ryan Phillippe, Paul Walker, Jamie Bell, and Barry Pepper, this last type

already in the movies of g On the other hand, the appearance of Paul Walker inis very much promoted

this filmand it hardly appears 10 min. Another of the negative points of the film resides in therepetitive

Eastwood'ssoundtrack, which repeats 7 musical notes over and over again, until thegets bored too much

viewer, on the other hand, both historical recreation and photography ���a is excellent, as well as the sound,

the some moments one crouches in the room trying to dodge the bullets. In summary; an excellent film,

which does not reach the viewer as much as it should.

" 1

" Who would not like to be able to reinvent their life, leaving aside what we were and we do not like to see

from the present?

Jota (Nancho Novo) tries to throw himself from a railing into the sea but his cowardice prevents him. Instantly,

a motorist has an accident and falls into the sand. He does not remember anything, not even his name. Amnesia. Jota

invents an identity for the girl, Lisa (Emma Su���rez), invents a life in common with her, pretends to be

his partner when he accompanies her to the hospital. As soon as possible, Jota and Lisa leave the hospital where she

remained hospitalized to start a life together. A life that was supposed to be in common before the accident

but that only exists in the desire of Jota. They set up camp at the red squirrel campsite to spend atime

vacationand there they weave a web of lies and deceits about a non-existent relationship that they create

based on their wishes. Who would not like to reinvent their life, leaving aside what we were and

we do not like to see from the present? Who would not like to rebuild their own lives without anyoneus of

remindingwhat we have been? An intriguing story of love and lies directed by the creator of the fascinating

lovers of the c�� Polar circle and Luc���a and Sex. A magical and surrealist tale that will probably only be

appreciated by lovers of the M���dem universe.

" 1

" Savage Grace is nothing more than a sensationalist melodrama of the same quality that exploits the curiosity of the North

American public, deived from sciences in the great families of the high society.

There are families whose lives seem taken from the imagination of some scriptwriter of melodramas or soap operas,

but as the well-known phrase reads, reality always surpasses fiction. And as is often the case, there is always a

producer who has exploited the morbid curiosity of the human being, and decides to undertake a project to

tell that story. And here we have Savage Grace, who narrates some of the facts that happened to a family

of the North American high society between the fifties and seventies. In the United States it seems to be asaga

mythical family, almost a legend, and the circumstances are that they are not for less. But that's what the film is left

with, in a sensationalist, twisted and truculent story, which only seeks to awaken curiosity in the

public. All elements are forced to give even more sense of cheap snake, with some scenes

that could have been devised by the pseudo scriptwriters of programs like Here's Tomato. Tom Kalinse gets

so screwed up that the film becomes pathetically funny for those spectators who still have the

courage and the fortitude to take it all as a joke . The sequence of the airport is simply one of the most

embarrassing that has been seen in a supposedly serious film in a long time, and it is enough to see the expression of

Elena Anaya, who is thinking of who He would command her to embark on such a disproportion. Something like this should also

think Unax Ugalde, Bel���n Rueda and Sim���n Andreu, although their roles are merely testimonial. Julianne Moore

has the excuse that the character was a bomb, and that under the right circumstances, it could have been

Oscarizable. Savage Grace is nothing more than a sensationalist melodrama of ��� It is a quality that exploits the curiosity of the

American public, ���ived from sciences in the great families of high society. It is a film that

offers no incentive in exchange for the unpleasant task of watching your ninety minutes, which become eternal.

" 0

" Many things for 20 minutes. It's based on real events, I do not tell you more. Well, two or three laughs I hit with Macabre, eighties (because it's 1980) Lamberto's first work

Bava that is impossible to explain without disembowelling, so you fuck \*. Those who do not want to read already know. The thing

starts with an earless pendant waiting for her husband to leave to currar to go see / fuck Fred,

a mustachioed guy who dies decapitated to get out of a curve when concuc���aa all wafer with the pendulous pendulous

copilot on the way to her home because her son he just drowned. at the hands of his diabolical

older sister of thirteen or so. Many things for 20 minutes, that's why the rest of the movie is from the point

of view of a blind man who hears the pendulous pendulum at night (and now crazy, it has been according to the synopsis

five years and according to the movie an anno dopo in a fucking asylum) practice intercourse with the head of Fred, who

keeps in the freezer the bitch. At the end, in a progious tour de force ( in effect, if you see up to theminute

15thof the movie and jump to the last four you see everything) of little more than five minutes, the despondent pendant kills

his daughter (choked �ndola, of course, but ���and the blood?) And he starts to practice sex with his head. The blind man

surprises her and kills her in the oven (!). Then a breath is heard. The blind man approaches the bed. and the head

bites the jugular. Fine.It's based on real events, I'm not telling you more. \* With love and with care.

Seriously, it is made disemboweled with vayis cario topoint if you give to see her.

" 0

" The film is not up to scratch. The guide of Milos Forman and Jean-Claude Carrière is rather lazy and insipid,

bordering unfortunately on vulgarity.

The year 2006 will be remembered in the Spanish cinema, above all else, as the year of the great

historical productions. On the big screen, the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have been portrayed

, the rise and fall of the greatest empire in history, and the final decline of another of the great empires that

humanity has seen. Returning to the cinematographic field, during this year it has also been shown that Spanish

cinema can seduce a director like Milos Forman (one of the few filmmakers alive with two Oscars to the

Best Direction) and to a world-class star like Natalie Portman. The Goya Ghosts immerse us in

turbulent and turbulent times, while in Europe new ideas and thoughts are opened to

any price and the protection of arms, in Spain the old regime prevailed and the Inquisition maintained

the old ideologies, frightening the people. In���s (Natalie Portman) is the daughter of a wealthy merchant, who

poses as a model for Francisco de Goya (Stellan Skarsagard). Due to the fanatism of the Inquisition, In���s is

arrested and falsely accused of heresy. Brother Lorenzo (Javier Bardem), member of the Inquisition, whom

Goya paints, tries to intercede in favor of In���s, falling in love with her. With as many expectations ashas generated

Los Fantasmas de Goya, to fulfill them all would be a truly titanic effort, and in honor of the truth, it must be

said that the film is not up to par. The guide of Milos Forman and Jean-Claude Carrière is rather lazy and

insipid, bordering unfortunately on vulgarity. All the force that could be presumed to the film, taking

into account the size of Milos Forman as a filmmaker and the greatness of the figure to be portrayed, is conspicuous by its absence.

Despite the failure of the argument , Los Fantasmas de Goya presents a brilliant technical invoice, of which

the photography of Javier Aguirresarobe and the artistic direction of Eduardo Hidalgo stand out.

Above all, in Goya's Ghosts stand interpretations of a superlative Javier Bardem, a

solid and convincing Stellan Skarsgard, and human suffering and Natalie Portman, capable of transmitting all the

suffering of his character. Although the comparisons are odious, it is also inevitable thatcomes to

Carlos Saura's superb work (especially in the visual aspect), which is Goya in Bordeaux,mind. The

Ghosts of Goya is a film that, visually is a delight for the public, but to which it fails thesustenance

fundamentalof any cinematographic work: a good history that backs it.

" 0

" The only good thing is what this director dominates: the nude scenes Last night I went to the movies to see the film by Tirante El Blanco (Tirant lo Blanc) by Vicente Aranda. I went to

the Yelmo Cineplex cinemas, because in the Abaco they were not, so I went to the competition hehehe. I really expected

much more of that film, only with the beginning and left me with a bad taste in my mouth, as always the only good thing is

what this director dominates: scenes of nude. A beginning with expectation of the film and a decoration that

was noted that it was decorated, pure and hard, little care that aspect, after the battles, bad, very bad.

I expected more action in them and only saw horse butchery (bloodshed) and four swords that

looked like school when they taught you to cross swords and give blows. The truth is very bad, the battles are

not very well looked after. Most characteristic, to see Rafael Amargo as the great Turkish chief, the truth is that when I saw him, he had

a good resemblance, but I fit it in that it gave me that some dance would be marked as a great dancer that is

. Special Mention to Victoria Abril, well she in her line of her papers , it shows everything, it begins with a

recital of a doormat for our suspender and later the breasts and already to finish naked completely. Without a

doubt it is its strong. These scenes explode them like nobody. It is already pigeonholed. the public knows it and says it. As a

conclusion, I say that there is a scene from the film that stayed with me. not to reveal the film will not

tell details but know that it is something er���tica.la scene where everyone helps Tirant the Blanc to

"" coite "" (that I think is the word that defines that scene) prevented from his legs that are broken, brought on a

stretcher, turned around ... carried to the Princess Carmesina, in the position of missionary and with a maid, acting

as a mamporrera and all pushing the Tirantlo in and out so he can deflower the sweet

Carmesina full of lust. I do not give more details of why that limit is reached, because it would unveil a large part of

the film and although it is something bad. Well honestly, quite bad, I will r�� It's the situations, some very

shocking and hilarious.

" 0

" It's a film that you do not have to ask for pears in the elm, it simply excites the lovers of the musical

and tries to get the smile of the poor person who has to accompany the one who likes this type of movies.

It is a sentencing phrase that I loved nothing more to listen to it: The tastes are like the ass, everyone

has one. And it is that it helps me to refer to a genre that excites me and I can not give an explanation

of why and it's the musical. Simply because I let myself get infected by that energy that gives off and that magnetizes me no matter

how silly it may seem. In the middle of a critical message against the racist prejudices that were in

that ��� little, we find ourselves with a film that intersperses the most varied songs together with alook

sixtiesthat falls in love and that dazzles what is happening in each scene. Far from the histri��� nica that

could be the image of a John Travolta characterized as a woman, we find ainterpretation

sensitive, which allows that although you are recognizing the Danny Zucco de Grease, actually have fun with the

image that is giving of the mother of the protagonist in the film, complemented with a wonderful Christopher

Walken.Although you already know my devotion for the Pfeiffer and in this movie is not for less , few actresses

lend themselves to interpreting the characters alvados with as much grace and naturalness as she does and in

addition to that sensuality that characterizes it, no matter how much I exaggerate it. It is a film that you do not have to

ask for pears in the elm tree, it simply excites music lovers and try to get the smile of the

poor who has to accompany the one who likes this type of movies. I also had the chance to

have fun with I declare you husband and husband, whose surprise is having fun and making me laugh in such a way, without

all the jokes have been spent on the trailer. A good comedy to escape from the real world and release that

laughter camouflaged during our usual life. And another side, Angelina Jolie, shows one of her best

performances in Un Indomitable Heart, it shows that the actress luch��� a lot for that role and that he had in his

conscience that Marianne Pearl herself, the real protagonist of what happens in the film, chose her

to interpret it. It is a film that reaches the heart, I remembered the feeling I had when I left the cinema

when I saw United 93, because you know that these things happen in the world, but seeing them recreated and told masterfully

in a movie. ��cula, they continue to surprise you even though you know how they happen. Within a short space of time, they put me online at home, with

which I will be able to update with the usual that I would like and as a final colof���n, in a I can not be

talking because we do not have a broadcast where it is working, is that I have been granted the mortgage on my apartment,

which I am happy because I will be ruined for 40 years, but having a sofa and a DVD to see my

movies. .Culas.

" 1

" The casp���metro in low hours. More Pajares and less Estesos. The film is about Manolo (student of the same Fraga), a social science teacher who is going to be

promoted to a ministry. The cheerful teacher has several problems, since he is involved with thedaughter

minister's, in the youth he was a porn actor (of tremendous tool, by the way) and currently has a

problem of "" virility "" . For that reason, he resorts to an eminent psychiatrist (Ozores) to cure that lack of

erections. On the one hand, the psychiatrist wants to divorce his wife while being harassed by a gay man. On the other, they

want to unseat Manolo from this position, searching for details in his dark past. Come on, art and rehearsal that is

usually said. Juanito Navarro de senador, Fernando Esteso de er���tico, Ozores de psiquiatra, Maria Isbert, Chus

Lampreade, etc., is that he does not lack detail. The film itself is a tremendous firecracker, because, unlike

others, it does not have too many gracietas. Although it has its point in certain aspects. It has fish nipples will

jump defying the laws of gravity, which faithfully reflect the sexual freedom and the joy of the

joyful 80. It has subtle gracietas on the volatility of certain pol��� ticos, with their continuous changes of

jacket and ideology. It has its entanglement and comedy, but it does not happen there. Well, a bit of science fiction

there is also, and is that after watching Ozores and Esteso fuck one believes that it is possible to dodge bullets or walk the

waters. Resumiendo, one more of the genre "" Ozoril "", which does not stop liking me, although paraphrasing a veryking

famous"" A nude is worth seeing the film "" Well, really said Par���s well It is worth a mass, in relation to his

more recalcitrant Christianity to get the crown of France, but deep down he wanted to say that, for

sure. The casp���metro in low hours . More Haystacks and less Estesos. PS: "Why should I remind myself of this to Ayatol

Khomeini?" Says Esteso before his girlfriend's doormat, as well. , without laughing or anything.PD2: Fuck, that grotesque

male bodies. What difference does it make with the metrosexuals they wear now. PD3: Enzoable scene from Ozores

as a psychiatrist in his underpants, for the annals of cinema history. PD4: "" Rooooojaaaaaa, when

did you rooooojaaaaaa? "" PD5: "" I am less macho than Est���baliz "" great phrases for later.

" 0

" Everything in it is imperishable, with magnificent interpretations, being at the head a Claude Rains more

horny and p���caro than ever, at the same time threatening. A wonderful movie that features Gloria Stuart, the

endearing old woman of "" Titanic "" of charming female protagonist.

"We'll start with a handful of murders. Important people. Small people Just to show that wenot

domake distinctions. "" Mictics, great, funny, fantastic (in all concepts) film that has gone through

its own quirks in the history of movie theater. Thanks to James Whale, an excellent director, misunderstood and insulted

because of his sexual inclinations, owner of a universe of his own, the film transcends the moment it

is made and becomes the heritage of The humanity. Seen tens of years after its premiere, the film

has the same validity, freshness and bad milk as when it was made. Everything in it is imperishable, with

magnificent interpretations, being at the head a Claude Rains more horny and p���caro than ever, at the same time

threatening. A wonderful movie that features Gloria Stuart, the endearing old woman of "" Titanic "" of

charming female protagonist.

" 1

" No premonitions were needed to show that he liked the girl. They already had Jessica Biel. Spielberg said she was filming the cinema she would like to see as a spectator, Tamahori could probably say

the same thing. What differentiates them is, only, that Tamahori is a worse spectator. Nicholas Cage has a superpower

that allows him to know what will happen to him two minutes beforehand. Use the cheap wizard

saloon cover, and occasionally hit a casino in Las Vegas. The police are looking for him to help them

prevent a catastrophe. He looks for a girl who appeared in one of his premonitions. His weak point is his

humanity; he is not able to remain indifferent when he knows what is going to happen to another person. The issue of

anticipation makes you think. One wonders if the 11-M or 11-S massacre could have been avoided with that

two-minute advantage. Maybe some traffic accident. But we are not witnesses of many traffic accidents

in life. Cage wants to meet the girl, he approaches and she gives him a long time. So try to start with

another conversation. We discovered that the scene was not real; It was anticipated, so you can fix it. A life with

anticipations resembles a virtual life, or Windows: all failures can be fixed. There are no

blunders, slips, accidents, or chance. It almost completely disappears what one

considered cinema. The police search for Cage, which is logical, the criminals also look for him, and that borders on

abuse. Tamahori already had enough of our credulity with the story of the two minutes. It is not for

gentlemen to ask us more for what we believe about the delinquents and also for what, if it is the girl, the

magician anticipates so much beforehand. Nor did he need premonitions to show that he liked the girl.

They already had Jessica Biel.

" 0

" Sex, drugs, violence, gore, shots, weapons, poisonous reptiles, painful actions, Revisionist plot,

bad CGI, infractions to elementary physics, in short, everything a film needs Bad bad

really to end up having fun one hour and forty minutes.

The worst thing that has a film that does not give much of itself, is that it happens from the beginning, and that ends up giving

you the same. This film is the result of the biggest promotion campaign launched this year. Already since February they

began with the rumors about the "" light "" content of the scenes with snakes, and that the director would shoot

new footage closer to the gore. Then they showed us the scariest story painter, and I think that

wanting people to step on top of the production company and create more excitement . When thepasses began,

previouseveryone posted excellent reviews and considered it milk. Everything for what: to end upSo much

seeing a by-product that entertains, but by-product.expectation ends up taking its toll, and I thinkdo not

Idiscover anything if I tell you that every situation you see in this film is you have seen a thousand and one times in others.

I'm talking about "" Passenger 54? with crossing of "" Anaconda "". Neither special effects are to shoot rockets.

The snakes made with CGI technique have been embedded by the most innovative company in Hollywood, and they supplement this

deficiency with attacks that exceed the limits of bad taste. It was clear that if not, there would be

no way. The story is the most simple: A kid (Nathan Phillips) witnesses a settling of accounts traveling

escorted by a policeman (Samuel L. Jackson) from Hawaii to Los Angeles to attend the trial. However, the

plane in which they travel will become a deadly trap when thousands of poisonous snakes are released

with the aim of leaving no one alive, witness or god to accompany them. .Sexo, drugs, violence, gore,

shots, weapons, poisonous reptiles, painful actions, plot, Revisionist, bad CGI, infractions tophysics

elementary, in short, everything you need a bad bad movie really to end up having fun one

hour and forty minutes. You will not find deep conversations, or coherence in the plot (the bad one at

the beginning does not emerge more in the whole film), the snakes do not see each other until well past 30 minutes of the film,

including the Samuel L. Jackson of "" Pulp Fiction "" is a mirage of the past, but even so, you're going to be

stunned when hundreds of serpents of all a hundred perpetuate their particular killing. Series B with B of bruta.He

read by ah��� that, if you do not enjoy with the film is "" that you have vagina "". It is theordinariness and stupidity

greatestthat can be concluded from "" Serpents on the plane "". This movie is a perfect excuse to pass the

time, and that's it. You'll like it if you did not have anything more important to do and bore who left a thesis to

see it. All the rest is trying to elevate "" masterpiece "" a film that falls into oblivion after 20 minutes of

watching it. To the contrary, it is "" Crank "", which with the same entertainment goal of flat encephalogram, far

outweighs it. I can repeat myself, but lately they are thinking about it. Paraculas to be viewed with the

group of cronies hooligans that you can not put in the room "" Back "". I would gladly have put

a cuba in the middle of the movie, but it's not a plan, that I later confuse the plots. If you expect me to pronounce

on the participation of Elsa Pataky in the film, is that you have not seen it yet. THERE IS NO INTERPRETATION. The

girl is limited to wandering the plane with a doll and singing a lullaby to children who still do not understand

how they survive the massacre. The Yankees have had to be blown away watching her walk the red carpet

of the premiere, and they would stay saying "" ��� It will be this girlfriend of some directive? "" Conclusion: the expectations of

watching a film are left at the cinema door. For this movie you need popcorn, desire to joke

and a wide experience watching terror-series B. So you will have a pipe.

" 0

" The film could be included in a very specific field of the fantastic that uses the figure of the monster,

as a paradigm of the challenge to the natural and social laws, to explore the fissures of ourworld

everydayand the fragility of everything we call normality.

One of the greatest virtues of The Host lies in its hybrid experiment condition. The film could be

encompassed in a very specific field of the fantastic that uses the figure of the monster, as a paradigm of the

challenge to the natural and social laws, to explore the fissures of our everyday world and the fragility

of everything we call normality. However, on many occasions, Bong Joon-hoo manages to get his

film into genre-inspired genre digression, denoting annarrative pulse and

enviablesense of rhythm. Without losing sight of it The main motivation of its characters The Host intersperses

scenes of action and exciting brilliant special effects with moments that swing between tragedy and

comedy and, thanks to actors always up to the point, these trancisiones result tremendously emotive and

revealing.Bong Joon-hoo takes on the challenge of engaging in an intelligent and fruitful game with theexpectations,

spectator'sand for that purpose it deploys a renewed and original treatment of many cinematographic resources while at the same time

proposing a juicy challenge to the conventions of the genre. The director's confidence in the possibilities of his

material is noticeable, for example, in the decision to show the monster very little after ���s of the beginning of the film

(in a spectacular sequence of almost ten minutes duration that leaves the list very high). It is precisely

this domain of the situation that allows the director to also be at the other extreme to work on

some topics (the deployment of skills that come together in the sequence of liquidation). ���n of the monster)

without them being too forced or strident. The staging of The Host emphasizes thequalities

expressiveof the different scenarios creating a very disturbing contrast between the asyptic and aggressive white

of the interiors of the hospital and the cold, dirty and rainy atmosphere, of blue and gray tones, that will preside over the

rest of the film. Another of the successes of the film consists of the moderate but very effective use of thecamera

slowthat, far from the exhibitionist emphasis with which it is usually used, in The Host accentuates the

disorientation and confusion of the characters. Through distortions and echoes, the alienating treatment of

sound enhances the expansion of the suspense and the isolation of the characters, while at the same time contributing to suggest

the characteristics of the monster (the result of a design that oscillates between the extreme heaviness of his body and the

reptilian sinuosity of his movements). The choice of a very tight and not very effective montage will allow the

director a very dynamic use of the movements of c� Quemara that emphasize the lines of action that take place

within the painting and provide a high dose of truth and realism. Since the first scene of the film, Bong Joon-ho

places abuses of power in your point of view. The constant presence of newsreels onscreens

televisionencourages us to question the role of the media while the progressive

dismemberment of the family serves the director to articulate a fierce criticism against the Nefarious act of

all the estates involved in the case that will culminate in a very hopeless end whereis

the loneliness and vulnerability of the individual in a terribly hostile and threatening worldrevealed.

" 1

" Undisputed masterpiece of cinema. You can not go to the point when it comes to ditch a headline. Maybe having been a boxer made Robert Rossen a film director with unsuccessful pugilist wood

or moved the camera as if it lodged a straight right in the air or tried to knock out the rival with a good straight to the

gut. He was also a communist. So we have an ex-boxer and a communist that was funky in theHollywood

glamor, Cole Porter and party outfits in carpeted swing and champagne rooms. Then he was

called by the HUAC, the Committee of Anti-American Activities. A director conjured to portrayworlds

subterranean, marginal jobless and lives plunged into disaster had to be a dangerous guy. In addition, Body

and soul and Politics were not particularly sweet: they both tell us that the world is, by its nature,

tragic and that as one escalates in the taking of responsibilities in Valm���s is abandoning the ethics and more is prone

to corruption and to the detachment of the noble ideals that marked his idyll with the future and with all

the good and beautiful things that got the life. Rossen went down to the ring or to the nicotine-offices and thefurniture

ladendepressingof the political parties to denounce his disappointment. The sticks we carry in life are not

written: they are written. A notary is called who testifies to our desolaci���ny and the testimony is kept in a

cash register so that someone, thirty years later, to check how pissed off we were or what little

happy that our days were on earth. Rossen filmed with bad milk so that the coming generations would

attend, impiously, between sadness and admiration, his gray guignol, hisimage of the

nativedeep America ���sa of which all American directors speak at some point in their filmography.of

Rossen is oneAmrica of boxers and billiard players, with large pockets of politicians andtica

political commitment desmontable.Elmade him leave the United States once he refused to give the names of

the companions of ideological bouts. He did not talk about John Garfield, with whom he joined the short shoe and the

gloves and also the sand of the words, that tricky terrain in which those who hold the Power does not want to

enter for fear of losing it. The politician loses his innocence in his work journey: Starks, a great

Broderick Crawford, ends up corrupted, disenchanted, staying in the same barracks of vices and sins that he

himself criticized at the foot of a wagon, lacking of oratory with which deceive in the future but invested

with sincerity and power of convocation. McCarthy packed her bags. Recorded in Italy, Spain, Mexico and even

the Barbados Islands. The return to his country (1,961) was apotheosis. He rummaged through the same wounds. The

hustler is an absolute masterpiece. One of the best movies in the history of cinema. Without palliatives.

What is inside this movie? Honor quiz��� Life to dry. The battlefield of yesteryear metamorphosed into a

modern simulacrum. The basement smells of hot beer, stale smoke of black tobacco and sweat. Theadds

curious readera billiard table and a powerful light to illuminate it, a large group of vocationallymen

idleand perhaps a jazz music of props and we already have the perfect frame for a movie. Black cinema film.

If we put a thin glass of wide mouth well filled Jack Daniel's or some good malt whiskey

then the scene is simply perfect. The lady who has long since ceased to be, generous cleavage,

Narrow skirt, painted and very long nails, prowls the game and waits for his gallan to give him a look, a

puff of smoke or a gui���oc���mplice. Life, at times, requires glances, puffs of smoke, accomplices

if one has lost in the way the esteem and hope that something good can happen to him. Thetable

pool, like the arena of the circus, like the ring, like the bars of the bars, is the quintessence of those low

backgrounds. It is necessary to see Jackie Gleason, the fat one of Minnessota, move around the table with his body

amazing, move the stick and look, at all times, that will collapse or that the heart will burst is to

attend a master class on how to move a camera and c��� how to make movies. Point. Minnesot Fats is not just the

name of a character: it is also the mark of a famous and reputable billiard stick. There'sin Madrid,

also a frienda billiard club with the bombastic and mythological name of Eddie Felson. The hustler is not

just the mythical character Eddie Felson, The fast, The Rellicker, a loser, an anti-hero antihero.

It is the story of the search for purity, for perfection. It does not matter if Rossen puts the emphasis on the ring or

the pool table: the instinct is the same, the voice is the same. They are amoral men or a

morality of contention, painted the color of money or the epic of survival. P���caros, tah���res,

sick of love, disenchanted, villains dom���sticos, linnets and hustlers without soul: the motley fauna that

Rossen uses in that gray theater that is the pool table, territory m ���tico and met���fora superb

life. Secondary characters absolutely essential: the "" wild bull "" Jack LaMotta, who acts as bartender;

George C. Scott, like that kind of taco pimp; Piper Laurie as the self-destructive lady in love with

loser Felson. Jackie Gleason was never better. Piper Laurie embroiders it. Paul Newman (what risk writing this)

makes the best role of his life.

" 1

" I want and I can not cinematic that arrives in Spain with 5 months of delay. Without a doubt we are facing one of those films with actors of certain renown Costner, Hurt, Moore that

will delight the lovers of the cinema and that nevertheless and after a promising beginning it is diluted just like

a sugar in hot coffee. Let's not deceive ourselves, we are before a well-constructed film, Well shot and that drinks

from such a diversity of sources that surprises the most painted, sorry that this diversity makes the

tape a disservice, since, although the beginning is promising, final remains in a laughable film, at

times comically stupid and where, despite trying to give the script not 1, but 2 laps of gui���n,

it always waters and in everything moment.It is curious how at the beginning of the film the villain is a hero, and the heroine

villain and they try to change the roles so many times that one has no choice but to put a face cousin and

nodded again and again as grand and yet embarrassing quasi-circus spectacle (harder still a) .The

direction of Bruce A. Evans, respected screenwriter ( ""Me "", "" Starman "" and "" The Island

Cutthroat"."), which debuts at work here Direction seems more like one of those jobs "" custom "" where the

director is not more than a mere figurehead or man of straw, who endures aesthetically the chaparr ,N, placing

both Costner and Demi Moore, in the best moments on screen and, holding the pull of what is

coming, in this guide that is also fruit of Evans and that stays at "" half pist���n "" waiting to be what it

had to be and was not. Also in addition to the aforementioned to 2 television, Danielle Panabaker (as thedaughter

protagonist'swhich we now see in the series "" Shark "" as the daughter of James Woods) and the CSI's LasCSI. Resuming

Vegas Marg Helgenberger'sand being concise, I want and I can not cinematographic that arrives in Spain a

5month delay (in USA premiere was in July).

" 0

" I think this guy has just invented a new (sub) genre: the gore-hist���rico. He will be a loudmouth and an

alcoholic, but no matter how many heads they roll, that is not his. How does this guy film?

I am still shaking the weeds, cleaning the mud, taking off some blood spatter

and, above all, the smell of decaying (human) flesh. seen "" Apocalypto "" and is that Mel Gibson is so

beast. I also think that this guy has just invented a new (sub) genre: the gore-hist���rico.Con "" Braveheart "" already

warned at the time that the scenes of battle would contain hard planes, and that is that at that time they were very

crude; and in "" The Passion of Christ "" definitely gave free rein to his most untied side. "So much Mad Max

has gotten into his head and body! And he has created a new (sub) genre with a couple of co?.! First by having

your characters speak in some ancient Maya-type dialect (which gets you full in time and place); and then

showing the violence, without recreating it, in its most primitive and real form, which reminds us that

humans are so like animals, and that our ancestors, be here in Scotland or the pre-Columbian America, they

were even more so because their weapons were perhaps less sophisticated. And this not to mention that with a budget of about

50 million dollars, it recreates a whole world of the late fifteenth century, when other directors, for example,

Nancy Meyers, need twice as much to furnish the comfortable houses of its two protagonists in

"" Vacations "". Rolling heads. The result would delight Truffaut in "The Good Savage" (1969), and

Terrence Malick, for his idyllic vision of the primitive, naive community, pure and in perfect harmony with

nature; and this whole utopian world ravaged by wars in the name of progress and civilization. I would also be

able to reach agreement even with the very Stallone and Schwarzenegger, because both the Dutch

"" Predator "" (1987) and the Johnny Rambo of "" Acorralado "" (1982) would jump a lagrimilla of emotion to see

this intriguing "" Jaguar claw "" so convincingly played by Rudy Youngblood.And it is to be expected that it will

enthuse equally fans of adventure and action, and of good cinema, because "" Apocalypto "" is a

great movie. Quecula that hooks from start to finish. Filled admirably, leaning mainly on the

image and taking advantage of the plasticity even with the color of the paintings that cover the bodies of the

slaves: white for work, blue for the sacrifice. I am not going to Reveal nothing, not even the type of

staples worn by the aborigines to sew wounds. Better discover it for yourselves, but I'll

leave you with that taste of decaying (human) flesh that so well corresponds to the vision of aempire

decaying, the survival instinct. and also with hope as an illusion that can never bebe

defeated. It willa loudmouth and an alcoholic, but no matter how many heads it rolls, it is not yours. How does

this guy film?

" 1

" A failed immersion in the world of guilt and revenge. I do not know if this is a tribute to Charles

Bronson, but, of course, he would be dissatisfied.

Some of us are already a little tired of both post 11-S. Greengrass and Lee (Spike) already made great and

entertaining films, respectively, about the tragedy, even if they were totally different and

incomparable. Now Neil Jordan arrives from Ireland to, secretly, make a reflection on the

consequences of said terrorífico day, although I say surreptitiously because it covers it with the story of an

urban justice that wants to take revenge on those who murdered her boyfriend. Sounds topicazo, and it is, but

Jordan unfolded, fortunately, in a regular way leaving a pestle, although equally unsuccessful,

commercial film. And one of the good things that it has is a great Jodie Foster, with a couple ofscenes

truly shocking, and a great Terrence Howard who knows how to handle himself as NYPD. A clumsy ending

(it's a plagiarism to that wonder of Fincher!) Makes the strange thing that is in you dismantle and stop being what it

was as a whole (more or less like the character of Erica). The plot is simple, although the Irish wrap it in

such a way that it seems, more or less, deep, with reflections on revenge and that feeling so common. No

guilt. Yes, the character of Foster repeats the same thing a thousand and one times, I do not know if it is clear to us, or because he

always feels the same once he has avenged himself. The film is repetitive, foreseeable and in several

occasions extremely unreal or lacks logical sense, but at the same time it is shot realistically,

with a pulse on the part of Jordan truly personal and some bright sequence shots like Erica

escaping through the streets of the city (similar to the initial of the, that s���, magnificent and previous's

directorfilm, Breakfast in Plut ���n). It has successes, although it has more faults. It is risky, typical, predictable,

strange (never better said). First of all, a failed immersion in the world of guilt and revenge. I do not know if

this is a tribute to Charles Bronson, but, of course, he would be dissatisfied.

" 0

" The scriptwriter does not maintain a coherence at any time, the scenes are happening according

to the director's wishes, with the only justification that they fit , regardless of the story.

Several days ago we had already gone to see her and I, but I still had not been motivated enough to

write something about it. Because I look so pessimistic, because the film is a disappointment. Not at the

level of the director, the technical team or the actors. In all those cases, it's what anyone who has seen

other films by Tony Scott, or Denzel Washington can expect. They work as they usually do,

with their level of quality and their way of acting or directing to which we are accustomed. So it's a

pretty fragile movie, with action, with Denzel doing his role as good (he has the bad one, for other stories) and

fighting to save the girl. Highlights are the performance of Val Kilmer, which is improving with the

years, the scene of the explosion (which we have seen in the trailer) and how to shoot Scott. But all this

remains in nothing, if you build everything on a defective basis. A film of time travel,

camouflaged as a thriller, needs a solid script, without too many mistakes, or at least connecting all

the stories, the motivations of the characters and their actions in a way that that end up fitting in the end. This

is not the case. It seems that the scriptwriter just thought about making a story of time travel, where in the end

the protagonist saves the girl, and if you have to do stupid things to get it, including spoiling all the

previous story, it is done and this, that what matters is that the film ends well. I will not go into

the amount of stupidities regarding the theory of temporary travel, eye, not with respect to known science,

but with respect to the theories that count in the tape itself. That's the problem, the scriptwriter, or the team of

writers do not maintain coherence at any time, the scenes are happening according to the

director's wishes, with the only justification They're fine, no matter the story. A disaster, come on. When I see

Deja Vu I understand why so many millions of dollars are paid for a good guide, they are becoming increasingly scarce.

" 0

" ��� After all these years of rumors and secrets has it been worth the wait? Well, not much,

really. And not because the movie is bad, much less, but because it offers exactly the same as we have been

watching for quite some time.

Among the details of the IMDB is an amazing one: the script began to be written in 2003, and 158were made

drafts. This shows the secrecy that surrounded the premiere of the feature film about The Simpsons, and

also how unclear the plot of the movie was, since it's one thing to tell a story in 20

minutes , and another very different to fill an hour and a half of footage. In the end, what we see on the screen is a new

gaffe of Homer that this time may cost Springfield very expensive, to the point that the government

decides to make them disappear from the map . Literally. In addition, because of their continued clumsiness and selfishness, Marge,

Bart and Lisa end up abandoning Homer, who will have to save not only Springfield, but theunit

family. After all these years of rumors and secrets has it been worth the wait? Well, not much,

really. And not because the movie is bad, much less, but because it offers exactly what we've been

watching for quite some time, and so it's not easy to justify waiting for hundreds of thousands of fans of thefamily

yellowAlso, the 2-D and 3-D mix that has been used in therecreation is a bit strange

Springfield. While it is logical to take advantage of the jump to the cinema to offer more colorful backgrounds and other types of

framing and effects, it does not seem to be the film indicated to amaze the staff with the technology. �a. That is, we

must first recognize that there are funny scenes and good jokes, but also the basis of trying to make

a punch line in each line of dialogue. And yes, some criticism of the system, mark of the Simpsonian house without a doubt,

also falls, although in the meantime it is easy to ignore gag. What is striking is the little weight that

the secondary ones have here (less Flanders, of course), which often appropriate the chapter of rigor, and

although they must leave pr��� Everyone except the deceased, in the vast majority have no phrase to

say, as in the case of Smithers or director Skinner. But those who have been treated the worst are the

protagonists. Homer is so stupid and clumsy in everything he undertakes, that he does not cause a smile, but stupor, and even

certain anger. Bart is far from the sympathetic hooligan we know to become a traumatized child, and

Lisa ceases to be the moral vortex of the family and has no moment of glory. In general, and knowing

that it sounds strange, they have managed to caricature some cartoons. Although maybe it is being unfair, and what

happens in the background is that we already have so "" drafts "" to the Simpsons, that it is impossible to get something different from the

usual, and when you try to do something surprising, you lose something of the vital essence of the characters.

But it is inevitable to remember one of the first jokes, that we heard in the mouth of Homer: "" it amazes me that we have

paid to see something that we can see for free on TV "". What a bad time Homer chose to be right.

" 0

" This stridency of modernity in three entirely dispensable acts nevertheless attracts

condescension, even if only due to the risk it poses in this Europe with so much need for cinema that a

box office and cr��� ethics

Storm is a Swedish film that Bergman does not direct that is as much as to say a pop group that is not Abba or

Roxette. Otherwise, he might as well have been Namibian or Belgian. Now the cinema has these things: that its

arguments happen in an abstract, decontextualized country. So (imagine) any viewer can

better identify with what is counted. In Storm this reflection (l���cita) marra: the protagonist couple

embarks on a crusade that at times seems a treaty of psychoanalysis and by others we see a metaphysical thriller

of profound Kantian principles. That is. That the directors (two perpetrate the event) have gotten more involved

and, in the end, they have given birth to a mass entertainment with pedigree of art and essay that does not enter through the

eyes and that escapes (it is my case, let's see, I'm losing mental fortitude with the years and I can not stand three tricks in a

row) for some brain space that we do not have tightly closed. In addition, it took a little time. It could

be the afternoon or the state of ���nimo or a symbiosis of both with a bonus of previous work fatigue. Storm is a

disconcerting film, which does not mean bad entirely. It is not ascribed to the clear ones by any genre and dives

without enthusiasm the stormy sea of ​​the abundant mini-genres that it presents as amodel pass

sophisticated. He does not worry at any time for recalling style or narratively in any. Perhaps (due to

his premeditated lack of serious pretensions) he does not need it. Storm is of a squeaky magic: maybe the

post-Bergman Swedish cinema is all like that and the p��� The Nordic public is fed up with pastors who pray about faith and

about sin on a farm lost in a forest. Master Bergman, who was very bored to me, was like that.

The fascination exerted by some of its portentous images (the dark streets, the camera in chopped,

twisted, on the pavement) does not save the film, but does not weigh it down to total oblivion. There are moments offilm

careful: there are not two sloppy ones, but neither does the pulse of a firm hand that knows, at all times, what it

does and with what object. This lack of expository clarity is, in my view, predicted in the very succinct

libreto.Interesa the hodgepodge between na���fy hardcore, that expressionless limbo of its complex (and abobada)

plot. Storm's style is his non-style. And that has a little bit of the Swedish film, that is, as I say,

Mozambique. We believe that history is not the fundamental attraction but there are other

possibilities: we are more aware of not getting lost than of reaching port. Is that the symptom of a bad movie?

I do not have it clear at all. He does not remain a charm, a picturesqueness, a certain artistic direction, a

simple composition of the scene that paints a plot with a vocation of science fiction and thriller orterror

modern, but some dialogues disarm my patience and produce a huge intellectual, whichme

disturbancedisturbshours after having seen it. This stridency of modernity in three entirely dispensable acts

nevertheless attracts condescension , even if it is only because of the risk involved, in Sweden, in this Europe

with so much need for cinema that adds to the box office and criticism, to make this film. Let's not be, then,hard

excessively, but in what I promise I will not relapse in his viewing unless the forgetfulness disturbs me or makes me

soft like a croissant at eight o'clock in the morning. Oh, and if someone sees it and has more to do than me to see if

it explains the storms that come and go and the last sense of the box of yore. I still need a

psychoanalyst. Argentine, if possible.

" 0

" Banderas convinces the director, the students and the parents, but she still has to convince the

public

Antonio Banderas plays Pierre Dulaine, a dance teacher, inspired by real life, that tries to

take ahead an elective in the institutes oriented to the difficult boys. First you have to convince the

principal, then the students, and finally the parents. Does it help to learn to dance in

high school? He still has to convince the public. This is a film case with an interesting question.

Dulaine gives several answers: "" if your children learn to dance as a couple they will learn to respect themselves, "" he

tells the parents. The stories of the boys also want to show that it's worth it. There are two students

who are Romeo and Juliet, for the sake of family quarrels, a boy with complexes, an anti-snob andcouple

anti-racistof obligatory presence, and a trio with jealousy who learns to express themselves with the music. The creators

did not seem to be convinced with these stories of the students, nor with the teacher's statements.

They decided that if they wanted the film to work they had to have a competition and a prize. It is

a consecrated formula that is too easy but that on the other hand has always worked. I'm notinterested in

muchdiscussing whether walking along well-trodden paths is good or bad cinema. Each one will tolerate it according to their degree of

fatigue. But I was very interested in the idea of ​​the Salle Ball as optional. The only thing I regret is

discovering that cinema is not the best forum to discuss educational proposals. It is good to propose them, but

not to discuss them. Think that the love stories and the third act that we have always pending a

thread consume three quarters of any story that wants to recover the investment.

" 0

" A more adaptation of a video game so forgettable, as unappetizingAdmito, without any hint of blushing that the film by Rob Cohen, starring Vin Diesel "" xXx "" is a from

my recent action tapes that I like most and that I've seen her on more than a dozen occasions; it is also

true that this one, that today we were not, was going to be starred also by Diesel, but, this one at the last moment was

thrown backwards in that shooting of Anibal, which seems to have no end), and the producers and others,

before the license expired that Eidos (the creators of the video game) had sold them to transfer

their character to the big screen, they decided to look for the worst possible substitute, this is none other than Timothy

Olyphant, who of course does not look bad, nor does he have on screen the cocky and confrontational attitude that the

character needs.Tambi���n is It is true that the shadow of Luc Besson, the producer of the film, is elongated and that

whiff of European-European action film accompanies the film, and even gets to ballast in some moments,

leaving aside the action made in the USA that you might need, to stay in a laughable experiment that a to

again, based on a video game, one can not do more than sigh and mutter to that sufferinglast at

least posible.A Xavier Gens, French director of the film seemscare littlehis character, and this, his

first film is dedicated to walking in any type of situation seen before, and that is that Hitman

goes from being an agent to the purest 007 style, to a mercenary of Stallone's films, Schwarzenegger and

Even Van Damme in his best times. You have to have peeled your ass watching action tapes as well as

thumbs in hundreds of video games (of the first thing, of the second is not my case), to check that the

tape de Gens is not among the most outstanding of the genre, with an argument so badly faced (perhaps a

bald, dressed and with a bar code on the back of the skull is not localizable), that one wonders

how someone noses, with 2 fingers can give Iit's a little bit of plausibility with reality, because of my

thinkvideojueguil that it is, and it's not enough to put an image of the game so we can see what it is.Resuming, that

I do not want to extend too much, an adaptation nm���s of a video game so forgettable, as unappetizing.

" 0

" The Kingdom mixes reason, faith, work and love. Although at the beginning it may seem like a firecracker I

recommend you keep watching it, there are only 5 chapters that are worth seeing.

Lars Von Trier dares with everything from ejerver one subbliminal vejacin the female gender in his films

to make a series of terror through TV clunkers like Dogville (q forgive me scholars) .The

Kingdom arrives to nunestras stores in DVD to the stores in its version dubbed into Castilian. A series that

despite not having renewed a season 2 por for its successful excaso to me I am cool and therefore here I am

recommending it. It is a science fiction series ny terror broadcast by the ABC channel during the second

quarter of 2004 with an audience close to 10 million, although it fell week by week. The series is

based on a novel by the famous writer Stepehen King and the episodes of the series correspond with those of the

series, which tried to recreate the climate of fear and despair of the original book. The series has been seen in Spain

in the "" Night of series "" of Canal Plus in autumn 2005 and in some regional channels. Lars,

presents this series with a Light touch, considering the overload of its aesthetics. There is someone who defines this

series as a world movie that must be elevated as one of his best works. The Kingdom mixes reason,

faith, work and love. Although at the beginning it may seem like a firecracker I recommend you keep watching it, there

are only 5 chapters that are worth seeing.

" 1

"? Shooter: The Shooter? It is a film of the mont, not above average, but that does not mean that one

ends up falling asleep after paying 6 euros and peak.

I have a serious problem of critical decision with this movie. It is not that I consider putting it back and

half for bad quality op���simas performances, although it really is so, but it is not being any wonder, in

the end it has been entertaining, and it is one of those mysteries that surround the cin���filo taste of each one.

Shooter: The Shooter? It is a film of the mont, not above average, but that does not mean that one

ends up falling asleep after paying 6 euros and peak. One of the main problems that this film has is its

director, Antoine Fuqua, and the good taste that he left behind? Training Day? or? King Arthur? That is why one expects

that this form of cinema will be prolonged in his next works, but as with all directors, he always

falters. In? Shooter: The Shooter? Fuqua has found a very bad adaptation of a novel, and that brings

consequences. Without having read it one captures that the events, and not the action, develops so fast that

sometimes it leaves abysmal gaps. If we had to prosecute the film for its gui���n we would not stop

defects, but even so, the way in which Fuqua tries to save the dishes is very commendable. Get with a history

requetevista and reckless to give a rhythm that does not turn its 120 minutes into an unbeatable drink. If you had

seen the trailer, you had practically seen the film. There are two pillars on which the film is developed: A

former retired military man is betrayed by the government to endorse a dead man, and in his interminable flight he will

find a good ally to unmask the plot. We have seen many movies with the same story,

too many. The initial sequence is a classic of? Here it smells like dead ?. The next half hour is the ABC of the

US government betrayal and the huyda and venganza is a book. Neither enjoys? Shooter: The Shooter? ofelements

surprisingto leave you speechless, and the conclusion is more than predictable, but irremediably I

feel attracted by the development for a good reason: that touch of John Rambo that the film has ���cula. I already missed

the kaki together with foliage of the forest, where a hidden shooter is brushing one by one to the

thugs without dialogue, and to the domestic cure? Of the wounds of the protagonist, he only needs to see Whalberg

biting a machete. What memories. Unlike "Training Day", Fuqua has used more explosions than

dialectical confrontations, but it is that counting on Mark Whalberg in an unbeatable condition. Physical gives

rise to pu���etazos, kicks and other caresses are luxury. However, at the interpretation level,

this is not Whalberg's best film. A flat guide and sometimes stupid phrases leave it as a jumble

of muscles with a goal very much like the donkey with the carrot in front. Michael Pe���a is the other prota, and I

highlight his scene with a contraption that seems designed by the very Jigsaw. Who gets out in this film is

Elias Koteas, as a schizophrenic federal agent with a final worthy of entering the gallery of "Better Execution ?

. Danny Glover is not a paragon of Oscar's phrases either, and the girl, Kate Mara, can do little except make her look

scared. It is nice to see Ned Beatty again. After reading all this maybe you can

explain why I debate so much between yes and no. Sometimes I think that it has more eighties tints than an action film

according to the times, but even that approach has meant that we do not see a new show of

fireworks without sense. It's a good action movie, but it's not THE action MOVIE this

season. I have seen it to evade me for a while, and it has taken effect. For lovers of the genre ofshots

remoteor very fond of the anatomy of Whalberg.

" 0

" Sometimes a novel can be very interesting, but taken to the screen does not have the same effect. A

quality product that was expected much more.

Everything made us foresee that we would find ourselves with a more than interesting proposal from the director of Caught by his

past, since together with him we find great names within the world of cinema. ��fico, but even so The

Black Dahlia does not manage to stand out as a film.Josh Hartnett, Scarlett Johannson, Aar���n Eckhart and Hillary

Swank under the direction of De Palma and with a script by Josh Friedman based on the novel by James Ellroy, (who

wrote the magnificent novel LA Confidential), introduced us in the forties, on the streets and in the

problems that exist in the movie mecca, from the hand of a tandem of policemen and good boxers such as

Harnet and Eckhart (Bucky Bleichert / Mr. Ice and Lee Blanchard / Mr. Fire). A crime will unleash the vicious circles

and the possible bifurcations that the good Bucky must interpret to get to solve it. But one thing is

for the character to do it and another for the spectator, who in the middle of the movie starts to be quite lost and

who often envies the policemen that he sees on the screen, since he will need to ��a his notebook and his pen to be able to

aim and make the necessary schemes to avoid being disoriented. There are times when a novel can be very

interesting, but taken to screen does not have the same effect. In the technical section nothing to object, a

good photograph, an artistic direction according to the time and social conditions of each character and

the area in which they move, wardrobe and others also fulfill to perfection. In the interpretative section

the truth is that they are also correct, a good casting with many familiar faces and that we have already commented.

Many will wonder that then how is it possible that the result is not excellent? And the answer is

simple: the gui���n. Normally all the films that we see have professionals that makethe

most oftechnical sections are good enough to go unnoticed, and when something

fails or does not finish liking the movie ���cula, is usually for the same endemic evil: the gui���n. In short, a

quality product that was expected much more. Fortunately, next week we will see new

films by two other teachers, such as Scorsese and Allen.

" 0

" Daniel Graig presents a Bond much more human, sensitive, imperfect and why not say it, much more

handsome and sculptural.

Fortunately, times have changed for one of the most naive actors in the cinema, agent 007.

That being macho, rude and insensitive never liked women (although the creatives of the disgusting and

illegal campa AX's still create it). Brosnan's fortunate cessation in his 007 role allowed the actor to

show other facets (Matador, 2005) and the producer to make a turn of one hundred and eighty degrees on

the image of the secret agent that, on this occasion, we will know from its origins. Daniel Graig presents

a much more human, sensitive, imperfect Bond and why Not to mention, much more handsome and sculptural (

silencing those mouths that quickly criticized him). But not only the male protagonist has changed in

this new installment, since the female protagonist (Eva Green) is no longer submissive and hypnotized by the

presence of the "" super macho "" 007. She is beautiful and intelligent but does not make his body a profession and prefers to

reserve it for his private life. The film, based on the homonymous work of Ian Fleming, has great action

scenes , made in impressive sets that are based on a dynamic argument to which, on

occasion, you could recriminate some voids that may mislead the viewer (we do not know with

certainty which Many days the game lasts in the casino, in the airport it is not shown clearly when Bond

abandons his pistol so that the metal detector does not sound, etc.) However, these details do not cloud the

intensity and quality of the film since, for the most part, it does not an important information for the

development of the plot. It is worth watching the film for several reasons: it is a good action story that

will entertain us, we can see the evolution of the Quen that a classic character suffers in the cinema (although curiously

this was the first novel) and, in addition, we can rejoice the view for more than two hours. By the way, this

time it will not be them who will leave the sea, it will be him (and he will not disappoint you, promised).

" 1

" Ma���osa, passionate, provocative, delirious, sensitive, great, disproportionate, emotional, cheesy, all descriptions

that fit and define both this and all the filmography of Pedro Almod���var.

The cinema of Almod���var -mainly from ���tame (1989) to this part- is always the same and leaves no room for

doubt: either he loves it or he hates it. The loas sometimes exaggerated to his work, broaden that gap and take

advantage of one or another option. Today we are facing one of his very good films, the best with Matador and

Carne Tr���mula, having in common with these masculine roles and physical impediments of the same. Talk with

her is one of the melodramas to which she has accustomed us, although this time with less touches of comedy

but with the same characteristics of her cinema, a recognizable world in which the sexual and thecoexist

mundane, kitsch with chance. It is about the birth of the friendship of two men united by the

convalescence of their two loves. A journalist (Dar���o Grandinetti, content) and his ill-fated bullfighter (Rosario

Flores) and on the other hand, a bisexual (Javier C���mara) a nurse in the care of his neighbor, dancer and love

, character in which Almod���var focuses all his phobias and feelings transforming him almost into his

alter-ego. Other stories of love, of loneliness, of unrequited love are interwoven, all of a

constant and always present sexual page, with temporary paths backwards and forwards that make us

fear for the continuity but going afloat with elegance. What differentiates her from her latest films is that she

does not do it under a strictly feminine gaze, nor is she guided by her strong female protagonists, but by the already

mentioned masculine ones. The route -with few low blows but which has them- is pleasant despite itstheme

conflictive(rape, vegetative life) but without explicit scenes or bad taste, with something of which even

the Detractors of his films will not be able to deny any of his films: well directed, well acted and

with a lot of emotional charge from beginning to end. Only in a film by Almod���var (or in one of Woody Allen)

can coexist and mix without danger of dementia, a collage of the most colorful to know: a Spanish singer

(Rosario), an Argentine actor, the daughter of Chaplin, Caetano Veloso , body dance (at the beginning and end,

which remind both of Poderosa Aphrodite and her Greek choir) etc., etc. Ma���osa, passionate, provocative,maudlin,

delirious,genial, disproportionate, emotional, corny, all descriptions that fit and define both

this and all the filmography of Pedro Almod�� �var. In the must we can mention the ending, which is an

ambiguous constant optimism in his last works, closer to Hollywood and further away from his cinema itself.

" 1

" Delicious comedy that will make you laugh, suffer, cry, get excited and unleash your emotions without

any problem. It shows us that large media deployments are not necessary, nor are renowned actors to

make huge films. We loved it.

The billboard is like a box of chocolates, you always eat first those that do not bring packaging and are more

attractive, for the end, when only the rectangular shape and anodyne wrapper are left, you have no other

taste them With the film this is the same, I have not seen any promotion of the same, goes on tiptoe in

front of attractive buttresses attractive, but of course that the stammering viciously. My

recommendation, veanl���, in the cinema or the video store, but see, in company or alone, but pay attention to me and see it,

I'm sure you like it. ��cula is about a guy called Ca���n who lives in a downtown neighborhood of a big

city, who has seen his population have gone from being an aging Spanish colony It is a symphony of

immigrants from various countries with their own cultures and traditions. Ca esn is fat, good-natured, somewhat frisky,

butcher and a perfect loser. On the other hand, has a brother named Abel who is the opposite, a

winner of life married to the woman who loved Ca���ny with two daughters, who in a slip leaves apregnant

Muslim girl. For more tangle, this is Ca ven's neighbor. Total, which Abel rejects, this is about

committing suicide, at which time her family discovers that she is pregnant. Ca���n, to safeguard his

brother, decides to tell everyone that he is the father and take everything. Look, I am not a film sage, or

practically I have no idea same, but I only know that if a film ends and we get up dancing to the sound

of the soundtrack, laughing and jumping, it means that the film has enchanted us (or that we have smoked a

giant joint, which is not the case). It has that freshness of the Spanish comedy films, but of those that were

done before, with no great pretensions other than to show us a small story, insignificant for the future

of Humanity, but which penetrates us in the deepest part of the heart. I do not think the director wanted to show

an image of immigration in Spain, much less, it simply tells a modern story, and

there are currently immigrants living together. And more and more, so you can tell stories

like these, which mix cultures and ways of seeing the world as naturally as possible.,

Resumingdelicious comedy that will make you laugh, suffer , mourn, get excited and give free rein to your emotions without any

problem. It shows us that large media deployments are not necessary, nor are renowned actors to make

huge films. We loved it.

" 1

" Not only is bad solemnity in its approach, but, for the first time in my journey cin���filo, I

find a film that, I would not know to say exactly synopsis.

I thought I had seen it all. I thought that no film, bad as it was, could make me bring

my hands back to my head. But you see, Senora, I was wrong. �� from part to part. Ultraviolet is not only bad of

solemnity in its approach, but, for the first time in my cinephile journey, I find myself with a film

that, dear readers, I could not say exactly his synopsis. They say it's easier to talk about a bad

movie than a good one. But definitely in my case it's not like that. I must admit that when I left the cinema I

was wishing I could complain about it all, but as it has happened to me before (for example, when I saw

"Timeline"), it's hard to talk about something you have not enjoyed At all, but good, hairs to the sea and there we go.

Ultraviolet, in principle and without having seen anything of her, the most a bare trailer, it is another

film of these of future sombre���oa cause of an illness, of wars, of contamination and I will not deny that

as a general rule they fascinate me, mainly because they know how to join the social criticism of why the humanity

arrives at the moment to which it arrives with a point of action quite interesting (we have excellent examples like

Matrix, Blade Runner, Equilibrium, the Saga Terminator.) but Ultraviolet has overcome all fear at the time of

using these elements in an inappropriate way. Normally, when these two elements do not marry

perfectly (as in the examples cited above), we can always stay with theargument

apocalyptic and moralizing, or with the action well presented and entertaining. In this film, the argument,

plain and simple does not exist, and the action is exaggeratedly absurd. In theory (and I say in theory because in the

pr���xis I totally differ), the story that the distributor exposes us is the following: At the end of the 21st century

a group of human beings emerges a genetic mutation created by a virus. As more people are

infected, the fear of the government increases and the infected are treated as marginalized, subjected to

frightful tests and put in quarantine. The government has taken thekill them, but

decision toa woman with a terrible past is determined to prevent it: the beautiful and lethal Violet ... And now comes the sonic

���JA! that this servant would give them in the face to those who have written this paragraph. Here comes the m .o.

(Attention: contains revealing details - if there is anything to reveal - of the "" Argument "") At the end of the

21st century and without apparent reason there is a new disease in the world that is not known or where it has come from or why

and people go and get it. The doctors rise up with the power to better control the population. Ultraviolet in

theory is one of the "infected", a little lady who changes color of hair like Jorge Vestrynge ofparty

political, and who seizes the weapon that ���Acabar ��� with humans? "Cause" with the hemifages (to wit),comes out of it

a child. The boy does not know why a maternal feeling awakens in her and the aunt is engaged, against her

companions and against her enemies in "Saving him"? The child dies. Appears inmidst of all this some guys who

call themselves "" Blood Chinois "" that neither those who know (to explain what, really, gentlemen writers?) A bad

malsimo that in the end it turns out that he is also hemifagous and the typical outcast hero half in love with the character

of the Jovovich. The child, in the end, turns out to be alive. Do not ask me how. Point and ball. I must admit

that when I saw that the director was Kurt Wimmer, the same one unjustly defenestrada by the distributors

"" Equilibrium "" and that appeared in it the hardworking William Fitchner as a supporting actor (one of my favorites), I

thought that maybe I would find something like the famous cult movie before named and not distributed in

Spain by mysterious reasons But you see that the day that Kurt Wimmer agreed to shoot "" that "" was not very Catholic, of

course. The dialogues: Typical, empty ,Os, lacking any reasoning or linguisticallyapproach

correct. Not even the presence of William Fitchner (Wimmer's fetish actor) manages to save the furniture. And the

truth, with such a gui���n, the actors can do little. The action: as I said before, exaggeratedly absurd.

It tires sometimes because of excess. It does not fit with the argument, it is cumbersome and it is not beautiful at all (at least, that

consolation would be left to us), but above all, the computer effects are BAD FACTS. Very bad facts. I have seen

B series movies with better digital work than Ultraviolet. The music: Repetitive, crushing, and a bad imitation

of "" Equilibrium "". With the difference here, it does not make any sense or accompanies. In the best moments,

goes unnoticed, in the worst, overwhelms you. In short, a film completely forgettable in its many

facets, a blot on the career of the Jovovich and Wimmer, and a waste of time if you plan to see it.

" 0

" Tape whose only positive points are Paul Giamatti (great as always, the rest as if they were passing by

...) and the technical aspect, at the height of the circumstances.

Tape whose only positive points are Paul Giamatti (great as always, the rest as if they were passing by.)

And the technical aspect, at the height of the circumstances. it fails miserably to such an extent that

the story is blurredly sketched on the screen; one does not know what they are trying to tell us until

well past the hour and quarter of duration. And his gui���n, trickster until he can not, does not help atQuite

all.disappointing, although he lets himself be seen and, at least, within what fits, is entertaining and

sequences "" m� ��gicas "" are quite attractive to the eye.

" 0

" The most ironic thing about this matter is that we probably would not have appreciated the

unique character of this segment of Grindhouse if the Weinstein brothers' production company did not I had decided to separate

the two films, forcing each of them to measure themselves against the public alone.

As a second part of Grindhouse, Death Proof (2007) is at least disconcerting; although it begins

as an evasive entertainment of a nostalgic nature with Robert Rodriguez's Planet Terror (2007), it

soon becomes something completely different, freeing itself of its function. Ren referential as well as the

supposed formal precepts of the dual experiment that served as the initial reason for its existence. The most ironic thing

about this matter is that we probably would not have appreciated its unique character if the producer

of the Weinstein brothers had not decided to separate the two films. ,Culas, forcing each of them to measure themselves

against the public alone. Like the whole of Grindhouse, Tarantino divides his segment into twoparts

well-differentiated: in the first one, Stuntman Mike (praise everyone to Kurt Russell) appears from the

shadows like a serial killer to the classic way, a road psychopath who murders young damsels

using as a weapon not an ax or a knife, but his "death-proof" car, which it allows him to crash into

his victims while he escapes unharmed. This first half is quite typical, and is even framed

within the original aesthetic proposal: intentional scratches on the tape, abrupt cuts andgrainy image

typicalof the seventies. In the second half, however, the director turns over the tortilla of the genre

slasher and turns his film on the other side of the coin "sexplotativa": that of feminism understood as the

the greatest male fetish, the sub-genre popularized by Russ Meyer and in which solid t���as spread their justlosing their beauty

punishment to men without. And punishment is precisely what is coming on

Stuntman Mike, who finally finds the horna of his shoe in his three not so incautious victims. By this

time, Tarantino has already completely forgotten the formal corsal of his particular experiment: the

cinematography is now perfect, without alterations or intentional failures, and one of the best

car chases we have ever seen takes place. seen in recent times, the duel between Stuntman Mike and his new

victims, three tough girls among whom are authentic film specialists (all praise Zoe

Bell). And beyond the references to that cinema that is no longer done, we find here a film of Tarantino in

every rule: contrasting a bit with the blatant action of Planet Terror, this segment reveals theverbiage

typical generalof its director. Approximately one hour of the little more than an hour and a half of footage goes in the

di���logos of the protagonists, which (I must confess) has seemed a bit disproportionate to me. Thankfully,

however, that Tarantino has managed to compensate for this verbal incontinence with two of the most spectacular andscenes

intensethat he has filmed so far, both marking the climax of the respective mini-segments in which He has

divided his film: the dreadful "" accident "" that seizes the lives of the first victims of "" Stuntman Mike "" (and

that in a detail full of morbid reproduces six times before our noses) and the aforementioned persecution

in which the monster of Kurt Russell hunts the new heroines. Also, both halves are so different

and reach such different conclusions, that we realize very early on that Death Proof is in itself such an

ambitious formal proposal (om���s) that the whole of Grindhouse. It may not be as enjoyable on a

basic level as Planet Terror, but Tarantino's superiority as a director has managed to create a film

that goes beyond in his af�� To take the spectator to the place where he has simply wanted to

take him, at the cost of throwing overboard the aesthetic-nostalgic precept of which part. The only downside

that I put to Death Proof is nothing short of paradoxical: does it make sense to use the forms of theproject

Grindhouseonly to eventually get rid of them and revert them? Would not it have been much better to launch such a

proposal alone instead of attacking the concept of such a tribute (as well as itssegment

predecessor)? Is not it an action in itself that, although great, can be somewhat egocentric? It is clear

that I do not have the answer yet, but such a radical act can only come out of the mind of afilmmaker

privilegedor a tocapelotas. And now that I think about it, why can not both be?

" 1

" Colleagues in the forest do not even have a couple of minutes that are worth remembering, nor do you get in love with the

characters, and it is more, one spends the time and little that lasts, wishing that it's over

I consider myself a lover of animated cinema, and that is that whenever I see, that of animated films is

for children, I want to rip his head off, but , sincerely, and for a while now, this

alluvium of dull films, poorly made, with a laughable argument to the greatest extent, with stories a thousand times

seen, and where the Good work that leads (and especially work and care) an animation tape behind, is

vilified, because of an excess of little zeal at the time of doing it, before, in my m� It's early childhood,

how many movies did you have a year of animation? Maybe 2, maybe 3, but not now, now every month, more or less

we are planted a couple of tapes, where, as I said, originality is conspicuous by its absence, and that is that "" Colleagues

in the forest "" does not have a couple of minutes that are worth remembering, nor do you get in love with the characters, and it

is more, one spends the time and little that lasts, wishing it is over. Gentlemen, animation tapes yes, but also quality

(animation) tapes.

" 0

" The Curse of the Golden Flower is a film of great formal and aesthetic perfection, a real

pleasure for the senses of the spectator, that if he lets himself be caught by Zhang Yimou, you will discover the poetry that

hides behind each scene.

Although it is only for a minority, The Golden Flower Curse was one of the most anticipated films of the

season, much m It's the Hollywood megalomaniac film that premieres this week. The previous

works of Zhang Yimou have only one possible qualification, and it is that of exceptional, bordering on the masterpiece,

especially Hero.Yimou is a very personal director, although there will be many who do not appreciate his talent and s See it

in his works, mere comicYimou achieves what very few directors have achieved

comics. Zhangthroughout history, and is to make poetry with the images. The script is a mere excuse to organize an

authentic spectacle for the senses as it was not seen in a movie theater from the great Akira Kurosawa, although

that is a big word , and Yimou still has a lot to even approach the figure of the great

Japanese director. The Curse of the Golden Flower proposes a history with tints of tragedy in the Chinese court at the

end of the first millennium. A story full of palatial intrigues, plots, desires and desires in the pure

line of Shakespeare, saving the distances.have written that this film vaguely resemblesThrone

Some peopleBlood(adaptation of Macbeth, by the way), although if you want to look for similarities with Kurosawa, you better

go to Ran. However, all this matters little, since the enormous visual spectacle that unfolds before

the eyes of the spectator clouds everything else. The Forbidden City of Beijing is the ideal setting for Yimou to

perform a really impressive staging, with some planes overflowing with beauty and poetry, such as

family reunions, aerial views of the patios full of chrysanthemums or the last half hour

of the film. Highlights the strength of Zhao Xiaoding's photography, immense, with a chromatic palette worthy of a

master, like the choreographies, of an amazing plasticity. of the Golden Flower is a

film of great formal and aesthetic perfection, a true pleasure for the senses of the spectator, that if

he lets himself be trapped by Zhang Yimou, he will discover the poetry that hides behind each scene and each shot. Making

a fight a scene full of beauty and lyricism is only available to a few chosen, and we are before

one of them.

" 1

" Folklore altarpiece of the Spain of hunger, these times are not particularly different now. The

difficulties are others. It may not be hunger or censure the arguments of the revolution, but

still the son of those pacts.

The Spanish Civil War did not last three years, although the textbooks, the encyclopedias, the wikipedia and a

certain turmoil revivalist now raised for the pain of the dead, give in three years. �os of the contest. The

wars do not end when the weapons are deposed or well-dressedsmiling for thephoto

jerushas,historical, sign a document in view of flashes and rolls of celluloid. The war seems to end when

the confronted personnel step on the streets again, as the Cuban troubadour said. Wars are

wars and there is none that, at its end, does not teach and the seeds of which it is crouching ready to

rise and give its emboldened cry of blood. And now I've gone off on a tangent and instead of talking about

Spain, which is what I was proposing, I ended up writing generalities, applicable to Borneo and the islands of the Pacific

atolls. South Welcome, Mr. Marshall is written not long after the end of the

war. In it, there is still a deadly smell, a delayed hunger, a desire to close the quarrels that both

did not finish solving until well comedied the twentieth century. Garc���a Berlanga writes with bad

temper the folkloric altarpiece of a simple and easy-going España, alienated in its most intimate position, to the catechisms

of the jerifaltes of the war and the high politics, which were the champions of the New Spain rebuild of the

caudillo profile of General Franco. Misery and hope, hunger and joy, intermingle in Villar del R���o,

the town in which things happen that would not be believable if we did not have a (unfortunately) objective

view of what was Spain during those almost 40 years of reductionism, prohibitions, censures and

hunger.Berlanga, a communist covered by post-war needs, receives the order of make a film that

extols the figure of the singer of copla Lolita Sevilla. Together with Bardem, he writes a refined altarpiece

about rural Spain, Spain fed on coplas, Spain stopped in time, looking with one eye at the

United States. UU, the country called to revive the European economies, the cultural colonizer may���sculo. Retable of

customs truffled Italian comedy (Miracle in Mil���n). Villa del R���o is decorated so that thefriend

Americanenjoy the hospitality and the gypsy hullabaloo of a manchego village transvestite in Andalusian who

wishes, above all things, to please so that after the pleasure rains the plenipotentiary man��� of economic

aid promised without reservation by the high institutions of the State. Under theandbaton

peasantenter���ableof a Pepe Isbert made mayor of the pantomime, the whole town is launched to represent thework

planned, fanfare and song included. Antològicamente (and it is not thing to eviscerate the end) nothing happens as it

was believed. The cardboard-stone used to imitate an Andalusian town is in the brain of its dawn. Sudden iles

Desires, in the secret hope of Yankee gold, are made in lists. You have to satisfy needs,

but likewise it is legitimate the whim. When reality overshadows fictions, the glorious spectacle

of wealth is reduced to the gray routine of sadness. The villagers are satisfied, what remedy: they are prepared with

heroic enthusiasm to cope with the disappointment and to be supportive, obedient to the cause, good and, finally,

sentimental, humble to face the day. �aad���a that is coming on them. Encased in the idyllic vision of the

American (PLan Marshall in the background), they had no problem in caricaturing themselves to achieve what they wanted.

Like life itself. These times are not particularly different now. The difficulties are others. It

may not be hunger or censorship the arguments of the revolution, but still the son of

those pacts with the Americans and we live in a world colonized by Uncle Sam until inconceivable ends.

This miscegenation thrives and there are some governmental efforts to demarcate the American from the homeland,

the distribution quotas and the delicate handling of the numbers so that the abuse is not scandalous. And it all

started with Pepe Isbert in Villa del R���o; They are still in Villa del R���o, dressed in gypsies, on astreet

festooned and gay, waiting for the convertible Cadillacs of the Ohio benefactor.

" 1

" Without a convoluted story or an artificial accomplishment, Wang Quan'an creates a masterpiece that speaks

directly to our heart.

Dir: Wang Quan'anInt: Yu Nan, Bater, Senge, Peng Hongxiang, Zhaya He came to the Berlin Festival with his sincere

naturalness and achieved naturalism and took away, in addition to the hearts of the jury, the Golden Bear of the 57th edition

of this festival. It does not have a complicated script of convoluted history, but quite the opposite. This

Chinese film tells us about the vicissitudes of Tuya, a young woman who takes care of her children, her uninvolved husband and

cattle in a region of Mongolia. She is strong and hardened in hard physical work, but her body

suffers. If she does not want to die (and with her family), she must divorce her husband (whom she loves) and find a

new husband who can take care of the family. Wang Quan'an does not use a contrived accomplishment to

tell the story. history, but resorting to the motto of the less complex better. The long shots abound, the

camera in hand to make the viewer feel more verismo, and the balanced compositions. It has a

minimalist aesthetic, but strong in colors and striking elements of the culture where thetakes place.

story, which are visually striking for the western spectator. All this is the packaging in

which this small masterpiece is presented to us. What is really admirable in this story is the great verismo of

the interpretations and the fact that it is one of those movies that come straight to your heart and are a breath

of fresh air on the billboard, saturated with films typical and boring. Some writers andalready learn

filmmakers couldfrom this film and the motto, less is more. Hollywood should realize that the important things are not

the great artifices, nor the most luminous fireworks. The important thing is to have a story to tell

and tell it with your heart. And that is what Wang Quan'an admirably achieves well. A moving story that

allows us to sneak into the experiences of other realities coetaneas to ours and gives us a small

pill of wisdom: not always what seems to make you happy is what will make you happy. Do not letescape

this filmfrom the billboard, which although it has been on the bill since October, in January it continues to fill the room in which it is

projected.

" 1

" Disturbia was born to be seasoned with popcorn and Yankee syrup. Intrigue, none, we will not find anything

more than telefilm scares. Not even sexual scenes promise a climax that exceeds that of an

advertisement.

A large part of the universalizable consumer cinema that we have recently seen on the billboards follows the artistic

maxim of the icon of the avant-garde pop-art, Andy Warhol, according to which the essence of the Art is not in the

originality of the work, but in its reproductive potential, both in the popular psyche and in the process of

production and diffusion. Art, then, is not creation, but eternal return of the same, always fleeting, and in its

contingency is where its wealth resides. Thus, a portrait of Marilyn can adopt diverse colors, even knowing

of the evident repetition of its forms and its figure coming from an extra popular iconography. �da of the

common means of communication, leisure or consumption. This philosophy of art supposes a decrease in the slow process

of creation (in this case reproduction). ) classic, and a cheap and universalizable diffusion. But in turn

eludes the responsibility that existed in the classical art of being the creator of a genuine work, product of the

genial idea of ​​its maker. On the contrary, the postmodern artist is the heir of art as a form ofdiffusion

popularof icons that one day were called works of art or teachers, but which today are only updated from

nostalgia cin���fila or, as in this case, from its Warhol reproduction for fast and profitable consumption forDisturbance

an extensive mass of spectators.is, like many other cases, a recent example of this tendency in

which it rests with more than demonstrated success crematstico apparatus Hollywood production. In fact,

Hollywood invented the cinema as that machinery full of fetishes (geniuses that would say if we talked about

painting) represented through its actors, actresses, directors and movies. The idea, the concept, the

theme, the intentions of the author (screenwriter or director) are diluted by the dazzling glamor of this

props that fascinates the fanatics of their pageantry. See if not the glamorous photographic with whichare sold

emblematic festivals such as Cannes or Venice, guarantors in their day of a cinema today blessed as a classic. In

Disturbia everything is an adaptive reproduction of the classic on which it rests, there is no deconstructive will in it,

no less passion that seeks to honor the Hitchcock and his indiscreet window ( 1954). Everything is more cold and

calculated. From taller characters to adolescents, which is where the majority of the public (which

the polls say fill the seats of the cinemas of the developed world) are going to identify more

likely . Thus, we are presented with elements whose contextualization (���modernization?) Does not fulfill an

artistic or narrative function, but a mere adaptation to the public who will provide the expected final benefits. This is the

case of the use made in the film of new technologies (mobile with cameras, portable computers,

digital cameras of high definition and small size), whose archetype will exemplify without shame

the typical oriental wise (but histri���nico), faithful friend of the American protagonist. Even theis allowed

director(we do not know if suggested by his producer) the idea of ​​including knowledge ofin the protagonist

Spanish, in clear complicity with the increasingly influential p�� Hispanic audience in the US Evenaspirants

White Houseknow that they should be forced to make venial guidance to the potential Hispanic voter, if they want to

scratch votes. That is, the Hispanic police will not have a very decisive role in the resolution of the facts that

Disturbia suggests. Everything must be like the good-looking American would like: white boy looks for a white girl in the

urbanization of luxury single-family homes. Disturbia was born to be seasoned with popcorn and Yankee syrup (what

that'smore benefits left to the exhibition halls). It will not disappoint those who let themselves be carried away by their easy but

natural need to bask in this September that promises a lot of backward heat. Intrigue, none, we will not

find anything more than telefilm scares. Not even the sexual scenes promise a climax that surpasses that

of a commercial with a cute girl strolling palmito by the neighborhood. Warhol did not deceive his surrendered

spectator. Everyone knew that the empty banality of several colored Marilyn resides in that, in its electrifying

transience of the media fair.

" 0

" The man who could reign, is a film as immortal as the cinema itself, one of the jewels in the crown

of the genre of adventure.

Filming this film meant for John Huston to fulfill his long desire to bring to the big screen the

work of Rudyard Kipling The Man Who Would Be King. It had taken him several scripts and almost two decades to get

a definitive version of the story, and find the ideal actors for the project. At first

Huston would have wanted to have Humphrey Bogart and Clark Gable (it sounds really good!), But time passed and his

great friend Bogart and the most famous long-eared Hollywood died. It was also thought of Burt Lancaster and Kirk

Douglas. The project continued to be postponed, until in the 70s Huston contacted the mostpair of actors

famousof his time, Paul Newman and Robert Redford. Very rightly Newman advised Huston to hire British

actors. This was how two actors were reached whose chemistry on the big screen was such that it left the

Hindukush at the height of a small pebble. The faltering figure of a beggar breaks the silence surrounding the

young journalist Rudyard Kipling. In the shadows, a figure leaning on a cane moves heavily towards the

surprised editor. The beggar asks for water to quench his thirst. "You do not know me?" He asks. Kipling answers

negatively, and then gives him a drink. "Here we decided, here it was, in this room, do you remember?

Danny and I signed the contract and you were a witness. You were here, me there, and Danny here. Do you remember? "" The

journalist finally recognizes him. "" ���Carnehan! "". The beggar who was a proud British one day continues: "Peachy

Taliaferro Carnehan. Keep looking at me, so my soul will not escape. "" "" Carnehan! "" Repeats an astonished Kipling.

"The same," replies Peachy, "and not the same one who was at his side in a prime vag���n of the Marwar train

three summers and a thousand years ago." And with a flashback to a railway station three years ago begins one

of the films of definitive adventures. The man who could reign tells the story of a friendship and a

A time when much of the world was still an unknown and the romance of danger and what remained to be

discovered were still possible. It was a time when the white man trusted himself and his technology

to make his way through jungles and mountains and between inferior peoples who were destined to be dominated by

the great Christian power And among the white man the power to fear was Great Britain. In an India

recently subjugated by Victorian England, an ex-military brigand and Mason, Peachy Carnehan, survives by

emptying his pockets. English and clueless clueless. A young man dressed in white, thin, wearing

glasses and a thin mustache, steals a gold watch while buying a train ticket. When he contemplates the symbol

that crowns the clock chain, he curses his luck. He just robbed a companion more. When he tries to

return it, the traveler is already in his vag���n. Peachy looks for him and gets on it. There you will know he has stolen a

writer and journalist, Rudyard Kipling. Peachy will try to return the watch to him without his knowing it, but when

a rich Indian goes up to the vag���n accompanied by a sand���a his plans will go away Aln to the fret. Neither short nor lazy

take advantage to blame the Hindi for theft and throw him off the train. Kipling will tell you that he missed the clock at the

station. But among Freemasons, everything is forgiven. Later, Kipling will meet Danny, a burly

ex-petty officer with big sideburns to whom the journalist must deliver a message. Danny and Peachy, both

ex-soldiers of His Majesty's army, after almost stepping on the jail for blackmailing a sultan, will meet

in Kipling's office to to act as a witness in the signing of one of the most unique contracts ever written. Danny

and Peachy have risked their lives for Great Britain, like so many others like them, and have helped

make the country of Queen Victoria the first world power. However, its reward has been poverty and

oblivion. Proud, cheeky and without a penny ("I have good taste for whiskey, for women, for

vests and for many other things, but I can not exercise", says Peachy), both have decided that the pr��� Ximatime

neck jugarnto their advantage. His plan is to cross the Afghanistan, to cross the Hindukush and to become

kings of Kafirist���n, a region of warlike tribes. "They apparently have 32 kings," says Danny. "We

will be 33 and 34". "No white man has left from there alive since Alejandro," says Kipling. "What's

Alejandro?" "Asks Peachy. "" Alexander the Great, king of Greece "", responds the journalist. "" Well, if a

Greek did it, we will do it "", Peachy concludes. As I said, the English blood at that time was valued

in kilates. It is then when Peachy and Danny sign their contract before Kipling, in which they promise not to

try alcohol or women until they have achieved their goals, and they promise to divide all

profits equally. Even though Kipling thinks they are two crazy, everything seems to be well planned. The

next time the journalist meets them, he will be fascinated by the ingenuity of the two adventurers,

since he will not find himself before two Englishmen but before a mad magician and his assistant. Disguised in this way, they will cross the

border with a caravan and they will go into Afghanistan. If in the first half hour of film we have

attended above all the portrait of a �� The time and the colonial concept of life, as we begin to see

how close Danny and Peachy are together, is from Afghanistan where we really contemplate

in all its dimensions the strong and peculiar friendship that unites the British outcasts. Peachy is wit and

prudence, while Danny is the charisma and the heart. After surviving the Afghan guerrillas, the two

friends enter the Hindukush. "The mountains were tall and white like wild rams. They were always

fighting. At night he prevented us from sleeping the heat of his battles "". Danny is temporarily blinded by the

snow and follows the road caught at the tail of a mule. In an unreal moment, the English will run into two

giants. When they discover the secret of the silent guardians, the earth, which had mistreated them so much

but in a fate of destiny had left the way clear, collapses behind them. There is no going back.

In its passage through the mountains when at a crucial moment we can understand the idiosyncrasy of the two

characters and how their friendship goes beyond the usual. Trapped in the snow and believing themselves already dead, the two

friends remember old army exploits, sing yr���en. They have lived for a long time, and together theyovercome

havemany dangers and dodged many arrows and bullets. They know how to accept what fate brings them. At

no time is there any reproach, and both await the end with joy. But the avalanche that their laughter provoke

will open the way to Kafirist���n. Fate plays in your favor through your particular vision of life

and death. Arrived at Kafirist���n Peachy and Danny will implement their plan: introduce themselves to the king of the first

town they find and offer their services and their rifles to create a modern army and overthrow the rest

of the kings. For this they will have the unexpected help of Billy Fish, a gurka who has served in the British ranks

and who will act as translator for the two Englishmen. Fish will be the closest thing to a third friendcan

Danny and Peachyfind. As you will see very soon, the king has many enemies, who urinate

upstairs when they bathe (very deep-rooted custom among those tribes as they will soon check). Danny and

Peachy will soon be rid of the monarch patico and occupy the throne of the kingdom they are building.

Arrived at the village, Danny and Peachy are asked if they are gods. "We are not gods, we are English, which is almost

the same". A colonialist assertion that will take on a new dimension later on. The plan will follow its course

with success, but everything will change when Danny, who is unharmed after receiving a crush, is taken by the son

of Alexander the Great. As a king, Danny will be considered a God on Earth. On the advice of Peachy the

English continue with the deception. Before leaving with the Alexandrian treasure that the monks of the place have

custiodado during centuries, the English must wait for the monsoon season. Meanwhile, Peachy

builds a bridge over a great abyss and Danny plays his role as divine king. The patilludo soldier turns out to be

an excellent legislator and distributes justice "" as if he had invented the laws "", in the words of Peachy himself.

Once again, the friendship of the two Britons is unwavering. They have clear objectives, and the role

that each one plays in that particular association. At no time Peachy complains or shows any discomfort

for being suddenly a simple helper. Danny asks him to revere him too so as not to arouse suspicion.

Being a plea, Peachy accepts without further discussion. When the formidable plan is about to be fulfilled,

a woman crosses her path. Her name is Roxana, as the mythical wife of the Macedonian king, and Danny will be

captivated by her formidable exotic beauty. Peachy will manage to take away the idea of ​​approaching her

momentarily, but Danny's low passions will begin to make a dent in the discipline discipline of

man-God. The man who could reign is a song to a lost time and, as I said, an exaltation of

male friendship. Throughout the film the role of women is secondary, anecdotal. Out of the friendship

between Danny and Peachy the pictures are practically a sexual object. When Danny begins to believe his role,

the importance of the terms of the contract (basically, almost the terms of the friendship of the two scoundrels) will

float. When Danny decides to stay In Kafirist���n as the new king and take Roxana as his wife, for the

first time a fissure will arise in the friendship of Danny and Peachy. When in their room the two companions

argue for the first time, more than a curtain seems to separate them an abyss, as big and deep as that

on which they have built the bridge. The pact has been broken. The wrath of the god Imra looms over them. By

betraying their friendship and violating the contract, Danny has indirectly signed the fate of ���ly and Peachy. Although he

intends to leave with his share of the treasure, he can not deny Danny one last favor, and attend his royal wedding

to act as godfather. It could not be otherwise: like the formidable friends they are, Danny's

destiny will be linked to Peachy's. Both Michael Caine playing the cunning Peachy and Sean Connery playing

Danny are amazing in their performances. , achieving a chemistry on the screen much closer and closer

than that of Newman and Redford. The two Britons should have shot many more films together, but I guess

the poor success of the film did not make it possible. Although it is difficult to distinguish between two giants like these in what

were some of his best roles, Christopher Plummer manages to get his small piece of cake embodying

Kipling, fitting the paper with the softness and perfection Den a silk glove. From the actor who plays

Fish and from whom little has been known to say that he endures the attack of the two adventurers, and being who they

are is saying a lot. Without a doubt, an endearing character. The beautiful Roxana is played by Caine's wife

around here (and I think they are still together today), Shakira Caine. A lucky guy, this Michael.

When Huston was already almost desperate to find his Roxana, ���ly other guests saw Shakira at a

party and could not help but say that fate had put her there for them. One of the constants in the

career of John Huston has been his intuition to surround himself with good writers and a particular sense of smell and know how to

make almost logical to adapt literary works. His cinematic adaptation of the monstrous Moby Dick is

proof of that. In this film, Huston used a regular collaborator, Gladys Hill, to write the script.

The construction of the story is perfect: we have action, adventure, humor and drama in equal parts. The

imprint of a male in the American sense as was Huston is noticeable in the construction of that

typically masculine and brave friendship that Danny and Peachy maintain. The work behind the scenes of Huston is equally

impeccable, maintaining a balanced rhythm at all times, letting everything flow naturally,

developing the characters at the time the story runs its course. A craftsmanship that has not

had the reputation of subsequent adventure films like the Indiana Jones archifamosa. I will not enter

to affirm which one is better, for me they are all great movies of the genre, but I know that I think that the man who could

reign has a romanticism a���ejo of which the archaeologist's films with a whip are completely lacking. In one of the

most fleeting and strange cinematographic careers, the old man who plays the debut priest � in the cinema at

the age of 103 years. Huston discovered him while his grandfather worked as a night watchman in an olive grove. The

director offered him the paper and the good man accepted. In the first days everything seemed to be going well (you could not

interpret a cham���n in a more realistic way, it seemed that the priest had been contemporary of the same

Alejandro) but the team soon noticed that the Moroccan was asleep in the filming. The reason was that the poor man

had continued his work as a watchman. Huston made him see that with what they were going to pay he could forget about

the olive trees forever. In addition, seeing some scenes filmed, the old man considered that from then on he

would be immortal. This man might have been an illiterate guardian of olive groves, but of course he knew how to understand

the first thing that consisted in cinema. The man who could reign is a film as immortal as the

cinema itself, one of the jewels in the crown of the adventure genre.

" 1

" How Carol Reed did not need Orson Welles to get a small masterpiece. Very good and funny film by Carol Reed, a great director who has unfairly been relegated to a

second order, for believing for many years that his best film "" the third man "" was actually directed

by Orson Welles, something only in a small to true part. This one is magnificently directed and

interpreted.Alec Guinnes is superb, the film has a wonderful staging, very good use of the

Cinemascope, with a blank photograph and lovely black Extreme English humor that is intoxicating, and

some steely and double-edged di���logos. In short, a film where one is at all times with a smile in

the mouth, when not with the grateful laughter. If you have the opportunity to see this little masterpiece,

losing it will be a very bad idea.

" 1

" It is told with such enthusiasm and in moments it is so frenetic that one contemplates it, not only as an

extraordinarily accomplished story, but also as something absolutely believed. Eble and incredible at the same time. A

real achievement.

Francis Ford Coppola reinvented the mafia cinema with the undisputed masterpiece The Godfather. We could say

that after this trilogy became world famous, they had little to see the newincursions

cinematicin the mafia with these films. That is to say, there was no such quality or success like the one that

Coppola had achieved, although there were some marvels of the genre that did not deserve to be forgotten, such

as the recent Infiltrados or Eastern Promises (I have not seen Scarface, for the record). And, as a stroke of

luck, at the end of a year as mediocre as it was in 2007 we get a wonder called American Gangster,

the first incursion of Ridley Scott in the world of the mafia. And what a raid! It is a truly

vibrant, fascinating film, one of those experiences that you can not miss. It is told with such enthusiasm and in

moments it is so frenetic that one contemplates it, not only as an extraordinarily accomplished story, but

also as something absolutely believable and Incredible at the same time And therefore, there is no doubt that this is an

unforgettable new show of good mafia cinema. An authentic achievement. Probably has a weak point

quite evident, and is that its excessive duration does not allow it to finish rounded as a masterpiece.

It contains scenes that could be excluded perfectly, thus creating a film that is even more entertaining and not so loaded with

so many details. Despite this, Scott gets a fast pace and memorable scenes and as fast as the

assault to the empire of the drug or exciting as the meeting between Frank Lucas and Richie Roberts to the exit of

the church (surely one of the best cinematographic scenes). Last year's figures). And to say that everything is

underpinned by a very correct script by Steven Zaillian, although too loaded with unnecessary moments and

secondary characters. But it is that, as in every great film, the situations and characters that appear are

many and varied, with two protagonists of opposite ideas that dominate this cage of crickets (or drugs)

called Harlem. First of all, it is an exciting film, full of life and with excellently written di ,logos, those of

taking off the hat (located, above all, in its final stretch). And it is possible that American Gangster contains

one of the most intelligent and magisterial non-surprise endings of the last years, even to the most typical. Everything in

this film, rather, is grandiloquent, in spite of containing small personal sections like the divorce of the

detective Roberts or the relation of Lucas with his wife. The issue of the drug, however, is not shown as a

background, and that is a great point in favor. Perhaps the film does not contain too many scenes related

to the fateful situation of drug addicts, but we assume that it is a terrible vice and

we observe how in the The seventies drug was a key point in American society. Terrible, but

true. In spite of everything, the two main characters are the center of the film. And, without a doubt, there could be no

better choice than that of Denzel Washington and Russel Crowe (two actors like a pine tree). Their

interpretations are, simply, impressive, seem out of reality. And in many ways

American Gangster is close to reality (unforgettable the last dialogue between Lucas and his mother). They may

seem typical, as if the basic portraits of mobster and police were added without more and had no

hint of originality, but I assure you that if one is attentive, Frank Lucas has little to do with any other

gangster seen in the movies. Of course, Washington gives us an exceptional role, full of charisma and hard

character, with a kind of transformation towards the end that definitely excludes themodel

gngster. This is, without a doubt, an authentic American gangster, with personality and hidden facets that are not very

recognizable. He is a real character. And Richie Roberts, masterfully characterized by a superb Russel Crowe

that has little to do with the sad mind of Lucas. This is an honest man (maybe too much), with ideas

quite clear and gross to say enough. You can also look like the typical police inspector of a

seventies movie, but some of his di���logos and, above all, the one that keeps the g ���ngster, they are so

memorable and different from what we are accustomed to see that it separates him from the basic model of divorced hard

to peel. The secondary ones are all very correct, although they do not reach the high level of interpretation of the

two protagonists. A masterful film, close and frenetic. A non-pretentious social criticism that can be

described as grandiose, passionate and narratively perfect. However, its excessive duration prevents it from

reaching the masterpiece it could have been. And to round off, two performances worthy of an Oscar

each and a no less brilliant address. I hope that throughout the years he will be remembered as the authentic

classical (now modern) that he is.

" 1

" The film has funny moments of good black humor, some scare well achieved or certaingores scenes

well-resolvedbut overall it suffers from a certainly mediocre makeup.

The unknown DAVID GEBROE apparently loved I ZOMBIE and DEAD CREATURES of ANDREW PARKINSON and he said to

copy quickly to see if I get the original thing. Of course, the idea of ​​developing the ZOMBIE

phenomena in favor of the drama of an illness was much better done by PARKINSON, therefore he got much more

humor with a relationship of couple by means of something similar to MORTAL ZOMBIE one of the few decent films of

YUZNA.The director with a very low budget that oscillates the amateur returns to count on the same actors of his

opera prima, the horrific comedy THE HOMEBOY that less you get the urge and are the highlight of

mediocrity general.El film has fun moments of good black humor, some scare well achieved or

certain GORES scenes well resolved but overall suffers from a makeup certainly mediocre with little

force in the development of a story that improves in the end for an attempt that had good spirit although it

is disappointing and is that not everyone has the talent of PARKINSON that if you saw this film is weird I do not

pong to the cry in the sky after seeing their ideas plundered.

" 0

" With a work that only this scene of action offers as a reason for praise to the film, or the interest that

can provoke the physical attractiveness of the actors, and above all, the actresses, nothing can save the product of the

most resounding suspense.

On the occasion of today's DVD release of Michael Bay's new superproduction, I was encouraged to

take a look at it with certain cold sweats that ran through my column in the face of the fear of violence that they produce

most of Mr. Bay's films (all mediocrity except the sympathetic, and little more, two parts of TwoPolice

Rebel). I have even made the intention of avoiding any intention of looking for a meaning in the film, and

simply letting myself be carried away by a fleeting, forgetful entertainment that made me disconnect a bit from

so much analysis. Technical, acting or any other kind of quality judgment on the film, adding to all

this my dose of popcorn and coca cola, as it should be with a product like that. Well, despite my good intentions,

and I really promise that I have tried, again the cold sweat has taken over me, watching this new

bombing in the form of Michael Bay film. a good start to the rhythm of pure and simple action, it is clear that

any attempt to find a film with a minimal sense of narrative rhythm would be a utopian ,

demonstrating Michael Bay with this Transformers what an aspiring filmmaker should never do to learn to

tell a story. Everything happens at a rushed pace, illogical and absurd, with several stories crossed in

different parts of the world that end up crossing in the most illogical and impossible way seen in the ��� last

months on a screen. A confusing plot and narrative that is an absolute waste. We will never know

whether the script really exists or is a mere excuse for certain actors more limited than

Stallone in a Shakespearian drama give free rein to their shameful acting. All framed in a

story that really is ridiculous, about two races of alien robots (good and bad, as

simple as that) that seek on earth an object that will give them the ultimate power to some, or protect the

universe to others. With regard to those actors who swarm through the film, say that of course, as a good

Hollywood mediocre superproduction (and yes, I think there are good ones, but not this one in particular) resorts to

different actors of diverse strata to satisfy all type of public, beginning by the pretty faces

of televising announcement indispensable in all work (sic) of Bay as the bell�� Just Megan Fox and Rachael Taylor,

or in their male version with Tyrese Gibson and Josh Duhamel shedding testosterone from all the pores of his

body (to the rejoicing of the pictures), ya���adi� Serving young actors such as the promising Shia Lebouf, that in

this film is perhaps of little salvability, or actors of certain prestige that one wonders what the hell they do

in this nullity, like John Voight and John Turturro (simply sorry the latter). Separate mention for that

irritating black actor named Anthony Anderson and his corresponding appearance in every film of these

characteristics. Truly, if it were Megatron, I would go straight for it without thinking about it. Little more than

adding, horrible narration, painful gui���n, I said. logos stupid everywhere, and little to be saved from such a

disproportion. If we add to this an exaggerated duration for the little story that counts, we have the most

absolute philological nullity. In an effort to find something positive, say that Bay has a virtue (perhaps the

only one), which consists in creating set pieces of proven effectiveness in the action scenes, the best of the film

without a doubt those 20 last minutes in which the very high budget really sees its investment justified,

with a confrontation between robots that remove hiccups in certain scenes. In short, with a job that

only offers this action scene as a reason for praise for the film, or the interest that can provoke the

physical attractiveness of the actors, and above all, the actresses, nothing can save the product of the mostsuspense

resounding. All of this analyzed from the prism of the cinema as art, or as a minimum of worthy entertainment, because of

course, there will always be someone who is limited to making the audience dizzy. Avoid

even wondering what they're showing you, find him some attraction. A server.NO.Something more than adding,

by budget, intentions, and excessive ambition, the worst movie of the year by far.

" 0

" If you're scared of disgust, you may be interested. If you look for the scary movie that appears in the

trailers, you better rent The Exorcist or something like that, which is more disgusting than scary.

I believe that there are two ways of giving fear, with disgust or with scares. For example, a film in someone

looks at a mirror that is soiled and, when he cleans it, sees that he has a knife behind him at the ready, this is

scare. If in the same case as before, instead of a gentleman knife at the ready, we have a man with a face that

falls to pieces, eyes hanging out of the orbits and that pulls hair to strands, this is disgusting. The

first mode I like, the second I find disgusting (although it has an extensive public). If there are people who

like Antena 3 movies at midday, why are not there people who like giblets? The

film is about some kids who deserve to die from the first scene (this I contribute). By

circumstances of life, they decide to go to a distant city to see the end of I do not know what league. For the same

reasons that nobody knows, they decide to go by secondary roads. When night falls, they camp in a strange

place, which smells a bit strange. The girl, is brave and the next day, decides to investigate that smell.

It comes from a grotesque decoration in which a disgusting master pulls the corpses he finds in the gutter. And

with this introduction shit, a Spanish gentleman has made a film easy and a bad time. I think it's the

first time counting the film I put her to birth. I always wait for this paragraph. Anyway. The

film is a dirty one that gives a lot of disgust and little fright. The characters, as I say, deserve to die in a

road accident before reaching the ghost town. The most foolish character is the brother of the

protagonist, an expression of bad that wants to look, seems asshole. Which character more forced. The

sets, that's it, are quite interesting, and the wax figures are scary. The general idea is not bad, but

that more fat crap of development. Especially the ember that they give us until they arrive at the town, that we care very little.

Resuming, that if you are scared of disgust, you may be interested. If you look for the movie of

fear that appears in the trailers, you better rent the exorcist or something like that, that is more disgusting than

fear. What a disgrace !!!! Besitos.PD: The scene on the piano still stirs my stomach. PS2: Now that I

think about it, you may have to see the disgust I got from the two bottles of wine I had between my chest and my back.

Who knows. PD3: The house wax if it is cool, although physically complicated. PD4: If at least they were

bare breasts of virginal maidens, but not even that.

" 0

" Shane Black's fox was saved for his best guide: the one that, once exposed and assimilated by

all the clichés of the genre, the dynamite after yes, to make almost any variant revision almost impossible.

As many people had put through the clouds the premiere in the direction of Shane Black, the guy who took the action

cinema the highest in the 90s ('Lethal Weapon', 'The Last Boy Scout', 'The Last Great Hero') and then

practically disappeared without a trace (at least in the IMDB), I decided to see the work in question. And despite

the expectations, I came to be surprised. And how 'Kiss Kiss Bang Bang' (2005) has the classic elements

of cinema that Shane Black helped make the past decade: an unlikely pair of researchers, a

complicated plot with kidnapping and dead in bulk, an antihero looking for his redemption, cynical dialogues, a

grand finale of about 15 million dollars, minimal. But the fox of Shane Black was saved for its best

guide: the one that, once exposed and assimilated by all the clichés of the genre, the dynamite behind it, to

make almost impossible any variant revision. He created the monster, he destroys it. Shane Black strives

to take the opposite himself, with surprising results: the protagonist, Harry Lockhart (huge

Robert Downey, Jr.) is a kind of apprentice Martin Riggs or Joe Hallenbeck, with the proviso that it does not hit

or seals, and kill or speak. Gay Perry (at last another great role for Val Kilmer) is his companion of

wanderings, nothing less than a white, gay, pedantic and bad-tempered detective (the antipodes of the characters

played by Danny Glover and Damon Wayans in 'Lethal Weapon' and 'The Last Boy Scout'). Harmony (awesome and

funny Michelle Monaghan) is the sexy, young girl who is always kidnapped insuccessful screenplays

Black's previous, but here she is less sexy, less young and good, let's say that more dif� Easy to hunt. Theplot

criminalis a small matter, compared to the drug trafficking in the American army or the corruption

of soccer ���dem. Instead of blowing up buildings in the air, there is a huge coffin and the surprising thing, as I say, is

that it works. Probably because Black knows as nobody the public to whom this film is directed: the

same fans of his cinema of the 90s, but ten years later. ,S, saturated, difficult to impress but

nostalgic for the genre, after all. The key elements are there (impeccable chemistry between the

protagonists, a scene of torture that is clearly self-contained, evil screw-ups, a car sinking

into the water. ). And this time reinforces the product with fun direct guides to the viewer, who only

has two options: to leave the cinema frightened before such scam, to the cry of "" this it does not go with me ""; or forget

about depth of argument, coherence of plots, etc., and enjoy each self-homage, each gag,

each broken unwritten rule, muttering to himself: "" it was time you came back, Shane "" .A 9, despite the fact that

the police plot does not hold up. Cool.

" 1

" Raw, honest, organic, emotive: This is London is an uncomfortable film, which is not forgotten ... Despite what the public, ill-informed, tells , This is England is not about the origin of

the skinhead movement in England. He does not even over-recreate himself in illuminating our ignorance withlandscapes

urbanburned by unemployment, racism, drugs and the infinite tedium of never knowing what to do. Nor does it

inform on the way in which youth loses innocence and snubs their discomfort in the permeable, warm and

fraternal belonging to a group. What This England is doing is offering a ugly and sincere, emotional andportrait

realisticof affection or love or friendship. And he does it with the reliable skinhead wrapping and his heads

to the zero, his high boots and his ignorant nationalism, learned at the foot of beer, without foundation records or

bureaucratic committees that Stab him. People of little emotional imbrication, but who share very

solid codes based on a slight inclination towards violence, street hedonism and similarpatterns.

imagingRichardson, Ken Loach, Mike Leigh, Michael Winterbottom or Danny Boyle had previously prefixed antone

English proletarian classand handled stories of simple people, suffocated by unemployment or theanorexia

mentalof a gray, pacata, condemned society to fail in the management of their own happiness and devoid of

horizons outside the neighborhood, of the industry in the outskirts, of the bar with generous pints and folk on the radio,

but Shane Meadows formulates a more modest initiation exercise, has a voice of its own,discarding

proudlyall influence of classic British realism (those illustrious names to a greater or lesser extent) and

offering a model of Modern cu ,om���s, giving ps keys icol���gicas (the dead father in the front of the

Malvinas or Falklands) or even historical (the skins stripped of racism, but it is the far right that

manipulates them and converts them into what we know today). And also Meadows paints some skins wanting to have

fun, colleagues of his colleagues, little interested in making life worse than it is. In fact, the gang

bifurcates in two: those who seek good vibes and beers of Saturday night under the vacillan rhythm of the Jamaican ska and those

who seek to build a camorra, stone pakis and paint soflamas that they do not understand in the underground passages of the gray

city ​​in which they live. Both factions live, however, in orphanage, stripped of solid family

ties and thrown into a hotbed of violence where fanaticism rummages in mediocrity to extract

fear. The oppressed working class (the working class heroes of Lennon) lacks glamor, drink in a bottle of

third and walk dressed in style (what they believed) while the city collapses and crushes them. Their children are self-

confessed losers: Meadows grants these anti-heroes the humanity that others denied them, gives them humility, a

heart almost. Salvas, hurras and ca���ones to the interpretation: characters that give life to actors in a state of grace,

who act almost without effort, imbuing with faith the routine, gray and toxic life of these neighborhood losers.

Thomas Turgoose, the twelve-year-old kid who opens and closes the function, leaves the viewer knocked out. If you

can, watch the film in English, subtitled. Ah��� wins even more even. The score of the film is prodigious

(Ludovico Einaudi) and its soundtrack is a generous compilation of ska, soul, funk and folk-rock (Toots and The

Maytals, remnants of Soft Cell, by Dexys Midnight Runners.) Eighty they were screwed, were not they?

" 1

" There are so many virtues of 'Sweeney Todd' that the result is a spectacular musical that returns us to the

wildest Burton since the nineties.

They say that Tim Burton took a long time behind adapting Stephenmost macabre musical

Sondheim's, 'Sweeney Todd: The Demon Barber of Fleet Street', and seen the result one can not deny that the

wait was worth it. Especially for the director himself, who puts all the meat on the grill to sign

his most gross film from his already brutish 'Mars Attacks!' The story is faithful to the musical almost at

bottom: Benjamin Barker, once an illusive barber, returns to his native London after fifteen years locked up for a

crime he did not commit under a new identity: Sweeney Todd. When he returns to his old barber shop, he discovers that everything

he had has been taken from him, and he is plotting revenge against the corrupt judge who caused his misfortune. With

the help of Nellie Lovett, a dark baker, and her silver razor blades, Sweeney Todd will unleash

an orgy of blood that will become more and more ruthless. , reaching guilty and innocent alike. With

'Sweeney Todd', Tim Burton proves that he is one of the few Hollywood directors capable of setting aside

the tepid and moral or familiar conventions that dominate current American cinema. The original work was already

an example of how evil, cynicism and amorality are at ease for modern society, but thething

complicatedwas to bring that sense of rottenness to the big screen in times of correction. n Politics and

self-censorship. The small miracle has been done by the Californian director, who would have had a great time filming

the degollinas of the deranged diabolic barber and his repulsive accomplice. And speaking of c�� Accomplices: if John

Carpenter has Kurt Russell, Tim Burton has Johnny Depp. His ���lter ego on the screen since the time of

'Eduardo Scissorhands' is at ease playing Sweeney Todd brilliantly, with his obsessive

slopes. A new freak to add to his long list, with the proviso that this may be the one that serves on a

platter the Oscar that has been pursuing his entire career. And next to Depp is Helena Bonham Carter, who

gives the perfect reply to Depp with a Mrs. Lovett in the fine line that separates unconditional love from

mass murder (of bread) . Also notable are Alan Rickman and Timothy Spall as the villains of the function, and an

unrecognizable Sacha Baron Cohen and a young Ed Sanders effectively underpin the high level of

adaptation Cn.Close the chapter of flattery, highlights (once again in the cinema of Burton) ambientaci���nt���trica and

oppressive nineteenth-century London charge of the legendary Dante Ferretti and the gloomy picture of Dariusz

Wolski (see their histories and tell me if Tim Burton does not choose his collaborators well). All the elements are

added to the original music of Sondheim, and the result is a luxury show at all levels. But not

everything in 'Sweeney Todd' works. The big problem when it comes to adapting a musical to the cinema is to measure

correctly the percentage of "" musicality "" that the film will have, and in this case Tim Burton has sinned to be

excessively faithful to the original. It has been a long time since I saw a musical musical SOAN (easily 90% of the

function is sung), and although most of the n� ��meros are bright and are perfectly embedded in the

plot, there are times when it is inevitable to feel outside the sinister and hooligan spirit of it.

In particular, attention is drawn to the moments in which the other protagonist of the story appears, which

in the musical must fulfill the function of "" lyrical moments "" and of counterweight to the black adventures of Todd, but

in the film appear as dead times that, to top it all, are even irrelevant to theplot.

mainStill, there are so many virtues of 'Sweeney Todd 'that the result is a spectacular musical thatus

returnsto the most wild Burton since the nineties. Pity of the insipid couple co-protagonist. An 8'5.

" 1

" Movie of little action on a secret agent that begins in this of the licenses to kill. Almost better

we wait for its version in DVD and we enjoy it a rainy day.

To me the 007 this I never finished to like, although thanks to the fondness of my father by therefinement

bondiano, I have swallowed all in repeated occasions. Anta���o, the viewing of one of his tapes was a

family event because, although you did not like it much, you had to admit that the explosions, the

action, the odds and ends he used, etc. , were unique in the movies of the time. Now the subject has changed and

any movie has special effects of esc���ndalo, so it costs more to highlight the movies with

"" license to kill "". This is a secret agent in the service of the British government that kills two

people to be double zero. Then in his first mission almost creates an international conflict, so they give him

a vacation, which takes the opportunity to pull the thread and discover a bad taco guy who cries blood through an

eye. So he gets into a multimillion-dollar game to keep this man in the dust and take millions from

international terrorism (if he had given him a shot at the beginning of the movie, he would end up there ) What about

the movie? I'm glad you asked me this question, friend. The film has been quite weak, and

I expected little. To begin with, they have taken (the actor and the character) a pretty garrulous Bond, withmanners

unrefinedthat will humanize him, but that take away all the glamor. Maybe it's right for the times

, but I prefer an anachronistic character. They show us the evolution of the character, as it matures during the

recording, but in the cinema of pure and simple entertainment that's enough. Then, where is the action? It has three

scenes "" trepidantes "", some sex and love, an eternal and boring game for those who do not understand

poker, some characteristic humor and that I like and little m��� s. The tape does not waste any action as expected and

has a guiding depth that I did not think was necessary. By the way, the torture scene is a bit

pathetic. Resuming, a film of little action on a secret agent that starts with the license to

kill. Almost better we wait for its version in DVD and we enjoy it a rainy day.

" 0

" Raimi has confused complexity with excess. Instead of an hour and a half he has shot more than two, instead

of a villain he has gathered three.

A friend who reads the vignettes tells me that, in the universe of superheroes, Spiderman represents thehero

complex. That leads me to two conclusions, the first, that the discomfort of the film is probably more

applicable to Stan Lee than to Sam Raimi, and the second, that if it pretended to be complex, he only remains in the attempt.

Peter Parker is as complex as a chorizo ​​sandwich. Raimi has confused complexity with excess.

Instead of an hour andhalf he has shot more than two, instead of a villain has met three. Sandman chases

Spiderman because he is an outraged father. His friend Harry Osborn is a son in search of revenge that can not fail

to fulfill the will of his father. Venom is a photographer who competes with Peter Parker and hates Spiderman because he

believes he took his girlfriend and the post. Almost all the bad guys are victims of some confusion, just like the

girl. That gives them the possibility of waking up from their self-deception but never before doing something to

Spiderman that fuels their infinite self-pity and justifies a scene of action. Spiderman is a series where

the tr The transition between good and evil is not particularly complicated. Apart from the mistakes that everyone

commits to commit, there are external forces. The bad guys invent things that end up dominating them, like

the Green Goblin, or Doc Oc. In this third installment appears a black plasticine that adheres to the victim and

brings out the worst that is inside. The background of "" Spiderman "" is that no one is bad, what happens is that ahand

black, either in the form of a chemical formula, or in the form of sticky tar, is to blame behave badly

Small children are worth those explanations to go pulling; politicians would love to have them to

justify their blunders (who doubts Aznar was abducted, or drugged by Bush's cigar,

when he signed the Pact of the Azores?); but aspiring creators of complex heroes should squeeze their brains

a little bit more. When the starry tar takes over Spiderman and pulls his suit black , and his soul, the

hero becomes a bad guy. Which would explain to readers / viewers what aconsists of

bad guy. The evil consists, according to Lee / Raimi, in a provocative fringe and a casual walk, in the style of

Travolta. It consists of parading through a fashionable place embracing the vampires and dancing with frenes��� like a

lig quen who has lived all his life in those slums. The good consists of Peter Parker's rueful gaze, faithful

as a lamb. Jerry Lewis suffered the same dichotomy in "" The Crazy Professor "", when the clumsyteacher

insecuretransformed into Buddy Love. Jim Carrey suffered it, or he enjoyed it, in "" The mask "". The three

share the same disgust towards that type of heroes that in other movie theaters, a couple of streets down,

they delight the whole world.

" 0

" In Promesas del Este, David Cronemberg demonstrates that he is in top form, portraying violence in a

raw and stark manner.

Since his early years, cinema has always felt a great fascination towards organized crime and everything

that revolves around it. There is nothing like banning something for a person or group of people to start

providing that good or services clandestinely. And these are the stories that interest the cinema,

although all are eclipsed by the most famous capo in Chicago. But, why is the Mafia

in the cinema always related to the Italian-American mafias? David Cronemberg was released two years ago A

History of Violence, film Encula in which he analyzed the psychological causes that provokeoutbursts

violent. It was the story, worth the redundancy, of a gangster who tried to lead a life away from

crime, among ordinary people. However, in Eastern Promises is the opposite way, it is aperson

normal, Anna (Naomi Watts) who is unwittingly involved in the machinations of a powerful family of the

Russian mafia. On this occasion, Cronemberg makes a portrait of the hierarchy, power struggles andconflicts

personalthat occur within a mafia family. It also shows raw and stark violence,

as already announced by the brutal initial scene, which will leave the viewer impacted by his harshness and savagery. With a

great visual power, Cronemberg introduces you with a firm pulse into the entrails of history, and once you reach

that point, you can only observe the mastery of a filmmaker like David Cronemberg. Viggo Mortensen

performs what is surely his best performance on the big screen, as he brilliantly composes

the disturbing and enigmatic Nikolai. In Eastern Promises, David Cronemberg demonstrates that he is in full way,

portraying violence in a raw and stark way. It is an exciting story, and without a doubt,

one of the best films in what we have been in 2007.

" 1

" Only twenty minutes of the spectacular fight in LA are saved, although remember

"" Tranformers "", it continues to work like a charm, having fun like few others do. Pity that it is completely

insufficient.

Hyung-rae Shim writes and directs a unique story in which everything has a place: a curse, dragons and

giant snakes, and the army of the USA. The journalist Ethan discovers in one of his recordings what

looks like a giant scale reptile. It is immediately familiar to him, as he remembers how he saw something similar

in an antiquity shop when he was a child, in which his owner explained that Ethan himself He was the protagonist of a myth

that is repeated every five hundred years. According to the legend, two giant snakes, one good and one bad, come out of

their hiding places to reach a girl that generation after generation was born with a dragon mark on his

shoulder It contains the necessary element so that the snake that finds it before becomes a dragon

and reaches the kingdom of heaven where it will remain for the next five hundred years. or something like that. The idea of

placing a fight between dragons and army in the middle of a city as imposing as Los Angeles was in

advance a stimulating proposal. Sensation that was confirmed when watching the spectacular trailers that

circulated through the network, where special effects were appreciated colorful and very careful. Even the argument

could be, at least, curious, by adapting a legend of South Korean culture to the present.

Unfortunately, the final result is a genuine disappointment, because there is no where to take "" D-War. "" There are many

failures that brutalize the film, in most of its aspects. The performances are all regrettable, with

special mention for Jason Behr (Ethan) and Robert Forster (who plays the owner of the antiquarian and mentor of the

protagonist). I do not know what the casting directors would be thinking about, although it's true that in a

film like that they do not look for Oscar-winning jobs either. Another important burden is the entire assembly. Planes

cut without sense, flashbacks of flashbacks (in the initial stretch above all) that are not only ridiculous, but

that make you lose your head, are just a couple of examples of the galimat�� Visual alas we attend. Only

a couple of shots are saved in which, through awkward zooms and tremulous filming, something ofis achieved

(impossible) realism, as if it were a documentary. But where else was it used? ���a "" Dragon Wars "" is in your

gui���n. Vac���oy little stimulating, moves through all the popcorn movie theaters resorting to absurd

situations that have neither feet nor head (see the time when boy and girl kiss, I had Being known

only a few hours before and with a giant snake chasing them) and constant references to "" Jurassic Park ""

or "" King Kong "". It is impossible to take this film seriously, but it is that even without doing it, you can not

accept such desprop���sitos.La truth is that this film that promised so much, onlyare saved

the twenty minutes of the spectacular fight in LA, that although I remember "" Tranformers "" enough, it still

works like a charm, having fun like few others do. Pity that it is completely insufficient. Do not waste

your time.

" 0

" In 1988, John McTiernan directed an action movie that had a charismatic and humorous character, something

that was not abundant at the time (now yes?) Since if we look at his billboard companions then we

meet Seagal, Van Damme or the uncle of Crocodile Dundee.

In 1988, John McTiernan directed an action movie that had a charismatic and humorous character, something that was

not abundant at the time (now if?) Because if we look at his fellow billboards then weourselves

findat Seagal (Above the Law), Van Damme (Bloody Contact) or the Uncle Crocodile

Dundee.There were also great gifts like Mu� Diabolic Echo, A fish called Wanda or Cocktail. The Crystal Jungle

presented a cop with very bad host and problems at home in a skyscraper full of foreign terrorists

very bloody and with small feet What would not Tarantino do with McClaine's feet? The cop confronts

the threat with effort, sweat, blood, ultraviolence and plastic explosive. The bad ones obey Hans Gruber,

a guy who remembers the Sheriff of Nottingham and who is cool to hell. Your hand will not shake when you count to

three and burst the head of Holly Gennero's boss. Sorry, John. A 9.

" 1

" The main problem is a bad direction of actors, a very poor development of the gui��� and an

exaggerated search of the fright punctual rather than terror.

Joel Schumacher moves on to the supernatural and psychological thriller with The Number 23, aplot film

promising and interestingto which the limitations of its director and part of the cast have turned into a

film vulgar. Starting from a brilliant and breathtaking start that generates illusions, the slow and slow rhythm

is imposed as the footage progresses, which together with the attempt to cover too many areas without

focusing on any, end up causing boredom and certain hast� ��o.At the end, one has the feeling of being in

front of a story with several different morals and philosophical pretensions, instead of a good

horror film, which is what was really expected from she. The fact that its main character is one of the

greatest histrions in history, who has never been very clear about the difference between acting and playing the imbecile,

does not help either. And the fact is that Jim Carrey's face is associated with grimaces and strange gestures, but difficultly with

fear or fear, despite his repeated attempts to look like a real dramatic actor and get so two

of its main goals, which have long been earning the respect of the Academy so that they reward him with

an Oscar and be considered a real actor. Possibly get the first of the two alginda. In spite of

everything, in this film it is clearly observed that the main problem is a bad direction of actors, a

very deficient development of the gui��� and an exaggerated search of the scare punctual more than terror. To take

a nap in the movies, or have an original coaster when it is edited on DVD, could serve. On the

contrary, if what you want is to spend a good afternoon or night of suspense, in no case do you consider throwing

money in the entrance.

" 0

" Will please all those unconditional of Terry Gilliam. Those who do not have a bomb-proof stomach

are going to have a really bad time ...

With two years of delay it will be on our screens next June 8th. "" Tideland "" , the last film by

Terry Gilliam. Not even the FIPRESCI Prize that he won at the San Sebastian Film Festival in 2005 has

managed to make a dent in the Spanish undercard to this film, hard to digest, and which provokes reactions

found in the spectators who have the opportunity to see it. To show a button. When the film was shot

in Donostia, more than half of the audience left the theater. Even the critics left

the projection with an upset stomach. Gilliam also won the appreciation of journalists when in the press

conference after the film described as stupid the spectators who had left the room because theynot

couldstand The avatars of the child and the corpse. Inspired freely by the homonymous novel by Mitch

Cullin, the filmmaker tells the story of a girl whose parents are yonkis in the city and that due to avatars of

fate, the orphan is left in the countryside. However on this occasion the director of such emblematic films as "" 12

monos "" or "" Brazil "" goes almost to the saddest and macabre sadism to tell this story that He says it has to do

with "" eyes of a child "" and in which the line between reality and fiction is very narrow. Despite his passing through

Donostia and the award he received there, this film has not enjoyed good reviews and is a turning point

in the career of this filmmaker. From my point of view there are too gruesome moments that border on

sadism and that do not really contribute anything to the story (like everything that happens to the corpse) and I am not

convinced by the interpretation of Jodelle Ferland, who at that time I had 10 years, and sometimes it

seems too exaggerated. Maybe all those who are unconditional (but really unconditional) of

Terry Gilliam will like it. However, all those who do not have a bomb-proof stomach will really have a hard

time because there are really macabre moments in the movie

" 0

" The most accomplished of Isao Takahata in addition to a summit for the genre. It has its own identity signs in addition to the signature of the Ghibli studio, without However, we are not talking about Hayao

Miyazaki but about Isao Takahata. With similar and occasionally shared careers (Marco, Heidi) the second one

has been more experimental and therefore more irregular. The Tomb of the Luci���rnagas is his most successful

film, in addition to a summit for the genre. So much so that a prestigious American critic said that it is

a must-see masterpiece for everyone, but above all for those who still need to see it. Today, they

dare to deny the bread to the animation. Children are children and need their mothers. Marco traveled half the

world, from Italy to the Andes, to meet his. Seita, our protagonist, does not have that

opportunity: it is possible that his parents were taken away by World War II. Her priority should be to

protect her sister, mature quickly, and lose her childhood so she can preserve his own. That is

his sacrifice, accepting responsibilities and that his sister can continue to dream without noticing thather

bombs are falling aroundand people are dying everywhere. The only good thing is that the more Seita gets involved in getting

older, there will always be something left of the child she has inside, the one who builds a tomb based on luci. ���rnagas

convinced that he is the best possible bunker against human barbarism.

" 1

" Never, I repeat never, I have seen a film more bad than this one. The jokes that he makes do not seem funny to me

while the situations seem pathetic to me.

I do not like that a film needs a previous explanation to be able to see it, or that they have to

explain it to you. It's like the prologues of a book, that only they have to serve to thank and things like that, not to

explain of what goes. That's already the book, which is the work you actually buy. Well, the same with the

movies. You can not see one and not know if it is a documentary, if they are actors, if it is serious or if it is a

farce. The film is about a journalist from Kazakhstan who goes to the US Make a documentary about life

in that country and modernize yours. Travel together with a fat producer (and we assume that the camera thathim

records, that does not come out) and companion of hardships. In his trip through the US, he shows us how the people of the

deep American react to the situations he poses. It seems to be trying to be a current portrait of the

United States, from within. Never, never again, have I seen a film more bad than this one. The jokes he makes

do not seem funny to me while the situations seem pathetic and shameful to others. The portrait that

shows us this kind of documentary can be very faithful to those that are cooked in the first power, but what

interest does it have outside its borders? And what's more, should it show like this? I do not know, calling this movie seems to me

very daring, with jokes of the guy who fucks (sexy show) his sister or who has locked up a brother

behind bars while his sister teaches him Rabbit. It has even been

outrageous to me. Resuming, the worst "" movie "" I've ever seen. A total and absolute scam for the spectator,

where, without order or concert tries to bring to the limit situations "" normal "". Of vomiting.

" 0

" Fill the heart of much lover of cinema that seeks, among so much trash and so much fire of artifice, a

restful trip to another world. Run to the cinema. Go take it away and put in place a rubbish.

It is often insisted on pointing out that the cinema that lacks means oozes ingenuity. This argument is not a

monopoly of the seventh art, but it is affirmed in it with more bombast evidence. A study does not leave a paste

in a film if you suspect that the product may be weak at the box office. Exceptions, of course. We are

very quick to see American movies that smell like money in every frame. This is not new. What I think

is new is that there is a new European cinema commercial approaches very similar to those that

are styled in Hollywood. Cinema is art and it is business. Or even it's business and, sometimes, art. As I've been

a long time without seeing art in recent production films, I tend to distract myself by reviewing classics.

Magnificent invention the home cinema and the dvd. Replay one at home the conditions you would like in the cinema, which is usually

(besides) contaminated with annoying noises of dizzying popcorn and febrile melodies of halftone in

row nine. All this comes to the case because I have just seen a film that, in the end, is European, although it

is also Asian. He will never compete at the box office with post majors. Very rarely will I be the talk of executives

in the café at eleven o'clock, but it will fill the heart of many lovers of cinema who are looking for, among so much trash and

fireworks, a reposado trip to another world. The film in question is called The Mongolian Dog and, more than a

film to the classic way of the term, it is a documentary that invites us to think differently. ��� Should not the cinema

do that from time to time? It's about a girl (Nansal) who takes home a dog she has found in

a cave, a puppy, actually. The father is obstinate not to host him because he imagines him descendant of

the wolves. Superstition occupies the entire family imaginary and the plot focuses on imposing on thesuperfechery

ancestrala residue of reasoning. The conflict is not entirely Mongolian: it is universal. It becomes entangled in

popular religiosity and throws its bow, vigorously, to the most intimate of human feelings: the belief

that there is another world and that our soul does not die. In the absence of a Christian heaven and the Father's Right, thenomad

Mongolbelieves in reincarnation and, in some arcane way, suspects that when he is dead, his spirit will travel. �

plants, trees, small animals. Until I hit a dog, and then I can jump a man. The most

exciting thing about The Mongolian dog is its rare nature. When we see it, we know that we are witnessing aevent

unique, the transit from one world to another. The Mongol nomads are forced to seek the city, which is an

extension of the western city, food of vigos, fevered for its moral dissipation, focused on growing

the expense of man. And the viewer, oblivious to that rattle, is literally stunned by the force of the

feelings that the film exhume. To gush. This is art. Mental detoxification Openness to anlanguage

ancient, but to which we are not accustomed lately. I did not see The story of the crying camel, from the same

Mongolian director. I promise to go to the video store and catch her. When I'm not here (and that my video store is a jewel

among the jewels for the movie buff) I'll go home and put on some movie iran���, of desas of long shots

and hypnotic music, when not absent. I will fall asleep thinking that all the sem���foros of my town

becomes chrysanthemums. They go to the movies. Go and remove it and put in place aof

messany posh child with a hook between the meshes of amphetamine and hormonal films.

" 1

" Hard movie, very hard. Fíbula prodigiosa. True portrait of a time and the character of the military who,

through a coup d'état, dictatorially ruled the country for almost forty years.

It is curious to see how, however worn out and exhausted a topic seems to be, someonealways arrives

with the necessary talentto give it a new and refreshing approach. That is precisely whathas done

Guillermo del Torowith the Spanish Civil War in "" El Laberinto del Fauno. "" The film is a story with two

distinct parts, one realistic and the other of fantastic cut, better integrated than at first glance

seems. I say this because the film's most obvious problem would be the poor integration between theworld

imaginaryof the protagonist and the real world. I could not help but feel that problem when I saw the film but, as

I say, after thinking it over calmly I have come to the conclusion that it is not as serious as it may seem. An example:

the adventure of the protagonist with the banquet she can not touch (magnificent tribute to "" Alice in

the Wonderland "") takes place just when she is punished without dinner by the Captain Vidal (a Sergi L���pez who would

represent the real-world fairy-eating monster). I think why a second andperhaps be necessary

attentive viewingto do justice to the filmbut for now, lettalk about ella.La work of

William direction Bull is brilliant. His way of introducing the themes, the characters and the details

(the knife, the medicines, the keys) integrating them perfectly in the story places him in the group of the

chosen ones worldwide in terms of narrative capacity. those virtues were not enough, del Toro

seems to be a great director of actors since he extracts from them all outstanding performances.

Although Ariadna Gil and Ivana Baquero are very well, I would like to highlight some magnificent Anlex Angulo and Maribel

Verd��� in two interesting characters of those with which it is very easy to identify. And, above all of

them, Sergi L���pez spreading his shadow throughout the film and composing an antol���gico character. Nothing in the

film is more scary than his gaze, his movements, his obsession with his father's watch or the coldness with

which he is able to perform the acts m��� s cruel and barbaric that can be imagined. In a film with such a

marked fantastic component, it is always important the work of the special effects team, the direction

art�� �stica, sound, makeup, etc. M���sa���n in a film of these characteristics in which, to the

fantastic side, we add a realistic component. Well, this film demonstrates, once again, that

in Spain we can bill movies with a finish as perfect as anyblockbuster.

HollywoodHard film, very hard. Fíbula prodigiosa. True portrait of a time and the character of the

military who, through a coup d'état, dictatorially ruled the country for almost forty years. All

that and more is "" El Laberinto del Fauno "". For me, so far, the best film of Guillermo del Toro.

" 1

" If to a perfectly planned and performed action scenes we add a charismatic protagonist

very well seconded by a handful of good actors, the result can not be other that the consecration of

Greengrass as one of the greats of the action cinema of our days.

As I have already mentioned on one occasion, "" The Bourne ultimatum "" (The Bourne ultimatum) was next to

"" Ratatouille "" one of the last cinematic hopes of the summer, in what American cinema is

concerned. Paul Greengrass did not have it easy. After having made "" El Mito de Bourne "", one of the best

action movies that are remembered, and have shaken us with "" United 93 "", the expectations before his new

film were high Finally, as happened with "" Ratatouille "", I think Greengrass has lefthappy.

even the most demanding onesSome will attack you for the gui���n, usual excuse to attack the action cinema, but

it is not the most important script of a film like that. Despite this, it works perfectly and has interesting

details. Regarding the story that counts, suffice it to say that we are facing the resolution of thecrisis of

identityagent Jason Bourne (Matt Damon), known by all those who have seen the previous

deliveries. The really impressive of the movie ��cula is his rhythm, so frantic that I have to check the IMDB

to check that it lasts 111 minutes that I thought seemed like a sigh. A rhythm that is supported, not so much in the

much talked about camera movements, as in an impressive montage and a perfect planning of the action

scenes. It serves as an example the spectacular persecution. It takes place in T���nger and it deserves a

place of honor in the pantheon of the great cinema persecutions. By the way, am��� the resolution of the scene

reminded me of what Hitchcock said about how difficult it is to kill a human being and that it resulted in shocking

im�� �genes in "" Torn curtain. "" But let's go back for a second to the subject of camera movements. The most

insightful will be thinking: is this the same Jeremy Fox who criticizes Michael Bay's camera moves

and his excess of plans? It's me, and I think we have to differentiate between moving the camera madly and

moving it frantically. In the first case, one loses the reference of what is seen on the screen

to the point that if we parse the image we would not even know what we are saying. seeing. That's what

happens in much of Michael Bay's cinema and the robot fights of the recent "" Transformers "", on the other

hand of Bay's most content, would be a good example. However, with Greengrass the opposite happens: there is

debauchery but not confusion. It is known at all times what is happening. One of the reasons why I

consider Greengrass to be a much better director than to Bay. If a perfectly planned and

performed action scenes we added a charismatic protagonist very well seconded by a With good actors and a

really powerful soundtrack, the result can not be other than the consecration of Greengrass as one of

the greats of the action cinema of our days. He could not have found a better place to show us his

talent than in this conclusion of what it is, possibly next to that initiated by "" The Crystal Jungle "", the

best trilogy of action of the history of cinema. Final evaluation: 9 out of 10

" 1

" Niki Caro gives a camp to all those who make portraits victimizers and simpletons. When you see that the subject of a movie "How this can be summed up in" "a woman's struggle for her dignity in

a macho environment" ", many of us think, and I the first one, that we are going to find insults to the

intelligence and to the cinema like the one of I give you my eyes, of Ic���ar Bollain, that does not hesitate to explain the inspiration of

his movies. However, Niki Caro, with this film gives a camp to all and all those who

portray victims and simpletons of situations like the one that reflects this film. In the mid-1980s, a

woman goes to work in some mines in Wisconsin. But they are not the mines that we can find in Asturias,

underground, in which women also worked and whose conditions are harder than those of the film. The

fact is that Josie Aimes (Charlize Theron), who runs away from her parents escaping from a husband who mistreats her,

is not the first woman to go to work in that mine where the number of men is greater. Her friend Glory

(Frances McDormand), who is also in the union representing women, warns her how hard that job can

be. As soon as Josie enters there, I do not know. he does not find the support of his father (Richard Jenkins) who

also works there, but he begins to suffer the abuses and humiliations of other companions and that other

compañeras see as something normal and assumed. However, Josie, with a reputation as a "light girl" and amother

youngof two children, will try to fight so that no one can do her the impossible job with

humiliation. Not only will you find yourself with macho prejudices from a good part of theworkers

mine, but you will also see how your company hide their heads before that complaint, fearing that their jobs

are in danger. There are no explicit beatings, there is no physical violence. Yes, the kind that we usually see in the news programs

and car programs of "" journalists "" trash. Here the abuses are more "realistic" and "see yourselves". And I assure you

that they provoked in me (and certainly in more than one) a more intense anger than in anysequence

beatof I give you my eyes, troglodyte (this is the troglodyte thing ��� only missing the title, but

certainly not recommended). Decent against bastards, fair against miserable, daring against cowards.

That is the theme of the film. The good pulse of the director, a wonderfully chosen and excellentlycast

directed(eye to the sequence of just 2 minutes of Richard Jenkins before the members of the union), some

shocking characters and musical moments used with great skill (Santaolalla in his l��) �nea and a new song by

Bob Dylan that you can listen to on Radio Katana) are the highlights of a good movie that I think is

being undervalued. except I enjoyed it and enjoy it as soon as it comes out on DVD.

" 1

" Goya's character is nonexistent, that is, he does not paint anything. It is an excuse to give a title with

packaging to a story folletinesca.

Doing a couple of word games you can say that Milos is not in Form and that Goya does not paint anything.

Seven years after the appreciable, though pretentious, "Man on the Moon" and decades after "Amadeus"? and

? Someone went over the cuckoo's nest ?, the Czech director returns with a disproportion of such dimensions that it is

difficult to decide where to begin to take the hands to the head : Goya's ghosts? (? Goya? S Ghosts ?,

2006). Yesterday it was released in Madrid theaters and tomorrow it arrives at the general billboard. Maybe the mistakes start

with the fact that Goya's character is nonexistent, that is, he does not paint anything. It is an excuse to give a title with

packaging to a story that could have been located at any other time. If only it were that and it

was in a secondary plane, very well, but it is that above they dare to show it as buf���n that presence,

without getting involved, the time that it is his turn to live. His character is not lacking in motivation or depth: it

simply does not exist, and Stellan Skarsg���rd can do little (the two new versions of "The Exorcist

?, Pirates of the Caribbean: The Dead Man's Chest?) fix. Rather, it turns the temperamentaltemperamental

Aragones into a humorous andpainter. In addition, his clearly Scandinavian musician only manages to

add more implausibility to his anemic interpretation. But the fundamental problem, once again, is the gui���n.

The story dealt with is the classic nineteenth-century follet���n of the fourth division. If already nineteenth century classics are

stagnant today, "The ghosts of Goya? It is a simpler still greater. The twist of gui���n with

which the conflict of the film arises is the most absurd that has been seen in years and, if that were not enough,

the interpretation ���n de Portman still leaves him more ridiculous. The thing is this: ready to "" clean

Spain "" according to the teachings of Brother Lorenzo (Javier Bardem), the henchmen of the inquisition go to a

tavern madrile���a in which they notice the curious behavior of In���s (Natalie Portman). This behavior

is that, when offered a succulent Segovian suckling pig for dinner, she rejects it with a grimace

of a girl child that is neither credible nor well interpreted. If I were a foreigner, I could react like that, but

being Spanish, I would have seen that dish before. A grimace that would not even Lindsey Lohan in? I want to

be superfamous ?. So, seeing the inquisitors that she refuses to eat pork, they come to the conclusion that

she is a heretic who practices Judaizing rites. Or that's what the script wants us to believe.

Actually stop being so bad actress: when,few seconds after the same scene, you wantmake

the "" tavern "" kissing the feet of a dwarf, the implausibility is greater than if vi Let's go to Pamela Anderson to

collect the Nobel Prize. How Natalie Portman, who only knows how to play a role, has credibility as an actress, is

something that surpasses me. Meanwhile, we still have to explain why Keira Knightley is superb in? Pride and

Prejudice ?. Leaving aside how badly she acts, the problem is that it does not make sense to stop her because of

that, it is a forced twist of gui���n. But the worst of gui��� It is not the mental simplicity of history or itsline

thick. The worst thing is that, in order to have "" importance "", the whole history of Spain is also used during the

fifteen years covered by the film. Obviously, a stupid and simple story needs acontext

historicalthat simplifies the whole history of Spain to the extreme of insulting folklore. The first

insult begins by centering the story around the Inquisici .N While it is true that it is a relevant part

of the history of Spain that we do not feel particularly proud of, it is also true that thewas perpetuated.

typical Anglo-Saxon traditionn de Espa���a = Inqusici���n, as accurate as saying that the history of England is summarized in the

extramarital adventures of Carlos and Diana. Secondly, all the reforms brought by the

Napoleonic invasion were simplified to leave them reduced to "a group of very, very, very bad people who shot

the priests at church"". Third, the expulsion of the French and the coronation of Ferdinand VII is sold

as an instant process that allowed the Spaniards to return to their selves. Just be: the shout "" Live the

caenas! "" And reinstate the Inquisition that we liked so much. If you want to ignore me, try to endure

what is probably the worst movie of the year and hallucinate with the following series of things: the double role ofacting

Natalie Portman,as a crazy and disfigured mother and daughter prostitute of ���sta. The otherguiding trick

cheapthat makes Natalie Portman find herself, a baby conveniently abandoned. The bad that is the portrait

that Goya paints of Javier Bardem. How pathetic are the "" montage scenes "" using Goya frames. One

thing is that, as a convention, we accept that they speak English when in theory they are speaking Spanish or French,

but then, �� Why are you suddenly heard shouting in these languages? Only the work of the "" dialogue coachs "" is

saved: all the Spanish actors have a more than worthy English accent. For the rest, things like?

Goya's ghosts? and? Alatriste? they only give more greatness to what, against all odds, has risen as the

best historical mega (co) Spanish production and Newspaper of the year:? The Borgia ?. Always assuming that? The

faun's labyrinth? is in a different category. It should have been titled "The daughter of the chaquetero", in honor of

the character played by Javier Bardem, the true protagonist of the film and almost the only savable de This one

" 0

" Apart from the initial scene, the most notable of Lucky You are the poker games. The rest is to

forget, which will not be easy due to the two hours of tape duration.

The shadow of Steve McQueen and Edward G. Robinson in The King of the Game is very long, and for that reason the poker has

been almost an alien for the cinema. In the poker, when your opponent bets, if you want to see his cards, you have

to see the bet or raise it. Fortunately, when we go to see a movie, only the entrance fee is paid

, and there is no need to cover any pre-conceived bet. But, if you had to bet on Lucky You, what would you pay for it? Would it

be the right one? To stand for the brilliant Curtis Hanson of LA Confidential and Prodigious Youth, or for the

mediocre 8-Mile Curtis Hanson and In his Shoes? Although with our hearts we wish that Lucky You was

the first one, badly that weighs us is the second bet. Eric Bana plays with solvency aplayer

professionalwho desperately seeks to participate in the world championship of poker and prove

himself and the others who are at the height of his father, a world bicampeñ to which gives life Robert Duvall. And between

those complexes the character of Drew Barrymore sneaks, that more than vase seems the typical and annoying

moscard���n. Lucky You starts with a lot of force, with an initial scene that sums up the essence

of what poker is. a film holds the type the next half hour, but from that moment is going to

deflate throughout its excessive footage to reach a very predictable outcome that leavesunsatisfied

anyone. In between, the spectator attends a cheap double melodrama: on the one hand we have aconflict

paternal-filialthat would make Sigmund Freud blush with shame, and on the other we find ourselves with the

sweetened relationship. Entren between Eric Bana and Drew Barrymore. There is one detail that is really curious, and that is to situate the

action in 2003. It is supposed to add more dramatic load to the gui�� �n, by contrastingplayers

veteranwith new technologies and new ways of understanding the game. Which will be quite

incomprehensible to all those who are not versed in professional poker. Apart from the initial scene,

the most remarkable of Lucky You are the games of p�. ��quer. The rest is to forget, which will not be easy

due to the two hours of tape duration.

" 0

" A wonderful déssis of surrealism full of reality. One of those gems for which it is worth going to the

movies.

Jason Reitman will be included in my list of favorite directors because of his ability to makethings

surrealseem more real. That's Juno, the story of a very particular teenager, who for

being so young has very clear how to focus your life, when it gives you a tremendous turn when you get pregnant.

Her personality and that decision are very unbelievable, as well as the environment that surrounds her, but Reitman achieves

with a few funny dialogues and very extreme situations but that taken with a incredible genius,

you think that those problems and those people can really exist in our daily life. Juno is also

a breath of fresh air to a cinema that entertains and excites at the same time, without resorting to the same

t�� Icos. If we add to this, the magnificent performances of Ellen Page, Allison Janey, JK Simmons

and Jennifer Garner, because the story is much more fun and attractive for the viewer. Ivan Reitman is

characterized by caricaturing hypocrisy that we manifest in reality, first with the wonderful

Thanks for smoking and now with Juno, and also characterized by characters with a strong personality that are

surrounded by other characters they accompany the perfection to tell those stories. I do not think that it takes anything in

the next Oscars because it is not a dramatic independent film, if the I would have done it that way, maybe I

would take it away but it would not reach a Reitman quality, so I prefer not to take it, and surprise us with

films like this one.

" 1

" He left the cinema with the conviction that a long time ago he did not see a film as bad as this. It's just 11 and 20 at night and Although there are still 40 minutes to go before the film starts, Leuzor and I

must be in positions 61 and 62 of the eager ones who are waiting for the Avant Premiere of La Profec���a, the remake of

that classic blockbuster of 1976. But then the only demonic possession that seems evident in the narrow

corridor of Cineplanet Alc���zar is the novelty spirit with its dose of nostalgia seventies or eighties - as in

my case - that drives more than one, to devour popcorn waiting for the start of the film of

marras.Sigui���ndole the game to the urban legends of 666, journalists are Lana hunting those who want to

talk about the end of the world. Several photographers turn on the lights of their cameras and blind at half turn.

It was the only thing that dazzled me that night, because after almost two hours I left the cinema with the conviction

that it had been a long time I saw a film as bad as this. To the point: The only rescue: the curse gesture

of the nana Baylock, trainer trainable of the adorable Damien Thorne in his first evil that, for the

sake of Modernity is no longer done, for example, with a tricycle, but with Scooter. With her respectable wrinkles,

Mia Farrow has built the face of the "apistasta de satan���s" that no one resembles the Rosemary of the late

60���s than a day ago. innocent pari��� and victim to the son of the devil. I dishonor poor Roman Polansky by putting him in

the film of this movie B. The thing is that Woody Allen's ex-blonde has the only act, let's say,

redeemable Because the others. Oh, the others. Liev Schereiber is miles away from playing the role of Gregory

Peck in the role of Robert Thorn, Damien's supposed father. The new and suffered earthly stepfather demonstrates

his lack of resources at the time of dramatic progression. There are no nuances, everything is flat on the face and

body language and also is not able to convince us in its final dilemma of eliminating or not the son of the

beast. Although a little more successful in the moments of tension, Julia Stiles, who plays Kate Thorn, does not

even reach ten percent of Lee Reemick's interpretation in the original version. It is assumed that with all the

technology ��A disposition, this could be a ribbon ready to ruffle our hair every second. However,

the too trite effect was that the only thing he did was to make it more predictable than it already was by having a

better directed previous version. However, the Artistic Director and the photography director had their success in

showing scenes and cold atmospheres and surreal moments, such as the psychiatric clinic where

The Thorn came in search of answers to the incomprehensible behavior of the adorable creature. It was not

that I expected more of this product, nor did the original version become, in My opinion is a great movie, or

a cult film, but I think some respect should be had when trying a new version of

those works that Some reason remained in the memory of the viewers of the world and are part of the

history of cinema.

" 0

" It is not among the best movies of Woody Allen, but it surpasses many of his mostcomedies

recentand is undoubtedly part of the best humor cinema that can be seen today.

The downside of having a career like Woody Allen's is that you have set yourself the list very high. It's

hard to please everyone after movies like "" Annie Hall "" or the most recent "" Match Point "". That said, it

is clear that a work that is lost in this comparison, can perfectly overcome many of the

films that compete against it on the billboard. That's exactly what happens to "" Scoop "". Despite not

being among the best films of the New York director, he outperforms many of his most recent comedies, such as

"" Everything else "" or "" Disassembling Harry "" , and is part, undoubtedly, of the best humor cinema that can be seen

at the moment. In "" Scoop "", Allen repeats London as a stage and returns to unite intrigue and comedy as he already did in

"" Mysterious murder in Manhattan "" . Although he can not reach the level of this last one -which is, in

my opinion, among his best works-, he retells an interesting story in a funny and ingenious way,

with witty dialogues and the rest of the typical elements of his films. Scarlett Johansson is a young

student of journalism who investigates a possible murderer from the information that a ghost gives him.

Yes, a ghost. Well, it is not the first time that this man plays with the absurd, not much less, ���no?

And the truth is that it is appreciated to see it in a role that is not of beauty, although it is not one of its best

interpretations. On the other hand, Woody Allen returns to put in front of the camera to accompany it in its

investigations and to interpret, of course, the same paper of peculiar type of always. Everyone who hatesmovies

Woody Allen'sbecause Woody Allen comes out will hate it too, of course. The rest will enjoy it, as long as they do not

pretend that the director is capable of surpassing himself every time he premieres something new. And those who still do not

know it - if there is anyone left - can have a good time at the cinema with a comedy different from what is

usually seen. The truth is that I am already waiting for the next one.

" 1

" Miller and Snyder have constituted a cinematographic referent that should be taken into account for all fans of

fantastic cinema. There will be no shortage of critical voices about this 300. Among them? The majority- critics who

remain anchored in the past ...

To start talking about 300, and there is a wide opinion, we have to name two key names: Frank Miller

and Zack Snyder. Both, together in this occasion separately, have constituted in a short time areference

cinematographicvery to take into account for all fans to the cinema in general, but above all to the fantastic. The

work of this renowned author of graphic novels consists of very well-known titles such as Batman A���o Uno, Sin city,

Daredevil Man without fear or the one that concerns us now, 300. It was not until the second that I have quoted, Sin city,

when Miller really began to have relevance in the cinema, being until then quite reluctant to

adapt his works. Along with Robert Rodr���guez, Miller also felt in the director's chair to

guarantee a faithful and quality adaptation that would not soil the reputation created by his novel graphic, and so it

was. Sin city was released with a moderate commercial success? I suppose that the DVD will have been sold as donuts,

although Spain does not have a decent edition yet, but a legion of followers felt very

satisfied with the results. ��sticos, as well as the general public, which with greater or less pleasure, responded

well in its just measure to a formal proposal very risky for the times. After this,

rumors would soon be heard about another adaptation of a famous work by Miller, which is none other than this 300. For

this occasion we wanted to tell with another director of proven effectiveness,of who is concerned, Robert

regardlessRodr���guez is - in the fantastic field and with a powerful style that can make the most of thenovel

graphicin its plasma In images, without losing the magic of the vineyards, as is often the case, or so manysay

amateurs, since I, as you will already know, would have read me. is usually, I do not follow too much the world of

comic- in many other adaptations. The director chosen for the occasion was the emerging Zack Snyder, accustomed

to the field of music videos and who triumphed with the magnificent remake of Dawn of the Dead, which even

exceeded the m�� This is George A. Romero's movie, something unusual in the world of remakes and more so if

we are talking about original films that are so well-known. Snyder was already confirmed in the first minutes of that

Dawn of the Dead as a director able to print a force and a tension the images that,ad

today's, are very few who get in their proposals. And that movie was not a bluff, since now, in

300, Zack Snyder has done it again, with Miller very aware of his steps and without losing respect for the

graphic novel or, as I see it, the amateurs. Already entering fully into the film, and not in thenovel

graphic? which I have not read, although I am considering doing it-, we can already say that, after the long wait and the

high Expectations, 300 does not disappoint. And, just as it happened in Sin City, the visual experience it

offers is something worth seeing in a good movie theater, with a giant screen and quality sound. Just for

this, 300 already deserves to be seen and recommended. Now, entering other sections, the film hardly loses

strength, being altogether an interesting, entertaining, well interpreted work? Gerald Butler magnificent, with

brutal final shots, mounted in a superb manner? a comic in movement in structure, but not at the

same level as the strictest Sin city-, musicada to perfection? attention to those metal chords in

some peak moments, or to the m� ��sica ���pica that manages to bristle your hair - and with a bill and a task of

impressive artistic direction, which make 300 a trip to a well-called modern cinema? And not pretentious, nor

modernete- that looks for spectators of many types without remaining in a mere blockbuster, and that achieves its

objectives by fulfilling its promises: pure and hard spectacle, as well as an innovative character and

even transgressor. Of course, the critical voices about this 300 will not be lacking. Among them, most of

them are boring and with narrow sights, that remain anchored in the past and the no innovation, in the

nonprogress of cinema as art, now that technology is capable of offering m���sv���as. Will there be, as

happened with Sin City, do not understand? or do not try to understand- the variants that such works suppose in their

conception, and the school that, surely, they will create. Actually, do not be fooled, because 300 is

a type of cinema with an assured public: thousands of fans of the graphic novel or Frank Miller in

general, fans of the world of comics, fans of video games, fans of the fantastic,

fans of the epic cinema without purist prejudices, well, and within some lines I will talk about it, 300 does not stand out

precisely because of its historical rigor ��rico, and does not intend it- and, in turn, the public that seeks blockbusters, what has

turned this exercise of style into the great success of what we have been doing for a year, raising 160 million of

dollars in three weeks and approaching without problems towards the 200? of this I will talk more widely in the summary

of the box office that is on arrival. -And as I said , do not pretend to look for a history class in 300, no. The

film, like the graphic novel - which, I understand, faithfully adapts almost everything - are visions of the

battle of Thermopylae, which, in fact, fought Spartans against Persians, in clear inferiority of

numbers of the firsts. So far so good, but the fantastic, even mythological, section is present

from time to time, and the narrative licenses do not know limits, which I do not see as something negative, because

I did not know anyone to say neither Miller nor Snyder, nor the respective protagonists - at any time that they pretended to

tell something faithful to the historical data, but to create a solid entertainment and a spectacle. A sweeping visual

that served more as a genre film than as an epic in the classic sense of the term. What their

opponents also seem to emphasize is the allegedly xenophobic charge of the story, which leaves the

Persians as evil and stereotyped villains - King Jerje is seen as a mannered giant - , whatalready

somepoint out that turns 300 into a pro-Bush plea (���!) in, they say, an obvious metaphor of what is happening

now with its foreign policy. I, for my part, believe that there are people who have too much free time, although

it is true that the Persians do not go very well unemployed, which does not mean, I at least do not understand it

remotely, that the Arabs be the greatest evil of mankind or similar things, just as seeing The Passion

of Christ I did not think to think that you had to hate all the Jews so that appeared on the screen? and

there was also politics, even some illuminated came to say that that film would create a new extermination

of the Jewish people (���!) -.

" 1

" A story that, in a perfect exercise in cinematographic sapience, keeps you magnetized to the armchair,

imbibed on the screen. And, afterwards, when leaving, when you comment on the film ... What really happened in the

two and a half hours of projection? Nothing.

For me, what surprised me most about "" Zodiac "" is that in its two and a half hours of footage, removing the

beginning, absolutely nothing happens. And, taking into account that the film hypnotizes you, making you

look at the screen, lending it five senses, there can be no better criticism. Advertising, and more

taking into account that David Fincher also directed "" Seven "", this "" Zodiac "" has been sold to us as a film, yet

another, serial killers , which is already a subgenre with its own entity in the USA cinema. But it is not that. Or

yes, but not only that. Because "" Zodiac "", in fact, is based on the crimes committed by a disturbed, on

the US west coast. ., in the seventies, but what the film tells is much more than the

research carried out to capture him. Through his length, and nevertheless, precise and necessary footage,

"" Zodiac "" speaks to us of many more things than serial crimes and police investigations. He speaks to us about

obsession, of paranoia, of commitment and madness. It makes us reflect on the role of the media and

their responsibility to society, on media success, the desire for notoriety and the

compulsive need to be (re) known. And everything this, without great pyrotechnics, with a media containment and

a formal rigorousness as we did not see on a screen. Cinema in a pure state in which everything is at the

service of a complex, complicated and contradictory history like life itself. The music, an exceptional

soundtrack that perfectly contextualizes the story, the design of production, the costumes, those

characters who smoke as desperate and stuff themselves with junk food. all the details and all the elements

at the service of history, as it should always be. A story that, in a perfect exercise inwisdom

cinematographic, keeps you magnetized in the armchair, embedded in the screen . And, afterwards, when you leave, when you

comment the movie. What really happened in the two and a half hours of projection? Nothing. Or almost. There has

been no "24" "style tension, there have been no persecutions, violent interrogations, or explosions. In the

Seventies and in San Francisco there should not be forensics like Grissom No doctors like House. Theexperts

caligraphyare so human that they drink, doubt and make mistakes. Like the policemen and journalists. And evenAnd so

the murderer himself.a story that lasts over more than thirty years, that

has a grand finale that does not pirouette Technical-and that leaves you open-mouthed because seldom does theleave you with such

cinemaa truthful posture. And, of course, that Hitchcockian sequence in which the obsessed draftsman

goes to the house of a witness and, as in "" Suspicion "", neither he nor the viewer know what thatbasement will bring

mysterious. An exercise of suspense on the surface of the skin that is the most enriching and illustrative. David

Fincher is confirmed, therefore, as one of the great and best directors of contemporary cinema. One of the

few directors of those who, today, you can trust to feet.

" 1

" A story that engages, without introductions of any kind, with a shocking principle that does not let you

look away for a moment

As it could not be otherwise, forced me to go to the premiere that they had read the book, but this time

I did not put many obstacles because I knew that day I was special, why? very simple, it was the only one

of the six who had not read me the book, and what is more important had kept me out of

comments on this one (something like the Lord of the Rings, though that was much harder), so I would not

compare the movie and the book, if this was not in the book, if they have told it wrong, etc. So I just

watched a movie. And I found a story that engages, without introductions of any kind, with a

shocking principle that does not let you look away for a moment, and try to find out what happens to the old man

died. there was Audrey Tautou who reported 20minutes did not even appear at the audition for the

film because she was convinced that they were not going to catch her, only after insisting she did the test and There he is now.

I also remember that he read in a newspaper that the President of the French Republic, when negotiating

filming inside the Louvre, suggested for the role of Tautou to the best friend of his daughter (in

case he was coping) small jeta.El case is that the actress plays Sophie Neveu quite well, to my taste the French accent

too accentuated, there were times that he did not understand it well. For his misfortune, he stars in the scene that

I liked the least, and which I suppose would be something imposed from above (since we are talking about Hollywood), and that is when they run away

from the police with the car running backwards. I am between two trucks, I think, it is ridiculous and out of tune, they could

flee in a more normal way, go ahead and overtake cars. But he also starred in two of my

favorite scenes, in which he suddenly releases "" Cu���? "" Haha what I could laugh at. The other scene is at the end

when he gets his foot in the water and says something similar to "" will not be "", buen���simo.Tom Hanks has been criticized

for his performance that I consider the most normal, nothing bad to argue, and I support him by not kissing Sophie,

although you have to be in his shoes to keep the impulses. So the script hits on that, to my liking, and

hits the rhythm of the film that does not get boring at any time. Ian McKellen (Gandalf for

friends) appears to explain one of the most important things in the plot that is the picture of the last dinner, and he does it

spectacularly well, I take my hat off with �� This gentleman. It is a very important moment and without introducing

his character, appears on screen and steals all the protagonism to the two protas, with a magnetism towards theBetween

important spectator.the cast, I find an actor that I really like Alfred Molina, with a lot Den

movies behind him from which I have seen much less than you would like (I remember now the piece of

Coffee and Cigarettes, or Chocolat), always performs buen���smia, becomes his character from the

feet to the head, in the Da Vinci Code and always. Jean Reno is a film that comes to him that even the hair, a

French policeman, could not fail. And Paul Bettany gives you a tremendous thrash, which is what he has to do, so

perfect, when he lashes out he hurts me up. The theme of this movie hooks believers and non-

believers because it is a topic that is always on everyone's lips, and interesting. I remember a phrase from Hanks that I

liked and used in my conversations (very occasionally) about religion, I talked about when he fell into the

well and the only thing that calm��� fu��� thinking about the other life or praying (I do not quite remember what), and that religion is

true or false, makes people who have nothing or are �� In situations, limit yourself to something that gives you

strength. Highly recommended for all kinds of public, and for people who say they make manymistakes

historicalwith the church and others, and notice that the novels are fiction and consists of that the author invents

a story, so let's not say nonsense. I forgot to comment on the scene in which Shopie and Robert Langdon

go to the church where in the end they stop Sir Leigh Teabing, the director mix on the same ground

what happened a long time ago our protagonists walking, tremendous scene I liked a lot. After

thinking it a lot I like the end, is that I had not To another, the other possibilities create too many questions, will

there be a second part?

" 1

" A breath of fresh air among both green ogre, computer generated easy joke, and so muchDisney sequel

unnecessarydirectly to the DVD market.

For a few years, Disney does not raise its head. His latest non-Pixar products, such as 'Wild' or

'Chicken Little', left a lot to be desired, in addition to not creating any expectation, as his

movies did. Traditional animation movies during their golden seasons. Between so much frustration and so manysequels

unnecessary directto the DVD market, little, very good product has been ('Lilo and Stitch '). The

incorporation of Pixar Animation Studios to Tito Walt's dream factory was the salvation of this, and the

first result of that union. It has been 'Discovering the Robinsons', that is NOT a Pixar movie, but that

has had the very grateful collaboration of the God John Lasseter (creator of 'Toy Story') as a producer

executive.Something that has been noticed a lot in the final result. I had no expectations with this film. It did

not catch my attention at all, and I start to hate the kind of computer-animated movies

(that started with 'Shrek') that are disgustingly pretentious and that only containjokes

sillyand absurd and repetitive situations to "" fall well. "" But, fortunately, in this case I was

wrong, and I have taken an unexpected and very pleasant surprise (and, to whom? I want to cheat, a welcome

breath of fresh air.) 'Discovering the Robinsons' can be very sinful: of being excessively crazy

at times (especially during the middle, where you literally go by the hills of ���beda, see the

episode of the Tyrannosaurus, a passage that only serves to make the children laugh), of having some - few - gags that do not

they make the pinch of grace, of some small loose ends in the plot, and of being even localist (���

Qu is the reference to Raphael?). However, all the above mentioned is overshadowed by his

admirable and intelligent gui���n (despite the small gaps, forgivable to be a child title), for the

fun and entertaining that comes to be, and to recover during the magnificent final minutes the best and most

nostalgic spirit Disney (with the characteristic style of John Lasseter, that in spite of being executive producer, it

shows his own that he has gotten involved in the project). Technically, it's not a big deal. It's fine, but it does not bring anything

new. nor does he need. The soundtrack, a delight. It is a great adventure of time travel,

very well taken and very enjoyable: Those plot turns at a certain point completely change the

impression that is taking during the first half of the movie 100% recommended for the whole family,

although the cr puedeos may be l conen with so much (well, not a lot) temporary meadow. Of course, Disney has given a

BIG -and very grateful- step regarding the pain of 'Chicken Little'.

" 1

" It is worth going to see it because it is an air of freshness that the cinema, and not only Spanish,needed

urgently. In addition, he proposes an interesting and original story, with a beautiful soundtrack and the special

atmosphere that the paintings give him.

Ca���tica Ana is undoubtedly the best Spanish film of the year, and Julio Medem one of the best Spanish directors

. This post should be titled "" In defense of Ca���tica Ana "", because it is incomprehensible the number of

attacks, destructive criticisms, insults,? who is receiving this film. From thepoint of view

strictly cinematographic, whoever says that this film is not special, different, ambitious and brave, is

that it does not understand much about cinema. That is a complicated film, welcome to the real cinema, to the one that is made

from the heart, from what one feels and wants to express. What is chaotic, please read the title. That the

end is not the most successful, totally agree, is that if in addition I had managed to finish the film properly

, we would be talking about a masterpiece. I think you can forgive the end in exchange for the hour

and a half of freshness, feelings, emotions, desire to live, etc. that the tape offers us. I have come to read

reviews that what stands out in the film is that the protagonist, who makes a

simply incredible performance, spends the whole movie ���cula nude. The first thing is that it is a lie, and the second thing is that if it

still surprises us today, and it does not bother to see a nude in the cinema, it is that we have made veryprogress

littlein the last sixty years. I also read that it is the worst tribute I could do to her sister (the

movie is in honor of her who died when she went to make an exposition), who believes the people what it is

to say how a brother should pay tribute to his sister, who would know her better than ���lya who cares.

Finally I also read that the protagonist is simply an old hippie, until it was a kind

of Heidi who lives in a cave with her grandfather. What happens is that there are people who are annoyed that

today there are people with principles, with different ways of seeing life, people who want aworld. The

differentfilm is worth going to see it because it is an air of freshness that cinema, and not only Spanish,

urgently needed. In addition, he proposes an interesting and original story, with a beautiful soundtrack and

the special atmosphere that the paintings give him. But he does not manage to finish it properly, which can be

forgiven.

" 1

" A film penalty for those of us who were waiting for a picture of freedom, which, incidentally, could

be applied in our country.

It was preceded by a lot of hype and cymbal, good publicity and comments praising thecapacity

criticaland the courage that the actor has had to make a film about the witch hunt and a plea in favor

of the freedom. For I am sorry to say that he has not made a film, he has tried to do two and he has stayed with a

"specimen" of film. And of course, by opting to be a troubadour has completely neglected the script, whichus

presentswith characters that are born from the first frame as heroes, defenders of the truth and honored

when they are not What journalists? It is important to clarify that American patriotic sentiment is widespread. Not

only are they journalists, first they are patriots. In Europe they have "idols" or "rebels" like Sarandon or Robbins

who criticize Bush and his politics, like Clooney, but they never stop saying that they are patriots (although

saying it only with certain presidents they already make their ideology sing). Patriot is a word in our

country is a plague and has connotations of past times and is supposed to be overcome. That's why the

protagonists of this story are before Americans than journalists? And go patriots and journalists! But

Clooney wanted to highlight that and has chosen to pull newspaper library and video library to illustrate his story about the

excessive power of the State, completely neglecting the gui���n without giving life to the characters and ignoring the

dramaturgy of the situation so that the viewer could feel the terribleness of that moment. It is adocumentary

fictionalmade with a great photograph, a very powerful David Strathairn but Without life or emotion, something very

disappointing for those of us who expected something similar to The Dilemma, another possible example of how power can

crush people. Failing to see the movie of Ang Lee and Truman Capote, is one of the mostnominations

unfairfor Best Film and Best Original Screenplay. A film penalty for those of us who were waiting for a picture

of freedom, which, incidentally, could be applied in our country. Guess who has the power and who the

truth (something very pretentious to answer but it is what sells the poster of the film).

" 0

" The best: Stefano Accorsi and see that Italian cinema can copy the dynamics of American cinema and remain

true to its principles.

There are films whose main problem is that they are not able to limit themselves. They are so ambitious that they try to

count too much and end up losing themselves in the immensity of themselves. This is the case of Romanzo Criminale. His

story could have been a good drama, an extraordinary Thriller or an immeasurable police or action story

but since he does not opt ​​for any of them it is actually a standard example of them. Theeffect

sideof this is that you need two and a half hours of footage to tell your story. A story that

occasionally misleads not knowing what character is the protagonist or who are the good guys and the bad guys. It is

normal since the book was tremendously extensive and the solution was to eliminate characters or even

unify them. Rulli and Petraglia, screenwriters of the film, had to make this huge adaptation. The

Liban���s, the Fr���o, the Dandy, the commissar Scialoja (a modern Javert), all of them have a fundamental role in

the plot and have been treated with very delicate strokes. They personalize the themes of the genre cinema as well as the

Italian stereotypes, which gives each of them a charisma without which the film would not be half

as effective. . The Italy of the 70s is the ideal setting for the narrative of Romanzo Criminale, which recounts

the exploits of a group of Roman delinquents, for thirty years living and sharing thehistory

Italianuntil 1992: attacks, kidnappings, the murder of Aldo Moro, drugs, robberies, blackmail, corruption

dress their daily actions. The "" band of the Magliana "", takes its name from an area of ​​Rome and It is agroup

really compact, since they have been together for a lifetime. Those friendships that can make people reach

unsuspected limits. Their coldness and the actions they carried out were really shocking because, despite

their operational cores and having controlled the mafia in the center of Italy, they were excessively cautious,

secret and violent. On the other side, the personalized justice in a very insistent commissary and convinced of what

he does will follow them by his evolution trying to put it hard. There is something that the director has done

tremendously well and it is to exploit the idea of ​​the bandit to narrate the adventures of the characters and create a

public sympathy towards them, including also the best resources of social and documentary cinema with

images. of time or sound recordings (such as the call of the Red Brigades to the Family of Aldo Moro

to indicate where to find his body, the attack of the Pope.). At first those who have seen the first

Tarantino films (which were still brilliant and not just decent) will see a montage that will be very

familiar and that calms down as the story progresses. The best: Stefano Accorsi (The Last Kiss) and see thatcinema

Italiancan copy the dynamics of American cinema and remain true to its principles. FROM THE FILM: He

appeared at the Berlin Film Festival. He got the David di Donatello for the best director of photography,

costume design, editing, production design, script, supporting actor ( Pierfrancesco Favino) andeffects

visual. Premiere in Italy: 09/30/2005. It will arrive in Spain if nothing prevents it at the beginning of 2008, doubled.

" 1

" F sobrebula on how to escape routine and sad monoton���ay find your place in the world. Personally Shyamalan is a director that I like, I think one of the true authors of current cinema,

although it is a director who awakens many passions, hated and loved in equal parts and unknown to many

more. Yes, unknown and if you do not ask any acquaintance: "Have you seen the last movie of M. Night Shyamalan?",

That will answer you, to the Once he throws an incriminating look, "" I do not watch porn movies "" and while you hold

the laugh you say, no man, he is the director of The Sixth Sense, then and only then will he know who you are

talking to. I personally like his way of making movies, and this Joven del Agua being the most lazy of his

filmography is a good movie with which he has a good time. Possibly with "" The Girl from the Water ""

as with the rest of her filmography, if we except The Sixth Sense, that is to say that she wins with the revision in

which she can get all the juice and messages that Shyamalan leaves in your tapes. But first it seemed to me that

it lacks a little point to reach the level of El Bosque or the undervalued Signals. But again we can

find many of the constants that were repeated in his previous works, and not only in common elements

that he usually uses when creating tension, if not in his characters, they all try to find their place in the

world, a role to develop in this life, be it a father who has lost faith, a guy who does not know

he is dead, or a man who discovers that he has superpowers and must learn to live with them. In this case

it is the manager of an apartment block called Cleveland Heep, played by a brilliant Paul

Giamatti, one of those actors who have an extreme facility to get along with the public, which one day rescues

from danger to a mysterious young woman. The girl turns out to be a nymph, a character from a children's story who is looking

for a way to return to her world of fiction from ours. Cleveland will try to help her. Shyamalan again

demonstrates that he has an innate facility to tell stories, brilliantly, that in the hands of others

could seem ridiculous. The photography is adequate, the soundtrack is great and the characters are very good, from

the morbid nymph played by Bryce Dallas Howard, to the group of hippies and their brutal

conversations, to that great character who is the pedantic critic of cinema that has just moved to the block and that

of course does not hit even one, great ridicule of Shyamalan to the critics who usually put him to fall of a donkey. The

young woman of Water is a supernatural story, a beautiful story for children, a story that many do not understand or do not

want to understand, people are still waiting for a horror movie when they go to see a movie. This guy's story, and they do not

realize that Shyamalan has never shot a horror movie, he's never shot a superhero movie, and

Jam���s has shot a film of aliens, he tells us about family, love, the f���, or specifically in

this film how he Logical can serve us to escape the monotony, the sad reality, or a

distant past that already seemed forgotten.

" 1

" The Orphanage is nothing that you have not seen 50 times before, and it is nothing more than a rehash of manymovies

different. But as always, there are ways and ways to make the rehash, and this is one of the standouts!

Having an object must be a degree, and Bayonne has achieved it to perfection. But, as it is explained that the best

Spanish film of 2007, and one of the best of the last decade of Spanish cinema, is a film remix. Suchfilms

unforgettableas Poltergeist or the Others, which is crowned with the end of Peter Pan and constantly falls on

the excellent Bel���n Rueda.Bayona has done what only the great directors or the You can do smart,is

that, take the best of other films, coordinate everything perfectly, and add some actions to

take off your hat. Like the gui�� If it has to be adapted to the situation, Bayona can focus on the

actions, which make the base more solid than it already was in principle. And then it is

when, after some very creditable interpretations, the absolute protagonist of the film, Bel���n Rueda, appears,

which is pointed at the same time in that of the papelon, at the same time that It shows us that pressure is not something that

goes with it. Although the weight of the film falls to him completely, he is able to leave the screen and eclipse

anyone who shares plane with it. The rest of the performances have to be highlighted, although Bel���n leaves little

for the rest. The argument you know it by heart, and needless to say, because after all, and As I

said before, it lives of all the references of the genre, and therefore, without knowing anything of this you already know how to

develop. And with that, it has some surprises in store for us, but they are given with drop-counts. The camera

is always in place and Bayona is efficient and effective. The rhythm is the right one and it is very well

accompanied by a tension that can be cut with a knife. There is little else that I have to emphasize about a film that I willyou

tellabout. �is of memory and that supplies the lack of originality, with some performances and a Bel���n Rueda de a���pa. Bayona

promises and we will surely feel his name several times more. All to end up consolidating, without a doubt, THE

BEST ESPANYOLA PELLECUM OF 2007.

" 1

" Through a detective and self-revealing itinerary, Clint will have to heal that wound that the abandonment and

the loneliness they have caused him, and that makes him approach the brothels beyond the line that a police officer should not

pass. He looks for answers.

On the tightrope is the story of a policeman who has to discover and arrest a psychopath rapist and

murderer who, however, has his same tastes and seems to know him thoroughly. Through aitinerary

detective and self-revealing, Clint will have to heal that wound that abandonment and loneliness have caused him, and

that brings him closer to the brothels beyond. �� of the line that a police officer should not go through, only looking for answers.Clint

Eastwood plays a New Orleans policeman as contradictory as good , gentle and

tender with his daughters, a character far from the police archetypes that made him famous, very apt for

his interpretative qualities, given to the subtle gestures radiating thoughts and experiences not

transferable with words, typical of the best actors. Gui���n is exquisite. It is an elaborateguide

and pamperedto the point of containing clues, symbols and repetitive elements or items that give the cin���filo the

possibility of intellectual enjoyment, which is almost the same. It's typical of a police thriller. I also like it because it

's one of those films of the genre paradigm that I might like, which is the police thriller of

the eighties, the one where the streets of the big city can be seen and felt just as they are, hard and near, where

violence breaks out and does not hide, and where sexuality is disillusioned. In the paradigm of thelife

meaninglessof the great American city, the characters of Clint Eastwood, Al Pacino or Charles Bronson have to overcome

the wounds of their past - already too reused in Hollywood cinema - that paralyze them or prevent them from

enjoy life and imprison them in the sordid world of crime and murder. These alreadystories

classiccontain women who, it could not be otherwise, act as the revitalizing archetype of the soul for these

tormented characters, the feminine symbol of the woman who, for the depressed man, brings him back to

reality, giving her strength to face her. Because here Genevieve Bujold in the main plot does not help

anything, it only makes it difficult, however it is in the relationship she has with Clint where her advice helps her not to

find the murderer, but to find yourself.

" 1

" United 93 is probably the best movie we've had in a year.to most

Pay attentioncriticisms, wear scarves just in case.

Five years since September 11. That fateful date, we all could attend live, to one of the

greatest tragedies of recent history. Many analysts, journalists. They said that day began the 21st

century. Three planes crashed into terrorist targets, one not. Paul Greengrass, director of films

like Bloody Sunday or Bourne's ultimatum decided to focus on that plane, the one that seg� In the investigations it

was demolished by a group of anonymous heroes who already knew the previous echos and who were not willing to

be used as a means to cause more victims. Obviously his maximum intention was none other than to save his

life, but they did not manage it. We all know the echos, we know what happened on that flight 93, what interest Does he

then have to make a film about an echo of which we know his final tragedy? .Homenajear to the

victims of terrorism. United 93 is possibly the best tribute that these people can receive that that

fatídico They died because some bastards decided to start a crusade against the West. We could also

take it as a tribute to the victims of terrorism in Spain or anywhere in the world, because after all

, their only sin was to belong to a society far removed from extremist doctrines. The first 45 minutes

of the movie ��cula, the British director uses them to situate us before the axis of the tragedy that he tries to

show us. The first moments of that black day, with the impact of the first two planes (shown through

the radar and without using real images captured by CNN except in specific cases), the perplexity of

the authorities , the chaos thatin the control towers of the different airports and in the military command

occurs, a chaos narrated with camera on the shoulder, from a distance, without knowing who is who. We only have

names, anonymous people whose privacy we do not know about (as it will happen when the director

finishes focusing on the airplane in question). That distancing allows us to put ourselves in situation, Paul

Greengrass asks us for patience through these images, everything has to come, and the director knows that he must

show it, otherwise he would not have meaning to do it. With parsimony, without hurry, telling each of the

echos punctually and showing each anonymous hero beyond the firemen, who flourished that day in thetowers

control. He who first detects the possibility of a kidnapping, Ben Slimey (giving himself life as well) who made

the decision not to allow any more flight in American air space, Major James Foxx (also

d�� Life itself) that did everything possible to achieve the presidential permission to shoot down the planes

that were heading to Washington. At that moment we enter the plane, is kidnapped. Again with camera on

the shoulder and the testimonial music that goes unnoticed during almost all the footage puts us in situation, and

surprisingly makes us feel part of that small group of hostages, we are one more and we are

scared what we observed (especially the last 20 minutes). And it is here where emotions are

unleashed, passengers know what happened, call their families to say goodbye and we

shudder at what we see. The passengers rebel against the terrorists, and we exalt ourselves with them,

we feel the need to open the head to one of those sons of bitches, we believe that there is hope, that a

happy ending is possible, we reach the cabin with them. and the screen cuts to black. And we woke up, and it was not a

film, but the recreation of real events, and we are aware that there was no happy ending. Nailed in

the chair, head down, some repressing the tears, others crying openly, we got up and left

the cinema sorry, without understanding why, not knowing what the hell happened. There is no policy in this

pesudodocumentary, there is no I hate, there is no rancor, there are no patriotic messages, no American flag in the

foreground, no sign that makes Greengrass decide on one detail or another, even humanizes the

terrorists in which maybe It is the most controversial decision of the film (but which would not be displeased to

be). Only people, human beings, victims of the sinraz���n of which we feel part. As I said before, the

distancing from which the film is narrated, far from being apathetic, allows us to be part of it, like

each one of those anonymous people who perished that day, we are them, and they are93 is a

us.Unitedvery emotional film without pretending to be, United 93 is probably the best movie of what we have been in for a

year. Pay attention to most criticisms, wear scarves just in case.

" 1

" The short Hotel Chevalier is possibly the best of the film. I must make it clear that even the most assiduous

followers would agree that Viaje a Darjeeling is one of Anderson's worst films to date.

I'm not a big fan of Wes Anderson, I could almost point to the group of detractors of the filmmaker Tejano and

wield against him the problems of his own idiosyncrasy and his indie-fantasioso humor. But still being

aware of it and analyzing the film as knowing its peculiar director and scriptwriter, I must make it clear

that even the most assiduous followers would agree that Viaje a Darjeeling is a of their worst tapes to date.

Three brothers psychologically quite upset (and one of them even physically) embark on a

peculiar journey for spiritual discovery. In fact, the oldest of them has set a trap for them

to meet their mother who disappeared in a secluded village in India becoming a nun

and who did not even attend burial of his father. Anderson's absurd humor is not a humor of gags and jokes

if not to bring situations and di allogos to the limit (sometimes even surpassing it). In this way, the

actors he has chosen to give life to his brother protagonists are also an example of this. Adrien Brody,

Owen Wilson and Jason Schwartzman, which more ramshackle and physically corrupt than the previous one manage to give at

least a little sickly coherence to everything. Anderson does not renounce his fetish actors and in fact enjoys

he even allows himself the luxury of inviting Bill Murray to the party in a first andfirst

promisingshots that soon fade away. In this show of gifts, he also made the projection of the

short Hotel Chevalier, which is possibly the best of the film, a prelude to the story told in the

film where the brother played by Jason Schwaetzman is reunited with his girlfriend (the same Natalie

Portman nude who will spend the rest of the tape spying on the phone) in a Parisian hotel, ashort

very successfulby suggesting let see m��� s that for what it really is, a kind of summary of the film

that has a lot of roads to explore but that is wasted without mercy always ending in dead

ends.

" 0

" Underestimating the intelligence of the public is the worst sin in the film In the years we have been dedicating ourselves full-time to the world of the seventh art, we have learned many

unwritten rules . One of them has to do with the tapes that have caused a lot of expectation before getting

to theaters. If that film in question, when its premiere moment, the distributor chooses to hide it

from the press, it is almost certain that they do it so that the media do not have the opportunity to speak ill of it.

Reasons: the long-awaited film at the end of the day is not very good, but if the public does not find out, the

attendance to the cinemas will not be reduced. And unfortunately this premise is fulfilled in "" The Da Vinci Code "".

Too solemn, too cold, too politically correct. A lot of noise and few nuts around a

thriller too conventional. "" The Da Vinci Code "" is largely, with the exception of its final part, a

sort of almost literal figurative representation of the book that inspired it. As if it were a graphic

version of the text, which includes literal transcriptions of some dialogues or key expressions andrefers

strictlyto it in the description of the actions, in the recurring flashbacks and in the adjusted

description of his characters, perhaps with the visible exception of the banking manager Andr��� Vernet. Howard takes advantage of

the privilege of having been able to shoot the initial sequence in the Louvre itself to handle from the start with

a firm pulse and a well-known occupation of a tanned narrator, the suggestive climate of intrigue that seems to be accentuated as the

hieroglyphic grows -known by the dissemination that took the book-raised under the noses of the

symbologist Robert Langdon (Tom Hanks) and the young cryptologist of the French police Sophie Neveu

(Audrey Tautou): the death of the conservative elder of the Louvre - and grandfather of l The girl revives a secret

displayed around the work of Leonardo da Vinci and that could question the foundations of Christianity and the

power of the Church. It is undeniable that, if Brown's book had not existed, none of the A Hollywood

studio would have put money to turn a film into a film so thick built almost exclusively on

explanations and (somewhat) fanciful speculations about symbols, c�� �digos, secret cults, religious history and

messages disguised as art, which are presumed to be the only attraction to question

the fundamental principles of Christianity. Conspiracy theories lose value and credibility by the

way they are presented. The explanation that Sir Teabing (Ian McKellen) makes of The Last Supper,painting

Da Vinci's, is apt for minds trained by the Barney dinosaur. Underestimating the intelligence of the public is

the film's worst sin. The story, then, advances thanks to the solution of puzzles, the detection of

codes and the boast of historical knowledge but not to the construction. Den characters, designed morebasis

idiosyncraticthan personalities of flesh and bone.Generally a generous director of actors, Howard is not

able here to provide an identity to his protagonist partner, that remains artificial, pale, rigid and

inexpressive. In a film so loaded with palabrer���a there is no room for that, or for emotion or style. It is the

most impersonal film of Ron Howard, a filmmaker with a job but not talented, who although he has sent

some skids in his career could always be trusted a couple of hours with total confidence. Not anymore. "" The

Da Vinci Code "" (film and book version) is a sample of the eternal conflict between historians and novelists. If the

novel and / or the film accurately reflect reality, then it is accused of not being a novel because it does not

contain fiction. And sometimes plagiarism, because logically the novelist has to rely on the study of

historical sources. And if in the fiction he disfigures the facts, then he is accused of not telling the whole

truth, which falsifies what happened. "" The Da Vinci Code "" does not pretend to be history It is not history, and therefore

can fiction the facts, invent a new reality, although some facts have been taken from history.

What is true and what is fiction in a novel is a privilege of the novelist. If what he writes is an argument

stuck with historical reality, perhaps it would be a criticism. And even so, in the criticism there is also a

great part of imagination on the part of the writer. Independently of everything, it is ridiculous that in the

XXI century , leaders of various Christian doctrines such as the Catholic Church and governments such as the Philippines,

Thailand or India banned the exhibition of the tape, for things that are not entirely true , in

some way they make people think, which would mean that they too will sooner or later come to question

their reality, something very dangerous for those who wish to have the masses under control.

" 0

" No country for old men is the happy reunion with his first works commented, a return to the

roots full of a dry violence with disturbing characters incarnated by brilliant actors.

Some authors after seeing their respective careers in danger decide to return to the cinema of their principles. The

COEN brothers had two comedies well below the expectations of filmmakers always well

recognized. Intolerable or THE LADYKILLERS mean an alarming decline in the talent shown

in previous occasions, especially in the black movies that they offered at the beginning of their filmography Cona with

titles as appreciable as Easy Blood, Death among the flowers and more recently the memorable Fargo. NO

COUNTRY FOR OLD MEN is the happy reunion with his first commented works, a return to the roots full

of a dry violence with disturbing characters incarnated by brilliant actors. The hit man Javier Barden

seems to be able to repeat nomination to the oscar after before dusk, the winner of the oscar TOMMI LEE JONES by

the fugitive demonstrates the sobriety that accustoms. Accompanied by two other great actors of always

grateful presence in the faces of JOSH BROLIN that we saw recently in PLANET TERROR and the great WOODY

HARRELSON that has great performances in his filmography with born assassins or the CHEERS series. All of

them in full state of grace in a perfect film full of strength, with excellent di���logos, perfect in all

technical aspects, in a brilliantly constructed guide that gives us the return to the masters of

great ones as always will be COEN.

" 1

" More than worthy product, taking into account, that is, the limitations of all nature typical of the time,

country and gender .

The truth is that I did not have too many references to Filipino horror movies. And when I say that I did not have

too many I could say almost none. I had always had the feeling that it should be something like the

Neoceland���s, with a lot of vinesse and casquer���a everywhere. The final push to satisfy this latent curiosity was

given to me by the special dedicated to him on this website. He managed to get me a copy of Blood Criature, which

apparently and according to I have read from other colleagues in this same section, and other information that I got after

spending some time on it, is the one that gave the kick-off. The fact that it was based on a story by

HG Wells was in a way a small guarantee of at least some quality in the script. And the truth is that in

spite of everything I expected a kind of grotesque that later turned out not to be such. Bearing in mind the

technical, economic and all kinds of limitations, Blood Criature turns out to be a very worthy product, as

long as it is judged with "special" criteria, so to speak. . After a start that

can be described as intense, a somewhat regretful development continues to revitalize with aending. The

quite moviditotruth is that the, or rather the monster causes hilarity, but as I said before,

we must take into account the limitations of all types of this production. The interpretation is almost the least,

because the truth is that there is not too much complexity in the characters. That is, as a curious fact I will tell you

that you missed the introduction. In which they warn you that a bell will sound before the abrupt scenes

to prevent the delicate ones of the stomach, and that I see in the criticism of other companies. ���eros and in some websites

is a curious fact of the film. But the truth is that in the version that I have seen does not appear. In short, that

as experience is not bad at all, but the truth is that it is not that you are willing to delve into this

gender Although who knows, the same thing I see two or three more and I just dazzle.

" 0

" According to the sophisms of the guru, anyone who receives money from a bank will not only have to repay the

entire loan and its interests, but also You will lose all your assets; the fallacy is so obvious that itnot

isworth refuting it.

The orensano Rodrigo Cort���s is, fundamentally, an author of "" videoclips "", and that is evident in his first

feature film. The truth is that the beginning is brilliant, from a credit card very worked and showy

(so rare in Spanish cinema, unfortunately) to an unusual start , with the narration in first

person of the protagonist, at the dead end one hour before the moment in which the action starts. It is not that the

resource of the cold-blooded narrator is especially novel (recall, for example, William Holden in "" The

Twilight of the Gods "", the unforgettable "" Sunset Boulevard ""), but yes, it is true that it is striking and

intriguing, especially if, as in this case, it is truffled with experimental visual games in the manner of Michel

Gondry in "" Olv���date de mi "" (see criticism in Criticalia) or Woody Allen in "" Disassembling Harry "". The plot has

its interest: a professor of History of Economics, who attends by the improbable name of Mart���n Circo Mart���n,

wins the biggest prize of the television ,N, three million euros (although in the film they always speak of

five hundred million pesetas: they are older than the wooden balconies?), Although in kind, not in metallic :

an eighteenth-century mansion, two or three cars which is cooler, a small plane, motorcycles, trips? in short, one pass.

The problem begins with a girlfriend affected by the new-rich-buyer-compulsive syndrome; it continues

when the protagonist learns that he has to pay almost fifty percent of the prize to the Treasury, and heno

hasmoney to do it; he continues when the bank lends him six hundred thousand euros (again they say it in

pesetas: one hundred million of the old blondes), but pignor���ndole everything won in the contest; e ���tem more with

the financial adviser who is advised, dedicated in body and soul to pluck such a p���nfilo. In this context

of absolute disaster, the linnet (implausibility of the guide: how a professor of History of Economics is

so slow on economic issues?) Good question , says the director and screenwriter Rodrigo Cort���s: now tell me

another?) uses an anti-economic guru and an anti-globalization point in his spare time, which preaches the good

news of the absolute perfidy of the banks, to which the director devotes practically the rest of the footage;

man, it will not be me who says that banking, in Spain and everywhere, does not earn much money, but the

demagogy with which it is treated here the matter smells that stinks . According to the sophisms of the guru, anyone

who receives money from a bank will not only have to repay the entire loan and its interests, but also s

lose all their assets; the fallacy is so obvious that it is not worth refuting it. Some bank has had to

make a big mess to this man so that he has such a huge desire to that business, but that should not

make him lose the north, that of a story that aroused interest. Pors down the path initially trampled,

that of a normal man overwhelmed by fortune that at one moment seems to smile at him, although he is really

giving him a pu���alada trapera. So the things, soon the bright start is lost to focus exclusively

in accumulating annoying arguments in the antibanca diatribe, and in that effort Cort���s is going to lose all his strength, and

to the film most of his interest. At the end it recovers the thread in the scene in which the

protagonist is dead (by the way, to be more greedy than Harpag���n?), But can not recover the

lost time. There are still things and details: the gur��� that composes Chete Lera, that although it is more false than acoin

three-euro, is a peculiar character, inhabitant of a house partitioned from large decks of newspapers and with a

catatonic mother that feeds on the energy that the television emits; or the Santillana chair, thesuperior

protagonist's, which seems the result of the cross between the Snow White Witch, Cinderella's Stepmother,

Mrs. Rotermeyer of "" Heidi "" and the presenter of the program " "The weakest rival" ". An irregular group that

confirms that, if its director forgets his phobias and dedicates himself to serious filmmaking, he can

become a first class filmmaker.

" 0

" I can not reach, from there my feeling of guilt. Edward Norton with thatand concentrated lookme more

dullremindsof an astigmatist than an exalted illusionist.

Even when you have to turn a blind eye to not being arrogant? It is true that in this blog I have treated

several films very badly because they were cosmic to a superlative degree when their initial mission was not

just comedy (as proof of this it is enough to take a return for the category Do not see it). But the goal

of any visit to the cinema is usually the satisfaction of the fulfilled mission and the pleasure it generates to see

a good film, sensations that for one reason or another I have not felt for quite a while (at least in

regards to the reviews in this blog). When I published my opinion about The Big Trick a few weeks ago, I did it

with the same ideas going around in my head but on that occasion, perhaps because it was the first of

two realizations similarly, the sense of mission not fulfilled was not as strong. With The Illusionist I can not

but feel some guilt when I declare that I did not like it. Because there are many factors that usually lead to a

film to the rating of "" Good "" or "" Very good "" in some cases, factors that in this opportunity for me

have not been sufficient. music composed by Philip Glass, rarely so agreed and subtly dosed, the

photograph of Dick Pope (The secret of Vera Drake) with delicate cuttlefish that do nothing but submerge us

deeply in the Vienna of 1900 wonderfully set with the production design of the Czech Ondrej

Nekvasil. As always, a pleasure to see Paul Giamatti being able to wear not only any shoe that reach him

but also the costumes ( elegant not ostentatious) by Ngila Dickson (the saga of The Lord of the

Rings). Then? Then it does not reach me, hence my fault. Eduard Norton with that stern and concentrated look

reminds me more of an astigmatic than of an exalted illusionist, Jessica Biel has little to do to earn the nickname

of Miss Bone. If his character is hopelessly in love with the protagonist, it is a well-kept secret

because there is no chemistry with Norton. And finally Rufus Sewell as Prince Leopold has as many

details of tyrant and dictator as the film itself of great and surprising illusion.

" 0

" It's not a movie and it's not fun as it was the first part. It is simply one more product of

the exhausted "California dream factory". The third parties ... were never the best.

That something is wrong in Hollywood is not news. It talks about crisis of ideas. There is no more to stop to see what

kinds of products are coming to us from the homeland of MacDonalds: remakes, third, fourth, fifths

of, resort to adapt stories that are presupposed in advance they are going to have a faithful public (for example, that of

the comics), insubstantial films and with many special effects, in short, they are the ones thatthese days.

flood our billboardsit's Shrek Third's turn. It's not a movie and it's not

fun as it was the first part (in fact you're lucky if you manage to get a single laugh). It is

simply a product of the exhausted "California dream factory", a product to consume quickly and

then forget. History does not get hooked. In this case Shrek goes in search of the new king of "" Far far away ""

while "" Prince Charming "" plans to overthrow and invest himself in the king. And at some point, when you see with

your eyes wide open, the story becomes the typical Yankee high school comedy. The interpretations

are correct and according to what is expected of them. If at the end you are going to dare to drop by the cinema

to see it, I recommend that you at least see it in the original. Now, do not say you were not warned!

"0"

Eastwood is halfway between the masterpiece that has triedfilm and the message it

conveys

Theresomething about Eastwood films that resulta.pesado me. It has happened to me with the last three: 'Mystic

River' is a good movie, but I think it's overrated; 'Million Dolar Baby' has already begun to give me that smell

of drowsiness and pretension: a somewhat strange pair, but which has been confirmed in 'Banderas de nuestros Padres':

a film made to conscience, knowing it will be seen withmagnifying glass, which enjoyed the complicity of much of

the criticism and pblico.y has resulteda pel It is more complex than it might seem, but

also simple at the same time. And something heavy, yes. No, do not think it's a contradiction: Eastwood is a big guy

in the movie business. And 'Banderas de nuestros Padres' is a good movie. But their tapes always have a double

edge: the sins of the past, the importance of the future, euthanasia, and now, manipulation. Thefilmmaker

Americandoes not completely criticize the essential aspect of the film, perhaps for fear ofcensorship

indirectof American society. I still do not know. But everything leads me to think that Eastwood is

halfway between the masterpiece he has tried to film and the message he transmits. Our parents'

banners have typical and atypical elements. Knowing that it was a battle of World War II, no one could

expect less than an impressive landing on the island of Iwo Jima. Magistral, almost at the height of

Normandy's in 'Saving Private Ryan'. However, it is disadvantaged by the continuous flashbacks, which make

the rhythm of the film may be somewhat irregular. The idea in itself is understood, but perhaps they should not have

been so long, or so distant. But since I have brought to light the most basic film important of the last

decade, there is something that should be noted Eastwood: the story is more interesting than the one of Spielberg (producer

also in 'Flags of our fathers '). And what about the deal? Ryan Philippe meets, just like the rest.

There is no great performance, although in truth, the tape is not made for the show

of its actors. Once again, Eastwood will take the cat to the water. Although he could have seen hisreduced

footage, which is more than tiresome, "Flags of our parents" is a film that, hardly, will

not like. � And this is enough to say.

" 1

" Saved from absolute disaster by the two monsters who carry their charisma to rescue the film of

absolute neglect.

The director ROB REINER was at the time someone really important with a list of films among which

stood out the promised princess, MISERY, Count with me among others. Over time the talent shown was

totally buried in a list of simply abominable products from history of ours to say

there did not bode well in his career. To resurface has convinced two of the greatest interpreters of the

moment so that they work together, they coincide on the screen for the first time. Of course I mean the

winner of several awards from the academy that already coincided with REINER in some good men JACK NICHOLSON

accompanied in a heads up by a diametrically opposed actor in interpretation style then is quite

more content as you show his works in no perdiono life sentence, certainly I mean the

great MORGAN FREEMAN.Although the very different styles of both, the ���mica that is established from

the beginning is totally key to sustain a loose film. A film full of good intentions but not

of that quality film is made, is ballasted by a thousand gui���n sometimes seen, forsituations

unbelievableagain a direction without strength of the signing and a certain air to telefilme in his mediocre staging.

Nor does it stand out technically, or in his photograph ��a, music or wardrobe, being the t� Peak drama

desktop where you try to mourn for dramticos very sobados mechanisms for film leading to

aburrimiento.Salvada absolute disaster for the two monsters who bear his charisma to rescue the

film of absolute neglect.

" 0

" Despite the artist's lack of visual dedication, it is a film that knows where it wants to go, a good

rhythm and some very bad grape varieties that raise points of interest. view regarding concepts such as

hypocrisy, survival and the law of the strongest.

The horror that hurts a film as genuine as First Blood is the impersonal and telephonic direction

of director Ted Kotcheff - which does not prevent it from resulting in a narrative very fluid and in which the information

is very well dosed - and from here we start to value a product that for a long time has been

very badly valued and interpreted by traditional criticism, and that never becomes the masterpiece that should have

been because of the imbalance between the magnificent writing (gui���n) and the mediocre pulse of the filmmaker

(realization). In light of this, we note some nuances: the story about a disturbed man who sows chaos in

a small mountain village has more attributes related to melodrama or independent cinema with ���nfulas of

social criticism that to the movies of pure and simple action. From this angle, let's say that Kotcheff's work is not up

to the content, although the photography of Andrew Laszlo contributes to creating anstaging

absorbingand hostile atmosphere (fog , storms) that characterizes two strata of the scenography and of the

same theme: nature versus civilization, the savage against the representatives of law and order. First of

all, it is necessary to find out They are the causes or traits that explain an a priori insubstantial icon but

that - despite who bears it - has withstood the passage of time. And a film that 26 years later

remains valid with regard to their intrnsecos values and its repercussion in popular culture. As itnot

couldbe otherwise, the center of attraction is the archetype represented in John Rambo (Sylvester Stallone),

the timeless figure of the savage who threatens the established order, and which has its �� Optimum expression in the

images that open the film: a solitary man who advances on a dirt road from inside the forest

and in the direction of the camera, looking lanky and slightly faded look. Theessential

musical accompaniment of Jerry Goldsmith is, which warns us about the elegy nature of the film, tears

for a soul destroyed in the brutality of the war. This disheveled profile , progressively we are discovered as

an insane that is being victim of the past and present circumstances (attention to the flashbacks

used). And this is the trait that best defines the uniqueness and narrative claw of First Blood: to make

the spectator feel empathy for the savage, and aversion towards the forces of order. We refer to an

archetype that has its roots in universal history, from the Amorites in the days of Summer and Akkad,

through the barbarians who undermined the foundations of the Roman Empire, and the Taliban in our present

righ now. All respond to the archetype of the savage originating from the mountains (or the inhospitable desert),

those who hate civilization, threaten to invade it and destroy order. Well, the scheme of

First Blood is built on that same mythology. John Rambo, the savage, and the sheriff, played by

Brian Dennehy, defender of civilization, which puts the morals and customs that govern the life of the

people before the style of Rambo, thus embodying the intolerance against some ways of life (in this case, the

vagabond) that are outside of social conventions (it is laughable to read certain critics who see

in this film an ultraconservative discourse , when in reality Rambo is a countercultural icon of anarchy and

rebellion against the majority discourse, in short, they are not born stupid, but they do.) The spectator is

attracted by what he fears and is unknown to him. There lies the key that explains the magnetism of this

character: the disturbed one who faces the enlightened law using the laws of nature. Thatprofile

intelligencebased on the domain of wild nature, the ancestral survival instinct coupled

with skill in military strategy in the most dirty guerrilla. There the law is you, but here I am the

law. Rabidly anti-war, the film is the x-ray of a disturbed person, a victim of the system who

ends up rebelling against the order that created him when - after his escape through ���s of the underground

plagued with rats and helped by the light of a torch - he goes to the town and destroys the electrical supply of

the population with shrapnel, while he recreates the sounds and the fear of war with the fire of the p���lvora.

Following the metaphysical game, is the savage who has come to destroy civilization. In short, John Rambo

is the icon that responds to an archetype of savagery, hostility, alienation, and no devoid of alook

romantic. Yes, that classic romanticism, that of the marginalized and the bohemian beatnick of the loser, and although here it

alludes to those who failed in Vietnam, the beat spirit of n mode is part of the character. And First Blood

is a fierce metaphor about American society that fears the savage but creates it in order to defend the

civilization of those savage peoples who threaten it, to finally persecute it and condemn it to madness . And in

spite of the little visual dedication on the part of the director, it is a film that knows where it wants to go, good rhythm and

some di carlogos loaded with very bad grape and that raise points of view regarding to concepts such as hypocrisy,

survival, the law of the strongest in minority against the law of the weak in spite of being older��� to.

" 1

" The obduracy of the director for a company repudiated by the establishment, his honesty perpetuated in an

incomprehensible cinema, are capable of deeply moving the viewer.

With the film "" Ed Wood "" (1994), Tim Burton would give the definitive push to the process of revalorization of the work

of the filmmaker popularly known as the worst director in the history of the movie theater. Vilified by the time in

which he lived, Ed Wood, a controversial filmmaker wherever he may be, has become the greatest exponent of what

we know today as junk culture (concept of nature ambiguous). An approach to "" Glen or

Glenda? "", His opera prima, will allow us to clarify, to the extent possible, the value of this singular

director. A mysterious old man played by Bega Lugosi, actor who embodied �� to Count Dr���cula in the celebrated

version of Tod Browning (Dracula, 1931) and that Ed Wood is responsible for rescuing from oblivion, introduces us to the

film from a sofa in the middle of a small, and strangely decorated, laboratory. After carrying out a smoky

experiment, Lugosi, turned into a kind of demiurge, will go directly to the spectator to make way

for the narration of the facts: In the city, a transvestite has committed suicide. The policeman in charge of the case,

surprised at the condition of the deceased, will ask for explanations from a psychiatrist. This one, will illustrate him on

transvestism and transsexualism with two stories that will occupy the rest of the footage. The first,

significantly more developed, will deal with the story of tormented Glen (Wood's alter ego and played

by himself), who does not dare to confess to Barbara, with whom n is promised, his transvestite status. The

second, briefly tell the life of Alan, who will see his dreams fulfilled by undergoing a sex

change operation. The theatrical realism with which he they portray the everyday images of Glen's life, such as

the scene in which he watches the television wearing his sister's clothes, will approach the institutional video through

the overlay of the speech pseudo-scientific of the psychiatrist. This medical point of view thatus

keepsdistant from the protagonist with whom, in principle, we have to identify, will be linked to the on

tratamientorico treatment received by the omniscient character played by Lugosi. The spectator, accustomed to

a narrative made in favor of his privileged situation, attends to a confused and unbridled grammar

whose surrealism, like the torment of Glen, is increasing: grotesque metaphors (see the stampede of

bison) and other extravagant images will lead to a long dream in which they will be staged,

record� ��ndonos the presupuestonfimo budget of production, the ghosts that torture the mind of the protagonist.

Sex, fetishism, desire, violence, remorse. Finally, he will see the light through a situation that, due to its

more than evident symbolism, is laughable: Glenda, the female alter ego of our character, will not be able to �

save B���rbara from a fallen trunk that imprisons him, the virile Glen will get it. After solving the

nightmare, dare to explain the problem to his beloved and this, for love, accept it. Someone could think of

Ed Wood, for his willingness to convey a speech ��� intimate through such a peculiar narrative (since

transvestism affected him for life), as a bizarre precursor of cinematographic modernity. However

, his unconscious negation of the tradition that precedes him, seems to turn him into a unique case, a

rarity in the history of cinema. His willingness to make conventional films clashes with an uncommon personality

that seems not to have integrated the established mode of representation. The result: a film that

(re) invents cinema without proposing to it, that seems delirious in the eyes of all those who have been

educated under a determined narrative canon. The conviction with which he uses his fair-trade effects,

the innocence of his metaphors, the interpretation of himself, the narrative obfuscation. All this displaces the

interest of the spectator, turning the figure of Ed Wood filmmaker into the authentic protagonist of the film. His

obduracy for a company repudiated by the establishment, its honesty perpetuated in an incomprehensible cinema,

are capable of deeply moving the viewer. So it seems to have happened with Tim Burton who, far from

falling into the current cult of the freak, heir to the old monsters fair, has dignified Wood by

making him the misunderstood hero of a of his best movies. It would seem contradictory to us that

the famous director of "" Eduardo Scissorhands "" (Edgard Scissorhands, 1990), accommodated in his own brand of

authorial production, praises a filmmaker like Ed Wood . But if we can say something after seeing Glen or Glenda?

is that the conviction with which he works in his work against the current does not leave us indifferent.

" 1

" Here you hear, from beginning to end, the grinding of the predictable, hackneyed, rehashed, typical, schematic,

plémbeo. A very simple story told with very simple resources too.

The truth is irritating - but muuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuy irritating - spending two hours watching

as harmless as his product. And I say harmless because implicit and explicitly seeksassert

certain things and wantscommunicate a wellintentioned message and ah put the stop at Mannerist the matter.

What a shame. Or a lot of shit, in case I write with knives on my fingers instead of the calm

knocking with which I am about to comment on the last film by Ridley Scott (I think it's the same that made the

incredible "" Alien "", the very interesting "" The Duelists "" or the classic "" Blade Runner "", but I'm not sure of

anything). Let's leave the obvious and move on to something else, butterfly, who looks at the matter has milks.History

about a materialist banker (man, of course). Story about a four-eyed child with the air of anasshole

integral(because they are educating him in the sacred rules of competitiveness, we do not blame himand

entirelyleave a margin for his innocence) that arrives to adult and becomes a solid integral asshole

(I do not say it in bad faith, I simplify things a bit to go faster). They spend a few quarters of an

hour, a few funny things happen to him, he joins a little bit, he takes some reprimand, he relives his

childhood, he has a moment of doubt, the film ends and the integral asshole is still a complete asshole

but he does not so much. It leaves a little of the fold with risk to stay outside forever (because the good t���a

that has fished does not give for less, go) and we see the other chick taking a bath of grapes. Sometimes, in movies it is

possible to make a good movie with a guide or an outline of ideas that is summarized in three sentences, but here you can

hear, from beginning to end, the grinding of the predictable , manido, refrito, t���pico, schematic, pl���mbeo. A

very simple story told with very simple resources too. We have a character that goes from point A to

point B, but, apart from the fact that the viewer already knows the end (because it is a story that has been told a

million times), the character does not travel the path on his own , but is caught in its foreseeable

clich���. There is no progression, there is not the slightest ability to make cre���ble that the character played by

Russell Crowe can choose the other option. Because he is a character, as I said, without life, without that dimension

of the real human. This does not have its cause both in a bad gui���n, but in the very idea of ​​which part:

Mannerist, pamphletear and predictable. And if at the level of gui���n is not to shoot rockets, because there is no where to

take it. Is there subtlety ?. No. Is there dramatic force in the "transition" of the central character? No (or not much)

Is it a comedic costumbrista with a "retro" air like an aperspectivist exercise from a pattern ofrealism

crystalline and fluid? No. (I hear myself laugh) The photography, the staging, the music, offer some enjoyable

moment (and the little asses that come out. Brrrrrrrrwww). There will be who will want to save it by attending to those

technical (and testosterone) aspects, as they have done with the futuristic truce of Alfonso Cuar���n, but where

there is there is not. It is sad that even the great filmmakers are falling into the same trash. Or it would be that they were right

those who, already for quite some time, say that Ridley Scott is and has always been a bluff. What I want to

review Blade Runner.

" 0

" It is not an exaggeration to say that this film (to some extent) does for survival horror whatin its

Shaun of the Dead (2004) didmoment for the zombie genre.

Although it has reached our billboards with almost a year of delay, Desmembrados (2006) lands at

a very appropriate time, not only due to the fact that in Spain it has been premiered in a session ���n double that

sought to capitalize on the failed phenomenon of the Grindhouse Tarantino / Rodr���guez, but also because the recent

proliferation (with its consequent satiety) of survival horror and porno-tortures makes thatmust necessarily

wewelcome a film that takes a whole series of topicazos and parodies them in a way

that we can only describe as brilliant. And the best of all is that at no time do you feel that there is a

contempt towards the particular genre, but quite the opposite: the humor is so well taken and the

conventions of this type of history are so well managed (and reverted) that it is not an exaggeration to say, as

has been said since its premiere, that this film (to some extent) does for survival horror what in its

He made Shaun of the Dead (2004) for the zombie genre. Also taking advantage of the recent rush to shoot

low-budget productions in the countries of Eastern Europe, the story of Dismembered part of the same

premise of all these films: a group of people trapped in a strange land where they are massacred one

by one by a local threat. The difference is that this time the protagonists are notteenagers

hornyor an idlellic middle class family, but a group of executives of a multinational arms that

have begun to prove in their own flesh the violence that can cause the death industry to which they are

dedicated. Such social s���tira, which in more "" serious "" hands would have been laughable and indoctrinating, finds

here a field of laughter thanks to the use of the most hackneyed office sties taken to the field of horror:

from the useless leader of the team to the corporate ball, from the guardian of the political correction to

the hanging of the joints and mushrooms, all they must work as a team for the first time in their lives if they want to leave

unharmed from that experience. But of course, unlike other attempts at parody, Dismembered never ceases to

be a horror film (and in fact, there is a good piece of the film in which the laughter is conspicuous by its

absence) , as the levels of casquer���a and graphic violence are quite high, courtesy of the British

Christopher Smith, who had already made an advance in his least interesting Creep (2004). Perhaps the only

downside that I can put to Desmembrados is that, in the end, his ambitions have fallen short, since history was

for much more. The disaster of the corporative spirit plunged in a situation of authentic survival

could have reached epic proportions instead of remaining in a few specific references (the boss who

is a hard guy at work proves to be a real coward when it comes to the moment of truth), which makes me

think that Christopher Smith has not wanted or has not been able to give his film a greater resonance thematic.

Even the original title, Severance, makes reference to Deliverance (1972), which although it is not a

horror movie to use, I know that it is an ancestor more than evident of the survival horror Instead, we have to

settle for a very good cross between The Office and Hostel (2006), with Hungarian macizorras included. If something can

be attributed is that, sometimes, your mood can be somewhat bufo and too basic (which does

not reach the mastery levels of Shaun of the Dead, for example), but despite its failures is

appreciated, as it is a tape of the that I, in particular, did not expect much. In a year in which thepremieres

really outstanding horrorhave not been many, a film like Dismembered comes to fill a certain

void. I also think that, with a little more promotion and separate from your double-session partner,Sheep

Killer(2006), there could be given a very pleasant surprise.

" 1

" The opera prima by Jorge S���nchez-Cabezudo is a wide film, in all its splendor, where someplots

openalmost at the same time, are shelved, one by one without leaving a loose end .

The Spanish cinema occasionally puts a few drops of honey in our mouths, out of the hand of "" torrents "" and

"" Mortadelos "" we find great films, like this one that brings us , a story told in pieces, piece by

piece, as in an imaginary puzzle, where a group of well-known faces, Carmelo G���mez, the always excellent

Celso Burogallo and the television Mariano Alameda and Cesareo Estevanez, together with the beautiful debutante Judith

Diakhate, they compose a tape, that although its argument is deceiving (that of the terror that they announce seems of a

film "" with monster "") and not a tape of coincidences, where things abound "" so normal "" as envy and

hatred in the villages, well I know some of La Mancha, land of my maternal family. Something that has

caught my attention is that a Spanish movie wave, it is not "" made in Spain "" if you do not have your sex ration orwomen's

lightclothes, this can not be an exception ci���n; (What did he do to the movies to uncover, pardiez!)opera prima

Jorge S���nchez-Cabezudo'sis a wide-ranging film, in all its splendor, where a few plots open almost to the

time, they are shelved, one by one without leaving a loose end, and see that it is difficult for this to happen, since

often there is always a loose thread from which to draw the skein. In short, a good film Spanish,

which from time to time you have to do homeland, what noses!

" 1

" The most terrifying (without exaggeration) in the Spanish horror film, one of those wonders that both like

inside and outside our borders, if all the tapes were how are you , the crisis of the Spanish cinema would be

a chimera.

Before getting into the subject, say that right at the entrance of the cinema, as 2 more Madrid were Ariadna Gil

and David Trueba, both, buying tickets for the film, have occupied seats just in front of us,

although I would have loved to debate with Trueba for a while, in the end, and even though my wife has pressed me as

much as she could to at least congratulate him on "Welcome home" (film that we love), but

I have not been able, I can not help it, the people "" famous "" imposes respect to me. Having said that, it does not

matter too much but it looks good here, in the blog, Let's start talking about the film, one of the most expected

by a server, and that, after its premiere in hundreds of festivals (and also its excessive success) and its

representation in the Oscars this year, it was time for it to be released, and that is, all the news that

came from outside made presage that we were facing something big; and so it is.JA Bayona composes a film

that, drinking from indeterminate sources (more drinks than plagiarism), knows how to get into the consciousness of the spectator

and is that it is easy see "" The orphanage "" so many references to current horror film that one loses the account, it

is true that its end also bears some similarity with a recent success of home cinema. Belen Rueda (out

of that stupid television presenter that was once), and that is that, someone put, not only the scream in the sky

when Amenabar gave him a role in "" Mar Adentro "" But when someone said that Bayona would give himin his debut, he

the lead rolewanted to believe that he was wrong, without a doubt, it has not been like that, and right now we have in

Bel ���na a BIG of our cinema, that with 2 films is already going to rub elbows, very soon on the screen with

someone of the stature of Julianne Moore, ah��� that remains, that dir�� �an others, but Bel���n, little by little has made

a hole in this difficult world of 7��� art. Start the film from less to more, giving, first a global vision

of things, taking us little by little to a vor���gine where the terror, the darkest of our fears and the

claustrophobic situations appear on screen almost of the hand, and without letting us breathe, and although it is true

that sometimes the poetic mixes with the real (not to reveal more), other times it is the paranormal that takes

the terrain of the narraci���n.Excelente the soundtrack, electric, dark, with an unconventional classic nuance, and

always carried by the hand of the images, without clashing, without showing chiaroscuro , in short, a delight of the

composer also debutante.Alucinante the sets, costumes, and exteriors, being, the house whereare

the eventsdeveloped almost, a character more, t���trica, anguished , almost ag���nica.Como negative note,

to put one is the performance of Fernando Cayo, completely embarrassing, who is not credible in his role

as husband of Bel��� n Wheels, more interested in any "" trifle "" than in looking for his son, disappeared "" in

combat "" In summary: The most terrifying (if exaggerate) in the Spanish horror cinema, one of those wonders that

both like inside and outside our borders, if all the tapes were how are you, the crisis of Spanish cinema

would be a chimera

" 1

" I do not know if Lars Von Trier is a genius, but in? Dogville? He did an impeccable work of creation andtechnical realization

conceptual andand, in addition, demonstrated that his art is a firm catalyst for his deepconcerns

spiritual.

There was a town with its false messiahs and a girl who came from nowhere, fleeing from a darkness. Escape

from a wolf's hell was to fall into a wolf pit in disguise. The time came to test the val���a and the

resistance of a collective caged in itself for pretending, for wanting to be without being, for fear. Everything ends

with a decision whose origin lies in the depths of human consciousness, the gaze of a compassionate god.

The conscience can be dangerous, it is the flames of hell that hide on the other side. It may

sometimes be better not to look, not to think, not to wish for the good of humanity. We are too fragile to assume such an

immense responsibility. Lars Von Trier created a raw and naked allegory from its external form to its

depths. What he tells us is too serious to be said: politicians, thinkers,opposition

or anypop singer will not say it. The truth disguises itself as absorbing and devastating parabola, disturbing

for the receptive souls who come to apprehend the ultimate meaning of the story: we are prisoners of a

fragility that overcomes our noosphere of moral codes and � There is a point of desperation so

destabilizing that the same sphere of human culture ends up giving way to the horror of violence,

consciously and reasonably justified. The naked scenography it is at the service of the naked and direct gaze

with which Trier introduces us into the town that represents the whole of society, according to theallegorical game

proposed. It is not a pedanteria since that disposition of the scenographic elements allows to encompass

the totality of the beings and the facts that encourage inside and outside the homes with a simple assembly of

frames, c ���mara in hand, placing the viewer in a point of view (the eye of the camera) that allows him to

know the life of the people without the conventional limit imposed by physical borders (doors, walls, etc).

This, in addition, has an elementary function in the construction of the history: to emphasize the profiles and the

human content over a minimalist environment, and to create a collective entity that flows and interacts Comoa as a

whole faced with the two central characters. Great example of how to execute an abstract concept (in its

allegorical configuration) that leads to the recreation of the life of a people under a certain omniscient,gaze

unrestrictedto the planes in chopped, but in any angulation and around any of the characters

inserted in the collective entity. In short, a superb orchestration and drawing of each of the elements of

allegory, interconnected with dynamism while achieving a powerful realistic dimension (reinforced by the

movements of the hand that guide the camera). Despite its allegorical abstraction, the story tells us some

events that could happen anywhere in the world, in our immediate reality. The transfer of an

immediate reality to the allegorical space facilitates the game and the articulated speech in the different profiles, and

at the same time, it gives a local significance to universal problems: the hypocrisy. ��a, the dissatisfaction, the

existential emptiness, the faith or the distrust in the other, the weak line that separates the purity from the perversion , the

shadows that cloud the distinction between victim and executioner, the danger of feeling morally superior to a

specific stratum of society and the danger of being too aware of it. There is a certain nihilistic aspect

in its conclusion: there are no more laws than those that each one forges by itself, and these can justify aworthy

genocide, withoutremorse. I read somewhere that von Trier would have to be put in

jail. Certainly, its parabola has a destructive power, sharp and without tapujos.As��� then, if in the translation

of the conceptual to the represented film is a real achievement, also triumphs in the development of

the relationship between the mysterious fugitive and the locals: the interactions have that point of ambiguity

that requires the correct representation of a social conflict. From the initial uncertainty to the subsequent

harmony and coexistence, and the return to the imbalance by the unknown, the paranoia, the malice, the violence,

the distrust and the distrust in a progression that is degenerating towards bitterness of betrayal. The fire that

destroys the micro world, which for about three hours has shown us a flow of human acts,

justifies and means the transparency and austerity of the scenario. Like a burst of pain and

ignorance, it leaves you speechless. I do not know if Lars Von Trier is a genius, but in "" Dogville "" he did an impeccable

work of creation and conceptual and technical realization and, in addition, demonstrated ��� that his art is a strong catalyst

for his deep spiritual concerns.

" 1

" The perfect creature is one of the bad movies that you are going to be able to see this year. I do not think it's even

worth seeing for those who are very fond of the vampic or G���tika theme. It is slow and devoid of

emotion.

When I saw for the first time the tr���iler of this movie, I was very excited "" another vampire movie and

over with vampires beb��� s "". Of course, at the cinema, I almost feel the shock. The perfect creature is one of themovies

badthat you are going to be able to see this year. I do not think it's even worth seeing for those who are very

fond of the vampic or G���tika theme. It is slow and devoid of emotion. It narrates how humans and

pseudo-vampires live together in a retro-future in which these vampires are known as "" The Brothers "" and playin

a rolesociety similar to that of Catholic priests, ah��� I leave the obvious similarity for reflection. This

Co-production New Zealand-United Kingdom has taken me out of my boxes for many reasons, as there are so many, I will

comment on the most relevant.First, the sets suck a lot, it must be said that in

sometimesalmost seen the stone cardboard, I have not heard in my life a soundtrack as insignificant as

this, not at all accompanies the story goes UNCOMPASS andaddition for greater I guess it goes

unnoticed. That retro-futuristic touch that the film made me erect my heart, god, what an ugly thing,

what an emetic idea, it causes a sensation. No continuous repudiation towards what you are seeing. It also does not hold up

because a slightly advanced society would never have the wholesome streets without asphalting, that there are sequences in

which you can see the dirt floor and ��� Straw? We're going to run from fright. Not tothey havetelevisions

mention thatblack and white, microphones that look like they were taken from DUNE living with vans and airships, anyway. And as

expected, here I have a good section of DESPELLEJE : Dougray Scott (The impossible missionary bad II) that already

delighted us in Hitman and hallucinated us in his next TV Movie Dr. Jekyll & Mr. Hyde starring "" TheCreature

Perfect"" and concludes in what will surely be the worst interpretation of his life. But let's see Dougry,

why do you always make a gesture by moving your head to the side as if you were a beast? Jo-der is

fine once but all the time? I created a pathetic way to build a character as rich as "" Silus "" and

m���xime "" a vampire "" that has an infinite number of possible records and siembargo the final result

created by Dougray is paup ���rrimo.And good to finish with the marujeo "" I could not leave behind "" to Saffron Burrows

(The mystery Gal���ndez) alias "" The fashionable anorexic "" already you know it because I've said it many times, I'm

up to the nose of the fucking look chupach���ps and I plan to continue reivicing the curves (M���nica Belucci to power!) this

actress is that really give you some ganitas to give a hot sopita, uh god, is e complemente perfect

to finish spoiling what could have been a great movie. In addition it is extremely bland and takes the gun

like a spaghetti, fatal, interpretively ZERO POTATO.

" 0

" Perhaps for the public today the age difference between Cooper and Hepburn is difficult to digest

but, remember, it was the fifties. Being a playboy took his years.

Formidable comedy about the complications in a relationship. Maurice Chevalier is the best private detective

in Paris, the city of love. His daughter, Ariane (Audrey Hepburn), lives fascinated with the glamorous world of

illicit loves that she knows by heart through the archives of her father. One day Chevalier informs a

client that his wife is cheating him with tycoon Frank Flannagan (Gary Cooper) and the man goes out looking forto

himkill him. Ariane decides to prevent Flannagan without explaining the reasons, leaving him fascinated by the mystery.

Taking advantage of her knowledge of the life of the playboys, Ariane conquers the womanizer Frank by making him believe

(and suffer) that she is a girl as experienced and calculating as he is. Daring for its time, in this film

Wilder criticizes the double moral of a society that enthrones monogamy but lives pending of the secrets

of the celebrity's bedroom. Preventing problems with censorship, images of a solitary forest allude

splendidly to the sexual encounter between lovers. Perhaps for the public today the age difference

between Cooper and Hepburn is hard to digest, but remember, it was the fifties. Being a playboy took

his years.

" 1

" Erotic film, jewel of Spanish cinema, about the sexual life of a girl, from adolescence to

maturity. The scenes of great sexual charge tell us a story of submission and love that does not do if not

become essential in the video library of any cin���filo follower of On���n.

The ages of Lul��� is based on a novel by Almudena Grandes. The actress who was going to incarnate at first

the main character refused to know the explicitness of the sex scenes. Of course the

scenes are not, without reaching pornographic film, much less monks. We would rather say that they are endowed

with an important sexual charge, overflowing with sensuality. More bastaly, that puts the picha as to start

coconuts. As you wish.The film is about Lul���'s life, about her evolution through the

sexual relations she has. Tells us a story of submission Paul, a friend of the family, who takes him by

the hand in the world of sex. From her adolescence, to the crazy maturity of a woman who has lost the

north, Bigas Luna directs the writing of Almudena. I remember the first time I saw this movie, that I had

recorded it. the glorious first time of Telecinco. I was able to completely scratch the tape, from the times I

gave the "" palante "" and the "" patr���s "". Over the years, I learned that between tit and ass there were some dialogues that

might be worth listening to. And later, I understood the story they wanted to tell us. Of course

, if it were to be one of art and essays, it would not have given it so many opportunities. Resuming, erotic film,

jewel of Spanish cinema, about the sexual life of a girl, from adolescence to maturity. The scenes of

great sexual charge tell us a story of submission and love that does not do if not become essential in

the video library of any cin���filo follower of On���n.A classicist of the Erotic film espa���ol.Besitos.PD: The actress

has a morbo that must be a mortal sin.PD2: Both sex, both sex and I forget that Bardem act, making

amateur gay weird things. The scene he has in which they put what is being the fist behind

the boy is even afraid to see him. Well, and his mother, and Mrs. Mar���a Barranco, acted, and I do not

remember. The truth is that they are eclipsed by Francesca Neri and her sensuality.

" 1

" Although funny and reconciled with the kid who lives inside, it is a little

disappointing, you know the saying, where you went you should not go back, better remember how it was, not to

annoy her on her return.

Many years ago, maybe 20? Followed by television (that channel now called "" intelligent channel "" which

is the 2 of TVE), a series of animation that used to put many Sundays the afternoon, featuring 3

cute squirrels with shrill voices that carried poor John (his caretaker and "" father "") and his adventures and

misadventures, once again, and maybe thanks or no , to the lack of ideas in the mecca of cinema has been taken to the

big screen, replacing the original squirrels with animated characters in CGI. I must admit that in my

case Garfield, despite having seen the 2 movies. Since my wife loves the cat, she did not call me the

least, and yet this movie, moved by a bit of nostalgia, has taken me to see her knowing, in

advance, what she was going to find me. On the one hand we have Jason Lee (and older man), who here plays the

magic role of John, then the 3 squirrels in CGI, sync were well recreated, to make 3 bugs "" with

charisma "" through a PC is not turkey moque, then we have David Cross, secondary in countless films,

here is the villain of the function and of Lee's partenaire to the beautiful Cameron Richardson, whom wenot

haveseen in too many films, but who I bet will be a face (beautiful, beautiful) that is going Since

then, when I heard about the project, I thought it was a joke, and it was not until I

saw the first trailer that I had proof that this was going "" in serious "", in addition to that it has worked excellently

well at the box office will there be a sequel? Will the squirrels come back to the TV like when I was little? Big questions

without answer. The movie certainly does not give much, it's clear what will give a tape where 3 squirrels are

the protagonists? That's normal, I honestly did not expect to see Macbeth, or Romeo and Juliet, or a remake of

Citizen Kane, but nevertheless at the end of his viewing I have the feeling that he has wasted the

characters, who had Much more charisma in his animated series, and here they stay bland, blurred and

firmly misguided, apart from that I do not remember that obsession of the squirrels because John (��� was not John?)

was his father, rather, as far as my memory goes, they were dedicated to fucking him and making his life impossible,

within the rules and coexistence, since we are talking about a series of drawings for children. ���os, and we already

know that everything a child sees, like a little monkey, copies it. In the soundtrack I have lacked thetheme

main, something that is completely unforgivable, and that Many thirty-somethings I would have no illusion of having

recovered, although Chritsmas Time sounds to me that He came out in some episode of the series. Finally, although

funny and reconcile with the kid who lives inside, it is a bit disappointing, you

know the saying of, where You were not to return, better remember how it was, not to bother her on her

return.

" 0

" Sunshine is a hybrid between 2001: A Space Odyssey, Titanic (in advance it is already known thatwill not

the pointerbe left) and in its final part, The Shining.

When finally the movies of catastrophes seemed to be eradicated forever, the turn of the millennium was approaching,

and a couple of years before in Hollywood they took the opportunity to resuscitate this type of tapes. What if asteroids first,

epidemics, aliens, climate change, and the recurring stories on airplanes or ships. And when it seemed

that there was no kind of catastrophe that could be taken to the movies and that humanity had been rid

of this public plague forever , Danny Boyle arrives and brings us Sunshine. Speaking of catastrophes, Sunshine offers us

a really terrible approach, that our Sun cools and the Earth faces a Solar Winter.

Come on, even those in the same center of Bilbao in T-shirt would not be able to withstand the cold ifwas not

the death of the Sunremedied. An expedition composed of eight astronauts travels in a ship, the Icarus II (the one

who chose the name was luci���, because in case it only foreshadows the tragedy), the first, how not, failed,

m��� I know nothing to give more sense of transcendence to this second mission. Although more than a ship is a

giant bomb, to reactivate the nucleus of our star. The film begins with a small apocalyptic speech

, although in the mind of the spectator the image of an astronaut is formed on the back of the flying bomb

waving his cowboy hat through s of the stars and cheerfully shouting that of ���yeeha !. Small

about Stanley Kubrick, although the gui���os do not end there, since Sunshine is a hybrid between 2001: A

Space Odyssey, Titanic (in advance it is already known that it will not be even the prompter) and in its final part, The

Shining. Because the film is transformed into its last act, a science fiction story becomes

a kind of spatial psycho-thriller. The tape has some calamitous details, like the human error that

triggers the fatalities, that having in the ship such an effective computer (does not remember something?), This one is

incapable of correcting or even noticing of it. In his effort to constantly change the genre and seek

originality, Danny Boyle offers a bad rehash of some of the greatest classics of science fiction. And

as if that were not enough, he takes out of the ICU a gender who was in the last few years, and who justly deserved to disappear.

Because a film of catastrophes is a catastrophe in itself.

" 0

" Abominable creation that is called a film only to be broadcast in movie theaters. It empathizes more with the

monster than with the cast of actors who give pity in a film that is not known if it is a parody

of how bad it is. To go to piss and not drop.

"" First Tibur���n, then Alien and now The Host "". Very daring those of the poster have seemed to me. I would

have opted more for "" First Deep Blue See, then Karate to Death in Torremolinos and now The Host "".

Basically because the first ones were serious movies, and in this you do not know if it's funny, if it's crying (from

penalty is, yes), if it is of action of what noses it is.The film is about a crazy and very bad scientist who makes a

spill of something evil to a River. Total, that after the years it leaves a tremendous bicharraco that is dedicated to

eat the people of the margin of the same one. In these that eats the daughter of a silly blonde dye who

runs next to his father a fast food stand. So the fool, the father, a

brother and an archer sister are looking for her. Well, and the army that puts them in quarantine but they all go through the

Arc de Triomphe. Mother, what a piece of truce, unbearable. It is not understood if it is serious or not. To begin with, the

monster is fine, but it is not topped (technically). Then the human characters are sad, for

how bad they act and for the pathetic role they have. The protagonist gives up even disgust. The argument

is infumable and abhorrent, only being able to save like movie of monsters to the Godzilla style (of cardboard) the

first minutes. From the funeral (I do not have adjectives) this becomes an escalation of bobochorreces

that end in the lighting of the final cauldron. Insufrible. Resuming, abominable creation that is called a

film only to be broadcast in movie theaters. It empathizes more with the monster than with the cast of actors who

give pity in a film that is not known if it is a parody of how bad it is. To go to piss and not

drop.

" 0

" Marketing, cinema, redemption and blood on the canvas again. MetacinematogrÃfica, convincing in its legítima

revision of the cause, Rocky Balboa will provide a moment of fleeting pleasure to those who attend with one eye in the already

stallion Stallone and another in the film. Multiplied decula of 1976.

Between 1976 (Rocky) and 1990 (Rocky V) Stallone drew the predictable and rudimentary lines of a

character that would give him fame and, at the time, fierce litigation with the guild of the cr ���tica, that ruined with

contempt the franchise of the págil Balboa to the most dilapidated shelf of the videoclub of series B more humble. The public

burning of this saga miraculously saved the first installment, which won the applause of the Academy

of Hollywood (three statuettes: director - Avildsen -, montage and photography): Rocky was a noble work on

the world of boxing with a Stallone a� Sinn unpolished (or need to do) in the role of the lonely and stubborn

pugil who redeems himself from the dangers of the street based on bumps in the cuadril��� The other four deliveries

insist on the dispensable: Balboa, without money, returning to the ring; Balboa helping a friend who, in the

fourth, comes to Moscow; Balboa training a promising young man imitation of himself. This fifth part is,

substantially, an equally disposable film, but it contains a sense of the admirable dignity that the

others lacked completely. Stallone, bad actor, is an old dog in this film and knows that pouring his

personality into the story of the character, or vice versa, what we know, will make the brainy feather look

three feet to the cat and discover , stunned by the discovery, that in fact it is about the true

story of Sylvester Stallone, his glory and his decline, how life can leave you sounded, but not

stupid at all. The death certificate of this Rocky is written in a sober script and abounds, despite the

sad precedents, in too many clichés: the same ones that were once flag, anthem and lining of all

minutes. Do not avoid warning of a certain desire to perpetuate the tremendous phrases that seem to be copied from

any Novelty-B-pastry novelty to Estefan���a, but in English and with canvas in the background. This Balboa of

the 21st century is already fond���n, lives in his restaurant, widower, with a son who does not consider him. The

moral principles of this new Rocky are pasta or redemption: both maybe. One sees in this resuscitation

a very intelligent marketing operation designed in line with the heroes in decline, the end of life and

the coming of the myth that returns. Stallone has done it for the love of pasta and in 2007 he promises a

revitalization of Rambo, to which I promise not to go. Gonna fly now, the immortal melody of thesounds and is nowhere to be

original soundtrackseen. back to Rocky on the staircase of the F Museoladelf���a Art Museum with the

wind section of Bill Conti at full speed.Metacinematogr���fica, convincing in his leg��� Tima review of the cause, Rocky

Balboa will provide a moment of fleeting pleasure to those who attend with one eye on the already taller Stallone and another in

the multi-awarded film of 1976. What did you do in 1976 when Stallone burst Apollo Creed's nose

? I was in Primary and I listened to Hotel California of The Eagles, but that's another story and the same can

be told in another review. Oh, and the pure boxing scenes are accomplished.

" 0

" The final product does not have the quality that could be demanded from the creator of the magnificent Lost in

translation. In short: a story that does not just start and once you get it ends at half gas.

Luxuries, champagne, jewelry, scandals, gossip, culinary feasts, dresses made with the mostfabrics

exquisite, dances and parties until sunset. The new film by Academy Award winner Sofia Coppola

perfectly reflects the excesses that were experienced in the court of Versailles during the eighteenth century, anluxury

extremeradically different from the deplorable living conditions of the rest of the population. �n French, a luxury

that led to the loss of the monarchs of the place. The story, starring Kirsten Dunst and Jason

Schwartzman, focuses on the figure of Marie Antoinette, a woman who had qu�� � quickly abandon her childhood

to become queen of France. The film begins with the journey of the child of her native Austria to the court

of Versailles where her fiancee was waiting for her to marry, a wedding from which the children would be

satisfied. political interests of both countries. But that alliance would not be effective until the

heir to the crown was born, a child who would soon be born due to the impotence of the prince. It is a

risky film in the near form of presenting us the eighteenth century, usually represented in a verymanner

corseted. And is that kings can also be impotent, although the official story is usually

too complacent and tends to make a little reality to avoid showing what lessaspects

conventional. But Soffia Coppola dares to present us with a very personal and realisticof what

visionhappened at the time of the opulent French court. The setting of the court is perfectly recreated, without

skimping on costumes or showing all that opulence and recreating in remarkably long shots - very much in

the style of the director - to be able to appreciate every single detail to the perfection. Now, it is necessary to

ask whether it is really necessary for the comprehension of the plot the almost exact repetition of some

scenes. The first hour of the film is totally redundant since there is an unnecessary recreation: it has been necessary

to repeat a sequence three times to make clear the lack of sexual understanding between the

pr��� princes Another political point is the soundtrack of the film, we are accustomed to associate a type of

music to a specific time. In this case we opt for a great soundtrack but totally inadequate,

according to my point of view, for the type of film we are in front of. The soundtrack includesgroups

modernsuch as The Strokes, The Cure, Phoenix, New Order and Siouxie And The Banshees. While it is true that

sometimes some songs will not chirp so much, others seem totally out of tune (as in thescene

dance). As for interpretations, Kirsten Dunst seems to have stuck in her role as ateenager

superficial. In fact the role of a queen who evades their responsibilities and problems in aa

frivolous and wasteful way seems to come asglove. Of the rest of personages there is nothing to emphasize

since they are a mere accompaniment of the protagonist. However, what is worthy of praise is the

will of the director of experimentation and reinterpretation of history, the problem is that theproduct

finaldoes not have the quality that could be Exiga demand the creator of the magnificent Lost in translation. In short:

a story that does not just start and once you get it ends at half gas.

" 0

" Another one of the factor���a Marvel, about a motorcyclist who burns at night for a deal he made with Belceb���.

It is not even the worst of the genre, see Daredevil, or the best, see Spiderman, X-men or the controversial Hellboy.

Total, to hang out and watch some special effects.

I guess everyone you read to me is waiting for a fierce criticism about this movie. Well, no,

I also do not understand many behaviors of that style. Let's see if I explain, you can not evaluate all the films by the

same level, that is, a pornographic film is valued by the lustrous members and bodies of esc���ndalo, not by

its script. In the same way, if a comedy does not make me laugh, but it has a perfect montage, the film is

bad when it does not cover its cosmic objective. Well with the movies of pass from vi���eta to fotograma it happens the same, or at

least similar. The film is about a boy who does acrobatics with his father in the motorbike. One day he discovers that

his father has a deadly disease of necessity, so he agrees with the Devil that he will remove that

disease. By this contract, this happens to be a kind of hitman for Mefistteles, as many were

before. He becomes the ghost biker, modern version of the ghost rider. Basically one went on horseback

and another on a motorcycle. Well, another one of superheroes. The nefarious guide, as expected, with abiker

tormentedwho tries to kill himself by all means and that the Devil avoids. A love that can not be achieved because

these people have to be loners (contract things). And a curse that does not know how to

get rid of. Very typical. The special effects are very good, with special emphasis on the scene of the skyscraper

that is superb. And the whole is a bit boring, with very loose dialogues, and with little action, which is

the most important thing. These films have to have more fights and less metaphysical rolls than they suffer.

It looks like a Hemoal ad more than a movie about a fiery skull dude. Just anotherfactor���

Marvelabout a motorcyclist who burns at night for a deal he made with Belceb���. It is not even the worst of the genre,

see Daredevil, or the best, see Spiderman, X-men or the controversial Hellboy. Total, to hang out and

watch some special effects. And how does that boy not wear a helmet? Besitos.PD: I have to write the

culmination of the movie. The evil bad says, with all the solemnity that the situation demands "" My name is

Legi���n, because we are many "". Hahahaha, great.

" 0

" Rob Zombie is a better director than a musician. After the great house of the thousand corpses and while I wait for

his particular version of the classic Halloween of John Carpenter I review, in the form of director���s cut, his second

work.

Rob Zombie is a better director than a musician. After the great house of the thousand corpses and while I wait for his

particular version of the classic Halloween of John Carpenter I review, in the form of director���s cut, his second

work. minutes shorter than the version released in cinemas the film is, of course, dirty, cruel, bloody

and full of dust. The boot, the first almost fifteen minutes, credits included, are pure Peckinpah but not

only for the frozen frame, no, we will not go wrong. Old teacher shares with pleasure by

ambigos characters, the antihroe, although here the antihroe be a family of murderers Đakovačka in serie.Y

est ��� in danger. The story of revenge of a wood (great William Forsythe) brother of the cop who dies in the

best sequence of the original prequel leaves in Pa aal to Father Courage, what happens that this calculates worse

the consequences. Before that, the dialogue between police and film critics that gives headline to thisis

criticismmemorable. Unforgettable Sid Haig and above all a mans���nico (or mansonian) ) Bill Moseley. And those Shericowboys

Moon. With crazy desires to see Halloween, could it be in Sitges?

" 1

" Luc���a Puenzo makes a decision that honors her, completely avoids the path of easy curiosity, limiting herself to

narrating the story of a teenager who feels different and marginalized by a cruel and intolerant society.

A few years ago Argentine cinema lived a time of great splendor, in which all the films thatto us

camewere interesting, intelligent and innovative proposals. However, that wave was losing strength, and

now almost the only thing that comes to us are pretty simple and vulgar comedies or stories that are nothing but

cheap psychoanalysis. At this point of decline of Argentine cinema, it arrives XXY, the first opera of Luc���a Puenzo,

a very risky, different and to some extent provocative proposal. The story of some parents who must

flee to protect their hermaphrodite daughter could be an excellent carnage for a filmmaker who would approach the

story from the sensationalist point of view. But Luc���a Puenzo makes a decision that honors her, completely avoids the

path of easy curiosity, limiting herself to narrating the story of a teenager who feels different and marginalized

by a cruel and intolerant society towards everything that is different and does not understand. Puenzo does not fall into

melodrama nor into easy tears, but it is also true that the film does not acquire the dramatic andforce

emotionalthat could be produced. Presupa presuppose, the final result being something loose and disappointing. The best of the

film, and what sustains it, are its actors, and among them it is impossible not to highlight an extraordinary Ricardo

Dar���n, who is capable of transmitting more with a look than all the others. ���logos del gui���n.XXY is aproposal

different and riskythat we hope will help to revitalize an Argentine cinema that is in low hours. It is

also the opportunity to see Luc���a Puenzo's promising debut, and the privilege of attending anotherclass

Ricardo Dar���n performance master, that if a few thousands of kilometers further

north, he would be considered one of the best actors in the world without any discussion.

" 0

" Fincher builds a solid film in general, although the length of the tape and the rain of

information end up weighing on the shoulders of the viewer.

Although I liked it, 'Zodiac' did not seem like much, neither a masterpiece nor a memorable film,

but the work of the director of 'The Fight Club' with this film. The film is commendable.builds a

Finchersolid film in general, with a very interesting script and which is interpreted almost perfectly by the

whole of its cast. (great Mark Ruffalo). The direction is outstanding; the staging, excellent.

Attentive to the sequences of the murders: very realistic and well portrayed, with an enviable mastery of the

situation by the director, who in turn shines on occasion offering the viewer plans

of all classes to frame However, despite its virtues, Zodiac sins for my pleasure to become

quite long; Its rhythm is quite irregular. That the movie is long, okay, but it's not the same as long

as it becomes long, heavy, leaden and sometimes tiresome. Just at the moment the story hits aslump

considerableof rhythm, there is such a saturation of information (understandable: this is a police film,

investigation.) that ends up overflowing a pelin, only digestible for people who love the genre.

" 1

" Sincere praise of the flesh, fired portrayal of prostitution under the ironic and humorous prism of a

director vocationally gifted for eroticism.

Tinto Brass, in a way, is a green old man with a camera: one of the type that changes the Annals of T���cito or

the Complete Works of Giacomo Leopardi for a sticky copy of the Playboy, although perhaps the The queen magazine

of the guild is not her erotic ideal. The patron who governs his undisciplined vice is thewoman of meats,

ampullousm���rbida, reasonably feminine, but without falling into excesses, into stereotypes designed by fashion. This

voyeur is passionate about the sunlight filtering through the blinds, the bids, the big asses under awaist

narrowand the depilatory laziness between one groin and the other. All his films - and Paprika's brothels are aexample

perfect- range between the kitsch and shabby realism that Bigas Luna embodies here inKale and Hyperbolic Realism

Russ Meyer's. The aesthetic concerns of this gourmet man go from a little lady without underwear

riding a bike in front of a group of candid nuns to the most genuine portrait of the brothels ,temples

absoluteof the sin to which its rearing spirit tends. The Tinto Brass voyeur and filmmaker was first

licensed in Law and even was assistant director of a heavy weight (do not look for double meanings) of the

world cinematography: Robert Rossellini. None of those lines in his curriculum betrayed the director who

was to come, the man who looks, as one of his many films is called, the passionate eye that

it captures the light, its size, its more lighted volutes to illuminate the female body, to which it always

yields absolute devotion. Except Caligula, a fierce exercise of Pornographic aspirations and, in my opinion, falsely

historical and abnormally excessive, the cinema of Tinto Brass is generous with the spectator. It seems as if onlywants

the girlieto make the film that he would love to see. That is, an enchanted type of

himself. And somehow, he keeps his word intimate. The premeditated abandonment of glamor, the provincial genius

of the revolcons in the siestas, the picturesque parade of bizarre characters, morons, cynics,

savvy are recurrent in all his greedy work, paid to Politics, by esc���ndalo. Nothing thatin

disgusts youexcess. The brothels of Paprika is not a good film the way it is Knight without a sword, the law of

desire or Cr���a ravens, to bring the magnifying glass to the proper field, but in those jewels of the seventh art there is no praise

of the meat and that, like it or not, is part of the serious film speech or frivolous tramoya of pajilleros, is

what Brass takes at�� Term The ascension of the accidental Paprika whore to the throne of the Italian lupanares

(just when these are seriously threatened by the Government) and the vicissitudes of that libidinous crusade is

the fundamental issue of the tape. The same breath that brings the film to the Olympus of the erotic cinema (erotic,

chaotic or erogenous erotic, if you prefer the kind reader) is the one that separates it from aspiring to aquality

higher, but Brass narrates with sobriety and advances without preconceptions about the plot, displaying hiseccentricities

recognizable(those bid���s, those close-ups of the always shaggy sex of his f ,minas, that mammary abundance

of the overexploited protagonist) and offering , as a colorful soundtrack, moans of pleasure escorted by

happy songs of happy trumpets. It is impossible not to feel stunned by the cast of women of

hasty nudity and viperine tongue. The cin���filo also splices, Berlanga could say to dignify the

genre. What happens is that the abuse, in definite, stuns: that happens. The carnal self-confidence can be considered, in

its absolute extreme, even counterproductive for an erotic film that knows at all times the public

to whom it is addressed. If we see a pornographic film, we understand that the cinema does not exist, that what there is is an

industrial production mechanism that instead of making cakes from Alc���zar or knives from Albacete is dedicated to

filming the sweats of some hard-core athletes. We know what we're about and Tinto Brass, in that

exclusive mercantilist aspect, does not disappoint. Nor does he cheat. I do not have the Italian director as apiece

capitalof my cinéphilous filias and I am not Berlanga in my considerations, but I distinguish personal features

that privilege his film against the infamous caterva of children with a budget and c��� high-definition gangs that

are released to record episodes of light eroticism, insufferable and prudish for chains like Playboy or for the

always hungry corner of the classified DVD. In the brothels of Paprika there is no pornography a: everything is

overfed with hormones, everything is lean and cellulite demonstration of the formidable weight of a couple of great

tits. Beyond, nothing, John Lennon's strawberry fields forever, walks on the banks of a river in autumn,

Neruda verses and jam sandwiches. n York with semi-cured cheese. Desvar���o I have no doubt about the

cause.

" 0

" Tribute to those who lost their lives that day in the third suicide flight and demonstration of how the chaos of

those unsettling hours reduced all self-defense military measures to futility .

The cinema is a concentration of emotions of a couple of hours that increases and sublimates everything that passes through its

filter. But reality, sometimes, can contain so many ingredients that they reduce to superfluous everyaffinity

fictional. Paul Greengrass, making good the axiom that less is more, has followed this premise for a

masterly as well as honest tape. With a style of empathy with the documentary, United 93 is the first of the

films with an argument centered exclusively on the tragedy of September 11, 2001. Unlike

Oliver Stone, who has filmed a laudatory with jingoistic touches, Greengrass decided to renounce

any effect. I wanted to honor those who lost their lives that day in the third suicide flight, United

93, and demonstrate how the chaos of those unsettling hours reduced all measures to futilitymilitary.The

self-defensefidelity to the facts is such that Greengrass and his team interviewed on numerous occasions

the relatives of the deceased passengers at United to approach with the greatest possible respect those

people and those who still cry their p Loss. Hence, the deliberate absence of familiar faces in the cast or

having retained the true names of both passengers and suicide bombers. And in this

line of verismo, the story of how the situation was experienced from the air controls and thecommanders

militarywere based ��, directly, in the recordings of the communications made from civilthat

aviationmorning. So these dialogues are full of technicalities related to flight instructions

that, although incomprehensible years of the profane, also result in this mimicry that the story makes the

event real.Argumentally, the film proposes a classic narration without stridencies. The very evolution

of the facts, from the routine boarding of the passengers on the flight to the nervousness of the suicides

prior to their action, will be the one that impresses the drama what's next. Here, the identification with the

victims of the flight is absolute, because it does not occur to the head that, in any other flight,could

a similar tragedyhappen. And the terrorists, instead of characterizing them with the typical image of psychopathic

speeches, appear as young insecure but strongly ideologized to undertake

their terrible orders. the magnificent Greengrass script avoids falling into tantalizing grandiloquence or

trite political mentions, it simply focuses on two issues: how some passengers decide to confront each other,

and some , before the fact of dying in a suicide flight, and in how the rest of the citizens? military

included? he attended with impotence the live broadcast of the attacks. Thus, on the one hand, we share

the agony of the passengers of United 93 when they realize that the end of their lives could be close,

but also attended with stupefaction. ��na the incapable response of the first military power in the world in the face of the

greatest terrorist attack suffered within its borders. It was clear that, faced with the determination todefensiveAlthough it

kill a terrorist, little or nothing is served by all the self-measures on which the ideais built.

of internal securityresorts to excessively On the shoulder, this choice of plans is fully

justified to portray the agitation of that morning and in tune with the aesthetics realistic of the whole tape.

Those who see United 93 should forget about stereotypes already seen in airborne tapes. You will not findhero

the-man able to get rid of the captors or the military rescuers, he will only see ordinary people

, like any of us, who did everything possible to save their lives. Because the logical

instinct of survival is the one that emerges with more strength in such an extreme situation.

" 1

" Eragon's problem is not Narnia, with which he looks for a repeated comparison: he is The Lord of the Rings.

Popcorn, dragons and franchises ...

Eragon's problem is not Narnia, which is looking for repeated comparison: it is the Lord of the rings.

If that Peter Jackson trilogy did not exist, Eragon would be an absolute epiphany for the

hothead, for the fantastic, mind of a teenager made to spend hours on books. nourished by pages and

to get lost in mythologies of elves, goblins, magic and dragons. As the machinery of Hollywood is implacable,

we have to impose several corrections to Eragon, although in none of them the film is demolished in

excess. The stone found in the forest by a young man and later turns out to be a dragon's egg A proficiency

under whose sparkling nose hides the fate of a people subdued by a Barbarian and despotic king is the

foundation stone of the magic of all the tales of magical and of heroes on whom is deposited, in

a kind of arcane, the future of justice or the happiness of a people. All this is explicitly stated

in the film, but the problem is that we have already seen arguments so similar and narrated with equal or better fortune

that this one, by late, is irrelevant. This familiar cinema of popcorn and discreet astonishment does not spare. It is more: it

should be sponsored, promoted, converted into a common currency of the American production companies that give green light to

these box office, sometimes pungent in quality, but sweeping in suggestions and amenity . There are already

so few really worthy movies so that the whole family feels in row seven and is carried away

by the magic of the big room (let's leave now the trite argument of the convenience of domestic cinema) We

appreciate all you give. From this rudimentary, flat and populist cinema is born a spectator, now young, who will

then savor other works. That is the end of my criticism. Outside of that sense, Eragon is one morefranchise

cinema, Christmas, spurred by a book of massive sales and conducted with trade, but without

charm, by a director former expert in special effects (Terminator 2, Master and Commander, TheStorm

Perfect, Save Private Ryan) and that here he fulfills, no more. It is not possible, said the popular proverb, to ask for

pears in elm. This is, on top of that, a very simple pear. The epic that these stories require is weighed down by a

certain shortness of scene, even if it shines (and so on) in the majestic flight of the dragon and in thebattle

final, which is very successful. Of the actors, better not to talk. Jeremy Irons, curiously settled in the world of

dragons (Dragons and dungeons, verbigratia), pretends to be involved in his work as guru of the young

apprentice of Salvador, but he is lost in a paper that does notand that does not give any imprint of actor

fitwith character, which is, limited to sobreactuar, contributing tics too seen and gestures of old wolf very

greedy sheep (pasta) to which bite his already toothy tooth. Robert Carlyle is a shadow, a bad one of

���rdago, adl���tere, nevertheless, of the demonic king and motive of all the fant��� fant��� Stica, a John Malkovich that

comes out very poor and that, apparently, seems saved for a second part (Eldest). The third (Empire) of

this still quasi-adolescent geniecito (Christopher Paolini) who has managed to imitate his beloved Tolkien and

rethink it to deliver to the young public, is already said, ���ived from these medievalist goodies,

pure entertainment. And in addition they will soon make plastic dragons and dragons to fill the shelves of the

Toys' r Us of half the world and the McDonalds of the other half. They are very smart everyone. My daughter, who has read the

billet, left disappointed, in the bottom of her heart. Half a book had been eviscerated. Or more. Or everything. In order ... I

return to what matters, in any case: family cinema. What beautiful.

" 0

" You may even like those who do not read comics. Whenever we are going to see a movie based on a comic we are afraid that many things have changed with respect to

the original. Then, depending on the quality of the film, we can feel more comfortable in the chair, and

that if the film is good, you can always make concessions. This is what in my opinion happens with "" V

de Vendetta "". At the time I gave the graphic novel a note of 9'5, the highest of the ones I have given since this

blog about movies, books or comics with which I have enjoyed (or not). And in fact, I expressed my doubts

about what could come out on the big screen. Well, I liked the film, and a lot; In spite

of some negative criticisms that I had already read out there, I went to the cinema with enthusiasm. And while it is not as good as

the comic (it was very difficult, let's face it) it is entertaining. I must say that the character of Vme

hookedfrom the first moment, and although they change some things about the comic (we will not reveal which)

in many moments things happen as they are seen in the work of Alan Moore Obviously, we have omitted a

number of details that would have been very good, and in other cases it has been very tiptoe, which gives

the film an excessive speed (its main stick). And in a matter of two hours we are told facts that

occur over a year. In addition, without a solution of continuity, or signs of the type "" three months

later "" constantly, that if that, would have slowed the emotion. Natalie Portman I've

liked it, and I think that with this it can be de-cast from its role of Amidala definitely. Shocking, and

impressive especially from the spectacular "" shaved "". As for Hugo Weaving, the remembered Agent

Smith of Matrix, or Elrond in 'The Lord of the Rings'. because the truth is that I had it very difficult to

play a role in which you can not see his face at any time. His gestures must beenough

expressiveto convey the desired emotions, and he succeeds. That yes, it is necessary to say that it would have been very

well to see the original version to listen to its intonation, its voice. but it is that at least the dubbing is very good.

Really, he gets what he wanted, from a distance: to get excited, to get involved with a guy who is crazy but who

arouses sympathy from the beginning. On the other hand, I can tell you that I saw the movie It shows people who had not

read the comic, and the movie caught them offside in that pair of unexpected twists that they hit

during the plot, really surprised, so this film can even come to like those who do not read

comics. To highlight two things to finish: you can see the Wachowski's hand despite not directing, even with the

famous "" Matrix effect "" at some point. But in me it did not cause the laughter that seems to have caused in other people.

On the contrary, I took it as a gui���o, and also, do not abuse it. And the soundtrack of Dario Marianelli has

seemed very good for the film. Excite in the moments you should do it. go, I've done with it.

In short, it does not come to the comic, but I liked it a lot. So that I debate between the 7'5 and the 8. will be

ben���volo, not like certain professors of University.

" 1

" The film reveals that I know, that it's true, that Sof���a Coppola gets bored a lot. It's as if she was watching it. The young, rich and bored-of-so much luxury Sof���a is finished reading 'Marie

Antoinette: the journey' of Antonia Fraser, lying in bed with a soothing air, sighs and says "" ���Aish! I feel

as miserable and misunderstood as Mar���a Antonieta. I'm going to take his sad life to the movies. " And he goes tohouse

Francis Ford'sand says: "Pap���, this year for my birthday I want you to give me funding for a veryproject

personal." And Francis shudders to remember 'Hunch', but when his daughter says "" pooorfaaaa "",

you can not deny and produces the film. "" But with a condition, Sof���a: do something that gives money "" And so (I

imagine), Sof���a is inspired by Antonia's book Fraser to tell the most human and superficial side of the

last queen of France in 'Marie Antoinette', her last film. The story of a fifteen-year-old girl who

lands in the court of Versailles in all its decadent splendor against her will, becoming the first

target of all the whispers and then in the head of the Turkish (never better said) of the bloodyrevolution. But of

Frenchcourse, this is not what Sof���a wants to tell us. What she is interested in from Marie

Antoinette (Kirsten Dunst in an interpretation that confirms the legend about blondes) is that she was young,

beautiful, did not like protocols, loved to go shopping and the pelu, partying, eating cakes and

flirting with young soldiers. Oh, and that she got very bored, poor thing. So much is boring that the Coppolaus

tortureswith an hour and a quarter of "" adaptation of Marie Antoinette to the court "" in which the same thing happens over and over and

over again: I get up, I go to mass, gossip, I see the ambassador, I eat, I try to get my husband to sleep, I

fall asleep. And back to start. Her husband does not pay attention to her. Her only exits for the depre are eating cakes,

buying shoes and changing her hairstyle (a speech something given to the cliché of hers, Ms. Coppola). Luxury and yawns,

everything is one in this part of the film. Only a couple of scenes of those of revelry and the character of Asia

Argento are saved from nonsense. After that hour and a quarter is when Sof���a decides to show us the

evolution n of the character: of little princess and misplaced misguided (very to the 'Sissi empress', is also nothing

original) happens to be queen of France and mother almost at once, suffers a sudden attack of maturity and retires to

a cottage with her daughter, to play the farmers, provoking even more yawns among the public. She highlights

the plan in which she and her noble friends (her husband, of course) walk in a little boat on a beautiful lake with

an expression of boredom only comparable to mine in that. moment. It is the stage "" I am a complicated woman "" of

Mar���a Antonieta, since as soon as she is playing with her child as a Swedish officer is being thrown. Her husband

continues to move on from her. And for the final stretch, Sof���a Coppola has already told all that she is interested in the

character, who is already a mother and no longer spends so much on parties and champagne. so that it resorts (now s���) to thefacts

historicalto finalize the monarchy and everything it represents. This is the most fragile part, perhaps because it lasts

about five minutes. When it comes down to it, Sof���a does not dare to lower her heroine to the point of

decapitation, or refrain from inserting a floor plan of a room Versailles shattered, so that everyone

sees what was lost with the Revolution. Damn poor, load up on such a "cool" place and people. "

Aside from such a deplorable view of a character, Sof���a Coppola has a competent first operator like

Lance Acord, and a ���ador of production, KK Barrett, that recreates to the beast the golden cage that was

Versailles (with special detail in the food). The actors represent some snobbish, decadent andgirls

carefree littlewith similar fortunes (Asia Argento stands out, the only plebeian of the function, Jason Schwartzman

as the stunned Bourbon of turn and Kirsten Dunst for her quasi-plane encephalogram character and because she's more cute

than normal). And already. And finally one remembers the trailer ���se in poppy plan with eighties songs and

accelerated rhythm and realizes that this intention corresponds to about 10 minutes of the total of the projection , since

the style is pompous and faint in most of the film. But Coppola has listened to his father and has

managed to sell his vision of the sunset of Versailles as a fashion clip for nostalgic synthesizers. At least,

'Mar���a Antonieta' will not be what 'Corazonada' was for her father, and Sof���a will be able to continue eating cakes during

a good season. In short, never so little chicha gave to write so much. The film that reveals that I know, that it's

true, that Sof���a Coppola gets bored a lot. A 3.5.

" 0

" Impressive would be the word for all the pre-production, production and postproduction team. From

that great artistic direction to that magnificent soundtrack.

Yimou Zhang is not by pure whim one of the most respected Asian directors. His fantastic curr���culum

("" Hero "", "" Tiger and Drag���n "", "" The Curse of the Golden Flower "".) Delights anyone. Histaste

exquisiteto shoot the films is palpable in each of his productions. You do not have to be a great

critic to admire Zhang's class and style when shooting martial arts scenes. If in "" The Curse

of the Golden Flower "" I said that the characters, rather than fighting seemed to dance, here they look like Gods. And it is that Yimou

shows us some scenes of impressive action that will delight the whole world. In addition Yimou takes an

impressive match to the natural locations (attention to the impressive fight in theforest

bamboo). The actors can not be better in their respective roles. From Zhang Ziyi, unjustly not-nominated

to the Oscars for "" Memories of a Geisha "", to Takeshi Kaneshiro. They are all great in their roles and, in addition

to filming those scenes of action so impressive, they give their characters enough strength so that the

end has enough drama to make us cry. The most "simple", to call it somehow, would be the

gui���n. Although it stands on its own and is solid enough to take the film forward, it is Yimou

who gives it enough strength and spectacularity for the film to be what it is. Impressive it would be the

word for all the pre-production, production and postproduction team. From that wonderful artistic

direction to that magnificent soundtrack. A highly recommended film for lovers of martial

arts and love stories.

" 1

" 'Hairspray' is, without a doubt, the most fun movie of the summer, and most likely, of the

whole year.

Esc���ptico I was during all this time because a musical adaptation of a film of the king of the cinema

trash John Waters could be so freaky that I could not distinguish if I would have loved or They would have givendesire

me theto shoot me. I'm already pretty freaky, I do not deny it, but I was afraid that this musical would overtake me,

border on the absurd, the grotesque, the freak and stay in one of the m Multiple adaptations of

Broadway musicals to failed movies. But you can rest easy, because it's not like that.'Hairspray 'is a real candy

for any lover of the most casual musical and adrenal���nico: musical number without rest ,

frantic dances and a colorful and attractive aesthetic all at the mercy of a brutal soundtrack, catchy to

no more power and that makes you are moving In the chair from the beginning to the end. Shankman makes a

more elaborate adaptation work than, say, Susan Stroman in 'The Producers' and is

very grateful. The freedom of movement and choreography of the actors and dancers gives much more eye-catching to the

film and allows to elaborate much richer scenes in planes and other , but I do not bore you too much. The

actors are superb. The great discovery of the movie, Nikki Blonsky, embroiders it, the cast of young

pipiolos headed by a funny James Mardsen, a justito Zac Efron, Amanda Bynes and Elijah Kelley

are they leave, and they are no less the most experienced like Queen Latifah, an unrecognizable Christopher

Walken and the beautiful Michelle Pfeiffer. A special mention for John Travolta, who has become a complete

siren in kilos, without doubt, the most fun character in the film. I do not want to finish without making the obligatory

comparison. Conn with the original. The film of John Waters was much more politically incorrect, much more

hooliganism, and Divine was a lot of Divine, in this the story is simpler than the mechanism of a botijo, the gui���n

has some tricks that can be confusing but, what does that matter when what you are wanting is to

get up and start dancing? 'Hairspray' is, without a doubt, the most fun movie of the summer, and most

likely, of the whole year.

" 1

" Film student that I have not heard about, but Marlon Brando comes out before inflating like a

toad and a well-loaded doormat. I thought it was a grade 8 tost.

This is the typical film that most people have not seen, but that sounds a series of frames

that have stayed for the history of cinema. Who has not seen Marlon Brando pick up the butter and

go over it to the girl? Or the scene of the bathroom with a doormat included in which Marlon turns with her on

top? I could say some more, but they are all sexual, will it be that we have the ages of Lul��� to the

American? I am left with ours, which at least I found out what it was about. The film is about a girl who

is walking through Par���sy and crosses paths with a guy who is he shines the carton, and that he must take it out a few hundred

years. Total, that the two frames are again to rent the same floor. And the typical thing, for you,

for me, pumba (who would say my baby) are already wanting like monkeys in the zoo. And a relationship of submission

between Marlon Brando and the young lady begins, which leads us to a script from which I have not understood anything.

Luckily many desnudos.Direis out, the Tito does not know more to see in the movies aunts naked and is

able to sully the artworks considered classics. That's true, but it is that the girl beat a few

yawns that riet��� tu leon Metro. I can not criticize it, because I have not heard about it. It seems to me

a sequence of situations, around a strange, strange, weird type (that the deceased papuchi would say) but that I do

not see the link between them. That yes, it has a series of sequences that have remained for theretina

collectiveof the cinema. Resumiendo, classic of the cinema that I have not found out that it goes, but that Marlon Brando leaves

before inflating like a toad and a wench of well-loaded doormat. I thought it was a tost���n grade 8. I was left

with that silly face when everyone laughs at a joke and you have not heard.Besitos.

" 0

" Stardust is a tale of fairies, stars, princesses and an enchanted kingdom that will delight all

the public and it is always a pleasure to see Rober de Niro, a man that takes advantage of everything he does

with the spectacular Pfeiffer.

Spectacular film ideal to see accompanied by children (those who were in the room when I was in the movies

were excited and applauded all the time). The original proposal of this old English story takes shape from

the hand of Matthew Vaughn who is not known other titles of relevance. Tremendous, fun with an

inexhaustible rhythm and actors who are wonderful in their interpretations. Stardust is a fairy tale,

stars, princesses and an enchanted kingdom that will delight all the public and also it is always a

pleasure to see Rober de Niro, a man who takes advantage of everything he does with the always spectacular

Michelle Pfeiffer. If you want to have a fun time, do not hesitate in going to see it and you will be impregnated with all its

magic, great photography, ideal costume design and as not a great movie. But as not everything is perfect,

the role of "" Star "" I do not see it for Claire Daniels, which I think has a rough beauty and a wild nose.

I would have preferred a Chirsten Dunst. Claire always have a great and what is, is a great girl

that leave you in the mailbox your phone to call them to clean your home for hours, but that's

the movie.

" 1

" It's boring like a day's work on the day of the Feast of Our Lady of the Pigeon, it has no

budget and it's pretty ridiculous.

Titled by here Crocodile: a serial killer, Primeval tells the events that had (and continue to

take place) in a remote place in Africa where there is a predator that has killed more than 300 lives

human Dominic Purcell, the prismatic Prison Break star also looks his chest here, so I guess

it will be his idea. On this occasion, he plays a Gain reporter in search of the bug. He is accompanied by a girl,

Orlando Jones (you can bet your life that at least one joke is funny) and Jurgen Prochnow. The fact is that at

times the crocodile paints less than the monster of The Host and the movie goes away transforming little by little into a

political thriller and such, what happens is that it does not succeed because it is boring as a day of work on the

day of the Feast of the Virgin of the Dove, it has no budget and is quite ridiculous, because if something

is clear in this remake of Anaconda is that the crocodile thinks and is smarter than the people who

want to hunt. Inspired by a real case. Mandibulas was better.

" 0

" Narrates well, tells a more or less close story, but the script is unfortunate and a final indigesto in

the form of a follet���n like Guillermo Sautier Casaseca, with children and parents and supervening, it does notend up

exactlyimproving it.

Felipe Vega is a long-time filmmaker, but without a single success (not even a small one) at the box office;

watching his last film, "" Women in the park "", the reasons are understood: he narrates well, he tells astory

more or less close, but the script is lamentable, with a middle-class family in terms of separation, their only

daughter, and the many times they meet (by the way, almost always at a table with food: �� Why have not they

called it "" Women in the restaurant? "" Would you have been more informed? "To talk about their neuroses. From which it is

deduced again, as we already knew, that to write scripts to the food with writers (in this case with Manuel

Hidalgo, in spite of the pedigree cin���filo de ��� was a critic in the Fotogramas magazine a quarter of a century ago,

among other media?) is not a good idea, because it is already known that the knowledge that the writers of the world have

is through the Literature, which will be very artistic, but certainly not real. A final indigesto in the

form of a follet���n in the manner of Guillermo Sautier Casaseca, with children and fathers and surrogate parents, does notend up

exactlyimproving it. And is that Felipe Vega, in addition to making films about people close to him, should try to make these

people look, if possible, an inhabitant of the Earth, not of Mars?

" 0

" A work worthy of praise for the skill in the development of a height guide thatdenies

stronglythose who claim that science fiction and terror are minor genres.

Science fiction returns to the Spanish screens of the hand of the canary Juan Carlos Fresnadillo, who takes up

a genre that he already cultivated with Intacto, his only incursion up to the moment in the world of cinema, with the exception of

a couple of short films. 28 weeks later it is the second part of 28 days after, that for those who do not know or

remember, it related the catastrophe produced by the liberation of a virus that turns the British population

into murderers and forces to close the country. This continuation starts six months after the first, a moment in

which after having eliminated the virus, the country begins to be repopulated. As is usual in this type of

movie Under the mask of action and pseudo-terror lies a message that, through parallels and

analogies, pretends to alert the spectators and the population. In general, possible situations that could

arise from not changing the direction of events. In recent times, laboratories have replaced

nuclear weapons as a symbol of decadence and the inevitable destruction of a devalued world and

that steers its steps firmly towards the abyss. From the technical point of view, the magnificent

use of sound, music and silences is indisputably used as tools to generate tension. n.

In addition, the script is quite well prepared, much better than that of its predecessor, so it manages to

transmit the feelings of anguish and chaos that it pretends; all this through well-defined characters.

The cast is acceptable, although Robert Carlyle may be a little weaker. In general, a good

movie, as long as you are aware of the genre and the type of film you will be watching.

" 1

" Tom Shadyac is the typical director of family comedies, and this is not an exception, a typical comedy that will

please the little ones of the house, and that the older ones they will have to put up with a tape, which, without being round, makes

water everywhere, and that is that, even the script has not been prepared, nor is the filming clearly

worth remembering.

Say at this point that I love Jim Carrey, since all of you who read me usually know

about my filias and phobias, well, in this second installment in which Carrey said something like that � like "" come up here and

pedal (or give me more pasta) "" we have Steve Carrell lately, the character that he made in the

first installment to prominence, it goes without saying that Carrell does not even touch the histrionics

of the Ontario (Canada) but in his role as Evan Baxter is nice, restrained at times and

quite achieved in others. is followed even though it is above Carrell's filmography, you will know that he

is a complete specialist in interpreting normal men (both in "" Virgin at 40 "" and in the always

recommended "" Small " miss Sunshine "" does), and although Evan Baxter is quite States Senator, here,

oncem s, is a normal name stuck in what proportions celestiales.Tom Shadyac is the typical director of

family comedies, and this is no exception, tpica comedy that the kids in the house would like, and

older will have to endure a tape, which without being round makes water everywhere, and is that neither the script

has been drawn, nor the shooting (one of the most expensive of the current cinema) It is clearly something

worth remembering. The last of a movie that promised everything and once more it remains nothing.

" 0

" This is one of those movies that make people who? Hate? the Spanish cinema has to be silent

Last week I could see dark blue almost black, and the truth is that for different reasons I saw it

twice. The first one was last Tuesday, April 11, I was like anyone, I went through the box office and

when I was doing some shopping, I saw a missed call. Upon entering the room, the cinema manager told me

that he had called me, that Daniel S���nchez Ar���valo was going to come next Friday to present the film. ��cula

with his subsequent colloquium, and to attend. So on Tuesday I saw her for the first time and I loved her.

Later I will post my critique. On Friday I went back and I loved it again, Daniel went to present it

disappearing afterwards to reappear in the middle of the movie. ���cula and sit in one of the first rows. I

was very curious, because I had read the post or news (as you want to call it) that he had written in his

p��� gina, in which she detailed how she had gone the other day in a session of a neighborhood cinema to

see her again and watch the spectators. So here I was, observing the observer as he says, - I

am one of those who goes to the movies with popcorn and cocacola? that of course they accompanied his visionado.Posteriormente

held a colloquium in which Daniel commented different aspects of his film and on the currentscene

cinematographic. It is curious and at the same time "" sad "" that for example programs like Buenafuente and others, do not

take this director and some of his actors to talk about the film because they are not "" famous "".

As S���nchez Ar���valo himself emphasized, the public of these programs is quite similar to the one that has

Dark Blue almost black, so there is a range of almost two millions of viewers who could be interested

and go to see the film, but of course, by not appearing in these programs because that opportunity is lost.

Well, I'm going to put the cr�� next Ethics, but first of all, and although I have nothing to do, thank Daniel

to come to Santander to present it. There are many people who did not know the figure of Daniel S���nchez Ar���valo,

but before this first opera he had already dazzled us with other little jewels: his shorts. Dark blue almost

black retakes the characters of Physics II, but does not forget situations and aspects that have made him

grow as a director, so he incorporates parts of the world created by him in his previous works: Expr ���s,Alpinist's

Gol, Prophylaxis and Thefault. This is one of those films that make people who "hate" Spanish cinema

have to be silent, or at least less can say that he does not like but not the typical thing that is shit,

because this first episode is almost magistral.Daniel as a good scriptwriter that is, has managed to dose and make

Dark Blue almost black dazzle and make us re���ry cry with human characters and very close.

Characters that we can find in any city or even in our closest circles.stories

Urbanthat give the possibility of showing that in the cinema there is something more than explosions and assaults, and that

allow the actors to enjoy with characters that will make them grow and explore several

records. From a sensational Quim Guti ���rrez going through Marta Etura, Ra���l Ar���valo, Manuel Mor���n, Antonio de la

Torre, Ana Wagener up to H���ctor Colom���. No doubt a spectacular cast, which although many people seem

unfamiliar, from now on will begin to be familiar. There are many people who say if a movie is good or

bad as It seems logical to them, although in addition to having this appreciation, we must

pay attention and pay attention to many other aspects that make up the product that has just been seen. On the basis of all this,blue

darkalmost black, is confirmed as a good film, although I dare to describe it as excellent (one of the

best of the year, and that we are in April) and that people vibrate with the film, I do not think there is anyone who

is indifferent and is not immersed with the characters and their experiences. In addition to that, already in a technical plane,

the direction of the "" rookie "" Ar���valo is very successful. The planning, use of the camera, of its few

movements, of the squadrons, of the music, of the artistic direction, of the casting, in short of everything

that must be taken into account so that the house does not fall apart, is brought to the surface and in what way. The truth is

that if with his next film he manages to equalize or raise the level achieved with this, we have a director who

can give a lot to Spanish cinema and the best art in general.

" 1

" Carrey inhibits all his energy to play the role of a man attracted and repelled at the same time by

the free spirit of Winslet. Surprising and very original.

Surprising film of the multi-faceted and hispanic actor Jim Carrey (who has as many detractors as

followers), in which he shows us again that it is useful for something more than to do Exaggerated gestures in front

of a camera. It tells the story of Joel Barish, a writer who one day gets up and meets the

situation that his ex-girlfriend Clementine (Kate Winslet) has gone to a clinic that he erase the memories of his

relationship with him. Angry at the news, Joel decides to undergo the same procedure and erase memories of

his relationship with her. until in full "" erased "" of these memories he repents and decides that he does not want to

forget that piece of his life with another person. It is at this point that the real surrealism of the film

begins, with Joel trying in every possible way to flee within his own mind with Clementine. In the

argument we have Patrick (Elijah Wood), who works as a clinic worker, and taking advantage of the memories

of Barish, he tries to conquer Clementine, which he has fallen in love with and Stan (Mark Ruffalo) assistant and

worker together with Dr. Mierzwiak (Tom Wilkinson). Then we can also see Kristen Dunst as Mary,

who is the receptionist of the clinic, and that at the end of the film is going to play a decisive role in the

plot. ���cula is divided into two "" realities "", one is in Joel Barish's room, where Stan and Patrick,

along with Mary's subsequent visit, make a party with Joel's food and drink for the duration of the

memory erasure procedure. Patrick ends up confessing that he fell in love with Clementine by visualizing her

memories of Joel. Things get complicated when, as we mentioned before, the patient resists the

process and they need the help of Dr. Mierzwiak. That brings us to a second reality, inmind.

Joel'sAs Clementine's memories disappear, he realizes he's going to miss her a lot and

then tries desperately to keep her memories of places in her life where she Itnever

waspresent. One of the most well argued parts of the film is when the characters no longer know each other and even

then, they discover each other again because there is something that attracts them. Carrey inhibits all his energy to play the role

of a man attracted and repelled at the same time by Winslet's free spirit, which changes his way of seeing

life as change hair color. We also highlight Wilkinson, who confers on the doctor aintelligence

calmthat almost makes us forget the terrible machine erases memories of his invention. Even with this plot with

very superficial science fiction, "" Do not forget me! "" does not surrender to the ease ofeffects

special. His strong point are the characters, very well constructed and very well interpreted.

" 1

" The Source of Life is divided into three stories, the "real" being? the most powerful, interesting and best

armed of all.

The current cinema suffers a serious creative crisis, fewer and fewer films can be considered

original, and on the contrary copies, remakes or new versions of previous films abound. This problem is

especially acute in Hollywood, although one can not know for sure if it is because of a shortage of screenwriters with

ideas or because of the scarcity of producers who are encouraged to carry out different and innovative proposals.

But it is also true that there are some directors who are at the opposite pole, who in their desperate

search for innovation and originality, go beyond the limits of cinema. And Darren Aronofsky is one

of them without a doubt. Trying to explain what the Source of Life is about as difficult as calculating

the Pi number to infinity, a task clearly comparable to the works of Hercules. The filmus

tellsbasically a love story, a loss and the search for a source to avoid that loss. The

Source of Life is divided into three stories, the "" real "being the most powerful, interesting and best armed of

all; in it are the best moments of the film, some of a great viscerality. Thestory

triumphantof the conqueror and Queen Isabel of Spain in the sixteenth century (a great virtue of showing from the

beginning that it is a totally fictional vision of history) is well constructed, and catch the

viewer with that search of the myth of the fountain of eternal youth. In the third story Aronofsky is

where it completely fails, offering meaningless metaphysical digressions, and the poetic poetry and beauty of this

third story are totally imperceptible, becoming a heavy ballast more than in a help. The truth

is that the first twenty minutes, in which the three stories are interspersed without rhyme or, leave

reasoneven the most enthusiastic viewer baffled. But as the narrative becomes more linear and logical,

the film dramatically improves. However, when the moment of truth of any story approaches,

Aronofsky's lights go out, and it offers an ending thatprevious achievements. The best of La

defeatsFuente de la Vida, in addition to its short duration is the magnificent work of Hugh Jackman, who continues to

demonstrate his great interpretative skills. For her part, Rachel Weisz (real life couple of Darren

Aronofsky) also does a good job, with the great naturalness that has always characterized her.

" 0

" Now or Never is more than a simple and vulgar sentimental comedy whose only attraction is to see

the clown being made by a histrionic and unleashed Jack Nicholson.

The first few months of the year are usually dominated by the premieres of all the favorite films for

the awards season in the United States, both those that finally become candidates, and those that

remain in the United States. the way. But among all these premieres is also custom to sneak in other types of films,

Hollywood comedies with great blockbuster aspirations. Now or Never is a good example, a story that

tells in the key of tragicomedy the last d�. The lives of two men who suffer from cancer, but who, far from

surrendering, decide to spend the little time they have left of life in a big way. Said so sounds very hopeful, but of

course, you have to be lucky enough to be or meet a millionaire to do it, if you are slightly

unbalanced as the character of Jack Nicholson, much better. In short, a story that could have been

very funny is wasted here because of the easy sentimentality of Rob Reiner, a genuine specialist in the

genre. The story takes horrors to start, and that is that the first third seems out of a cheap melodrama.

As soon as the hispanic vein of the great Jack Nicholson appears, the film goes back, but more for the genius of

Nicholson and his expressions than for the gui���no the ability of Reiner. Another negative detail of the film is

how bad the sequences with chroma are, which are too obvious and obvious. Now or Nevernot

ismore than a simple and vulgar sentimental comedy whose The only attractive thing to do is to see the clown becoming a

histrionic and unleashed Jack Nicholson. And there are few actors who alone are able to make

a sad guide fun.

" 0

" Predictable telefilm of half-dead people and half-formed filmmakers who are looking for yawningand

jointsthe sensation that they are taking our hair very seriously. There are spawns of worse artistic quality, but -

I do not know why - the argument could have worked ...

The supernatural, in cinema, in literature, has always been material Easily salable. The ghosts of

yesteryear, those that were born aureolados of romanticism and fatigued tirelessly towers, battlements and s���tanos

bitten of mystery and prophecies, are now vague pop stars, mu���ecos shaken by the Russian mountain of

the box office, which is, after all, the heavenly door, the delightful and productive eldorado. The jerushals of the

cinematic industry are old dogs and they know how to make decent wrappers like the case here

outlined because what you do not see is an ectoplasmic plasta , an expensive telefilm with cult tape sticks that

remains, seen the gothic-menstrual concoction, in a high school thriller, in a juvenile operetta of the dead that is not

and of bad girls with corazoncito. The protagonist occupies such a broad spectrum of emotions that never,

under any circumstances demanded by the capricious gui���n, do we know what leads her to do what she does or does not

do, which comes to be id���ntica thing. The same could be said of the tormented poet, of the vate yuppie who

finds a corridor between life and death and runs between sarcasm, stupor and a vague whiff to

Sherlock Holmes of fifth category. , I saw Ghost with the age that Ghost has to see, I understand that this

unbearable hodgepodge of impossible love and astral travel comforts the adolescent soul, in need of

simple metaphysical ardor, of modern melodramas not too loaded with meaning. However, the film -

which seems to be a remake of a Swedish film not distributed in these parts - is not among the worst of the year,

but it has lacked really little. The perpetrator of this almost-infamy (David S. Goyer) has in his

showcase of achievements to have written the wonderful script of Batman begins. In his little box of sins,

Blade Trinity was in charge: that rare combination of successes and fatalities could not guarantee that we were

lucky and attended to this event. a good movie. One is already very back of tormented boys,

touched by the numen of beauty and very sophisticatedly destined to redeem the sins of others with their

generosity and broad philanthropy and in What is not seen (The invisible in English). ���s) there is one particularly

embarrassing, irritating, very high-pitched co���azo.

" 0

" a rather flimsy, boring movie that could fit into the

weekend TV show. At least the relatives of those affected by the infamous terrorist act will see some of the benefits that

this? Casta? produce

Oliver Stone has always been characterized by the strong political charge that surrounds each of his appearances, and

that has sometimes been transferred to his films. He is a famous one who declares himself critical of the system,

although in most cases the Republicans are the target of his acid comments. Like other

profession partners, he has positioned himself against the aggressive and coercive stance that his country adopted after

the September 11 attacks, most of them bloody history (not counting those that are perpetrated in the

name of the states). On this occasion, Stone leaves aside his political streak? social and focuses on the

story of John McLoughlin and William Jimeno, two agents of the Port Authority of New York who during their

work to help the eviction of the towers are trapped under the rubble after the collapse of the same. The

anguish of the families and the hard work of the team that at the same time tries to rescue them are theaxis

centralof the argument. Regardless of the reality of the drama that it reflects, World Trade Center is a

rather flimsy, boring film that could well fit into the weekend TV show

. In the interpretative aspect, Nicolas Cage shows immutable and hietic, for a change, while the

rest does not stand out too much. At least the relatives of those affected by the infamous terrorist act will see some

of the benefits that this "" caste "" produces, even if only five percent of the box office of the first end

week of its premiere in the United States; One-tenth of what they would spend on promotion and nothing compared to

what Stone would bag. But of course, he does everything because of sensitivity to the victims. Money is

secondary Or at least that says. Do they believe it?

" 0

" Jonathan Kasdan's first feature is not a waste of imagination, but rather the opposite, since it

is a story full of cliches and clichés It's worn.

There are surnames that will always be linked to the history of cinema, some with more strength than others, some

for good reasons and others for bad. One of them is Kasdan, Lawrence Kasdan, thanks to which they have

been able to make some of the most relevant films of the last decades, such as Indiana Jones, The Empire

Counterattack or The Return of the Jedi. Now it is the turn of his son Jonathan Kasdan, who assumes

responsibility for his first feature film, produced by his father, Entre Mujeres. Among Women is afilm

complexto locate, since it is a mixture of genres, although it resembles more the romantic drama. Carter Webb (Adam

Brody) is a young screenwriter who ends up leaving his girlfriend Sofia (Elena Anaya), and decides to take care of his

grandmother (Olympia Dukakis). There he meets Sarah (Meg Ryan) and his daughter Lucy (Kristen Stewart), and starts a

peculiar relationship with both, while looking for the inspiration to write the story he has in mind since

eleven years At first glance, the first feature by Jonathan Kasdan is not a waste of imagination, but rather the

opposite, since it is a story full of cliches and cliches. It's worn. In this sense, the viewer

takes the first on the forehead with the character of Elena Anaya, who plays a popular Spanish actress

who in a debauchery of originality have called Bu���uel. The script is a succession of common andplacesad

recurring, exploitednauseam. More than a linear plot we find ourselves with a distorted

narrative, as if they were independent sequences without any nexus in common. So monumental

hodgepodge ends up exasperating the most painted, and the viewer enters a deep trance, which

mixes the most unbearable tedium and a deep anger for having forced to see such a jewel. To make matters

worse the drowsiness that of itself provokes the plot in the stalls, it must be said that this is extremelystretch

predictable in all its aspects, and that in its finalthere is not a single surprise positive. The characters

are mere stereotyped caricatures, although the one that takes the palm is that of Elena Anaya (the scene of the

phone call since the party is embarrassing), we do not know who cheats her. ��� to join the cast,

despite getting ahead an indefensible character. Adam Brody meets in his role, like the young Kristen

Stewart, while Meg Ryan approaches the histrionics and overacting dangerously. Among Women is

four films in one: on the one hand, a story of an intelligent twenty-somethings that does not find its place in

life; a story of conflicting teenagers quarreled with the world because their parents ignore them; a

tearful melodrama about life and death; and a story of impossible loves. But instead of

agglutinating its virtues, it manages to gather all its faults.

" 0

" Film about three old men who intend to rob the safe of the mutual. Delicious and entertaining

act of three great actors in a beautiful story with a history of protest against the bureaucracy.

Of that type of cinema to taste.

Director: Juan G. Atienza.Duraci���n: Horita y media.Estreno: November 2, 1964 in Madrid,

Capitol cinema.Spectators: 95 of human beings, or the one who had to add was on vacation or it was afailure

commercialor the website of the ministry is not 100% reliable. In the current cinema do not leave older people. It is more, not

even in the television series. And when they come out they have papers or hyperdrams, or at most of

secondary entrayeables or simp���ticos. So to see a comedy where the main actors are threepeople

elderlyand young people are not more than secondary, because it hits a lot. Is that even the rest of the actors

are people over 50 years old. How the audiovisual trends change. By the way, the great Pepe Isbert,

has he always been old? I leave the doubt in the air. The film is about three old people who, fed up with the

bureaucracy and the misery that the mutual gives them, decide to make a robbery like those of the movies and novels. Itus

showshow they plan millimtrically the theft in the mutual that has caused so many headaches,

even the fruit of their actions. Delicious.This type of movies must be seen sitting on the sofa, very

agustito and relaxed. Why? Because they should be tasted, calmly, without stress or stress.just

Wehave to let ourselves be carried away by the three elders, with their dialogues loaded with sympathy and their critical point,

to have a very pleasant time. This movie is not going to change our life, but it will leave us very

cute, with a kind smile, thinking that the world can be much better. By the way, one of the

elders speaks with the voice of Alfred Hitchcock, but I think he is not the official doubler, given that he is Italian.

I suppose the aforementioned bender would do the same with this cantankerous old man. Resumiendo, film about

three old men who intend to dock the safe of the mutual. Delicious and entertaining act of three

great actors in a beautiful story with a history of protest against the bureaucracy. Of that type of cinema

to taste at home. It has very funny moments.Besitos.PD: Anecdotally, one of the actors is called

Felipe Gonz���lez. Nothing to do with the former president.

" 1

" The classic script of Hollywood knows that it is enough to concentrate the gun at three key moments, the two

turns of the first and second act, and the end. That forgetfulness may explain the box office, but it does not subtract an

apice of value from a huge movie.

With the big ones you have the feeling that your adventures are not more than an excuse, sometimes a

distraction to take us to your land, to speak to us in a way, with a tone. To speak to our ears, as

Shyamalan does, to confess to us, as Mankiewicz likes, to let go of his unbridled vein,

like Almod���var, or to tell us things calmly, serenely, which is a tone that runs through the wholefilm.

Daniel Sanchez Arvalo The adventures, incredible sometimes, always unexpected, leave each character on the verge

of losing their nerves, but it always ends in a more surprising play than the previous one, and it is recomposed

sober , sensible, serene. The film is built with a usual rhythm in Spanish cinema, which distributes the

chasms throughout the entire film. The classic script of Hollywood knows that it is enough to concentrate the thruster

in three key moments, the two turns of the first and second act, and the end. That forgetfulness may explain the

box office, but it does not subtract an ���pice of value from a huge movie. Jorge, the protagonist, takes care of hisfather

invalid, and with memory problems, takes the porter���ay tries to look for a job with his business title

that he has taken at the UNED. Her brother is serving a sentence and falls in love for the first time in his life with another convict.

She needs to get pregnant to change the pavilion. Jorge's friend spies from the terrace of his

building to a gay masseur. While Hollywood makes heroes without any sign of fatigue, Spanish cinema never

tires of healing your public. It cures him of his intransigence, of his incorrectness. AzulOscuroCasiNegro faces

burning issues, such as sexuality within the family, homosexuality as part of sexuality, sex

without love, inheritances between siblings, who takes care of the elderly, the labor market. They are all subjects that the

cinema avoids, because they are not easy, and because they are depressing. AzulScuroCasiBgro illuminates them with an

astonishing and astonished look, that of a S���nchez Ar���valo who does not speak to us to give us lessons, nor to persuade us, who

takes everything to his land, and ends up talking in that subjugating tone, sober, sensible, serene. The only lesson,

the thesis is its incurable romanticism. Without a doubt the tape that deserved to go to the oscars.

" 1

" Sometimes it is better to leave the superheroes where they have always been (on paper) and be more conscientious and

consistent with the responsibility that comes with resurrecting a myth

Brian Singer keeps trying to show his inner scholar, but the truth is that the genius of the lamp does not

wake up after "" Usual suspects " " So cataloging his X-men and his Superman asmovies. The

quite normalman of steel, for many, symbolizes the hero par excellence, perhaps because of his paradoxical

humanity, proximity, good work and because it is all that the human being has to dream, like flying, solving

conflicts in the world, etc. Then Superman acquires megalomaniac dimensions and it is when the genius Richard

Donner he enters into action after his "" The Omen "" and with a rather modern and outstanding filmography; Donner would

create his version of a hero that, from my point of view, has not yet been beaten. The comparisons are odious but

Singer has tried to resurrect two personalities such as Brando and Reeve. which is a bit humid, giving

green light so that one can dispatch at ease and realize that attempts to do enduring works

are far from making simple blockbuster for fools. Observe for example in the vision n of Singer that tendency

of aberration of the colors in the film or that new spongy style "" chewing gum boomer "" that subtracts that

proximity or proximity that Reeve had to the mortals; and being a little more fussy and personal,

do you need those modern touches in the styling and the steel man's suit? The most worrying thing is a

gui���n that As he advances, one can notice the decline in printed patent interest, to the point of seeing

incoherent things unworthy of the Superman saga. And thank goodness, that despite everything, the film is

backed by a Brandon Routh and a Kevin Spacey with a few homonym faces quite astonishing and that to a

certain extent they give very well the size and new airs or nuances to the saga ; except Lex's minions, which

I think have not been a good choice as the discreet soundtrack, which despite having the

heritage of Williams, passes without penalty and without glory. The other details as the special effects,

unworthy of today's ad, taking into account that in Hollywood is the only thing that he knows how to do lately and of

course the good direction-mastery of the c�� Singer's camera, I get to think that sometimes it's better to leave the

superheroes where they've always been (on paper) and be more conscientious and consistent with the responsibility

that comes with resurrecting a myth Maybe, better not to have woken up. (See next installments with the new

Superman's asthmatic son.) ""

" 0

" A good movie that both kids can enjoy as adults and that supposes a pleasant entertainment,

another film of animation that surprises.

Lately the cinema of digital animation is the one that more pleasant surprises has been given in terms offilms

fun, entertaining and coherent, except clear exceptions. But Monster House is another proof of this,

the second animated film by the hand of Robert Zemeckis, who this time only performs tasks ofproducer

executive, with the inestimable help of Steven Spielberg, leaving the address to newcomer Gil Kenan, you'll have better

luck than the failed Christmas story Polar Express, since its theme is far more appealing We

found the typical neighborhood of American houses in Monster House, but one of those houses

is not what it really looks like and its owner is a cantankerous old man who does not allow anyone to approach not

even to his garden. DJ is the boy who lives in front of the mysterious house and, obsessed with it, he spends

the day observing and pointing out every detail that happens. An accident will cause the old man to disappear and the house to be

left alone, is when DJ and his friend Chowder will have to face the house in earnest, which seems to come alive

at times. We could classify the horror movie for children, but it really is a fun story

that perfectly combines the story of fear with moments full of humor. There are scenes andmoments

remarkablelike the first time the two friends meet the girl and the two want to impress her or

the couple of policemen who are of the most surreal, to highlight some.Monster House improves At the level of animation,

the results obtained with Polar Express using the same technique, with real actors who had to putevery

on a suit and special shoesday and then in make-up. he put a rubber band on his head andpoints

reflectiveon his face so he could capture each of the body movements and facial expressions,

then act on a kind of plate that was a totally empty box. Where they developed their papers. Then

the process of animation and scenery would have happened. The characters are much more cartoonish this time and

I would even dare to say Burtonianos, and we have actors like Steve Buscemi giving life to the old

gru������n of the haunted house or to Jas Leen Lee playing the girl's friend, although undoubtedly the mostact

outstandingis that of Kathleen Turner giving life to the house. A good movie that could Disfrutarn enjoy both children

and adults and that is a pleasant entertainment, another film of animation that surprises, one of the best

proposals for this weekend if we go to the movies.

" 1

" In short, one of the most decadent and sick gore peaks. The author of MANIAC COP or Muerto on July 4, among others, came to perform one of the most brutal films

ever. s seen. Rolled almost in amateur mode which gives it a ���spero look with a dirt so real that even

thought if it was a SNUFF.A work that flies high above its death scenes where focuses on

the figure of the murderer (Awesome JOE SPINELL Seen in rocky and the godfather). A figure that degenerates little by

little leading us to a poetic end shot with a vigorous force and adentandronos in a dark mind inway

atrocious. Even in spite of its scarce budget, photography, music, decorations stick well in thataura

nightmarebeing the remarkable makeup giving realism to all its GORE scenes. To make matters worse, the

legendary CAROLINE MUNRO (Dr���cula 73 or capit���n cronos). In short, one of the most decadentGORE summits

and sick.

" 1

" Miraculously, we find one of the most original, hooligan and delirious films of

recent years with an apothetical Costner that reinvents interpretations about psycho�� �patas with a work full

of nuances where the actor gives an accelerated course of interpretation.

���Other PSICO THRILLER? In the end one more assassin that puts in check to the justice with its brutal crimes.

Another copy of the silence of the lambs and above with two interpreters completely finished a KEVIN COSTNER that

after triumphing with dancing with wolves does not stop making the ridiculous as much as actor and director in the mailman of the

future or WATERWORLD Accompanied by DEMI MOORE who lately gave us the angels of charlie 2 or in the

darkness. For more INRI the director only has a previous film in the unbearable poly by chance and

producer with titles as mediocre as assassins. With all this the normal thing is to think that you're going to eat amess

championship, because miraculously we find one of the most original films, hooligans and

delusions of recent years with an apothecaic COSTNER that reinvents interpretations on PSICOPATAS with

a full work of nuances where the actor gives an accelerated course of interpretation. His Alter-Ego falls on the

always brilliant WILLIAN HURT that we saw lately in SYRIANA or a history of violence. Technically

round with a gui���n that a���na diversion with intrigue and terror in equal parts coming out graceful of everything

proposed with great elegance. The only thing is that DEMI MOORE is still as bad actress as ever,

anyway a different film that will surprise you more than one.

" 1

" In "" Broken Flowers "" there is a harsh irony about human relationships, emptiness and loneliness, in various

ways

I was lucky to see this film in the presentation In the new issue of Godard magazine! Theredefinitely

isno better way to present a film magazine than by showing a sensational film (in addition as a

premiere in Lima). But at the same time it was very annoying to find, even among moviegoers, people with such

bad manners when it comes to watching a movie. His damn appreciations out loud, his half-spokenand

dialogueshis cell phones. The funny thing is that it was "" the lady in yellow "", the person who had let us in

by not having an invitation, the same one who disturbed the room with his murmurs. But in spite of these

interferences I could taste with attention this great film by Jim Jarmush. Don receives a pink letter the

day his last girlfriend leaves him. In the letter without a name one of her former lovers informs her that she had a son of his

twenty years ago. He adds that now the alleged son has left in search of his father, a single that everyone

considers a Don Juan. His friend, a fan of mysteries, designed a plan to find the author of the

letter. Then Don undertakes a trip through the United States to locate his ex-girlfriends and find a clue.

These lines that can make us believe that it is a film about "someone who learns great lessons

of life", maybe it would be if Don were not there. Interprea played by Bill Murray and, above all, if the person responsible for

this story was not Jim Jarmush. "" Broken Flowers "" (2005) is the odyssey of a Ulysses who would have preferred to

stay at home. After the departure of his girlfriend, Don does not seem interested in anything other than sitting

on the sofa in his living room. The persistence of his friend Winston, obsessed with playing to unveil the mystery, is what

ultimately forces him to get on the first plane. The key clue is to find a typewriter among the

ex-girlfriends' belongings and bring it to Winston to see if the letter has been written with it. With this

objective and trying to be as uncomfortable as possible, Don appears in front of the doors of his old girlfriends.

In this Odyssey there will be plenty of sirens that will try to stay with the traveler. One of the things that surprises

Jim Jarmush, and at the same time has so much fun, is the use of time in his movies. culas. What in others may

seem boring and pretentious, here the long fixed shots and the silences in the conversations offer the

spectator discreet and gratifying details, contained in every little instant. And "" God is in the

details "" they say that it said Santo Tom���s.En "" Flores Rotas "" there is also a harsh irony about relationships

human Vacuity and loneliness, in various forms, weigh on the lives of the characters. The communication between

them is complicated and tense, full of misunderstandings. Don moves like a zombie, for his girlfriends is that: a

dead man who returns for an uncertain search. But you can not expect much from a zombie either, except this one.

Bill Murray is so funny doing almost nothing. Rocked from a place in the car, circulating through perfect

developments, only a pu loetazo manages to wake up.

" 1

" Interesting film, with successful moments of suggested terror that give it a slightly higher

average interest, although with a final part full of topics and sensations. n of a final development of thestory

sought-afterto confuse the viewer.

After a more than interesting debut in Hollywood with a film in the service of Clive Owen within the

genre of the police thriller ("" Sin Control "") the Swedish director Mikael Hafstrom passes on his new proposal to the

genre of fantasy, in this case to terror adapting a short story of the master of suspense, at least for

some, not for a server, Stephen King. The story begins with the visit of Mike Enslin (John Cusack) to

a roadside motel supposedly inhabited by ghosts, to document his next book,

at which point we see that absolutely nothing happens in his presence. In spite of it Enslin writes books about

the ghostly inhabitants of those places, with books like "" 1st Haunted Hotels "" or "" 10Cemeteries

Haunted"", all of them guides for the survival against ghosts, without even In your own

words, I have never seen any. He could be considered a disgraced phonist who writes for pure and mere

affinity of economic survival, as shown by his discussion in a bookstore to talk about his work

only 3 or 4 are cited. people interested in some books, which are described below as sale books

in the cheap novels section. When you have the possibility of visiting the Hotel Delf���n, in whichis

room 1408supposed to be haunted, Enslin sees the perfect opportunity to close his new book with this

��� Last chapter about mysterious places and create your false story about a new haunted place. There he is

greeted by the hotel manager, Gerald Olin, played with a certain package by Samuel L. Jackson, who

warns him that this room should not lodge him, after a constant tug of war, he agrees to let him

spend the night in room 1408, but not before warning him that the "ghosts" of that room inhabit

his own interior. From there the film becomes the attempt of survival to a long night

by the personage of Enslin. It could be considered the film an attempt to move to a single room. Lan

the typical story of haunted house (not worth mentioning) "" The glow "" by Kubrick or "" The legend of the

house of hell "" by John Hough, to name movies of this style, because it would be a disservice), a

pretty commendable attempt with decent results, details such as the mirror effect through the window of the

room towards the building opposite, the absence of windows on the outside of the building except

room 1408 are more than suggestive and help create a Kafkian nightmare atmosphere, aswell

the main characterdescribes on one occasion. During the footage is questioned, more than the existence or not

of ghosts, the mental health of the main character, with details such as the recorder or the portable pc, aspects

that compensate that in a moment the movie If you take a wrong direction, the direction that this kind ofusually take

productions, which is to turn around on your own, trying to play with everything real or product of the

imagination, the fact that it has already come out of the room 1408, and that's precisely the moment when the film

breaks down to a high degree of effectiveness. It should be said that as the film progresses it falls again,

once more as usual, in a final that does not know how to finish the story, which is thrown by

the way m��� easy, where there is even a place for a fright of final fright that does not come to mind at all. The

work of the actors does not pass of correct, they give the sensation of having cashed the check and little m� ��s, especially John

Cusack, who despite being a good actor in my opinion, I have not seen him in this type of productions.

Samuel L. Jackson is a little bit smoother in his role as manager of the hotel, although he does not do much

more to go beyond convincing himself in his work. mysterious paper. On the part of the director, little to

add, very simple mise-en-scène without any hint of personality, typical product of order, limiting itself to being

correct. In short, a film It's an interesting story, with moments of suggested terror that give it

an interest a little higher than the average, although with a final part full of topics once more and the sensation Densophisticated

final development ofhistory to confuse the viewer, the most usual way to finish something you

do not know how to finish. Simply entertaining.

" 0

" This film is a lesson about many things: about how to make a brave but respectful film, about how to

build on real events without overshadowing the film. with ideologies, how to adapt the cinematographic rules and

keep moving.

Adapting real facts to the cinema is conflictive. Much more when they are recent and have changed the story.

11S is a date that we all in our memory. In the information society, we could contemplate

how we were attacked in the most unexpected way. And how the agony and anger of those moments made us

react. However, making a film starring those who are no longer present is something that

requires, as Paul Greengrass well explains in a small making of, sensitivity, approval of the families and

based on the facts that are known. Counting on that delicate previous work of the director, and knowing that he

had to make a film, the result does justice to both tasks: faithfully portray that moment and

get a great movie. This is why this film that portrays what happened on the United 93 flight, the fourth plane

of the 11S that crashed without reaching its objective, is a great container of many lessons to learn The

documentary treatment of this film gives us a role of spectators with "" special pass "". Hisreality

fictional, starring many of the people (not actors) of that day puts us squarely in the

uncertainty, the doubt and the fear that the worst can happen. The only problem is that the spectators know

that the worst will happen. The structure of the film is based on the chronology of the events. It

completely abandons the standards in which the presentation, unfettered situation and division of the history in acts

have a certain number of pages. of gui���n. That is why many people feel embarrassed or bored during

the first hour and ten minutes. It seems that nothing happens. However, the tension hidden in the tranquility is

something that is evident in the conversations of the controllers and military personnel. And then it gives way to a

brutal, taquic���rdica and emotional half hour that destroys our false hopes of "" happy end "". Cl���max and final

at the same time. This film is a lesson of many things: of how to make a brave but respectful film,

of how to rely on facts real without eclipsing the film with ideologies, of how to adapt therules

cinematographicand keep on moving and, above all, of how to fight until the end for our life and for

our freedom must be a natural attitude in us. Quiet, this phrase is not wrapped by the

American flag. It is the greatness of cinema. Simply. Greengrass has managed to change thewith this

filmfilm, just as the attacks on which it is based changed our history.

" 1

" "" The Odyssey "" Mayan version. An excellent film, technically magnificent, narratively as simple as

perfect and aesthetically beautiful. Again, and despite the criticism received, chapeau, Gibson.

As expected of a work by Gibson, emotion is the sustaining element of the film,

building, from it, a splendid narrative Vn.It becomes evident once again the taste for

story simplicity, without puzzles or unexpected twists, but not for that reason to stop awakening in the

spectator an interest. They are two and a quarter hours of film that, however, give the impression of being consumed

in a sigh, such is the intensity and attractive power of the same. Games of lights, fleeting planes,angles

impossibleand shocking movements of gr���a succeed to get fully into a world where the life of an

individual depends precisely on that, their speed and expertise. As if it were Odysseus, our

protagonist undertakes (much to his dismay, that s���) a journey of survival and overcoming, where luck,

audacity and, above all, the desire to return to their own will be their best asset. The actors are incredibly

convincing, Seeming, moreover, to have been taken directly from a true Mayan village. Their looks,

passionate, reckless and challenging, are constantly exchanged, thus involving us in this risky

game, of which only one can be a winner. As we advance to the beginning of the film , a civilization can not

be destroyed if it is not destroyed before itself. This is precisely what the film reflects, the

self-destruction of a people, a culture, a way of life; whose definitive executioners approach, slowly

but inexorably, through the ponto.���Blood? Yes, a lot. Dead? Yes, many. ���Savagery? Yes, a lot.movies?

Gore Absolutely. In short, an excellent film, technically magnificent, narratively as simple as

perfect and aesthetically beautiful. Again, and despite the criticism received, chapeau, Gibson.

" 1

" Film fourth in the saga of Rambo, where he has to release some doctors from the Burmese claws.

Tremendously violent, with special recreation in the ulcers and amputated limbs, it is entertaining to

see, and hard to think about.

Director: Sylvester StalloneDuration: If X bad Burmese die every Y second (where Y tends to 0), the

duration will be a bloody hour and a half.Standing: February 1, 2008I have a couple of teenage girls

that I train that the other day they confessed to me that they were in love (and you do not think that simply in away

platinic) of Sylvester Stallone. It could well be his grandfather, this gentleman, but surely if he finds out about this

anecdote, he takes a plane to meet such young and enthusiastic admirers. By the way, this man is no longer

worth Botox, will he use liquid to embalm mummies? Ah��� I leave the doubt. The film is about Rambo that is

dedicated to the collection of cobras there in the Asia of the charlies. On a good day, aarrive in their humble abode

mixture of preachers and doctors, intending to enter Burma upstream to help people

suffering a bloody civil war. Because they were going with a blonde wench, if they were not going to have to go by subway. Total, they

go, they catch the doctors, and has to return Rambo along with some mercenaries to free them. Classical

pattern. What's most striking about the film is not seeing a 60-year-old gentleman hit you on the bow and

fine cutlery. Impress the harshness with which he transmits a horrible situation that makes us doubt a lot about

the human being. Clearly it is the most violent film of the saga, with moments in raw excesses, but that

can be taken more as a vehicle to transmit a story than as a morbid for the thick casquer���a. The

argument is very simple, letting the development flow in a very logical way (to be a Rambo, of course).

I liked it a lot, despite a very slow start, but it's a tremendously crude movie. Not

return to see. Resumiendo, fourth film in the saga of Rambo, where he has to release some doctors from

the Burmese claws. Tremendously violent, with special recreation in the ulcers and amputated limbs, it

is entertaining to see, and hard to think about. I consider it a plea against violence and

wars. I liked it. Bs. PS: The embalming joke is not mine, I heard it on TV. My

progenitor says that this man uses growth hormone to stay young. That I calculate that when I am

100 years old, I measure 7 meters, more or less. PS2: And what this gentleman looks like to my ex-neighbor Ricardo.

" 1

" Planet Terror is like a bad joke that you always explain with your friends and that always makes fun and is

understood among that small group that knows what the thing is going on while the rest of the people look strange and

wonder where I have this grace if the joke is old and bad.

They already told us that the GrindHouse project aimed to recover the essence and spirit of theseries films

B-, and of course Robert Rodr���guez has achieved it with this first film that has come to us Planet

Terror tells us how a kind of virus begins to infect the population turning them into zombies

thirsty for human blood, come on, the typical movie of zombies but in this case so screwed and so

absurd that one can not help but applaud such audacity to achieve a bizarre as fun as this.

And if something has Planet Terror is that at no time is taken seriously if It is the same, and the director

takes the opportunity to put scenes of action, no longer impossible, but completely unthinkable,

di alogos to which more chorra and some memorable phrases stuck with shoehorn and without sense, and especially a

mise-en-scène and deliberately crappy and homemade special effects. Even the actors act badly on

purpose, and also emphasize that they have a couple of memorable cameos. In such a perspective one is not surprised that

the commercial failure has been sonorous and it is that Planet Terror is like a bad joke that you always explain with your

friends and that always makes fun and is understood among that small group that knows what the thing is going on while the

rest of people look strange and wonder where I have this grace if the joke is old and bad. This is

the film, a bad joke that only the fans of the genre will know how to understand, find the grace and

enjoy it for what it is, a bad movie, but in reality it is not, since it is what it wants to be, and

this is where its greatness lies. Of course, the one who approaches the cinema without having much idea of ​​what is going to

see and expect to see a film of typical terror action and is faced with such nonsense, it is normal that

does not make you or fucking funny, and is that surely you have not heard what's the joke?

" 1

" Cult movie of the most prolific director of Spanish cinema, where a vampire is eating what he

wants to a chatunga. More bad than hitting a father in sweatsuits. To say you've seen one

of Jess Franco.

Director: Jes���s Franco or Jess Franco, as you like.Duration: 89 minutes. Year: 1973. Viewers: 236,615

human beings. The other day I was watching a video of Mariano Ozores (with a Esteso in a deplorable state, everything

is said) and mentioned that there is a Spanish director who has made more films than him. What would it be? What emotion,

what excitement. Well, it turns out that a certain Jes���s Franco changed his name to Jess Franco (he wanted Jess Franc,

but he could not, I do not know why) he's done it ��s of 150 movies. Nothing, nothing, we are going to see one of such an outstanding director,

who seems to like women in leather. "" Vampires "", which in German is something of vampire lesbians that

catches my attention, that seems like art and essay. The film is about (I recognize that my version of Do not be

too faithful to reality) of a girl who does not know what's wrong with her. Total, that a voice-over tells that a

king (or similar) put his wife in a palace to scream and see if he dies (the real divorce, they

call it) with a few hundred of slaves. Time passed and the girl was every solid day and the slaves were

dead. After the years, the one that seems to be the king's wife (or similar, I insist) continues to nibble on the

necks of young girls who lend themselves. See, I have not seen the whole movie. And that you went out in balls

eating the bodies licked and leng���ent���s. But it is unbearable. Incredible planes, as in the

climax fuck the protagonists focus on a scorpion walking (leaves about 20 times), then a moth

trapped in a network and another insect that I have deleted from memory to put the Today's cover of the Brand. The

di sonlogos are the worst, with an argument that is not understood, or hooked, or nothing at all. Come on, it's

unbearable, so it did not surprise me that it has become something of a cult quickly. Resuming,

cult film of the most prolific director �fico Spanish cinema, where a vampire is eating what you want to a

chatunga. More bad than hitting a father in sweatsuits. To say that you have seen one of Jess

Franco.Besitos.PD: The sensual planes the truth that are like to divide your hips to culet���s, be told

in honor of the truth.

" 0

" It is not that the time is requested because it is boring, that it is not. If not because it is unbearable to see so much

suffering and a situation so miserable.

Terry Gilliam seems to me a genius but his genius in this case borders on madness. Tideland could inaugurate

a new genre, the cinema of bad vibes. A film in which you can not believe what you are seeing and leaves you between

the na���sea and the unshakable bass. This peculiar "Alice in worseland" is dirty, perverse, Ugly and Gilliam serves it

cold and very undercooked, practically raw. The protagonist is a girl who lives with two drug addicts. When

his stepmother dies, she travels with her father on a flatulent journey to nothingness, to a house in the countryside. The little

girl raves, fantasizes and skirts the schizophrenia while she prepares her dad for her injection of vitamins in what

are scenes that would hurt the sensibility of Charles Mason-but they are not the ones �� Unique. With this panorama, the

girl becomes an emotional beggar and establishes a relationship with her neighbors: a woman who lives terrified

by the wasps and her son, a mentally retarded adolescent. But sometimes it's better to be alone than poorly accompanied

and her psychotic delirium grows as she becomes forced Norman Bates infantil.Y with these

ingredients it is evident that the film, which delights in showing the little one possessed by her evasion of

reality, she makes you pass the footage thinking three things:? that someone calls social services ?,? I do

have a daughter I would not have let you star in this movie? and? When does this end? But it is not thatis requested

the timebecause it is boring, that it is not. If not because it is unbearable to see so much suffering and a

situation so miserable. As in The Labyrinth of the Faun, the protagonist locked herself in her fairies and

bugs to survive and the imagined story was the most attractive, in Tideland the opposite happens.so

The environment, the fantasy, the scenarios and the characters aredemented that you do not know which is worse and your

stomach, soul and heart shrink. but I did not notice if I had a good picture, soundtrack or artistic

direction, as a result of which I hardly looked.

" 0

" A very decent film and a very interesting and personal debut, which is what givesoriginality and solidity

this film.

The good thing about meeting audiovisual people and keeping in touch with them is that they can give you pleasant

surprises. One, because they invite you to the premiere of a film in which they are co-producers with acompany

Madridmade up of Eduardo Campoy and Jos��� Manuel Lorenzo. The second, because there are times when younot

dohave to lie and deserve to give them your congratulations in person. This is the case of my former colleagues of Adivina

Producciones, from La Coru���a. The production company, led by Jorge Algora and Susana Maceiras, has been dedicated to

audiovisual for years, commissioning spots, institutional videos, offering HD services and high-postproduction

end. between many other things. Now they have been fully involved in film production, starting a

couple of years ago with Camino de Santiago, El Origen, a documentary film in which I was able to participate during the

filming and the postproduction It was a very strong bet that had a worthy result, especially for the magnificent

picture, of Suso Bello. Later he played fiction, starting with the tvmovie Lying to life and

now with the debut of Carlos Iglesias in the direction of feature films: A franc, 14 pesetas. The story is

well simple: Mart���n and Pilar are a couple who live in a cellar in Arg���elles in the Spain of the 60s. But

a couple of events will make Martin trek to Switzerland to be able to earn money and send it to his family in Spain. He will go

with his friend Marcos and together they will see that in Switzerland they not only find work: they also find another way of

life that contrasts very much with the "" Spanish way of life "" that was in the Alc���ntara period. The first thing that

this film transmits during its viewing is authenticity. In the same vein as Havana Blues, a film that

gives the impression of being a very accurate portrait of Cuba. In fact many who are Cuban or have lived there say

that it is very close. Well, the same thing happens with this movie. I have never been to Switzerland, but it seems that it is

so well portrayed that the power of real and verisimil come together to make a more interesting story. On the other

hand, we must point out problems of rhythm that unnecessarily lengthen the movie It does not get long, but it gives

the feeling that the assembly could have been more fragile. The work of the actors is great, the staging

is done and the setting is very successful. Mario de Benito composes a kind and melancholic music

that perhaps has too much presence in the film, but it is still an interesting work. Special mention to

Isabel Blanco, an actress who personally knows the circumstances on which the film's script is based and

which makes up the most grateful and best-composed character of all . An authentic gift for the actress and a

totally adorable character for the viewer. It deserves nominations. Another ofmost interesting aspects of

thethe film is that it presents an emigration in little "" current "circumstances. It is the case of people who can not

find a job and they have no choice but to go abroad to find their own lives, but it has nothing to

do with the emigration that we see and that many try to sell as the only one: the one that emerges from the mostpoverty

absoluteand whose saving table is to go to another country with nothing. In the case of this film, they are characters

who are out of work and know the possibility of continuing to do what they know but in another country. But the

least seen and most "educational" aspect of the film is the way of life of the host country and the respect that

"" imposes "" and that we also have to profess . It is very significant when the old woman picks up some

papers that the protagonists have thrown on the floor to throw them in the trash. If something is to be grateful to

this film, more than the purely cinematographic aspects, it is the bofet���n that many of us feel when we see ourselves

identified with the protagonists and with the way of life who are: totally kind, neat,

logical and (this is more personal) full. The best thing about the film is that all of us who have not been to Switzerland

feel like immigrants and ignorant in many sequences. In short, a very decent film and a very

interesting and personal debut, which is what that gives originality and solidity to this film. At least I already have a

crazy desire to go to visit Switzerland? I hope not in the circumstances of the protagonists.

" 1

" Days of Cinema is one of the worst Spanish films of the last years, which has plenty of vulgarity and

is missing above all dignity

One of the greatest burdens suffered by Spanish art and culture in the 20th century has been thedictatorship

Francoand its censorship. And like any art, the cinema was one of the main victims of that ballast. Not

only because the freedom and creativity of our filmmakers, such as Bardem or Berlanga, were restricted, but because of

the imposition of a type of cinema that a posteriori has been called "" the Spanish language "". �oladas "". The films of

prodigious children like Joselito or Marisol, the folkloric ones, Paco Mart���nez Soria, Gracita Morales? and a long

etc. have done much damage to the health of our cinema. During the transition, a stage opposite to the

previous one came with the arrival of freedom, but equally damaging for the Spanish cinema, the "uncover", and in that

David Serrano sets his new job, Days of Cinema. After the success of D���as de F���tbol, ​​Serrano offers us

a story that tells the difficulties of Federico (Alberto San Juan) to shoot his first film as a

director. For Silvia Conde (Nathalie Poza) and her producer Jos��� Mar���a Culebras (Miguel Rell���n), this project is

the last opportunity to return to the cinema, or at least, say goodbye to He worthily. David Serrano presents his

new work as a tribute in a comedy tone to the directors of that time, authentic heroes of

our cinematography, who fought against everything and against all to be able to carry out his work. Theidea

initialis good, but Serrano fails his development, and commits a grave sin, not taking seriously what

counts. The film aims to cover both the crazy comedy and the pure human drama, and they already know the

saying. If that were the worst of Movie Day's ills, viewers could still feel lucky,

but unfortunately it is not. The script, in which Alberto San Juan has participated, is nothing more than a succession

of disproportions, to which worse, while the characters are mere empty puppets, without depth or

development. The film's chemical elements are nothing more than crude humor, easy jokes, absurd situations

that come to provoke the shame of others, and that leave the works of the Espa dela del destape in summits of

intelligent comedy. The dramatic moments are to burst into tears bitterly, since they do not possess intensity

or transmit the mísicas of emotions. Before such a panorama, little or nothing the actors can do,

although it comforts the return to the screens of Miguel Rell���nD���as de Cine is one of the worst Spanish

films of the � Last years, which has plenty of vulgarity and lack above all dignity. As a

comedy, it has no hint of grace, and as a human and social drama, it is laughable. Hopefully, from this

good idea, a film is made that takes seriously the story that counts, and that it does so with what has

lacked D���as de Cine, dignity.

" 0

" Fermat's Room is a film that at first captures its unsettling atmosphere, but

is shipwrecked by how unbelievable the characters and characters are. actors, except Santi Mill���n, who

interpret them.

There are certain actors, directors or scriptwriters, to whom we have mentally associated with a type of cinema

or programs, and it seems inconceivable that they can do something that moves away from what they are encased in

. Luis Piedrahita and Rodrigo Sope���a have always moved in the humor, beingcollaborators

mainof chemical programs, like the Club of the Comedy, Nada x Aqu��� or El Hormiguero. However, for its

first incursion of joint form in the cinema, leave of side the comedy and they are sent with a totallygenre

opposite, the cinema of suspense. The Room of Fermat is a film that attracts for its more than interesting

initial approach, four mathematicians locked in a room with no exit and that is shrinking little to

little, and because it supposes a type of suspense different from which usually the cinema offers. However, after a few

minutes, one of the main failures of the film is discovered, and that except for Santi Mill���n, there is no one who

believes that Alejo Sauras, Elena Ballesteros and Llu���s Homar included, be brilliant mathematicians. But the

defect is not only in the choice of actors and their interpretations, but also because

the characters are poorly constructed and worse developed. The atmosphere is very successful, bringing the concern

and burden just for the tape convey that sense of suffocation that completely captures the viewer.

But alas, this atmosphere only stays the first half hour, just as the originality of the script lasts.

From that moment, the plot happens so run over, becomes monotonous and predictable, missing all

the excitement, to lead to a contrived, simplistic and notall creresolution ��ble.La Habitat de Fermat

is a film that at first captivates by its disturbing atmosphere, but that is shipwrecked by how

unbelievable the characters are and the actors, except Santi Mill���n, who interpret them. The film

could have given more of itself with a polished script, a more elaborate resolution and less trampled , and a

more careful casting.

" 0

" The Science of Dreaming has a very personal magic, it does not look like anything else. He seduces with his

peculiarities that are not perfect and his experiments of a more emotional narrative.

The texture of dreams made from things of every day with peculiarities, like the material of the

egg boxes or the cardboard tube of the toilet paper . The Science of Dreaming is made of rare, but

real things of every day. Michel Gondry has the great sensitivity to find these fantastic things and

then weave them into a narrative that goes between the real and the dream without making much difference. When is it a

dream and when life itself seems like a nightmare? The last two films by Gondry were made by the hand of

screenwriter Charlie Kaufman (Being John Malkovich) , who always tends to these mental games between twisting

reality-fiction. Still in The Science of Dream shows many themes that both have in common, but the ingenuity

of Gondry is more organic than Kaufman and may even To say less mathematically cold. In the narrative

of this film, not everything is perfectly clear, nor clearly necessary, but it works. Gael Garc���a Bernal in the

leading role to which his dreams are presented as if it were his own television program. ,N, Stephan TV.

Even then, neither dreams nor reality become what he would want. This film is very much due to

Bernal's interpretation that remains between exaltation and calm, without becoming short at one

end or the other. Stephan arrives Mexico from France for a job that his mother got him that

supposedly is creative but in reality is basic and very boring. His French is not very reliable so he

oscillates between English to make himself understood, and Spanish for moments of true despair.

Adding to the general confusion and peculiar texture of the film. The Science of Dreaming has a verymagic

personal, it does not look like anything else. It seduces with its peculiarities that are not perfect and its

experiments of a narrative rather emotional. A joyful tragedy that is quite an experience for the

senses.

" 1

" An intelligent comedy, achieves its greatest advantage in not falling into the jovío zafio and easy, but in a

di muylogos very worked and mixed with surreal situations where it is impossible to prevent the viewer

sketches a smile in your face.

Surprise with capital letters took me while I was watching Between drinks. The truth is that Alexander Payne had left the

list very high with the brilliant A prop���sito de Schmidt and the satirical Election, but with his last feature film

until the date (not to mention his mini-story of Paris je t'aime), he has managed to seal a magnificent tragicomedy

with delicious sharp diagonals in the form of darts that Payne shoots without ceasing. With 2 Golden Globes and an Oscar for

the best adapted guide of 2004 behind his back, Entre copas (indie film of 2004) is a breath ofair

freshthat is so grateful to the avalanche of commercial cinema American where we have more shots and explosions.

Simply with a brilliant script, and a cast chosen to perfection, it is shown that you can sign one

of the best films of 2004. An intelligent comedy made for intelligent people, achieves its greatest advantage in

that Do not fall into the easy and unsophisticated joke, but in some very worked dialogues and mixed withsituations

surrealwhere it is impossible to avoid that the spectator sketches a minimal smile on his face. Through the vinyl

landscapes of California, we attended a road movie of unsuspected destiny. Initially as a trip

of bachelor horny and fun, happens to lead to a tragicomedy of second chances, and thetrip

farewellof that youth already lost, putting special emphasis on true friendship. In Entre copas, the

director interposes two completely opposite characters and through the exchange of ideas or opinions he

manages in a fluid way and resorting to the most ironic and sometimes black humor, closing a comedy bittersweet of

the most pleasant. From the first minutes, you recognize the strong magnetism of the film, that without giving you

barely any account is getting you hooked little by little and the only thing you want is to see what will happen in the next

scene, and how Solve our friendly protagonists. The quartet of actors is fabulous,

excelling a great Paul Giamatti as unsuccessful novelist and divorce lover of good wine Pinot, and who

seeks only the elegance and good taste of a good bottle of wine, instead of a woman. Then

we have his opposite friend Thomas Haden Church, an actor about to get married where he will use the trip as a last

glimpse of freedom and simply settle for a cheap Merlot in a plastic glass. The female day is

completed by the television Sandra Oh (from Anatom���a de Gray), as an expert in good wine, single and independent who

will end up in the arms of the actor. And finally, Virginia Madsen, a divorced and insecure waitress

who desperately seeks the attention of an interesting man. Alexander Payne, ironic and master

observer of human behavior, gets what really matters: something so simple and always

works like the stories and the characters that interpret them, and signs a play about the friendship of two

very different men and lost in their respective lives that only seek a last stroke of luck in life.

An excellent emotional story where he seeks at all times the complicity of the spectator and plays with that sense

of humor that most of the times arises precisely from a certain tragedy. Highly recommended Punctuation:

7.5 out of 10.

" 1

" A bad and typical film that, nevertheless, fulfills its mission: to entertain. The movies of summer They tend to be, as you can see, blockbusters palomiteros, intrigue tapes and

action, sequels, more sequels and remakes.course we can always find some exception, a film

does not necessarily commercial, ms well independently and with a good and orignal Guin (as yet released The

Young Water). Well, recently, with the sole intention of entertaining myself and not worrying about great scripts or

impeccable directions, I went to see, I suppose because of the attractive cast and the orignal nothing, but several times

entertaining, argument (the attempted murder of a president). It's about (you do not think you've

seen it by title, which should be the simplest and most unoriginal of this year) shadow of suspicion. It is

starring an aging Michael Douglas (who has a more than reasonable resemblance to Mat���as Prats, butsafety

withoutglasses), Kiefer Sutherland (who plays the same role as in the extraordinary series of television

24), Eva Longoria (I do not know how she could have entered such a production, coming from the excellent

series Desperate Housewives) and Kim Basinger (The only thing he can say is "they're going to kill you" "," "Careful, a

gun!" "or such stupid things). As you can see, the cast is not nothing special, but it is quite

correct and above all, striking for the public. The shadow of suspicion (The Sentinel is the original title,

that is also simple, but passable) tries to create a television environment (a chapter of the aforementioned series

24) in a film. The attempt, in my opinion, has not served at all, or rather, is much

lower than the series of Jack Bauer. The film would only need to transcend in real time so that it

could be called 24, the movie. In short, it's nothing original, but it's entertaining (which is what I

was going to do). I can only say little about the argument, since it's a small thing. I think that with the phrase "the attempted

assassination of the President prevented by federal agents and a conspiracy in the White House" can be

summed up The shadow of suspicion. Oh, and if you do not guess who is the traitor in the half hour of the movie is

that you have no experience (kidding). I just want to say that it looks a lot. A bad and typical film that,

nevertheless, fulfills its mission: to entertain (but not as much as 24, of which one day I will talk to you more carefully).

" 0

" Of course it is superior to the original, but only from the point of view of a brain contaminated by

the gore like mine. Because the movie is nailed to the original.

Not bad, but nothing wrong with this remake of a whole classics of children's cinema perpetrated by Wes Cravenago ...

almost 30 years30? One moment, almost 30 years have passed since that film, from which the only thing that can be rescued

today are the great covers of the classic VHS. Then I start again. Not bad, but nothing bad

this remake, but. let's not go too. Of course it is superior to the original, but only from the point of

view of a brain contaminated by the gore like mine. Because the movie is nailed to the original. ���Flags

stuck in baked heads? Yes. Salvajes Wild and funny challenges? Of course! How much tension, sometimes

almost unbearable, especially with breastfeeding babies in between? I can not deny it. But. 12 hours after

having seen the movie, I wonder if that is for so much. I mean, if a music group that is fashionable, with a

good tiron among young people and with a great production, makes a version of some Los Ramones classic.

I'm sure many stunned people will say that it's better than the original just because it's more hot, more slutty and more

punky, but. This remake is more punk than the original? Yes, it is heard louder, it has better production, and much

good gore in the carabana, but. I guess 30 years ago they thought that movie was rehostia, and

I guess Wes did not nail Yankee flags in the hollow head of the Nazi cowboy because he thought he still

had a lot to say in the film industry . and that was, of course. I do not want tomuch more on the

dwellsame subject, so I can only conclude by saying that you see the movie, that you do not need to see the

original, but I guess those who have seen it, will understand what I mean. Oh no! Despite my doubts,

the protago gafoso improves at times until it makes a hole in your heart, the young gunslinger is unbearable,

just like the screams of the sister in the Dantesque scene of the Caravan (very jevy!), I am very happy when the

old man is charred, and a couple of other things that stand out, especially for his goblin to gore of all life

made with style, if that is possible.I give it a well deserved 7.5. High Tension, the previous film by

Alexandre Aja, was much better than this one, in my modest opinion. And finally, to say that I am a great admirer of the

Hulk of Ang Lee, and with so much nuclear mushroom in the prologue of the movie, would not you have molao a goodbomb

green nuclearsweeping Texas and a charming green bug coming out of the ruins saying Hulk crushes?

���I'm sure so!

" 1

" A well structured work, a good photograph and a high level of ambience. MagnÃfica.Edward Norton has always seemed to me an enigmatic individual by himself. In any of its registers it

has a mysterious air in the background that in many occasions favors its interpretations. If, as in this case,

the role he plays is that of a magnificent illusionist who triumphs over Europe at the beginning of the twentieth

century, that quality to which I have referred helps to make his interpretation more It's convincing. Paul Giamatti

continues to demonstrate that he is a tremendously versatile actor, while Jessica Biel continues in the line of the

last years of diversifying characters so as not to be framed in action films and blood. The fact

that the scriptwriter and the director are the same person helps the argument is well linked and that the

sensation of the spectator is that of being in front of a well structured work; If to this series of qualities we

add a good photograph and a high-level setting (the Imperial Vienna already imposes itself), the

result is a product of magnitude. �fica quality.The mixture of intrigue, suspense and love require the

viewer a degree of attention, something that is not difficult to provide as the film itselfcatching

is responsible forus and their Just under two hours is not that they are bearable, is that in some cases, they

end up knowing little. We are looking at a film that, as it progresses, becomes more interesting, more immersive

and to which Neil Burger, despite his scarce career as a director, has managed to give the touch of solemnity that

the moment requires historical development, without losing the ability to do an entertaining job

that is attractive for all types of public, for the multiple turns of the plot and its diversity of

scenarios, that make it a multidisciplinary film. Magnificent

" 1

" Clerks II has nothing to envy to the best work of Jersey, with permission of Chasing Amy.

It works perfectly without being an explicit sequel.

He said last week about Monster House that was a movie like before, fun and emotional, that would

occupy a piece of our hearts forever. Clerks already occupied it and, dare I say that, more than

the movie itself, what we remember fondly is, in general, the Smith universe. Well, Clerks II has

nothing to envy to the best work of Jersey, with permission of Chasing Amy. Clerks II works

perfectly without being an explicit sequel, it is almost, a tribute to those two dependents for life that we are

all without being the caricature (fun, but caricature) that was Jay and Bob the silent counterattack. The

characters continue to work as they did more than a decade ago And, besides, now they have a lot more

things to talk about (because this is a movie of people talking, if Randal hears me I'm a dead man),

although in general , talk about the same thing: sex, freaks and cinematographic trilogy. And of course there are cameos.

And of course it's fun. In fact, the very bearded bastard has moved me at times, it shows

that he gets older (without falling into the ���o���er���a) The start, with a transition Black and white aln to the included,color

super. Kevin is still alive. A 8. (and no, I have not seen Jersey girl)

" 1

" Meticulous, precise cinema, desalambicado of gui���os to its commercial effectiveness, but necessary.The machinery of Hollywood has no mercy with the blood of their children. When we attended, disturbed,

shocked, to the terrorist attack to the World Trade Center, we knew that it would not be long before a film appeared that

narrated, amid the restraint that deserves respect for the v��. And a bit of audacity to make the necessary

changes to the box office, the ups and downs of the very serious events on board the planes. It's been a long time, but

here it is. , next to the project 11-S, Word Trade Center, born by Oliver Stone, so excessive always with the

History of his country, Platoon, JFK, Nixon, although in this case, we have already said, eaten by ameekness

unusual, clean on the edges and sincere, almost goal, in the narrative discourse. The difficult treat to approach

this film is delivered to Paul Greengrass, director of the blockbuster The Bourne myth, but also ���n artífice of

films of more social depth such as Omagh or Bloody Sunday, films that narrated t ambi���n real events occurred in the

most violent Ireland. What is obvious Greengrass is the pamphlet: it does not fall into any dogmatism, it does not look for the

easy flint, it does not insist on the brutality of terrorists. What he does and, in my opinion, very accurately,

is a vivid bodeg���n of the victims, whose tragic end we know nothing more The lights in theroom went out.

projectionFlight 93 of United Airlines became the fourth plane crashed on 11-s.nothing

We knowwith certainty about the experience of its occupants. There are telephone conversations now published,

but nothing that can be considered veridical. Greengrass, scriptwriter of the subject, rolls a worthy documentary. The

succulent catastrophic film raised by the American cinema in the last three decades has, unwittingly,

a sad milestone in this United 93, although It would be nice if it were not so, and the show that we attend is

pure fiction, figurative narration. With a concise guide, Greengrass pulls out a cast of practicallyactors

unknown. That cultural decontamination suits his message: that what we see is a crude brushstroke of

recent history, perhaps the least acceptable to the American people. Those who seek strong emotions, have

in this film their ��cula. One of them: one based on arguments that are very directly to us,

even if the flight is American and we all know that Hollywood, when they touch its senses, is a school

of capitalism. Film meticulous, precise, desalambicado of gui���os to its commercial effectiveness, but necessary.

" 1

" If you can avoid it, better than better. Designed as a pilot episode of a series, or shot for DVD or Video, this Z-series spawn (because it can

not be qualified otherwise) has been sold as "" second part of Starship Troopers "" the magnificent

film by Paul Verhoeven from the year 1997 based on the novel "" Space Brigades "" by Robert Heinlein. It should be

noted that when 90% of a film takes place in the dark or at night, it is because it has shortcomings! And

this is without a doubt! The script is predictable, special effects non-existent and also mixes

movies, from "" Alien "" to "" The invasion of the ultra-bodies "" to "" Hidden "" and that perhaps it tries to give some

action in the combats of the humans against the insects, without success, since the film is perhaps

more horrifying than you can find Of the original cast only appears an actress who was secondary in the

first film, nor is it to ask too much to the tape, which as I said, navigates between several genres,

action, terror. A film that if you can avoid, better than better.

" 0

" Little can be distinguished from The Perfect Creature, except for its neo-gothic setting. The rest, to

forget.

The Perfect Creature is a co-production between New Zealand and the United Kingdom directed by Glenn Standring and

starring Dougray Scott, Saffron Burrows, Leo Gregory, Scott Willis, Stuart Wilson, Craig Hall, Robbie

Magasiva, Lauren Jackson, Peter McCauley and Glen Drake. The film situates us in an alternative and retro-futuristic

1960, where vampires and humans coexist peacefully for 300 years. But this delicate balance will be

broken when a vampire begins to feed on humans, spreading in them a strange disease similar to

rabies, threatening peace between the so-called Brothers and the rest of society. stand out from

The Perfect Creature, a film that will reach our billboards next Friday. With a

Neo-Gothic fusion of Underworld and The Golden Compass - although its next generation will be to Van Helsing's

futurist-, The perfect creature is a failed attempt more to attract the public from the vampire myth. The

film is based on the assumption That a 15th-century alchemist believed vampires while trying to

find a vaccine for the plagues that hit the world at the time, such as the plague. Vampires,

considered as an aberration despite being nothing more than a step in the evolution of Man, found a

cure for these plagues and swore to protect humans, making the call Church and becoming

themselves Brothers. As an idea, certainly, it is not bad at all, but both the background and the form of the

perfect creature make waters everywhere, resulting in its aesthetics neogÃtica the unique rescatable of this

tape whose influences go from those previously mentioned Underworld and Van Helsing, titles like Equilibrium

or Ultraviolet: the plot loses all its appeal once it has been raised, presented � Taking a succession of archetypal

characters played by actors who seem to compete for the prize for the worst actor of the year,

among which we would highlight a bland Dougray Scott, probably the most insistent vampire ulso of the

last times. Although, let's be honest, we could say vampire as we could say ukelele soci���pata, since

a contained thirst for blood and greater power f��� Music are the only clues that point to confirm the

undead nature of the vampires of The Perfect Creature. On the other hand, the leitmotiv of Edgar, n���mesis

of the tape, we are not too clear at any time, justifying all his actions from a

disease that he has created. yes, sequel more than open, of course. Product direct output to

DVD, and little else.

" 0

" It does not reach a masterpiece, but I assure you that with a couple of well polished details it could be

perfectly. Magnificent

Unfortunately I did not get to see Truman Capote, that acclaimed film directed by Bennett Miller and

played by an Oscar-winning Philip Seymour Hoffman. And, honestly, now having premiered History of

a crime (���the crime is the translation into Spanish, because the original title is Infamous -infame-!) I do not think I

would have done too much. It is inevitable to compare both films, because they were made almost in parallel,

although the first one was released before, but since I have not seen it, I can not do it, so I will limit myself to

describe you the feeling that the film of Ahora has caused me, with a delay, we can see that the film by

Douglas McGrath. As you all know, both films relate the process of creation n of the novel A sangre fr���a

from the point of view of the politician Truman Capote. To do so, the writer, after learning of terrible

news about the murder of a family on a farm, went to the scene to write it

more closely. Although the relationship with one of the assassins raised an immense policy within the life of

Capote. From what I have seen, in the History of a Crime, not only is this process of creation explored, but also

the human personality of both the writer and the murderer. It is a shuddering and very emotional film, without being

lacrimatic or maudlin. It is not cold, and I think this is a point in favor, because it seems that Miller's

was, although not bad. This is not the typical bi���pic about a famous writer. Come on, who thinks that better than

not going to see it. This is a pure and hard drama about the human race, which explores incredibly, not

only the crime that happened, but the confessions that both Capote and the murderer carry out after The

very intimate relationship they maintain throughout the days. Perhaps this is the best part of the film, the dialogues that both

maintain in the jail and the last m miradatua look that they maintain, incredibly achieved . However, this

film, without being a choir, presents a wide variety of characters that shine especially in the scenes where they

explain their relationship with Truman and its peculiarities. To say that one of the strong points of this film is is his

staging and montage. Both are perfected, acting intelligently and

disorderly throughout the work (many scenes begin to be explained and then, abnormally

within this type of films, are concluded with another scene without phrases hardly). It is lovely to see History

of a crime, not only because it is well told and interpreted, but because it has a taste of extreme

exquisiteness. All, absolutely all the scenes are shot with calculated shots and not to mention the

setting, which would not surprise me if an Oscar were to be taken that year. that comes. Second, highlight its

stellar cast. There is no actor in this film that performs an interpretation that is not even simple. All are

splendid, but of course, not all appear equally. Special mention to the great Toby Jones,

playing Capote in a perfect, realistic and superb way; Daniel Craig, who gives life to the murderer with whom

the protagonist maintains relations with a brilliance that is no longer so inexplicable; and, this time I know, Sandra Bullock,

who does the best role of her career (no, in Crash she did not embroider it, here I am), which seemed a bit

impossible. These three actors look incredibly, but as I said, the number of secondaries

that appear do not fall short, but arrive, in their own way, at the expected interpretive level. Sigourney

Weaver, Jeff Daniels (all his appearances are formidable), Isabella Rossellini, Hope Davis, Juliet Stevenson

(attentive to the phrases he keeps with the camera explaining Capote's anime) and Gwyneth Paltrow in a

a role that could be considered as a cameo, but which nevertheless does a great job (look at the moment when she

cries while she sings). Also, talk about her superb gui���n. There is no time in History of a crime that is missing, nor is

it missing. Everything is in its sítio, well placed, although sometimes a little messy, and therefore more

elegant. It is a classic air film, because it has many qualities similar to the old movies of

wealthy people, but it is this structure of the script that distinguishes it from the rest. So, due to the magnificent

work of Douglas McGrath (both the gui���n and the direction) gives this film a different air, an air

m� It's independent and nothing commercial, that's it. It has a huge dramatic capacity and has anarrative force

little, because the scenes are not usually grandiloquent, so the emotion that produces (more

contained) has m���sm���rito. Attentive, above all, to the dialogues that Jones and Craig keep in the cell. They are

really amazing. There is no doubt that the technical section of the film is of the highest quality. The picture is

great, with some really prodigious close-ups and camera movements inside the tiny cell of

Craig also amazing. As I said before, everything related to the assembly and the staging is

enviable, not to mention the music, of classical air with songs like the one of the introduction, very

touching. A sensational film in all the senses capable of exciting at all times and exposing the

most perverse and human personalities. Everything in History of a crime has a why, and everything, absolutely

everything, is taken with mastery. I hope this is one of the candidates for the next Oscars, something that would notme

missthe least. It does not reach a masterpiece, but I assure you that with a couple of well polished details it

could be perfectly. As I say, great.

" 1

" Intense drama that avoids conventionalisms and offers a different view of romanticism.

Great duel of opposing worlds, values ​​and interests openly opposed.

Set in the New York of the mid-eighteenth century, the heiress puts us squarely in the entra���as of

American high society of the time. Catherine Sloper (played by Olivia de Havilland, who would receive

an Oscar for this role) is the daughter of a wealthy doctor secretly tormented by the lack of sympathy, grace and

beauty of his only heiress, who constantly remembers the virtues of his deceased mother. However,

Catherine's ingenuity and naivete keep her in an aura of happiness that is only threatened by the

demands of a social class totally encorsetada. Her life flows without major hustle until in one of

the multiple parties that she is forced to attend, she meets Morris, a young gallant who immediately

appears mad about her. After a brief courtship, Catherine finally falls at his feet and

both decide to get married. However, the humble origin of Morris and the suspicions of his father, who from the

beginning sees in "a hunter of inheritance, make everything complicated and that Catherine's life changed

forever. The heiress, based on the homonymous novel by Henry James, is undoubtedly one of the masterpieces of

William Wyler and the cinema of the 40. Awarded with 4 Oscars (actress, artistic direction, costume and band

sound) and other 3 nominations (director, film and secondary actor) is in my opinion one of the films that

has portrayed with greater brilliance the evolution of a character ( in this case Catherine's). Of naive,

cndido and insecure creature, the heiress becomes a cruel, cold and hard being without anyone or anything can

avoid it. The failure of love, disappointment, having felt despised by her own father and other

circumstances end up gradually turning her into a person who has nothing to do with what she was. A

protagonist rarely suffers this evolution, from the sweet to the sour, from the best of thebeing

humanto its darkest side. And seldom can a spectator feel so many different emotions when

observing him: pity, sympathy, hatred. But not only Catherine's character shines. Although more flat, the

characters of Dr. Austin (his father) and Morris are two other great bastions for this drama. On the one hand, the

measured hatred shown by Dr. Austin for his daughter, always uncomfortable in his presence, ashamed of his way

of being and anchored to the memory of his wife, and on the other the mysterious behavior of young Morris , that as

soon as Romeo seems like a white-gloved thief, at all times the tension is maintained and that one

suffers for the possible outcome of each encounter with two or three bands. In short, intense drama that flees from

conventions and offers a different view on romanticism. Great duel of opposing worlds,

values ​​and interests openly opposed.

" 1

" The intentions are good, perhaps the message that is wanted to transmit is better than the means used for

it, that is to say, a good content in a bad continent.

Imagine that humanity can no longer have offspring, that no woman can become pregnant, that the

human species is driven to extinction in the strictest sense of the word; surely they would wonder

what are the reasons for such an evolutionary disaster. Well, that's what I did during the almost two hours

that the film lasts, because at no time was the reason for annarrative element explained to me

important. The catastrophic vision of the European problem towards emigrants is also unfortunate,

not because in a few years we have a list of problems of a consistent solidity that derive of a

superpopulation accustomed to demand and not give (turn your neck towards neighboring France and be careful where you

park the car), but rather, for the terrible solution that supposedly take � �� Europe: the creation of

concentration camps, (��� you know that, in some European countries like Germany or Austria, theof

denialthe Nazi holocaust Is it a crime?). In Europe, are we too sensitized to create a Guant���namo?

fortunately for Europe, fortunately for the world. So, if the base of the story fails, it is

unlikely that we will become part of it. I doubt if in the homonymous novel written by PD James we

clarify some of these points, the truth I have not read, so I do not know if it is a mistake that creeps from the

literary product or it was a choice of the cinematographic equipment (although from what I have read in some

editorial I would opt for the first thing, supposedly the writer did it with the intent to talk about the

consequences of an event and not the fact itself, cheating, cheating). The truth is that the sensation left by the

film is a pity because clearly the intentions are good, perhaps the message that is wanted to transmit is

better than the means used for it, that is to say, a good content in a bad continent. And the content that I have

understood is that the nature of the human being is quite sinister, be it the supposed side of the bad or

the supposed side of the good, because they are all supposed and, in many cases, the reason is He finds in the

apparently more selfish being, who some time ago decided to think alone.

" 0

" Arturo's story is immortal, and this movie is a good example. JRR Tolkien was, after all

, a simple apprentice. And "" Excalibur "" is undoubtedly the best film directed by John Boorman.

"" Excalibur "" is undoubtedly the best film directed by John Boorman (other films worthy of seeing by the

director are Deliverance and El General, the last one an entertaining biopic about a famous Irish thief,

I do not keep a great memory of the Emerald Forest, although I saw it many, many years ago). His particular vision of

the artistic myth (the film is based mainly on a review of "" The death of Arturo "", an epic of the

15th century) is excellent . Boorman decided to put aside any historical point (highlights the absence of any

Christian reference) to focus on the mythical history, the good telling of evil, the cycle of life, the

man as a being between hope and despair. The cast of the film is excellent, with

a sober Nigel Terry as Arturo, Helen Mirren as Morgana, and the excellent theatrical actor (and one of

the notable assassins of the Colombo series) Nicol Willliamson as the magician Merl���n, undoubtedly the central character

of the film, more than Arturo himself. The story advances with and through the old and twisted wizard. It's

funny, but apparently United Artists told Boorman that he could choose any actor for the role of

Merlin, except Williamson. I do not know to what point this story is true, but apparently Boorman finally got

away with it. Thank God. Maybe at a first glance it may go unnoticed, but it is MerlÃn who is

behind the scenes the events that are happening. As a good son of the Devil that he is, Merlin manages

men at will to achieve his purpose. The story is simple: Uther Pendragon, with the help of

Merlin, achieves a difficult peace after several years of war. In the celebration celebration in the castle of his

once enemy, the Duke of Cornwall, Uther Pendragon is infatuated with the duke's wife, Igrayne. As

usual, the Duke is not very happy with that idea, and the truce is broken. While the Duke passes away attacking the

camp of Uther, this one lies with Igrayne thanks to Merl���n, who has granted him the appearance of the Duke.

Nine months later, Igrayne and Uther have a child of that night. But the deal was that that

descendant would be put in charge of Merlin. He takes the child, and Uther, repentant, runs after him. However

, he falls into an ambush. Badly wounded, he plunges his magic sword, Excalibur, into a stone. Nobody but he could have it.

The beginning of the film gives us an idea of ​​how MerlÃn uses low human passions and their

weaknesses to take advantage and carry forward your plans. Although in principle their intentions are good,

note that they are not the human owners of their own destiny. Is the control over inferior beings, even

for their own good? Should man give up his free will in pursuit of a better world? Merlin thinks so

, although in reality the welfare he seeks is his own. The story that continues is well known:

Uther's son, Arthur, manages to draw the sword from the stone and he becomes King. After several years of wars

against his opponents, he succeeds in unifying England under his command with the help of the famous Knights of the Round

Table, and a period of well-being and peace extends over the years. While Morgana begins to

conspire, the crisis arises: Arturo discovers the infidelity of his wife Ginebra with his best knight,

Lanzarote (this scene was shot by Boorman with an image of great strength, where the lovers wake up and see

the sword of the king stuck between they). The earth has been split by the sword; while, Merl���n loses its

strength and is deceived by Morgana: the order has been definitively lost. Soon after, Morgana seduces Arturo

and becomes pregnant with him. They have been going through years of crisis, famine, uncertainty. A weak Arturo languishes in

his castle, while Morgana and her son Mordred conspire to take over the lands and throne of Arthur. The

last hope is the Holy Grail, the sacred cup that will restore strength and faith to the king and resurrect the

earth. Ultimately, the Grail will be � Found, Mordred and Morgana defeated, and a new world will emerge��� from

the ashes of Camelot. Arturo will succumb because of his injuries and will be drifting on hisship

funeral. The magic sword, Excalibur, will return to the Lady of the Lake. Whentimes come

bad, and everything seems lost, Arturo will return, pushing Excalibur, and save England. The art myth

has many interpretations. In his genesis it is a story that speaks about hope, about a happy future,

a confidence in a savior in moments of weakness. With the death of Arthur the time of Merl��� andends

other magicians. Men, free, are left adrift, but free to forge their future. That freedom had

its price: in many moments those men of the British Isles would see dark times:retreat

Romanand the Barbarian invasions (where the historical Arthur is framed), civil wars,raids

Viking, the Norman invasion, the world wars. But in any evil there is no despair:

men suffer, fear, but finally confess in their future, because they know that Arturo will return: is this Arthur a

man? Evidently, no. A man may transmit his message, but the savior Arthur may be the force

of character, the knowledge that fighting and not lowering arms will reach salvation. Returning to the movie �cula,

"" Excalibur "" is a film of great visual force, with a great photography, an excellent script, and one of itsaspects

most outstanding, an excellent use of the music. The soundtrack lacks original compositions; great

masters of classical music such as Carl Off and Richard Wagner sign the melodies of the film. It is probably

the film (along with 2001: Odyssey in space) that best use of existing scores, to the

extent that they seem composed for some day to appear in the film. Arturo's story is immortal, and

this movie is a good example. JRR Tolkien was, after all, a simple apprentice. Very applied and with

great talent, but apprentice after all.

" 1

" Filthy pupurr��� of scenes and very recognizable clichés from other movies. It is contrived, the pace

is a real disaster, there is not a single credible or interesting moment.

Pretentious presumably modern film that drinks, without complexes, American cinema, Ikea ads

and other European films such as Amenabar. This last was recognized by its directors during the

presentation at its premiere in Sitges. I know that they try to sell it as the new Swedish Matrix, but

do not be fooled, the special effects do not go beyond a bad episode of "" Charmed "" "and the only thing in

common with the Saga of the Wachowski is the leather suit of the protagonist and a pair of dark sunglasses from amarket. I do not

streetmean to extend myself, saying that the film is a dumpy pupurr��� of scenes and very

recognizable clichés from other movies. It is contrived, the rhythm is a real disaster, there is not a singlemoment

credible or interestingand it is supremely boring. It is of the films that are not understood, but not because they are

intelligent and complex, but because of the lack of creative coherence, the lack of rigor, of talent and of being

everything that they teach as well so fatally. shown and developed. A torture.

" 0

" The film respects at all times the atmosphere, the aesthetics and the characters, indispensable elements

that have made the saga "" Silent Hill "" one of the m� Respected and played.

When a veteran videoaddict like me gets ready to see the adaptation of a game to the big screen,

a sensation of pleasure very similar to that which invades you when you take the control and turn on the console

with your last videojueguil acquisition. Regrettably, that sensation diminishes and

becomes disillusionment as the film moves away more and more not only from the original idea of the videogame but also of

its aesthetics, its characters, its "" enchantment "", in short of everything that made it a great videogame.

And it is that adapting is never easy. A videogame has been conceived in a very different way than a film,

although each time both genres give the impression of converging little by little. Because of all this, I did not have many hopes

with "" Silent Hill "". Well, at least it was not directed by Uwe Boll, a jewel desecrator like "Alone in the

dark", which encouraged me a little more. The beginning, quite typical, shows us a Little girl are ambula on the verge of

death. In these moments of sleepwalking, the girl (from The Ring, all the scary movie girls are the

same, for when a blond girl with short hair?) Thinks she is in "" Silent Hill "", so her mother, to

try to cure her daughter, will take her to that abandoned town in strange circumstances. It would have been much

smarter for the girl to say "" Disneeeey Woooorld "" instead of "" Siiiilent Hiiiill "" in thosespots

sleepwalking, but of course, instead of a horror movie tendramos another cosa.A from here,begin to occur

strangersin Silent Hill phenomena where frantic moments of action occur when darkness overtakes

the town where we constantly rain ashes and more leisurely times where we know something more about Silent

Hill, without at any time being bothered by this overlap between stories. The characters are well

achieved and characterized by their homologs (those who have it) of the video game, highlighting Cybil, the police,

which as a curious note appears in the 18 of the 20 characters more gays of videogames

(http://gaygamer.net/index.php?s=gayest), what list tonter���a.La film respects at all times the

Atmosphere, aesthetics and characters, indispensable elements that have made the saga "" Silent Hill ""

one of the most respected and played. Disconcerting at first, until we reach the middle wenot

doknow very well what the plot is, very characteristic of the videogame as well.���Finally! a dignified adaptation of

a video game. PS: the zombie nurses could have given more game, apart from the "" 1, 2, 3 to the English hiding

place "". PD2 : Buff, what an illusion to go out in the blog of Tito Chinch���n. I hope not to disappoint, although it is not up to

this experienced critic.

" 1

" How to put your tongue in a jar of jam and reba���ar with sa���a cristal.Viva harmless cinema, strawberry jam and the melodies of Wham: T��� the lyrics, I the music iscinema

innocuous, deactivated of any pretension to endure or to remove in the public any social, political

or even aesthetic conscience . That speech is not in its foundational libretto; In it there is an overabundance, a viscouslike

jingle-Christmas or machine-gun in the invisible speakers of a Great Surface. Like all romantic comedy, it

lacks philosophical pretensions (until Matrix had A halo of plastic embedded in an infographic tatami of

kung fu) and does not break any of the many conventions of the genre: love triumphs despite the couple's

flirting with uncertainty and, to the greater glory of the sweet effervescence of all idyll, overcome some

difficulties that are compensated by a glamorous end and seen a dozen times and although we are

very willing to fuel and turn it on, the movie It touches our sensitive heart.has

Whoeverfelt an effervescent tremor in the heart when hearing a pop melody, who has heard in his memory the notes of

his favorite song in the head in the tail of a bus at the precise moment Into what they are going to take care of in the

charcuter���a, this is their film. There will be no disappointment. Hugh Grant is a correct comedian - not the Cary Grant

they tried to sell -, an actor comfortably installed in a series of dramatic patterns that he hasastonishing

internalized withcraft. Drew Barrymore avoids the inconveniences of this mellifluous film to put

the hand and then his name is not lost in the tangible limbo of the divas who are on the way to stop being it.

In any case, nothing remarkable in this funny toy, nothing relevant: it was not intended. The film transits its

legitimate Olympus of intrascendence and frivolity paid to a sentimental recipe as foreseeable as inane. Itnot

ispossible to be too scoundrel when writing lines that, although never / never will be laudatory, will not

enter fiercely in the flesh, poking at the ulcer pure

" 0

" Film, tender, intimate, great, however, that fills us much more than those of large studios and

large budgets, astronomical figures and the like.

There are films for which we feel a series of fascination (why whenever I write this word I

remember a theme of REM that is called Fascinating?), A magic that it envelops them, films that, a

priori, have not been accompanied by the usual and I would dare call "sacrosanct" "promotion campaign, of

those that enter us through our eyes, that fill our eyes and that make us finally fall into the

temptation to see them even if at first we were not interested in them. I refer to

small films, tender, intimate, large, however, that fill us much more than those of large

studios and large budgets, astronomical figures and the like. And I want to talk about "" Little Miss Sunshine "" by

Jonathan Dayton and Valerie Faris, who has sincerely been for me a fantastic discovery and one of the

great films of the past 2006. Winner of the Audience Award at the last S. Sebastian Festival and

performed by Steve Carell, Toni Collette, Greg Kinnear, Alan Arkin, Beth Grant, Paul Dano, Abigail Breslin,

sister of the young children's actor Spencer Breslin. Once I have been able to view it, I must say that the film

is amazing, of these that fill you from beginning to end, it is true that it is a wonder that surrounds you and that

you do not know how to express the impressive sensation. No accompanying you, love, pleasure, complicity, fondness for the

characters. However, it is to be there seeing how things happen and enjoying like crazy with what is

happening, slowly, slowly but surely. Finishing, do yourself a favor to the senses and take a look,

which undoubtedly is worth it! For once in life ��� Pay attention and listen to me!

" 1

" Effective direction of actors, perfect framing, elegant use of planes-contraplanos, an

excellent scene in the rain. Quite a lot more than what can be said, in the current cinema, of many other

directors.

Film of good intentions and uncertain result that, in the absence of a plausible guide, seeks support in

characters as stereotyped as predictable. A lost history among clumsy di quelogos that, without effort,

manages to provoke the easy collapse. Recommended for those who confuse the meaning of the word melancholy To

our beloved Meg it begins to happen the same as the boys of the announcement of Coca-Cola. He has already

convinced himself that he belongs to another generation. She, of glorious past, who survived the French kisses,

the feigned orgasms in a cafeteria, the fierce telephone conversations in Carne Viva, the tedious

messages of Tom Hanks; becomes, in this film, in mam���, with the purpose of seducing the grandson that we would all

like to have. in sixty years. But, as expected, you will find a rival area in your owndaughter

teenage... or not. And it is that revealing, with great detail, the arguments, is exclusive of a sector of

the criticism that, in this way, manages to fill their articles. It gives the impression that they had nothing more to

tell. sometimes.When talking about this movie, it is mandatory to mention, in the first place, the successfulwork

casting; for being, precisely the actors, the main ones - if not the unique - attractive of the first work of

kasdan. Even so, it does not escape us that, in a few moments, the interpretations of all of them are

wasted, in a story without consistency, supported by flat characters that corroborate each and every

one of the t� Existing generational peaks. In this sense, the scriptwriter of the invention would have to reflect,

in future projects, on the type of genre he wants to address, and not leave this important aspect in the hands

of Divine Providence, as? everything seems to indicate- has done in the present occasion. If, finally, it is decided

by romantic comedy (this movie is not), you will find magnificent referents in yourfilmography

father's. If you are attracted to intimate stories, which are written by putting your heart in ink, you

should direct your eyes towards the slow, but sure, walk of Master Eastwood; undisputed leader in the

difficult task of transmitting the world of feelings. If you are interested in the feminine universe applied to the

American costumbrista comedy, you will have to adopt the touch of irony, elegance, subtlety and delicacy that the

critics discovered in the work of Lubitsch. If, in addition, you intend to incorporate autobiographical data, it will be

essential that you learn a famous phrase from Joseph Mankiewicz, here that says: "" The difference between

real life and movies is that a script has to make sense. Not life"". Try to perform, in a first

job, that hodgepodge between drama, romance and comedy with autobiographical tints, without going deeply into

any of them, to create an unnecessary amalgam; It is not pretentious, but extremely risky. A

risk that is not overcome, that does not convince the critic and that ends up paying at the box office. They say that, with

talent, one is born, and we do not put in doubt that of the debuting filmmaker. Your first tape is a statement of good

intentions. But it is also true that all techniques are learned, and the history of cinema is full of

indispensable references to follow, which, in this case, help to understand the errors of this ��� premium pear. The

most resounding comes from the warning John Huston made, "" There can not be a good movie if thereno

isgood script ". In the absence of that good guide, Kasdan's condemns his characters to the reproduction of

some typical, clumsy and awkward dialogues, to consolidate a deceptive story in which even the kisses are

predictable-, we are left with the effective direction of actors, the perfect framing, the elegant

use of planes-contraplanos, an excellent low scene the rain, and that one in which grandson and grandmother

remember the tender relationship between Ginger Rogers and his father, Sanby San Judas Tadeo !. We areleft

alsowith the good work of Meg Ryan, who is joined by Olimpia Kukakis, Kristen Stewart and Adam

Brody. We are, of course, with the impeccable performance of the Spanish vampire Van Helsing. And, why

not ?, we are left with the tricks of a filmmaker who, in a truculent way, manages to make us laugh and

cry. Quite a lot more than what can be said, in the current cinema, of many other directors.

" 0

" It is likely that the continuous references to other cult films end up boring theviewer

average, but it is because we speak of a tape that is simply not intended for that type of spectator.

The two films that make up Grindhouse are the apotheosis of these times of simulation in which we live,

the orgasm of the culture of copying and referential freakism, the same ultra-revisionist spirit that makes

every two of us three remakes of old classics or outright plagiarism that pretend to go through the

easy label of "" homage "" or "" parody "". However, in the case of the two tapes that make up this

curious experience, we can see the good trade of that pair of geek onanists called Robert Rodr���guez and Quentin

Tarantino, who to date have had no problem recognizing that their Films are pastiches of other

films, mosaics impregnated with their personal style and that allow them to exhibit their fanciful tastes whenever they feel

like it. In this sense, Planet Terror (2007) as Death Proof (2007) are two more samples of this

trend that occurs so much lately of "" we play to make movies of \_\_\_\_\_ "" (replace the space blank

for any gender you fancy). The difference is that, contrary to most of those who have

participated in this re-re-re-recycling of past ideas, these guys know what they want to achieve and (the most

important thing) c� How to achieve it When watching 'Planet Terror', one of the first things that come to my mind is thela

second half of Abierto aamanecer (1996), a film that (I confess) has always seemed to me like a film

from Montò In whose excessive worship he will never understand. However, this time, being free of the style of

his colleague Tarantino and with carte blanche to develop a story of zombies to his liking, Robert Rodr���guez has

managed to get rid of the ballasts that slowed down his previous tale of vampires, at the same time that manages to revel

in that absurdity that so much abounds in his filmography and offer a correct exhibition of the cin���filas sources from

which it has been used. And is that almost everything in Planet Terror takes the viewer to a reference or gui���om���sa

which is no choice but to receive with open arms. Those who read this know (obviously) that theimage

iconicof the film, the go-go dancer with the submachine leg, is the female complement to the figure of

Ash, the h��� hero of Evil Dead 2 (1987) who confronted the undead with a chainsaw attached to the

hand of his mutilated hand, but that's just the tip of the iceberg: here we have from the minimalist

style John Carpenter style to passages taken directly from Lucio Fulci or George Romero, without forgetting of

course that range of characters as nice as absurd (the go-go dancer with aspirations of comedian, the

medical anesthesiologist, the mercenary with the jug full of human testicles, the insane twins kangaroo or

that bizarre villain played by an invaluable Bruce Willis with goatee). These references,

however, are not simple fillers: they are the soul of the film (1). And if we add to that thedeficiencies

technicalintentionally incorporated into the film, we realize that Robert Rodr���guez has gone for everything in

his segment of Grindhouse, creating not only an entertaining sea experience, but also one of his most

rounded films, regardless of its resemblance or not with a cinematographic phenomenon thatonly

weknow in ear (without wanting to sound pedantic, I think it is necessary to remember that both I and 90 percent

of the people who read these lines are too young to have seen this kind of spectacle). It is

probable that after an hour and a half of footage, the excesses of Robert Rodr���guez may be somewhat tiresome. In

the same way, it is likely that the continuous references to other cult films end up boring the

average viewer, but it is because we speak of a tape that is simply not designed for that type of

spectator. Like every private joke, Planet Terror is valid only within its hermetic circle of

freak, and only a spectator who abandons all kinds of cynicism at the door can enjoy the

jokes, the incogruencias, the caÃtico assembly, the casposos dialogues and all that distilled blood for the

effect cÃmico. The new creature of Robert Rodr���guez may not be for everyone, and may also be

very far (in my opinion) from deserving the enthronement that has been given to him since months before his arrival,

but it can not be denied that it is one of the most enjoyable releases of this season, and by far. (1) There is a

scene that for me It summarizes very well: it is the moment in which one of the military (not coincidentally played

by Quentin Tarantino), after seeing on TV a fragment of that pillar of the prison "" sexplotation "called

Women in Cages ( 1971), he decides to rape the girls he keeps prisoner, and that he can curiously see on the

monitor next door. Without much effort, that scene shows much of the exploitative spirit of theexperience

Grindhouse.

" 1

" That what could have been and was not suitable for this limp attempt to revalidate the dramatic career

of Williams with a psychological thriller series B, fake, and, to the t impos term of the footage,hollow

apicticand imposing melodramatic thriller exercise with a Robin Williams focused and solvent,

tics, cre���ble, unaffected by the seriousness that the character demands, although one can avoid that at any

moment make a moh���n, twist an eye or, if this is possible, look at the camera and ask us, socarr���n, p���caro,

if we are ��� liking the mess. In this nocturnal Listener that here is entitled Voices in the night (there can

be no more hackneyed and suspect title) there are delicate issues that do not get relevant answers. All the

exquisite exposition of the facts collapses farrulleramente when the director, given account of the castle of

signs that has raised, warns that it does not have hand or charm to finalize them. Hu���rfana oflicenses

creative, thrown into the rack of failed projects, Voices in the night enthuses timidly: the story

of a radio announcer fascinated by the existence of a book written by a young man of fourteen years old� It becomes an

existentialist manifesto about love and loneliness, about feelings and the need to invent

someone to cope with the weight of routine, the hard evidence of knowing that we do not really have

anyone who loves us or for whom we have. The book of yore opens the pandora of dark, soulless,beings

disenchantedto the point that Gabriel Noone (Robin Williams) ends up wondering if the child / writer and his

mother (with whom I know) he has spoken on the phone) they exist truly. His sentimental precariousness (he has been

abandoned by a lover infected with AIDS) makes him obsess over the boy who, to add insult to injury,

is equally infected (abuses in childhood) and lives overprotected by his mother (a great Toni

Collette). The smart (and sorry) night speaker makes us a private investigator and flies to

Montgomery (Wisconsin) to submit to the polygraph of his eye the veracity of history and discover (here is

the very fragile central point of the story told) if mother and child will not be, at heart, a single and disturbed

being, and assure (oh dear reader) that I do not harm the viewing by how much In the first few minutes it is

Noone / Williams who puts this speculation into action. The narrative pulse of Patrick Stettner is more than

decent: he does not err on the side of results, he does not delve into what others might well have flouted, that is, theaspect

purely detectiveof history, and offers a magnificent Repafico distribution to fill what, surely, do not

forget: that the argument falters towards its half and, advancing towards its outcome, the interest is going back

until there is no interest . The claim to be based on real events can be a burden more than a

treat: you need an intelligent scriptwriter who unravels the orthodoxy of the truth and smears everything out of

pure fiction. A m��� (today) they can spy on me and make a film about my daily tripe: it would take ateacher

teachersfor a day ( today, to go further) give a remarkable film. Different case, desirable case, it

would be that on my boring Friday routine (oh it's Friday, what good) a savvy scriptwriter introduced

the minimum elements of distraction like so that Ethan Hunt, at my side, was a shy civil servant of the Public

Administration. It is not this, let alone the subject we are talking about. It is not enough that Robin Williams is

superb or that the treatment of light is a character more: it is necessary (said many times) that the

story is attractive and we do not have the impression at the end. They have been tricked, even if it lasts less than an hour and a

half and (in fact) everything happens in a plis plas.Vale worth as much as a walk along the river bank in

a rainy afternoon. Everything is fine if we do not mind getting wet. The cinematographic wet (advance) is capital,

but there will always be who (eccentric, bored, capricious) want that moment of intimacy with the rigors

of mother natura.Habr� ��, however, to be aware of this Stattner, which saves what, in others, would be pyrotechnic

material of the first order now that there are the faults of Valencia at its peak.

" 0

" The story and the whole plot, is made to sell the Duff discs as donuts, and that is not to

forget that the Duff empire extends not only to the movies, but also na disks and even a different

merchandising of the girl is.

Let's start by Hillary Duff, like Lindsay Lohan, Paris Hilton or to a lesser extent Britney Spears, I

fall like a kick in the face, so, I repeat, taking advantage of this week I go to bed

almost with the Lunnis , my wife explores (and exploits) the genre of romantic comedy in its most anguishedHillary

watersheds., here she acts as "" singing girl "" (much earlier of that operation of face that has left her with a

face, spontaneously stretched), remembering in some moments our motherland Marisol, with aargument

theoretically dramaticand where together with Hillary stand out, Rita Wilson (woman from Tom Hanks and a regular producer

of an infinity of films) that should be bored at home, Rebeca DeMornay, who left herlady figure in

sexythe cinema years ago (something like Sharon Stone, but in Hippy version), David Keith, secondary in countless

films, is here of father of the Duff.The story and the whole plot, is made to sell Duff's records

as donuts, and we do not forget that the Duff empire (I'm not talking about the Simpsons beer brand,

although it is irremediable to see the name and to think about Duffman), it extends not only to the films, but also the

discs and even a different merchandising of the girl is.

" 0

" Another one of those films that could have been interesting but to which their writers and

director's inexperience become boring and strange.

Moscow Zero is the second film of mystery or horror set in Russia that I have swallowed this

weekend. Like El Chosen, it is European capital. This, in particular, is one of those strange

co-productions of a few countries, which causes curious situations such as the appearance of actors like my

Cádiz-born citizen Alex O'Dogerthy ( known for being the antipanic ch���fer of C���mera caf���) along with the increasingly

swollen and deteriorated Val Kilmer (little remains of the one who interpreted El Santo). Narrated in a

somewhat sinister but not entirely credible tone, tells the story of an expedition of scientists and a priest who

travel to the catacombs of a former Russian monastery in which apparently a companion of them has disappeared

who went before and alone in them. According to popular legend, among the nooks and crannies of this

subterranean labyrinth, there is the entrance to hell. There is little more to be said of another lost occasion

to achieve an excellent film. ���cula of terror, because as in El Elegido, the promising beginning is giving

way to a tiresome, slow and developed cadence in such somber environments that it is difficult to follow the

thread of events that go losing interest as the footage progresses. One of the aspects that

I notice is the obvious (it seems to me) parallelism that is trying to establish between the

simbolog ���a of a supernatural demon and another that could well allude to the human being, in its most raw aspect.

This possible analogy reaches its c cuandonit when the sequence of a boy who sees what theis narrated

demons do in a Russian convent in 1920, while in the background a burning refertory is shown . Maybe I'm

wrong, but I think it's too much of a coincidence that it shows a huge affront to religion set in a time

so close to the October Revolution that it gave the constitution of the communist regime of the USSR, which

led to the prohibition of religious practice and the destruction of many buildings dedicated to the same,

while alludes to "" the demons "".

" 0

" Yes, the implication is shown with Planet Terror for imitating the B series or whatever they are called (the

production design and assembly are excellent), but I think that this guy has gone, too, towards his own way, and

that seems great to me.

There are essences, there are customs and there are talents that one can catch, or rather not. With those two

masterpieces entitled Pulp Fiction and Reservoir Dogs, Quentin Tarantino left a mark that faded through

the following years. However, there were personal customs that he did not forget, although thatessence

pure and hardof his first two works was no longer palpable. I rationally lost my initial identity.

Now, thanks to the Grindhouse friends project, he has had the opportunity (or intelligence) to return to his

beginnings, creating his own story, a brutality sealed in each of his frames by the unmistakable

identity of the same director. And is that, as I announced in the first sentence, this guy surprises me,me

catches, and that's why Death Proof seems to me a brilliant beast of Tarantinian cinema. If the two Kill Bill were

a mere exercise (not bad) about the martial arts and already on the way to more oriental revenge, her new

work is a realistic portrait of two groups of girls and of course a vision. A less human, but more masculine, of

a man obsessed with them. And it is that his cinema is a cinema of dialogue, apparently empty, withdepth

almost no, but always with that metaphysical question that is hidden behind cars,women

Sexyor guns: Where are we living in? At first glance this questi that I formulate may seem

somewhat simple, even too global. But focusing and analyzing this moral background, we can see that

in Death Proof the daily life of these eight girls is treated with a sensitivity (not ordinary but

realistic) that is later changed by the current world of the sick, of the obsessive man���acos that

abound in this not so healthy planet in which we live. The metaphor, then, is in those two extremelyworlds

opposite(which come to be touched just as they are out of phase), that of the female group, crazy and with that carpe

diem at all times, and the of that male murderer, raw and direct, with hardly a heart and too muchintelligence

cold. And the thing is that most likely you think that this is a bullshit, an exaggeration all gas (never better

said). But guys, if you see a film, as long as it's one like Quentin, of course, you can not go with the

intention, however seemingly simple and silly, that this is a simple and fun bullshit .

You have to see, stop and reason. And if you keep thinking that what I say is useless, that this entertainment is

much more than just entertainment, it's that you do not like Quentin Tarantino's cinema. Why only think

that Death Proof is a simple homage to those B series movies where cars and girls abounded in

abundance? Why not stop and think maybe it's something else? Without a doubt, I, and maybe I would, describe

this film as an intense and very, very hard work, done exclusively for the director himself and for a

few fans (I do not know � I, but I necessarily include myself in them) who see their cinema as something more than a simple

nonsense made to laugh (cry with laughter), have fun and leave the cinema saying "" What ��� last! "" And it is that

in this bloody and deep diversion about friendship, you can find numerous guides to thecinema

Tarantinian(their own man���as, let's say), be it the tone of the m�� Rosario Dawnson's story referring to

the already mythical whistles of Kill Bill, the close-ups of female feet, the short sequence

converted into black and white (that's right, it does not make sense when It is his intention) or the already very usual

conversations of groups of friends in a bar (I still remember that impeccable first sequence of Reservoir Dogs,

with an extensive dialogue just perfect). Here the script is also written by Tarantino, and it can be noticed

that, despite its simple plan, it looks very simple (psic���pata chases a group of stunning girls

young people), he can extract a lot, a lot of juice. And that's where the dialogues play, which practically

occupy half of the feature film. In the first, darkest story (from there to be placed at night), the

conversations between the group of girls (and some other boy) are incredibly realistic, everyday,

although sometimes afalse and disproportionate, that serious, and therefore obscure, point is noted, that fear of

bitsomething happening that (���l) keeps us more tense (and therefore the Public) of something happening, that the

evil Stuntman Mike destroys them to pieces before or after the beautiful blonde who appears at the

bar (memorable the dialogue with her, by the way). It also begins to witness that air of humor (perhaps with

a more ironic, not so black humor) that little by little will keep you m�� Ens in tension. And at the top of the first

chapter, is when Tarantino starts the engine and leaves us all paralyzed, with a frontal clash (I mean

literally!) Absolutely brutal, with a sequence impeccably assembled and repeated four times from

different angles. Then take the opportunity to fill that gap between the two stories with a no less

sparkling conversation between two Texas police (father and son) where what stands out is theshot

sequencem�� Ques that the absurdity of the content (although you laugh also). Then comes the second (or third,

if you want) part of Death Proof, which shows that radical change with respect to the characters. Here, and more

clearly the matter, our protagonist returns to the wanderings and intends to pursue another small group of flashy

funny girls. That's when, in a very intelligent way, the director brings us closer to the lives of those four

girls who are so different but how well they fall to us (and how crazy they are!). Here they are the obsessed ones and, at

first, with intimate but then defeated, it is the victim. Personally, I am more attracted to this second story,

because with that black and white beginning, the supermarket scene, the consequent dialog in the bar

(absolutely delicious), the appearance of the talented and excellent Z���e Bell, the purchase of the car and the

dazzling and perfect pursuit (with final heels included), one can not stay with just words.

If the first part was a brutal and certainly also excellent and striking intruction, the second is

to increase that madness (on both sides, sexually speaking) and make us believe that what we are seeing is

a film, pure and hard, by Quentin Tarantino. Recognize that they also take the palm the eight that are undoubtedly

in a state of grace and a funny Kurt Russell and no less crazy, with phrases as splendid as

those that loose in the first bar. And do not forget all the musical themes, highlighting the already unforgettable

Down in Mexico by The Coasters. I think Death Proof, more than a tribute and the final episode of this Grindhouse,

is the daring of Tarantino to do again what he likes the most, for expelling that very personal essence and

, in the meantime, making a brief appearance no less memorable. Yes, you can see the implication with Planet Terror for

imitating the B series or whatever they are called (without a doubt, the production design and assembly are excellent, with those

changes of tone and the grated ones in the screen made on purpose), but I think (or at least I can witness) that

this guy has gone, also, towards his own way, and I think that's great. And it is that nobody has to forget

that we are before a film by Quentin Tarantino, and that can be noticed even with closed eyes. It's not your

best film, but it's authentically personal, and that's what really matters.

" 1

" The Spanish cinema has lost a historic opportunity to create a jewel easily exportable to a large part

of the planet. There was material to do it and we have not known. It will be again.

Publicized in a big way as the most expensive film in the history of Spanish cinema (cost € 24 million

), it finally reached our screens "" Alatriste "" by Agust���n D���az Yanes.As everyone knows, it is about

the adaptation of the five novels by Arturo P���rez-Reverte on the adventures of the capit�� Alatriste (Viggo

Mortensen) and his friends in which the battles in Flanders and the palace intrigues of the Count Duque de Olivares

(Javier C���mara), Fray Emilio Bocanegra (Blanca Portillo) or King Philip IV are spotted with references to

Velazquez or Quevedo (Juan Echanove) forming the whole a good portrait of the Spain of the seventeenth century.It is that

historical fresco one of the forts of D���'s film �az Yanes, thanks among other factors to his beautiful

soundtrack by Roque Ba���os and his great artistic direction (Benjam���n Fern ���ndez) and costumes (Francesca

Sartori). Because if something gets the film is to move to Madrid in the seventeenth century with great effectiveness, with

its dirty and dark streets, its social differences, its morality? The choice of realism is evident in

scenes of battles in which D���az Yanes decides to renounce the spectacular and the greatmovements

masstypical of superproductions and offer us general shots in which we see It is clear that the

soldiers in the battle are a few tens. The photograph (Paco Femenia) is a real beauty, imitating the

style of some paintings of that time and helping create that pessimistic atmosphere that envelops the entire

film. Pessimism totally justified to be, in a way, the portrait of a society and an empire

that began to fall apart. Regarding the actors I can not complain because they are all good. To the

aforementioned we would have to add Elena Anaya, Antonio Dechent, Eduard Fernandez, Ariadna Gil, Pilar L6pez de

Ayala, Eduardo Noriega and Unax Ugalde. For me, everyone is tall but I'm surprised if I know why Fray

Emilio Bocanegra is played by a woman (the great Blanca Portillo). But, above all of them,

the soul of the film is Viggo Mortensen, who composes a perfect Alatriste, fatalistic, disenchanted,

implacable with his enemies but loyal with his friends. An actor with a magnificent presence who, although it is true

that he has a strange accent, is so involved in the role that there comes a time when he convinces me that no one

else can It must have been Alatrsite and that weird voice is the perfect one for the character. Until now, everything seems to

work in the movie, is not it? Well, no. Actually everything works in the movie, except the movie.

I do not know if it is a guiding mistake because of wanting to cover too much (let's not forget that it adapts fivenovels

differentabout the character) or assembly because of having excessively cut the footage to give it a longer

duration. s commercial What is clear is that the rhythm is never adequate, to the point of becoming

unforgivably boring in some passages. In addition, it lacks strength and narrative pulse, which also does not help to

attract the least boring moments. The sensation that it produces in the spectator is that of watching

a series of luxurious television at the same time. that you have cut half of the scenes for your passage through the cinemas.

In such a way that we jump from one scene to another without a solution of continuity, without giving time to create the

right atmosphere and with ellipses that cry out to the sky. A trailer of two hours and a half of what could have

been a great movie of four or five hours. In short "" Alatriste "" shows, once again, that with money

on the table we can make a superproduction that nothing has to envy to the Americans regarding the

final product. The bad thing is that we have not shown how to do them better than them and one is left with the

impression that the Spanish cinema has lost a historic opportunity to create a jewel easily. exportable to a

good part of the planet. There was material to do it and we have not known. It will be again.

" 0

" An absolutely mediocre film, with an impersonal television bill and lacking a narrative nerve, with a

script that gets lost in parallel stories that never finish fluent, a flat realization and

a horrible mounting.

In these times, in which the thriller has gone to swell the list of genres seen through

a vacuous aestheticism (except for honorable exceptions, which always exist), the intention n Bruce Evans, director

of this failed "Mr.Brooks", is clear from the first shots of the film, to recover a way of making films,

to create a cinematographic look by looking back ��s in time. But all good intentionsdrag

definitelya ballast difficult to release, because the film in question resorts to the worst tics of a

type of thriller that reminds a server to those samples of suspense of the early nineties , so

given to the television bill. Influences of which we will speak next. Before anything else, the plot of the

film puts us in the shoes of Earl Brooks, a successful businessman, possessor of a terrible secret, has

an addiction to Aln to murder, a disease that he believes he has left behind until one day, after two years without

killing, he returns to his mind, and he does so in the form of material manifestation, physical in his eyes, of his alter ego, the

criminal part of himself, named Marshall, which by way of those little demons of evil so common that

appear in the shoulder of the craziest cartoons, although in this case materialized as a dark character,

incites him to commit more murders. When, due to an unusual mistake in him, he forgets a small detail in

a crime scene, an amateur photographer blackmails him to be able to witness one of his murders in situ

(which by the way, Brooks he had promised himself not to do it again), under penalty of denouncing him and ending up

behind bars. A dangerous game begins for both characters, adding to the argument the persecution by

an agent of the law (and rich for more inri), named Tracy Atwood, for which Brooks begins to

feel a certain admiration. To make the argument even more complicated, Brooks' daughter returns home with a

dark and terrible secret. As I mentioned earlier, no element of the film finds its rightful point of

equilibrium and all this Bruce Evans's work does not exactly contribute to the scenes. Filmmaker more tanned

in the terrain of the gui���n that of the direction (not in vain his first and last film to date goes

back to a��� or 1992, and it was the inconsequential "" Kuffs, poli by chance ""), Evans does not know how to adapt to

what the film required and the hopes placed. In the field of gui���n, also had shown

tremendously irregular, being responsible for scripting the interesting "" Starman "" (directed by John Carpenter)

and above all his great work to date , "" Cuenta Conmigo "", one of the best (if not the best) films about

friendship in adolescence made to date. On the other hand, being responsible for things like the story

of "" The island of the severed heads "" (which does have some slight interest, is not precisely because of the horrendous

gui���n) or "" From jungle to jungle "", there remains any hint of credibility present in this filmmaker returned to the fold

of the directionA server, the film reminded him exceedingly to those thrillers of the early nineties,

so popular among the great public, despite having a television bill that ruined any

pretension to make a lasting film. Even so, the influence on the tone, the private look of tension, and

condescending with the amoral characters (in a very superficial way for that reason) of thrillers of

that time like "" Malas influences "", "" The hand that rocks the cradle "" or "" Rio Salvaje "", all of Curtis Hanson

(a filmmaker who luckily, then evolved giving rise to a more interesting director , although with a downward trend

in his career again), or from the movies of the now forgotten Joseph Ruben, such as "" Sleeping with his

enemy "" or "" The good son "", I find them obvious in a tone supposedly asyptic and supposedly minimalist

in the staging. It is a pity that the final product is not a satisfactory film at all, more than

anything because the starting point, the interesting manifestation of the dark side of Brooks' mind, could

have been shot with more subtlety and effectiveness, for its against, it becomes a character more of the film, and

that plays against the credibility of the story. Another interesting aspect was a priori the game that gave

the criminal mind of the seemingly perfect man, as a reflection on the dark side that every person

usually, or should, hide, in contrast to its impeccable presentation. Enn in society, and even family. All

these transcendent aspirations of the film do not just work any of them, due to a tragicrhythm

narrative, with parallel stories that far from enriching the film, they only cause to create aconfusion

narrative, which works more stumbling and looking for the supposed charisma on screen of Kevin Costner and Demi

Moore (really mediocre in their work both), that a narrative that captures the viewer with a narrative pulse,lacking.Bruce

something of which the film is completelyEvans it lacks a convincing staging at all,

not even a narrative or visually impassioned pulse, everything is cold and distant, with a convoluted andguiding

absurdthat leads the characters to decisions that are less questionable, a film tremendously mediocre in its

final result. This does not contribute much to elements that clash enough in the plot of the film, only

then can that condescending look be understood, even in the final resolution of the story, to a murderer

like Mr. .Brooks, while giving free rein to the reactionary concept of the family that one has in places like

the one that produces this film, being unacceptable (and it is not the first time that we can suffer it in theproductions

American, not forgetting the ��� only truly negative aspect that presided over "" embarrassing mess "") the mere fact of

considering a young girl the abortion, in a display of fanaticism and manipulation that irritates anymind

open and thinking. Kill what you want if you have a good heart, but never mind not having a child yet

being a young or adolescent girl, really irritating. The work of the actors does not help much to improve either.

the film, more than anything because both Costner and Demi Moore just put faces of indifference (quote

the unbelievable pressure exerted by Demi Moore to the character of Mr. Smith in the parking lot, incredibly

mediocre), resulting slightly better, but not much, William Hurt as a manifestation of thepersonality

criminalof Brooks or Dane Cook as a new fan discoverer of the "" art "" of murder. In short, a film

absolutely mediocre, with an impersonal television bill and lacking in narrative nerve (despite being

agiven to it as is the thriller genre), with a script that is lost in parallel stories that never quite

flow smoothly, a flat accomplishment and a horr ible montage (without going further, the terrible montage of

parallel acts on the crime scene remembering the footsteps of Brooks on the part of the agent incarnated

by Demi Moore, is confusing and terribly mediocre), giving rise also Escenasna scenes more typical of amodernism

misunderstood(the scene of the pursuit down the stairs, without sound and electronic music, should be a

candidate for worse scene of action of the year), that of a sober and forceful film. An insipid work that despite being

entertaining at times, gives rise to obvious flaws in all the elements that compose it. Absolutely

expendable and irrelevant.

" 0

" The most overrated movie that the cinema has given in recent years. At last I have seen "" Brokeback Mountain "", the lauded and praised movie. Ang Lee's The film that everyone

expected after triumphing at the Venice Film Festival, in a large number of awards from thecritics

American, at the Golden Globes and almost certainly at the Oscars, if nothing and no one is remediating it .

"" Brokeback Mountain "" seems to me, from now on, the most overrated film that cinema has given in recent

years. And more that I would like it if you get the maximum statuette. The viewing of this film of landscapes and

shepherds, has disappointed me. And for the record, I have judged this forbidden territory in the most objective way possible,

without abiding by the large number of awards that have been awarded to date and without stopping to think what

represents in my opinion the career of the director Ang Lee.The Taiwanese director has to date a

surprising filmography, as disparate as it is unpredictable, capable of making "" Sense and Sensibility "" and "" TheStorm

Ice"" and at the same time that martial outburst that it was "" Tiger and Dragon "" or a superhero tape for the

Hollywood system as "" Hulk. "" And that is that Ang Lee proves that he does not have that power that Clint Eastwood has to

tell sensitive stories, with extreme slowness and that look wonderful And that's what he tries here, but he

gets this love story between the two cowboys to be tedious, insufferable and long. "" Brokeback Mountain ""

tells a story of misunderstood loves, of impossible loves. I've seen it many times before and with

a greater interest in a large number of films. I will mention an example, in which I do not distance myself from the

rural, from the time of ambience and rhythm; "" The Bridges of Madison "" by Clint Eastwood, which seems key to me,

as a comparison when it comes to judging definitely as a major work of Lee's film. Just a few glances

between Meryl Streep and Clint Eastwood in this film already contain greater doses of passion than the two and ahours

quarterof the mountain cowboys. And it is that regardless of "" Brokeback Mountain "" is a

homosexual, heterosexual or whatever, it is first and foremost a love story that does not transmit a slight

feeling to the spectator. The story of "" Brokeback Mountain "" never gets to be touched because in no case n moment

manages to convey that relational character that, in part, does not come to be consummated byissues or prejudices

social. The few strokes that Ang Lee gives, about the fear that may exist in the characters about the

relationship, are scarce to convince us. In addition, the protagonists are extremely weak in their interpretations.

Ledger and Gyllenhall are expressionless. You never know what they are thinking, what are their intentions, and it is not enough

to make a face angry or pissed off. Hugely lazy in their papers. It would only save the submissive wife,

Michelle Williams, who has the best shot of the film, when she discovers her husband kissing with Jake

Smith. As loosely is his guide, very flat, that he barely sketches notes of all this long footage that

passes between sheep, mountains and sporadic encounters, without developing any of the subplots, without

any of them capturing attention. The work, therefore, is totally of the direction, that put in practice

this little theory that offers its gui���n, lengthening as possible the meetings of its protagonists, that are

repeated again and again to the boredom of the spectator. And it is that when the landscapes seem more beautiful and

interesting than the love story that is being told, is that something does not work. The passion fails, the

emotion fails, the touching fails. And that is extremely important in a film that is being awarded the title

of masterpiece with great ease. "" Brokeback Mountain "" I have known little, even a movie

wasted. It is true that Ang Lee does not intend to make a plea in favor of homosexuality, only to tell

a romantic story, but it does point out some small brushstrokes of social non-acceptance that never

comes to finish. It gives the sensation that at times he has wanted to give a greater life to the film, introduce

new and possibly interesting passages (like the one of the father-in-law of Jake Smith), but it ends up being prisoner of the

gui��� n, the story and the scant claw of the relationship on which this film is uniquely and exclusively based. It is not

that the film of Taiwanese living in Hollywood has nothing in its favor, only the intention of telling a

romantic story with a classic cut already gives some I point to your favor, in these days that run. Another thing is

that he has been able to take advantage of it or capture it with enough intensity on the screen, which is not the

case. "" Brokeback "" is one of those films in which his music seems to be marvelous or cansina, his photography and

pretentious or precious places, his history sublime or empty, his interpretations null or great, hisguide

perfect or bulky. For me, these forbidden lands will be more overvalued today than yesterday, but less than

tomorrow.

" 0

" JA Bayona's great debut, which puts Spain's horror film on the top spot again. Right in every

way, entertaining, disturbing.

In the middle of a film, after the door was slammed shut in the house (and we all gave the

corresponding little jump), a friend told me sottovoce: "" pa 'm��� that the house falls on ramp "". It is true. and perhaps

if the architect had done his job well, or if the carpenter had thoroughly checked those hinges, or if

someone simply bothered to close the windows from time to time, maybe then we would avoid somehow

another scare in this type of film. Now, can someone imagine a horror film, with a built-in

tumult, without any other bang? And what do they tell me about the noises, those noises that do not come from

any specific place and can not be assigned to anyone or anything in particular? Too late to be the

gardener, too sharp to be the boiler, too serious to be air. Neither can children miss

. Children are always scary. I was thinking of having one, but I have rejected that

option again.Bromes aside, in The Orphanage the old tricks work (that there are, already pairs) and the new ones (that

there are also ). The debutant Jota has shown to have a great talent for the realization (already knew

who came following his path) and masterfully directs a distressing film and very disturbing The

script is very correct. and although he drinks from many sources, one has to assume that there is nothing new under the sun

since the time of Arist���fanes. The plot hooks, moving between the thriller and terror, and in the end we are

surprised as they already did The Other or The Sixth Sense (among many others, of course). It stands out, for my taste, the

interpretation of Bel���n Rueda. So much that overshadows the correct interpretation of Fernando Cayo and the rest of

secondary. Rueda convinces in the desperate search of his son and the spectator suffers at his own pace. Add to

all this an excellent picture, very appropriate to the tone of the film, and they will have one of the

most interesting horror films. of the last years. It is confirmed that we dominate the genre.

" 1

" Who says it's easy? is another clamorous example of funny comedy that could be, but that

remains in a sad sentimental comedy funny at times.

There are many things that bring salt and pepper to life, and one of those elements is the

irony that fate sometimes spends. Although sometimes more than iron, it seems pure and true bad.

When one thing needs to happen, the other happens, and other times, when the other one needs to pass, the one passes

. All this little philosophical galimat���as comes from the irony that supposes that the Spanish films

triumph in Argentina and here they happen with more grief than glory (no, it's not a gui���oa V���ctor Garc���a Le���n), and that

the Argentine films pass them exactly otherwise, they succeed in Spain and in their country they pass with

indifference. After the great success of No Sos Vos, Soy Yo, arrives at the Spanish billboards the new work of

his director, Juan Taratuto. Who does it say is easy? it is an unconventional romantic comedy,

whose protagonists are Aldo (Diego Peretti), an insecure and manic man, and Andrea (Carolina Peleritti), a

graphic reporter who has traveled everyone, pregnant without knowing who the father is. The first half of the

film has the best qualities of a romantic comedy, is fun, enjoyable, and has a great pace;

However,the second half has all the defects of the romnticas comedies, leaves humor aside to

focus on the emotional level, reach consabidos conflicts, and lastly becomes ponderous. Today

, there are very few comedies that from the beginning to the end have the only and healthy intention to make thelaugh

spectator, since most of them end up hiding moralizing or sentimental intentions. On the other hand,

Diego Peretti (thank goodness Quevedo has not known him, because if he does not laugh at the "" ���rase a man to a nose

stuck "") performs a good interpretive work, m��� s content and less historical than in previous works.

Carolina Peleritti also offers a good job, and surely ends at last with the sambenito of old

model turned into an actress. In the end, who does it say is easy? is another clamorous example of funny comedy that could

be, but that remains in a sad sentimental comedy funny at times.

" 0

" It has one of the most impeccable finishes that can be seen in today's cinema. Not only does it triumph in form,

also in the background, and that is what differentiates products like "Children of men". It was time.

Martin Scorsese has always been a great technical filmmaker and his contributions to contemporary cinema do not tend to

leave anyone indifferent, even though he has produced works as plémbeas and failed as "" Malas calles "" and "" The

aviator "". In particular, I admit that they do not usually interest me too much about their stories about mafias and gangsters,

but you can not deny their narrative forcefulness. To begin with, "" Infiltrados "", at the technical level, has one of the

finishes m� It's impeccable that can be seen in today's cinema, a marvel of montage, of rhythm, a sobersense

aestheticin the frame and in the photographic, in the way of focusing faces, scenes of action, the

characters that die and those that shoot, the alternation between those in the foreground and those in the

background, the perfect coral structure that is developed to perfection , precisely thanks to

that montage that connects the different facts of a quite overwhelming visual and plot set.,

Becausethat is, "" Infiltrados "" not only triumphs in form, also in the background, and that's what differentiates

products like "" Children of men "". It was time. The characters are endowed with a sharpdimension

human, overcoming the difficult challenge of going beyond the clichés, while showing ambiguity. moral age or

an absolute lack of scruples, almost an encirclement between the will to be and what the reality of

corruption ends up revealing: a chaos in which no one is guaranteed stability in a world not ruled

by laws and a sense of justice, but by interests and longings of power and purelydominance

macho, in which the lie is a subtle deadly weapon. The impulse of masculine dominance is present at

all levels, both in the vocabulary of the characters and in the meaning inherent in the story, its

development and its devastating conclusion: the one that gives the last bullet He is the one who, from the beginning, tried to sit

down by force of arrogance and foul language. In principle, the central theme of the argument is the

struggle between the mafias and the police forces, but Scorsese's gaze on this universe of struggle between

groups is much more ambiguous, harsh and complex, building a universe with own laws, regardless of what is

dictated by the law and the common sense: there is no dividing line between the mafias and the forces that

supposedly defend the law: in the end, the acts of each other they are the same, everything is the same spiral of

violence and interests, as is demonstrated in the final meeting point between the two moles,

magnificently interpreted by Leo Dicaprio (��� still there are doubts , leaving aside his eternal ani���ed face,

in relation to his remarkable dramatic resources?) and Matt Damon. The rat that walks through the balustrade of the

balcony, in the last plane, comes to confirm the fierce message that leaves us on the palate, the bitter aftertaste

of a world ruled by "" rats "", regardless of whether the costume they wear corresponds to one or the other side.

" 1

" Bad movie like a testicle kick, about some aliens who come to the Earth for a picnic and a predator

who acts as guardian of Humanity. Or what do I know? Bad, bad. Only viable for those spectators who

like this type of film.

Director: Colin Strause Duration: Infernal hour and a half. Year: January 11, 2008. How big was Hugo

S���nchez, the most macho among the males. It was going to the field, accommodating the g���eval, and the f enminas go crazy

(maybe I got carried away). I remember that one time, before going out to a party, a companion would put on a

key ring from this man and kneel to commend himself to ��� l. And that we played handball. What

is this about? Well, one of the actors is the great Hugo S���nchez, or his cousin of the town, who for that matter. The

film is about a predator that has tremendous constipation. Given that the natural route does not come out, because it is

born a moj���n by the belly, that as Albert Pl��� sang, because it resembled both his mother and his

father. As you well know, these aliens are affectionate taco, so they are going to give prattling in the mouth to everything they

catch, including all the humans they catch when the ship crashes against the earth. Before the death of the

confederate, he makes a loss to the one who recommended him to eat plums to pass it, and he goes there to eliminate the Aliens

. What do I say that I could have gone with a couple more, ���no? What do you think that the movie is what I

told? It is true, but it is that it is such a moj���n, that it seems to me that my readers deserve something better than the vile

reality. While the first part had an argument, bad or good, this is simply that the Aliens want to

colonize the land (they reproduce more than the Gremlins in the bathtub) and a Predator encourages them to go for them.

We're brave! The characters touch the pathos, the plot is absurd, the action is one of those that the director was

told "" ���A that you do not have eggs? "" And boy did he have them. My little mother, who moj���n.Resumiendo, bad movie like

a testicular kick, about some aliens who come to the Earth for a picnic and a predator who acts as guardian of

the Humanity. Or what do I know? Bad, bad. Only viable for those spectators who like this type of

film, but who are enthusiastic. At times, it has really pathetic scenes. Tremendo tru���o.Besitos.PD:

Have not I ever told you my theory about aliens? What do I say, why do they have to be able to breathe

our air, why does not the water kill them (as in poop signals), why they are corporeal and can be a mere

gas , etc. Another day I tell you my theory, that you are going to laugh. PS2: "The government will never lie to us" is themoment

culminatingof the film. It is set so that you can hold what is left, what petrified you stay.

Repeat with me "" The government would never lie to us "" without remarks, yes.

" 0

" It's not that the scriptwriter is bad, it's that it happened like that. God does not know how to write scripts. I hate biopics. I have said it many times, but I have the feeling that nobody listens to me. For a

lover of stories, there is no worse story than a person's biography. The whole story of the "" Dreams ""

is told so we end up discovering that one of the characters was the bad guy. Even the worst scriptwriter would

have warned the public that this guy was bad in the first scene. "" Dreamgirls "" presents him as aguy

greatwho helps them climb. It's not that the scriptwriter is bad, it's that it happened like that. God does not know how to write

scripts. I do not know why the cinema tried to shoot them. If you charge copyright you will be left in peace, but as it does not

charge, we will have to continue holding biopics. And I do not know if I said it, but I hate biopics. The bad guy is so

bad that because of him the singer Jimmy Early could not stop doing drugs. He censored a song and Early threw himself for

his team of syringes and other heroin tools that, alas, he had prepared in a

pocket of the jacket. But if it is not for that, Early is saved. In this movie there are many people who hurt

other people, people who save other people, people who destroy the lives of other people. It is a film in which

nobody is to blame what happens to him, there is always a black hand. The bad guy has everything to blame. The truth,

I do not imagine anyone ruining my life. These tireless characters who cause so many casualties seem to me to

escape from a nightmare, but I have never met the original of the portraits.

" 0

" The existential drama of this gray family will sprout with all its power towards the end, in the cathectic

meeting where everything will explode, and something later, when an unfortunate accident makes possible, perhaps only

temporarily, the union of all.

Here is one of those (infrequent) cases in which the direction of a film borders on its gui���n. And it's

not that, deep down, this middle-class family history devastated by routine, everyday life and the

fatigue of living has no interest: the husband, condemned to die by the disease whose name nobody dares to say out

loud; the woman, forgotten in her condition as a female; the sullen adolescent (sorry for the redundancy?),

confused in her incipient sexuality, in her secret crush on her best friend; the little one, whose passage from

the real world to that of ghosts occurs with the naturalness that can only happen when one is six years old;

the old widower, who seeks his place in the world for the last bend of the road. But, with the

osiers provided by Santiago Roncagliolo's novel, well marred by an intelligent guide, the best is the

powerful staging of the new filmmakers David and Trist���n Ulloa (although the first he has a long

experience as a television director and the second has amply demonstrated his sensitivity as an actor in

films like "Luc���a y el sexo" and "Salvador" "), who manage with an enviable ease fragile where

there are: subterranean feelings, with an appearance of normality, where really runs a furious

winding of unexpected meanders. Filmed with intentionality, with stimulating frames, slight

photographic turns, precise and exact movements, the film is always attractive, although sometimes the interest

decays (the plot line of the grandfather is clearly inferior to the others), and does not incur the unfortunate vice

of wanting to be noticed, so usual in neophyte filmmakers. On the contrary, it seems that the Ulloa brothers have

been filming their whole lives, and the consequence of those tables was this beautiful film. It is true that the

beginning is somewhat hesitant, while David and Tristan find the tone that the story requires, but

when they do, which is soon, everything is going smoothly: the existential drama of this gray family will sprout� ��

with all its power towards the end, in the cathectic meeting where everything will explode���, and something later, when an

unfortunate accident makes it possible, perhaps � ��lo temporarily, the union of all. The sequence of the catharsis is

magnificent, with dramatic tension and emotional high voltage, but there are others, less striking, that are also

tremendous: the meeting of the child. �o with the ghost of the pedophile with a dog, a small prodigy of subtlety between

allegorical darkness; the encounter of the mother with her supposed anonymous lover, resolved with a skill of

teacher. Separate mention for the couple protagonist: above all, Elvira M���nguez, definitely the

best actress of his generation (and there are very good), splendid in this role so complicated; Nancho Novo

escapes for once from the bohemian ragtag that seems his brand of factory to make probo father of a

family, a gray office worker cornered by the nameless disease and by the end of an existence ah���ta de

"" aurea mediocritas "".

" 1

" The Gladiator sometimes makes eyes of such deep and deep feeling that one passes the function

hoping that some furious centurions appear and kill the woman and the son.

I know that those of us who write film seem like a panda of bitter people, that we always see the glass half

empty, and that when everyone has a good time we feel obliged to take our feet off the plate and to

find the cat three feet. I do what I can to talk about cinema as a spectator on the street, as one of

those who are asked for advice as a friend. I try to put aside, above all, the foolishness of verismo,

the cinema is fiction. There are still products that I can not with them, no matter how hard I try. "" A good year "" is an

example. A London broker without scruples, who collects the insults that send him as triumphs, inherits a

viñedo from his t� Eno in Provence, and you have to travel there to sell it. The house and the plantation are for

him full of memories, but there are two other reasons that hold him back. An illegitimate daughter appears in search of her

identity that could claim her rights, and, secondly, she meets a woman from the place that makes her fall in love at

first sight. The contrast in stressed urban life? Rural life is very beautiful if it were not for

hundreds of films before, and with much more content. The character of the heartless broker would have

delighted many more observant directors, Scott serves to release a couple of harsh phrases without the

remotest relationship with grace. The future that awaits the protagonist in his brokerage is represented

by the exasperated boss and obsessed with his Van Gogh who can not see the security measures. It was

much more graphic the boss of "intolerable cruelty", of the Coen, piped and full of cables. They aresecondary

very usefulso that we have clear what is the best choice that the protatonista can do. The illegitimate daughter is

in the film so that we can see a trait of the heart. n of the broker, although it does not stop being anfeature

unnecessary, or worse yet, disconnected. One of the characters in the movie, the uncle, says he knows the trick of the

comedy "" the trick is in the rhythm "". Maybe the guy knows, but the director certainly does not. More than

agility, what it prints is a kind of spasmodic rhythm. Although I do not go to the movies to see what the

actors do, I usually thank them for not spoiling the story with their faces. They should not have hired Rusell

Crowe for a comedy, the Gladiator sometimes puts such deep and deep-feeling eyes that you pass

the function hoping that some furious centurions will appear and kill the woman and the son.

" 0

" Odyssey told without flashes, between overwhelming and dark, uncertain at the same time that almost impossible. As of 2027, women can not have children. With this proposition, frightening and pessimistic at the same time, Children of

men connects with the science-fiction of a dystopian. However, the last film of Cuarn is not

so interested in how the Apocalypse has been reached, but rather the parallel and alternative path that arises in front of him.

The one that embarks the last pregnant woman towards the hope In this odyssey narrated without flashes, between

overwhelming and tenebrous, uncertain at the same time that almost impossible, the protagonists advance to grope by the chaos and

the debris, by photograms that seem to me Realistic than usual in the genre, and therefore

closer; without literature. Thus, the science becomes science fiction, and this in turn becomes a

horror film. Children of men is a parabola of the future without too much makeup, which dislocates a couple of

decades the diseases of our days, now already terminal. In fact, the date is circumstantial, almost

contextual, a necessary toll of ambience. Probably in what we write this, we have already reached

the film, or she has caught us. But as this is a story of hope, Clive Owen fights, in the

middle of the generalized breakdown, to light of dreams and illusions to an infantry world. So that, between so much

shouting and noise, do not stop listening to the rush of a newborn baby in search of affection.

" 1

" Your little one is in that it shows the world of drugs in a way that has never been seen before. Trainspotting basically consists of a group of heroin addicts who They spend almost the entire film hanging. The

story that counts is the least, what is striking is how it counts, since that same story

told otherwise would have been totally without interest, because it is not great It has memorable moments

like that of Scotland's dirty ba���om���s, you have to have a stomache to see it, just like other scenes in the

film, but even if it's the touch "Surrealist" "is worth seeing, it's not the only surreal touch of the

film, because to teach us how the protagonist feels when hung, Danny Boyle gives us some other

time like when he dives into the carpet and ends up in the hospital. Trainspotting is one of these movies that

become icons of a generation and thousands of followers love them, like The Fight Club or The

Orange Mec���nica, that later will influence in the later cinema, all of them films of cult. His little one is in

that he shows the world of drugs in a way that he had never seen before. Ewan McGregor made his name with

this role, then his career has taken a turn and He does not do this type of film anymore, although it seems that

the second part of Trainspotting will be filmed and he will be the protagonist again, but Danny Boyle is waiting for

the actors to age something. ���s. He is a good actor, he has a lot of versatility, he has shown that he can play

a drug addict, a normal guy, a gal���ne can even sing (in Moulin Rouge) and work with Tim Burton

(in Big Fish). he has accused Trainspotting of being too much like La Naranja Mec���nica, it may have some

influence, but the only thing they resemble is that we are told the story of a group of young people who they do not

follow established norms, in Trainspotting their lives are governed by heroin and in La Naranja Mec���nica it is

violence, but this has a much more interesting story and better gui� ,N, but of course, we are not going to compare

Stanley Kubrick with Danny Boyle.

" 1

" The question may be: Did you wait or did you expect an ending like this? If you expected it, it's that you're

a very smart guy. And let's not say whether you expected it from the beginning: a genius.

The question may be: did you wait or wait for an end like this? If you expected it, it's that you're a

very smart guy. And let's not say whether you expected it from the beginning: a genius. Since they stopped publishing the

magazine "" C���bala "", people need movies like this to say how smart it is. I'm not smart, I do not know much

about geometry. a, not much of history, like the song of Sam Cooke, but there are characters that I like.Jackman's

Hugh character I liked whenwantedreturn the insult. It was interesting when he turned the

rivalry into the only thread that moves his life. Then it is lost. The problem with these cerebral directors

like Nolan is that they put the story at the service of an idea, a trick. Posts to choose, I prefer the trick of

"" The illusionist "" who is at the service of history. And I did not like much "" The Illusionist "". The only thing I

can say for Nolan is how to tell a complicated story. It is a story in three times that

hide a surprise, and yet does not lose the viewer. The character of Michael Caine is that of the wise man, he

guides the magicians and explains what prestige is. It is the third part of the trick, the one that returns magic to

reality, the one that makes sanity reappear. Prestige is the part that the film lacks.

" 0

" The movie is simple, silly jokes, relationships between superfluous characters,fights

pastand exaggerated, the script is predictable, but do not see how well I've spent watching this

movie

DOA, Dead or Alive, is a wrestling tournament where the best in their specialty participate and which takes place in

a complex on an island. Up there invited to participate our protagonists, Christie, a

thief pursued by the police, Tina, an expert in wrestling with a rather peculiar father, Kasumi, a

princess who leaves his kingdom in search of his brother , and Helena, daughter of the late organizer and who will try to

prove what it is worth. The tournaments randomly face the opponents and any time and scenario

is good for a fight. But this year the tournament is not clear water and its current organizer hasintentions

hidden. And that's it, there is hardly anything more than chicha in this movie, or what you expected, great

philosophical conversations, characters that evolve with the plot, criticism social, interpretations of Oscar.

You will not find any of that in here, just a plot and a simple and even sometimes meaningless script,

spectacular fights, some more successful than others, and girls in bikini, and that's it, well, no, and volleyball, of

course, let's not forget the bikini volleyball. The fans of the game will have Sun his homage in the first

matches, with the postures adopted at the end of each and even energy level markers. The villain

is like Eric Roberts, who has not seen in the cinema and actor of series B and everything that they throw him

that he should let himself see more. The rest are t caos hunk and girls who spend half of the tape in bikini and the

other half in tight clothes. From the beginning DOA makes clear that it will go, the presentation of the

protagonists There are already three scenes where they show their skills and also their bodies, in bikini and underwear

, of course. The film does not leave a moment of respite, either there are fights or there is showcasing of bodies in

bikini, or both. There are gazillions, swords, and a lot of violence, but at no time will

we see a drop of blood or any wound, no marked face, like a lot of girls in bikinis but little more,

a true pity.The greatest virtue of the film, and here is where all its charm resides (and not in the girls in

bikini) is that they do not take it seriously at any time, know that no They can offer much more than what they

offer and do not pretend anything other than pure past entertainment. I'm already fed up withmovies

shitthat go deep and serious when they're not. Here at least they do not try to give

depth to the film and a background when there is not, or win. They play their cards and play them well, fights and

t���as in bikini and punto.La movie is simple, silly jokes, relationships betweencharacters

superfluous, struggles past and exaggerated, motivations of the ill-defined characters, the

script is predictable and often incoherent, but do not see how good I've been watching this movie. By the

way, have I already said that there are bikini tops all the time?

" 1

" It turns out that? Aces hot? it is not more than a Grand Gui���ol without grace or sense. A collection of bizarre

characters who will not hesitate to massacre each other without the slightest consideration or modesty.

You have to fuck, man. A few months ago he rented "Narc" "and was shocked by a devastating film, hard

and spartan to the modula. A film empty of any artifice in which Ray Liotta, pulling obese,

was superb. A film about friendship, love, loyalty and betrayal that, with a dose of

violence very close to what counted, passed the right speed, with the right rhythm. That's why,

when I saw that this "Hot Aces" was released, written and directed by the same Joe Carnahan from "" Narc "", he

rubbed my hands. And when I read that the thing was about mafia and organized crime. for almost levit���, that one has

weakness, well-known and confessed, by that genre. And, nevertheless, ���qu��� brutal and tremendous disappointment! It turns out that

"" Hot Aces "" is not more than a Grand Gui���ol without grace or sense. A collection of bizarre characters

who will not hesitate to massacre each other without the slightest consideration, without any

hesitation. At the moment we come to understand the reasons and, what is worse, without giving a shit. Is it

Tarantino's shadow too long? Maybe? But "" Hot Aces "", rather, connects with thedementia

lysergicof the worst Oliver Stone, the one of monsters like "" Alejandro "" or "" Assassins born "". An aesthetic of

violence that pretends to be funny and that is pathetic; he tries to impress and just bores him. Shots

here, tattoos there, gadgets by acull���. pseudo-mystical-intellectual parliaments pronounced by

supposedly rolling characters and cartoon prints as pitiful as those of the threebrothers.

psychopathDear Joe: What happened in your head? between the formal containment and the emotion without limits of "" Narc "" and

this idiot of "" Hot Aces ""? Did you suffer a stroke? Did not you recover? Did you have a bad trip with an

expired tripi? How did you convince the good of Liotta, the increasingly less interesting Andy Garc���ao to the

alternativillo of Ben Affleck to join this cluster of disproportions? see it because according to

the magazines of the field, you'll be the one to roll the next adaptation for the big screen of a novel by

James Ellroy : "" White Jazz "". And look, if this clown of "" Hot Aces "" you can apologize becauseall

wehave the right to go through a rough patch or to get drunk one night and make a fool of ourselves; Ellroy does not play.

So, friend Joe, be very careful out there.

" 0

" Cinematographic fast food in its purest form. A bad film of solemnity. When we see it and it

stings hours later when we ask ourselves what dark reasons move us, sometimes it betrays our

fidelity to good movies.

If we have to remember Snakes on the plane for a reason, in the future it will be because of its back room more so than the

film itself. Esfast food cinematogrÃfico in its purest state: a pizza four seasons that we eat in an

infected antrum, but that we devour with gluttony because, apart from being hungry, we are moved bypassions

lower, vices not commented. We all have, in the background, a quasi-masochistic aftertaste for watching trash movies and, along

the way, enjoy their pathos, their accepted rejection of quality. Snakes on the plane is a

bad film of solemnity. When we see it and it stings hours later when we ask ourselves what dark

reasons move us, sometimes it betrays our fidelity to the good cinema, to the cinema that says things and

says them in a pleasant way, with beauty. The backroom to which I refer is his trap, the starting point of his

deceptive guide as it turns out, kind reader of this film page, that nobody has written the gui�� �ny has been

written by everyone. This is, New Line Cinema, fathers of the monster, perpetraton the novel idea of ​​looking for

screenwriter on the Net, to offer bits of the film so that the Internet user, true repository of the

relentless machinery of Hollywood, bring his bread crumb or his entire bar , according to desire, according to

ingenuity. It was the blogs, and not the narrative skill of a guy locked in the attic of his house, those who

created the puzzle of the plot, although he lacks pieces and that are offered rummaging, rusted, eaten

by a lethal rust. If this is the way that the shots will go in the cinema of the future, I turn my

head to the glorious past, which has given my concerns so much pleasure. I return to the classics and those

who, not being so, ooze honesty, desire to invoice a decent product that can entertain (cinema is

many things, but above all it is entertainment). Snakes on the plane will be remembered for its back room (

I insist) and because our Elsa Pataky, blonde bombshell that Garci took advantage of in Ninette, appears in three

releases of the footage in his first raid. USAn USA. The young adrenaline plethora who wants to be thrown into

a Russian mountain of killer snakes in an unusual setting (! An airplane!) See n satisfied their demands. The

others, those who come, young or talluditos with more than a finger and three-quarter head thinking

not to admit that they cheat with such audacity, not go to the room: not squander the euros of sacrifice. If we

subtract the bizarro marketing device that second, Serpents in the aircraft had entered

directly into the shelves of the neighborhood videoclubs, along with Jackie Chan, Steven Seagal and that

muscular band of fifth-category actors who swell their current accounts with overcrowded spectators who

do not ask much for something as serious as cinema. We do not know if the conscious deglutition of aof this

draftdraft will irreparably affect the palate of the teenager who swallows it, without fried potatoes or a half

liter of light coca cola. There is even a snake that sneaks in under the skirts of a sleeping lady who,

dreaming and dreaming, believes that her clitoral fantasies are taken care of. Behold (in this metaphor of the gross) the

true symbol of this thing. I do not know if I forgive Samuel L. Jackson, who dazzled me in Pulp Fiction, who loved me

in Jackie Brown (ay Tarantino, who are in all of them), but the hand it opens alone and the dollars are

falling like man��� from the sky of the ignorant. Until Anaconda, another B series of neighborhood video store, entertained me

more. It will be by Jennifer Lopez.

" 0

" The great stories are hidden in the small acts of some men who discover that they do not like

reality.

True fans of the big screen have long since discovered that European cinema

has a lot to offer and, among all the productions signed in the old continent, German films

demonstrate the maturity of a cinema that is usually far above average productions. Goodbye Lenin, The

Educators or The Life of the Others are some examples of this. The one that today occupies us has obtained multitude of

international prizes (between which it is the one of better European film) and it is not for nothing. The Life of

Others placed us in East Berlin at the beginning of the 1980s, when the police for the security of the

state, the Stasi, maintained to a light control over what they did, they said, and almost to what thethought. The

citizensprotagonists are two men condemned never to meet face to face: on the one hand Georg

Dreyman , a prestigious writer who, pressured and favored by the party, does not finish writing what he

really wants; on the other Gerd Wiesler, one of the best men of the Stasi: meticulous, rigorous and

seemingly devoid of any trait of humanity. But then something happens that breaks the delicate

balance and will cause Dreyman to decide to break his silence, while Wiesler will begin to question his

own convictions. The trio is completed by Christa-Maria Sieland, an actress and a couple of the writer who partly

triggers the change in both. The film also serves as a portrait of what life was like inBerlin was

Eastharassed by the Stasi, which practically investigated any citizen who presented the least

suspicion of carrying out activities considered illegal. From opening the correspondence to listening to

the homes of those under investigation, going through illegal detentions followed by endless interrogations.

The rhythm is thriller, although there are touches of drama and even humor. Both the soundtrack (by

Gabriel Yared) and the photography are exceptional and the interpretations of the protagonists can only be

described as magnificent. Ulrich M���he stands out especially in his role as official of the Stasi, since he is

a character that requires a sober work and that is built through small gestures. In summary, The Life

of the Others is a must see for those who enjoy cinema, as it masterfully presents a

story that mixes different elements and in the end offers a very emotional film that leaves good

sensations in the viewer. Essential.

" 1

" The source of life has several of the most impressive scenes ever seen in a movie.

It would take a whole blog to talk in depth about The Fountain of Life, the new film by the politician

Darren Aronofsky. I have not seen Pi or R���quiem for a dream, but I do not think it's necessary to understand (if that's how

it can be said) the director's third job. And it is not only to understand his work, but to enter it, to

feel it. You could say that you love her or hate her, even if she does not want it to be either a masterpiece or a mess.

The film is neither one thing nor another, but rather, it is an extraordinary story, beautiful in every

way and full of an� ��ctocts and details really thought, of which you can forget more than one. The

source of life is not only a moral, a teaching of life, of its challenges, but also a poetry

made in images. You can see such poetry in almost all the footage, because its rhythm and structure,

repetitive, slow together and precious invoice are assimilated to any poetry of a level that exceeds

acceptable Can you cross out Aronofsky's pedantic film, weird, boring, shameful? Yes, it can be crossed out,

even if it is not, far from it. This is a film, without a doubt, original, strange, formal, repetitive,

beautiful, etc. Maybe it's not right, since as I said before, either you love her or hate her, but thinking about it,

I think, at least I, that this is the proposal m��� s risky year. I do not want totoo much, since this

dwellis a film that has to be seen and enjoyed, and the less you know about it before viewing it, the more youSay

appreciate it., first of all , that the script is good, no more. What stands out here above all is the

direction and originality of Aronofsky, it is clear. It is true that without a film the film would not exist, but it is that

here the aesthetics and the way it is told is what It truly stands out. The fountain of life has several

of the most impressive scenes ever seen in a film, such as Tom las (a huge

Hugh Jackman in the Middle Ages). hallucinating with the wisdom that comes off the tree, absorbing it and approving it

with the intention that does not end. Undoubtedly, this is one of the key scenes, which defines the human being in a very

accurate, spectacular and finally, as it should be, realistic. Secondly, I would highlight the

moment when Izzy (Rachel Weisz) explains everything related to the last chapter of the book to Tommy in the

hospital. This is a film that is sure of itself, that does not want to be pretentious. Its objective is to make people

reach this direct message of "" enjoy the moment "", to speak, in passing, of love, of real love and to

ask ourselves the question of whether there is eternal love. So we have an incredibly deep bet

(��� too much!), Full of wisdom and understanding. Of the interpretations, he would not reproach anything, absolutely

nothing. Hugh Jackman is better than ever, in a tremendously complicated role and difficult to interpret. Although it would

not be wrong to say that Rachel Weisz is even better than him, in a complex, risky andinterpretation

hopeful, that of immortality, which soon vanishes (� ��vaya spolier!). Both interpreters show

an incredibly realistic chemistry, full of nuances and meaning (who would not fall in love with Queen Weisz?).

Another aspect in favor would be the superb music of Clint Mansell, with a main theme that is absolutely heartbreaking

and exciting. This would be the third best interpretation of the work, the music. As a unique inconvenience, it would

add to the lack of sense that some im�� have. Genes, or at least that I do not understand. ���It is possible to know what is

that kind of medal that appears during several sequences! I do not know, will they be paranoid? And perhaps also that it is

too excessive, because at certain moments it seems that your head is going to burst with so much light. But hey,

as you can see, these little notes are really insignificant regarding the immense quality of the

film as a whole. A wonderful film, deep until it can not be more, beautiful, exciting,

complex, incredibly developed and with a couple of interpretations that deserve a strong applause, as well

as the direction of Mr. Aronofsky, which will have ��� Pending throughout my eternal life. ���R���quiem for a

dream!

" 1

" 300 is a work 100% entertainment, 100% static quality, 100% rhythm and, in short, a well

told story that will not make you think too much, but that will have the viewer completely hypnotized for two hours.

Sometimes one is reluctant to believe that more than a million people can be right. Time shows

that box office figures do not usually speak of the quality of the product and, in a way, the demanding viewer

(others will call him proud, erudite, arrogant, cultured, alternative, arrogant, or none of these, or all at the same

time) tends to relate taquillazo con pastelazo. However, these terms do not have to be synonymous with

force. It is the case of 300. While it is true that I thought it was a very good movie, I must also clarify

that I stand out from those who see here before and after. in the cinema, or of those who consider that 300 is

a total, perfect, sublime film. Maybe as a product of entertainment is a 10, but if the cinema is

something more than that, and I want to think that yes, it does not happen of remarkable film. The history, or the history of the story, they

already know it. 300 recreates in his own way the battle of the Term���pilas, imitating the homonymous c���mic of Frank Miller,

who in turn was inspired by the 1961 film " "The 300 espartans" "(translated as" "The lion of Sparta" "). The

historical facts in itself were collected by Her���doto de Halicarnaso (484aC-425dC) in his work "" Historiae "" or "" The

nine history books "", where they are narrated with more fidelity ���sta and the other battles that the Greeks

maintained with the Barbarian peoples (especially against the Persians in the Medical Wars). His story has been

the source of primary information for some and others. Despite this, no one expects to see a historical

film. It is more, that no one leaves the cinema thinking that he already knows a little more the Spartans and the Persians

(well, if the Spartan o pensabar thought of a liberator of slaves, and o� Perr Persian only a cat

with a lot of hair, so maybe I know, may have learned something). Frank Miller has never denied that what

attracted him to all this was the essence. Actually, neither the Spartans were 300, nor were they fighting naked, nor were the

Ten Thousand Immortals dressed up for Halloween, nor was Efialtes a deformed hunchback, nor a long etc.is to

Thatsay, the work is not a faithful chronicle of what happened in that gorge, but in favor of the authors I must

point out that they have never tried to sell it like that. It is wrong who uses these arguments to

discredit it. Now, a film must stand on its own. If you need to read a dozen

interviews with the director, a lot of criticism of what's wrong, and look at all the dvd's extras to make it

look perfect, it means something is wrong. I do not care if 300 lie more or less, but I miss some

context, some subplot with force, something more than swords left and right. The film captivates for

its aesthetics, for its photography, for its frenetic rhythm. but after a few days (the smart ones probably did not

need more than a few minutes) one realizes that it does not leave as much trace as it might seem. Do not

remember with special fondness any character (not even any of the actors and actresses who

embodied them), will not highlight the argument in any conversation (300 hold the efforts of a million people tounderlying

defend their people), I am not particularly enthusiastic about thetheme (the defense of freedom at all costs,

a patriotic roll very much to the American taste) and, finally, , I can never consider that 300 is a work as

perfect as some pretend. That's it, the good thing that nobody takes it away. 300 is a work 100% entertainment,

100% aesthetic quality, 100% rhythm and, in short, a well told story that will not make you think too much, but

that will have the viewer completely hypnotized for two hours. One of the best epic movies of

all time.

" 1

" Cinema, solid and at the same time emotive about theThe imagination is not impartial; on the contrary, he exercises his chosen choices with rigid dictatorship,

granting us pleasure or displeasure without asking permission or even mediating the common sense in his blessings. For

that reason, our personal memory in the matter of cinema feeds on a leafy and varied list of films that

do not always coincide with what our reason dictates to us as interesting, suggestive, and much less as a work

teacher. For this reason, the cinema travels with us, assembling the frames in a non-transferable way for each one,

as the moments that build our biography are mounted one after another. When I was a cr ,, I

oattended He enthusiastically and expectantly planned the cinema matins that were then offered in the neighborhood every

Saturday. First, the ritual of supply; could not miss the popcorn and some other sugary concoction

with which to anesthetize the nerves of the premiere (or increase them, who knows). However, to our

ignorance, almost all those films were classic from thirty to fifty. If

ever there was one of fear or catastrophes from then (they ran the seventies years). And almost all in

rigorous black and white, which was the color of the cinema that we used to see. Among those wonderful movies I

remember one in particular. In it, a smiling and proud Errol Flynn? Stuffed in afrog

Peter Pansuit- dared to face the bad guys with arrogance and irony, while passing from

street to chati of his adversary, an Olivia de Havilland, papier and blandengue, which I suppose would resemble

my pretty mam por at that time, but in a medieval plan. It was, of course, the mythical Robin of the Woods, by Michael

Curtiz (1938). But it is in the final scene of the duel to death - stairs up, down stairs - where my nails

could transform at times into a sad woman. All the children in the room were waiting for that duel that

we knew would arrive and what would be the result. Robin of Locksey, one; evil usurper of thrones, zero. In

Robin of the forests everything is optimism and vitality. Even the bad guys seem to smile (to plot their

misdeeds, of course), and the swords go through only those who must hurt. For a child, thatuniverse

Manichaeanwas a simple and precise narrative with which he went home happy to know what he was - that is

obvious - always on the side of justice and chati protagonist, and that he would fight (like frog Flynn)

against all those who dared to usurp thrones or steal princesses that do not correspond to them. Even

Don Quixote would be eclipsed by the adventurous adrenaline rush that condensed my neurons as he

left that dark cinema room. Over the years, he stumbled over a few tricks. The overestimated

experience, and some other film of adventure, Robin of the forests remained in my memory as are

those flowers that one keeps and forgets in books. When I saw her again (three, five, I do not remember how many more),

my rise became a commiserated adult smile, half tender, half asshole. And until now. I suppose

that with old age one recovers that capacity to return to be enthusiastic about the simple and pilgrim, and to dream that it

rises with the eagle and rough outlaw Robin those steep stairs from which to finish with the evil one of turn.

Until then, it is the bad guys who beat most of the time this naive spectator who writes to you. For

this same reason, a few years ago I discovered a gem that reflects faithfully the path we each travel

with the films that are posing at the bottom of the memory. This is the not-so-well-known Robin and Marian, by

Richard Lester (1976). Faced with the jovial and typical character of the version of Curtiz, this second one adjusts more to

what today usually is denominated like crepuscular, but maintaining an exquisite romanticism (moved away from the

arrogance of the mountebank character played by the nervous Errol Flynn). The plot places us many years

after Robin ended the injustices that threatened England and restored the legitimate throne of

Ricardo, Coraz���n de Le�� .N Robin is serving his king, who already has little heart and a lot ofcacique

insatiable. The castles are no longer impeccable, the war never ends and all the knights are tired

of serving their lord. Luckily (who knows) Ricardo dies and Robin returns to his land, after twenty years of

absence. Everything is very different. There is nothing left of the past five years, but there is still a bad guy (the Sheriff

of Nothingham) who rules the land of Locksey. Marion, for her part, has gotten herself into a

nun, which is what a woman had left at that time if she did not want to marry (and Marion already knows that she only

had eyes for her Robin). A grizzled and tired Sean Connery observes what has been left and will look for his

beloved Marion (an aged but splendid Audrey Hepburn), already installed in the monastic life. But the

tragedy will be again the one that unites both characters in a common company that will make them live again (even

more intensely, despite the fatigue and the reluctance) the happy years. The Sheriff of Nothingham, played by

Robert Shaw, wants to kick the clergy out of England, and there the mature Hepburn is an abbess. We can

imagine the rest. Robin and Marian escape back to Sherwood, where they meet a group of renegades of the

sheriff's dictatorial policy and try without much resolution to undermine their power. But as nothing is the same as

in Errol Flynn times and, nevertheless, life goes on as usual -assorts for the honest and prosperous for the

undesirable-, it is to be expected that the happyends no longer have a place in this film. That's it, they'll always be

Sherwood, that dream forest where lovers throw an arrow that will take them there from never left. There are

few bitter endings and yet as beautiful as Robin and Marian. If you have not seen the

movie, do not click on the link in the video and make yourself a DVD right now. It deserves the attempt.declaration

Hepburn'sof love to Connery is of an intensity that moves and leaves words speechless. And is that beyond the color

and brightness of the version of Curtiz, Robin and Marian is an example? As it already was No loss

regarding the western- of deconstruction An adult of a gender (the adventure) that needed this vision

mature and no more decorated than the real ones, those that life imposes on us with implacable ferocity, and that only from

beauty and love we exorcise and overcome.Lester? known more well by two films of the Beatles and

Superman II and III- embroiders the best film of his career, without falling into sentimentality or repetitions to the use of

this hackneyed myth of the brave outlaw and the desposable princess. And it gives us a solid and at the same time

emotive cinema about the immortality of illusions through the history of these two tanned lovers.

" 1

" Typical up to say enough. Based on real events is a subgenre in itself, and what happens in this Japanese production narrates,

between the drama simp��� and the comedy that wants to touch the sensitive fiber of the spectator, the initiative in a

mining town, Iwaki, that in 1965, and before the coal crisis by the substitution of oil, decided recycle a

large part of their jobs creating a Hawaiian theme park as a tourist attraction. An unusual idea

for the time, which needed, as a first step, the collaboration of the girls of the place to learn to

dance the traditional, and turistic, Hawaiian dance hula. Some young people who will start their own Full monty

attired with those exotic and daring costumes that even show the belly button! The work will also

become a personal struggle to try to get out of the mediocre destiny that awaits them, and logically a way

to surpass themselves as people. Among other battles, they must deal withmentalities

conservative and traditional, especially between parents and daughters, which will cause many arguments, including

physical aggression. But against all the adversities, and the initial logical setbacks of the incipient

dancers, nothing will stop the progress. The young Japanese director, of Korean origin, Lee Sang-il, has in his

hands a material with abundant ingredients to please the public easily; and in fact, in Japan it has been

an overwhelming success. Hula girls also has a clear will to try to conquer themarket

international. So much that in his treatment and staging seems more a western film than not

Asian. If we change their interpreters for other Europeans or North Americans, we will be left without any

distinctive feature of their nationality. And it is not that one would expect to find the spirit of Ozu in his story or

images, but he also did not expect to check the whole manula of typical situations for the occasion as itfalls

repeatedlyin the easiest, sweetened and predictable. A whole collection of topics, both in the characters

and situations, or unnecessarily lengthening the supposedly more melodramatic and important scenes. Perhaps the only

thing that stands out is the dance that Professor Hirayama (Yasuko Matsuyuki, almost a kind of

Professor Keating, in female version, leaving from the club of the dead poets), sticks to her first pupils who

contemplate it, through a window, with admiration.

" 0

" Smoke film, fake prestidigitaciÃ ³ n, cold fabulaciÃ���n, everything that should not be the good movies of

magicians.

To the thread of the illusionist, complementing it without treading it, occupying both different zones of a sameangle

narrative, The final trick (The prestige) is consolidated in the billboard as an interesting title, worthy, of a

sober manufacture and an absolutely splendid establishment (Christian Bale, Hugh Jackman, Michael Caine,

Scarlett Johansson). Directed by Christopher Nolan, who delivered the lavish and convoluted Memento, thethriller

insomnia(with some very restrained and surprising Al Pacino and Robin Williams, incontention papers

proverbialbeing who they are) and this last installment of Batman, far from the cliché of Hollywood politics

and hers, with fortune, to the cleverest study of the characters and a conscious distancing of theforms

cl�Physics of the superheroes to reinvent (he did, I do not doubt) the genre. Well, given all

this, The final trick (The prestige) should have been a film, at least, a film with wicks of

quality, entertaining, with enough references for the cin���filo demanding and with all the commercial shrapnel

for the passive film consumer, less devoted to search under the stones the scorpions of

genius. That hope fades shortly after advancing the footage that am� �� I felt confused, confused,

lacking a hook, maybe cold. It comes to pass with this magic tricks that once you have seen the

"" prestige "", as they say on the tape, nothing is already relevant. And Nolan does lavish tricks, he creates a vigorous

staging that is not without bright elements (there is a gothic tone, an almost unhealthy aftertaste to dive

into the most evil roots of revenge ), but that falls (with estrÃpito, I would say) in the final section: when

the hidden cards are turned upside down and we attend to the rationalization of the fantasy. Bale and Jackman are far

below what we expect. Caine meets. Scarlett Johannson does not just find the final role and

languishes as assistant-lover of the two magicians in a strange role, which does not just produce empathy in the

viewer. Magic and science never marry : they repel Everything that fascinates and dazzles by magic

brings after disappointment and disenchantment in the rational. Going into more detail would be to reveal thetwists

plotthat make it bearable (let's say simply bearable) the (excessive) footage. Or what happens (I do

not know) is that my devices have been today a level below the usual,

let alone say that it is much, and everything that Nolan tells and how he tells it has been left half me. Without making

effervescence in my brain. Without awakening my intelligence. ��� And you need to be very smart to see a

movie like this? I think no, honestly. Intelligence, the just one. Only one being awake, one wanting to catch

the details, one not abandoning the plot because there are, in excess, traps, tricks, how not, that later become

simplez of little ingenuity, tricks of a scriptwriter that the big issue has come to him too much and then, in the

end, the trick has not been able to close it as the magic cords command, without us seeing the root, the seed,

the secret. Bowie appears makes everything have a plus of morbid: one can not avoid (I, at least, could not,

fascinated by seeing the Grand Duke White, the absolute genius of music, the chameleon ��tico of the avant-garde

rock of the last three decades) feel a tingling in the mouth of the stomach so that when I finish the film I

grabbed my shelves of cd's yo��� (del tir���n) Ziggy Stardust and the Spiders of Mars .. and oh my god, ah��� I

thanked Nolan, the magic, the cinema that there is m� � Music and that behind all perhaps the film

has only served to remind me that there are perfect discs, sleeping the dream of waiting until the hand

c� ��amplice removes them from their sheath and introduces them, greedy, delightful, sinfully into the player's tray,

grabs the potentiometer of the amplifier, watches that the family is not too close and lets the

decibels ( I will say now that for a while overwhelming) flood the air, perfume the night, leave in my

memory joy and joy, love and also reconciliation with the world and its barbarities. ��� I have written movies or have I

written about Bowie? Well I have it very clear.

" 0

" Bardem or the psychic hitman of the Coens. No country for old men, or as they have translated it here, It is not a

country for old people, it will become one of the films that should not be missed from the Spanish billboard Deola

2008.

Dir: Joel and Ethan CoenInt: Tommy Lee Jones, Javier Bardem, Josh Brolin, Woody Harrelson, Kelly Macdonald

Violence breeds violence and no matter where you try to hide, the weight of your actions I will always come back

to give you a kick in the ass. This could synthesize the argument from the last film of thebrothers

Coen. After being found by chance with the remains of a shooting, an average American (Josh Brolin), of those

who live in a caravan in the country of stars and stripes, finds a suitcase full of money and decides to

appropriate it. But as no action is unpunished, they discover and send a psychic hit man (Javier

Bardem) to hunt him down. From the first frame we discovered cinema in its purest form and a story, written by

the directors themselves, who are catching you more and more. It's not what they tell, it's a story that youprobably

'veseen more than once, but how they tell it. A reflexive look at revenge, at violence, through a

slow pace, reflective and exciting at the same time. In addition to their good work from the point of view of

realization, the Coen brothers possess genuine talent for the direction of actors and achieve impeccable

performances that without a doubt will reap many awards (not in vain Javier Bardem is nominated for

the Golden Globe for this role). The Coen brothers discover a more visceral Bardem than usual and

highlight that this actor has many nuances, because in his role we discovered a dark andbackground

smellythat we had not seen on screen. After a mask of expressionlessness, it is Bardem's eyes

that tell us about the character. With a great expressive economy, Bardem composes one of the most memorable roles,

which undoubtedly will play a role in the history of cinema. It is not the only one that He is superb in his

interpretation. All manage to compose credible characters through expressive moderation. I would also like to highlight

the performance of Tommy Lee Jones in the role of police and voice of experience, which brings to the

viewer the narration of the story from another point of view. The photograph of ocher, red and brown tones

by Roger Deakins (director of the Coen's usual photo) and the music of Carter Burwell (anotherusual ones

of the Coens') they adjust as a ring to the finger to this story, becoming perfect tools to endow

it with greater echoes of verismo and profundity. No country for old men, or as they have translated it here, It is not

a Paras for old people, it will become one of the films that should not be missed from the Spanish billboard of

2008.

" 1

" The misuse of the times in the narration n, asas unnecessary and heavy aportacin information,

it becomes a quasi-interesting biography in aut ntico folletn.

Many of the errors that we see today in movies have a common denominator: the false assumption

that good content is enough, forgetting something that can even be more interesting: a caring and

attractive continent. Because I know if I can choose between a smart man and another who besides being intelligent

has the look of Eric Bana, so that we're going to cheat, it's going to be that he left me with the second.Bromas

aside, when a spectator goes to the cinema he not only wants a story to be attractive forreason,

whateverbut also wants to know how to tell (do not forget that even the best joke can be spoiled

by a dull pattin). All this prologue comes to the case to talk about the movie "" Catch the fire "", which

tells us the hardships that any person can suffer in a dictatorial state, in this case, It's about

a humble black worker during apartheid. Patrick Chamusso, our protagonist, is not the result of

fiction, but the film is based on the real life of this South African who became a hero

after his entry into the African National Congress (then resistance movement, nowparty

political). Up to here, the thing might seem interesting, however, the misuse of the times in the

narrative n, as well as the contribution of unnecessary and heavy information, converts a quasi-interesting

biography into an authentic leaflet with a certain aftertaste .N For starters, there is too much material in which we were

taught that Patrick was a beautiful person, with half of the images he would have believed me. So much of

images of tortures to spare and in which we are not informed of the time he was imprisoned (one day, one week,

one month?) On the contrary, we will hardly have material on the Patrick's entry into the CNA (and this is not an

aspect to summarize in some military tune). In short, too much melodramatic accent and little

order in the narrative structure. And for the record, I have not talked about the photographs of the final credits

(the actor and the real character united in a hug? No comments). Regarding the actors, the

appearance of n one of the enlightened of this century (and see that there are a few: Bono, Susan Sarandon, Angelina

Jolie, Pilar Bardem, Joaquin Sabina). We speak of the thinking good Tim Robbins, a character who has made history

in the last celebration of the International Solidarity Film Festival of Madrid with phrases as profound as

"" My intention was to support the festival, not to go photos with right politicians. I feel like I've been used. "

With atrocities like this, there are too many words. By the way, Mr. Robbins when he comes to my country to talk about policy

matters should be documented a little more, especially if he is going to talk about such a sensitive issue like

terrorism. Anyway, how do I love these self-described illuminators of the left who clean their ass

with tissue paper!

" 0

" The Fantastic 4 and Silver Surfer is nothing more than another clear example of the unfortunate state in which theis located

Hollywood action and fantastic cinema.

One of the basic laws of physics is that each action corresponds to a reaction of the same magnitude.

This law can be applied to a good part of the activities of the human being, although in many occasions the

reactions are usually disproportionate. The cinema was not going to be less, and the reaction to a success at the box office is to

make a continuation of it to perpetuate the good streak. And therefore, here we get the sequel to Los 4

Fant���sticos, worthy movie of s���per h���roes whose sole purpose was to entertain the viewer without incurring

too many mistakes. Facts that would otherwise be the norm in action films today are authentic

virtues difficult to find. The story of this new release continues at the time theone

previousOued,with the heroes turned into mediticas star beans are earned through the

promotion And advertising, like any David Beckham. Everything is prepared for the wedding of the century between Ree

Richards (Ioan Gruffud) and Susan Storm (Jessica Alba) in a ceremony that will leave in mere village pachanga and

palette to the scientific link Cruise-Holmes. However, the idyllic panorama is disrupted by the appearance

of a new and strange villain who is dedicated to boring the planet (and no, it is not the mayor of Madrid on board

the Tizona). To all this we must unite Hollywood's appalling fashion to introduce dramatic elements in

action films. The gui���n, despite the efforts to achieve it, does not have the minimum depth. In front of

such a script, one does not know what to do, if you take it easy and laugh joyfully at its expense, or cry

bitterly for such unpunished torture. Some of the di���logos of the film are really pat���ticos, although it is no

less embarrassing the null interpretative capacity of Ioan Gruffud and Jessica Alba, that will remain in cute girl

for the rest, or until the surgery and the botox allow it. The only pleasant surprise that awaits the

viewer is the funny cameo by Stan Lee. The Fantastic 4 and Silver Surfer is nothing more than another clear example

of the unfortunate state of the cinema. of action and fantastic Hollywood. What was entertaining and

dignified in the first film has become boring and embarrassing in the sequel.

" 0

" A story that does not recover the magic of the original, but that does not stop being a tolerable continuation.

Twelve years later, the Ganesa return. Dante Hicks (Brian O? Halloran) and Randal Graves (Jeff Anderson)

return to stand behind a counter to do what they like best, malvivir their work-trash,

lounging and having witty conversations (or at least pretend) about inconsequential and

preferably offensive issues. To the original campus (replacing the original store with a hamburger) do

Elias (Trevor Fehrman) join? an ultracatlic freak fan of the transformers? and the two girls inlife

Dante's: his girlfriend Emma (Jennifer Schwalbach, wife of the director) with whom he is about to marry and whose

parents intend to settle their lives in Florida, and Becky (Rosario Dawson), the local manager with which he

maintained an adventure. And how can it be otherwise if this is a product Kevin Smith, there swarm Jay

and Bob the Silent (Jason Mewes and Smith himself), icons of Generation X or jokes very worn as they

fall to each one.Curious decision Smith to go back to where everything started. Clerks was antriumph

unprecedentedof independent filmmaking and catapulted Smith to fame, but the director of New Jersey has not

since succeeded in connecting with the audience that encumbr��� him. Except for the products directed

only to the unconditional ones of Jay and Bob, his last films (Chasing Amy and Jersey Girl) were

sounded bumps. We do not know if it's success or age that has lost Kevin Smith, but the key to Clerks

was in his irony, bad temper and the bittersweet look on his generation. Since then, Smith seems to haveSmith

kept the bad baba only for his critics and demonstrates the need to introduce sentimental plots

that do not quite fit and that leave one perplexed.knows that his hooligan side is what what makesspecial

his cinema. In Clerks 2 has tried to overcome the original but as it has not managed to create moresituations

fun, these are simply more beasts. Frankly, one understands that before the tone of the dialogues a

spectator is tempted to get up and leave (without justifying the critic who starred in the famous scene). In

Clerks, a person inadvertently had sexual intercourse with a corpse. In Clerks 2, one person

willingly has considerable sexual intercourse with a donkey, while another masturbates while

Jesus asks for forgiveness. From the prank we have gone to the fat brush, which will not be a dish of taste for

everyone. That is why the sentimental plot of the film is even more incongruous. Not only is it conventional: it

is even ���o���a. It is the triumph of love, family and friendship, the need to believe in oneself without being

conditioned by conventions. An authentic Disney ending, replacing the fairy godmothers by Jay and

Bob in an intractable plot twist. Because that is what we intuited with Mallrats and that here isconfirmed

definitely: Smith is Disney with swear words. We could dare to say that Clerks 2 is a

family movie in front of images like Dante's drooling before a toothless little girl who greets him (again,own

Smith'sdaughter ), although I find it difficult to keep the ears of the children covered during the other half of the film,

in which the virtues of a practice are discussed Sexuality consists in consecutively alternating sodomy

with oral sex. Smith is the Shyamalan of comedy. A director who does not simply have his own style,

but who identifies himself on aberrant levels with his own films and encloses them in his personal universe,becoming

from which he does not seem capable ofindependent. Smith clings to his actors and his subjects as fetishes, and from there

come the successes and failures of the films. As successes, we will emphasize that, when it is not exceeded,humor

Smith'sreaches genius quotas, although within his meta-freak genre. The generational confrontation between

fans of Star Wars and Lord of the Rings is hilarious, but one has the feeling that their

place would be outside the cinema, not on screen. However, the main failure is the inability to take the

film beyond the anecdote. The love triangle is particularly disastrous. I think it's wonderful that

Smith considers his wife to be "the girl we all want in high school", but the reality is one and he does not

forgive. His bomb paper simply does not strain. Dawson, on the other hand, seems to have two unique records:

sexual bomb or freak girl, according to the camera privilege his succulent anatomy or his unattractive mandábula (other

Trick is usually fixed if you put glasses or not). His romance with Dante seems completely forced, by manylooks

lambthat he puts (it also does not help that one thinks of the shark music every time Dawson

smiles) and his conversion from nihilistic to believing in love has the credibility of a Saneuro

Marino. The rest of the actors do the only role they have ever done (I do not exaggerate, read their cards: most of them

only work for Smith or Smiths) in a story that does not recover the magic of the original, but that does not stop

being a tolerable continuation.

" 0

" The term thriller falls short when it comes to framing this film that recovers the best of the genre film

noir, which is approached from a new approach.

The first film by the director of Georgian origin, although based in France, G���la Babluani is a

shocking and brilliant story full of rawness and tension that make this filmmaker a firm promise of

the � Last times Filmed in black and white, with the characteristic visual stylization of the best black cinema,

to which it adds a certain "" dirt "" in the image that makes it win in realism, 13 Tzameti poco little by little introduces us,

with a formal expressionist touch, in a more and more smothering, suffocating, corrupted and degraded environment,

populated by "vampire characters who feed on the blood of others". As in any film noir movie, the

crime is the core of the whole plot? Skinny favor the viewer makes the film trailer to

gut it - to which the director approaches gradually getting to create each Once more expectation.

Babluani shows us how his protagonist / antih���roe (played by George Babluani, brother of the director)

approaches him, the knot of the argument, or rather he gets involved in it, voluntarily and

involuntarily at the same time. Arriving at a point where there is no possible return on something that started almost

as a simple game, by following the instructions of a letter addressed to another person. The spectator with the

ability to empathize with the protagonist can end up accumulating high degrees of tension and nervousness

clinging to the chair, imbued with an atmosphere of increasing claustrophobia as the guide advances. The characters are

minimally profiled in the objective and material issues of their lives. Little do we know about their

motivations. However, they are deeply analyzed in their psychology and they embody perfection (perhaps

because of that biographical minimalism) the sensation of absolute solitude, lack of communication , uprooting and helplessness.

Characters who commit the most despicable acts, without posing any moral question. It is that, after all

, what impacts us. The perversion of a human being completely dehumanized. The final result is a

shocking metaphor of the absence of morals and conscience that can come to reign in human nature.

In this way, the film becomes an ���rida and raw criticism of the morality of society, without any kind of

concession, the hope of trust in goodness or reason. ��n of man. Without mercy, without embellishments, 13 Tzametius

showsthe worst of what the human being is capable of, in his desire not so much for money, but also for

extreme sensations that escape normality and that come close to the most sinister morbidity. The trick is

that everything is possible and credible. Is man a wolf for man? Bablauni responds

affirmatively to the question with this film. Pure pessimistic fatalism brought to the screen with mastery.

" 1

" Long ago I wanted to fall in love with a fictional character and thanks to El Illusionista (2006), yesterday I

passed. My illusionist ...

Long ago I wanted to fall in love with a fictional character and thanks to El Illusionista (2006), yesterday I

passed. I mean, I always stop falling in love with fictional characters, the last one was the new-old James Bond,

who was re-hot, but with him, it was that kind of crush for a crash and flee by name, as usual. On the other

hand, this time it is a kind of love "" I want to have all your children "". Yesterday the character of Edward

Norton, the magician Eisenheim, really hypnotized me. And Edward Norton is not handsome, nooo, but he's too

attractive, I've always thought about it, he has a mixture of good masculine with intelligent good, the maximum. And in The

Illusionist is more attractive than ever. Even though this film came out almost simultaneously with another very

good film of magicians (The Great Trick), do not look alike. This story is narrated by Inspector Uhl

played by Paul Giamatti who already showed us his acting quality in another film recommended

by EBC, American Splendor. Uhl works under the direct orders of the future emperor of Vienna, the damned

prince Leopold who has a very good characterization of Rufus Sewell, one gets to hate him. The rivalry

between Eisenheim and Leopold is because the prince is engaged to Countess Sophie (Jessica Biel), the

childhood love of Eisenheim, then simply Edward. He was the son of a capinter, for which they had to

be seen secretly throughout his childhood and adolescence, until they were definitively separated by

her family. Then Edward decides to know the world and its magic and part of Vienna, returning 15 years

later become a great illusionist. Eisenheim's show becomes so famous that one night the pr ���ncipe

and his little sister attend to see him and when the magician asks for a volunteer "" without fear of death "" the prince stands

up, more willingly " to "" bravely "" to his girlfriend, the countess. It is just on stage that Edward and Sophie

recognize each other. But the rivalry between Eisenheim and Leopold goes beyond Sophie. The people hate and fear the abusive

Leopold, while he loves Eisenheim, because they truly believe that all their illusions are true magic. At

this point where Sophie and Edward have met and love has been reborn, they must To see how to escape

successfully, this time together. And stop counting to avoid bigger spoilers. V���anla yourselves, it's worth it. And

very careful to fall in love! Data: -The film is based on the short story "" Eisenheim, the illusionist "of

the American writer Steven Millhauser.-The story is fiction However, the character of Prince Leopold

was inspired by the true prince of Vienna, Rudolph, son of Emperor Franz Joseph I.-The character

of Eisenheim was based on the magician Erik Jan Hanussen, who was famous in Vienna at the beginning of the 20th century. Muri���

assassinated by the Nazis in 1933.

" 1

" In spite of everything, a very estimable film of fantasy and adventure, which stands out well above the

current mediocrity prevailing in this type of movie theater. But even so, it is too lukewarm to be the story of

an orphan wizard who confronts his parents' executioner.

With this movie begins a long saga of fantasy and adventures inspired by another popular���sima saga of

books. Chris Columbus handles this presentation and first immersion in a universe of fantasy

that comes to be a review of the classic icons of the fantastic: magicians, goblins and gnomes, dragons,

trolls, spells and hidden treasures. The children are the protagonists both in the work and in the enjoyment of

it, because in this first adventure the anecdotic and a sense of humor that goes from the

esperp���ntico in their first minutes at the most inane in the later development, to the detriment of the

dramatic possibilities of the story, a sentimental vein that remains personified in a superficial way

in the enso���ations of the boy protagonist, the orphan who looks for his parents while discovering

his skills as a magician and the dark ins and outs of his past and the evil depicted in Voldemort.

Designed exclusively to amuse children, the movie �cula undoubtedly works quite well and uses the magic and the

magician as a suggestive and stimulating appeal for the imagination of the children: a magic wand, a magician's hat ,

a flying broom, the dream that, in his time, we all had or when we were children. From this point of

view, the film is delicious, a world of magic and mystery that vibrates and unfolds in a setting of

gothic aromas, reformulation of the "" other world "" - as they are the world of Oz or of Never Jam���s - in this case

represented in the castle of Hogwarts, there where the charming and the sinister coexist.Adem���s of that, the

film emphasizes all in the plastic resources; excellent artistic design and special effects to the

height of what is required. Magnificent soundtrack by John Williams. The characterization of characters also

conforms to what is stipulated in a specific area such as magicians and magic, but in truth they end up being

too stereotyped and the film is missing an evil character with charisma, since Voldemort is no more than

a too decaffeinated puppet, with clear reminiscences to Darth Sidius or other representatives of the evil

seen a thousand times in film and television. There are other interesting things, such as the ambiguous and enigmatic personality

of Professor Snape or the histrionic caricature of the "earthly" family of the Potter child, but none of

them it finishes coagulating because of the dilution of the narrative, as we will now explain. The same ballast as always: the

mistake of trying to compress the novel into excessive and / or wasted footage, all to please the

fans of the book. And it has already been said that cinema and literature are not the same, and that when we are inspired by a book,

the first thing that must be taken into account is that the film must be built on an idea of ​​vertebration and

structure. Cinematon cinematic, and if it is necessary to delete characters and specific passages, it is necessary to

do it without fuss, all to reinforce the essential aspects and that can be developed in 140

minutes or in two few hours. Thus, the narrative does not finish with any of its elements because it was

intended to present too many characters and too much emphasis is placed on scenes or passages very dispensable.

The speech and the script should have reinforced the relationship between Harry and the memory of his parents (very beautiful

the scene of the mirror, great lyrical and sensitive moment between a sea of ​​inanity), the enigma of Snape and the stone and

the fight against Voldemort. Those were the three great themes that are diluted without finding the due forcefulness

in development and depth. In the last instance, the narrative is lost in frills andanecdotes. In

insubstantialspite of everything, a very estimable film of fantasy and adventure, which highlights

above the current prevailing mediocrity in this type of film. But even so, it is too lukewarm to be

the story of an orphan wizard who confronts his parents' executioner. Perhaps it has to be understood as a

project that, consciously and intentionally, does not want to finish up for the benefit ofinstallments.

subsequent

" 0

" Rodr���guez will charm all movie lovers by series byz but it will leave thesomewhat disconcerted

ones closest to the current cinema, and will be hated by a large majority of more commercial viewers.

Robert Rodr���guez is a director that I like very much, but in "" Planet Terror "" he suffers from doing what he

wants, paying tribute to all the films of series b and z with which he has grown, andcourse, or one is very fan or the

Ofnew proposal of the director of "" Sin City "" becomes quite insipid and at times boring. And I say this, because

what fails is the story. Zombies, pretty girls, military, Southern guys, touch Carpenter, Bruce Willis,

Rose McCowan. they are enough elements to make any film attractive, but if the plot is as

simple as this, the result is something that does not satisfy you. Without a doubt, the best thing of all is the

fake trailer (not so fake in these moments) of "" Machete "", which is the only one that has survived the massacre that they

have made by separating the two films that make up "" Grindhouse "", and that included a lot of fake

trailers in the intermission of both films. "" Planet Terror "" has fun moments and clearly stand out

as the "" ellipsis "" that leaves us without knowing what El Wray's past is, and why ��� of his skill with

weapons. He also has the courage to rescue and count on mythical actors like Josh Brolin ("" Thrashin "", "" The

Goonies "") or Michael Parks among others, but even so, this It does not seem enough to me to compare this work

with some of its previous proposals. In short, Rodr���guez will dazzle all movie lovers

byz series but leave somewhat bewildered to those closest to the current cinema, and be hated by a

broad most of the most commercial viewers.

" 0

" Jodie Foster has us accustomed lately to clunkers and this film goes on to complete its list of

trash-movies, whose scripts we accept the actors when there is nothing better to do and the end of the month

it drowns us

This is one of those movies that I had been waiting to see and I wish I had not seen her because her

viewing has turned out to be an absolute torpor without limits.Jodie Foster is accustomed lately to the clunkers

and this film goes on to complete its list of garbage-films, whose scripts we accept the actors when there

is nothing better to do and the end of the month drowns us. The gui� Almost non-existent, it overwhelms us with a whole series

of incongruities and stupidities worthy of a Z-series film. The film is totally absurd, boring to the point of

madness with a stinky cast, come on, not even the soundtrack , I mean, NOTHING, a real pretentious garbage and

without meaning. It is incredible that a girl gets lost in an airplane but less cre���ble a�� It is the development of

events. In what did the scriptwriters think for the love of God? Said, nothing recommendable.

" 0

" Excellent film by Pedro Almod���var, with in-cre-���-bles characters, hilarious,performances

wonderful, a setting that falls from kistch and a series of adventures apt to burst with laughter.

Excellent film by Pedro Almod���var, with in-cre-���-bles characters, hilarious, wonderful performances,

a setting that falls from kistch and a series of incidents suitable to explode of laughter. But in addition, the

film, starring Carmen Maura of 10, investigates, as always or almost always, certain features of the

feminine constitution that, if in other movies ��culas is very psychoanalytic and in some point sexist, as she

defines almost categorically what it is to be a woman, and the woman is almost a clown (always with good intentions, of course,

but that is not an excuse ), in this film the investigation is of a rather sociological order and there is no search of what it

is to be a woman but of what she did the society (ergo the patriarchal order, ergo the man) of her. The answer,

in a final that falls of perfect. Her husband was killed - albeit accidentally - by his youngest son who was sold to a

pedophile dentist to buy a hair straightener, the pet lizard was killed by a policeman and his

eldest son to go with his grandmother (her mother-in-law) to the latter's hometown. The house is alone.

Finally, she is no longer a wife, mother or housewife. He is going to pull the balcony.But then hisson arrives

youngest(he realizes he is too young to settle down with the dentist Note: the baby is about 11

years old) and saves her . Maura no longer falls on the balcony because she has someone to hold her. She becomes a mother again. The woman

defines herself, in what I have done ?, through negativity. To be a woman is to be a mother, daughter-in-law (not even a daughter, which is something

too personal), a housewife, a maid inhouse, a wife (if we look at the other characters we add:

someone else'seither a bitch or a bad single mother). var exposes the impossibility of the woman to be constituted as such: it is a pure

external determination.

" 1

" ���Transformers? it's just a special effects circus and it does not meet a few minimum attributes so it can

be a smart commercial product.

Often the usual debate arises: the problem of putting special effects and noise before the history

and configuration of characters in a suitable dramatic climate. And yet, when it comes to films

designed exclusively to entertain in the summer months, it is not so important that the narrative is

well structured as the story itself. It is interesting, novel, intelligent. Does therealize

readerhow complicated it is to make a good movie? When the structure does not fail, the story fails,

when the story is good, the structure fails. Transformers? It's just a special effects circus and itnot

doesmeet a few minimum attributes so it can be an intelligent commercial product. The story: nothing at

all. Bad robots, good robots. In the end they win. Good ones (ha-ha-ha). But in addition, they are good because I know,

because neither the design nor the characterization of the aliens of either side indicate any antithesis. See

what the Optimus character is reduced to: ���hola, I am a good robot and I come to help you if you help me, because

humanity deserves to be saved ?. And megatr���n, yuck, is the reostia: ��� I am megatr���ny and I am bad, humans

are worms.?. It is of authentic shame. For the story to have a soul, or what we can also define

as "dramatic force", the characters must occupy a space, that dramatic weight that we demand in a

plot deployment. But the happy robots are not history, story, or argument: they are agossip

spectacular and noisy, they do a lot of pirouettes, they metamorphose with an overwhelming visual display, they

jump, they shoot, they organize cuddles among themselves. What nice. in silver, ���Transformers? Is the version for

the summer of 2007 of similar products like ���Independence Day ?, ���Godzilla? or "The day of tomorrow ?. That is, what

we colloquially call an American? without substance, insipid, designed according to popcorn and

propaganda: the army always plays a crucial role in the struggle between humans and external forces

that invade It is a brazen transposition of the same story, changing the external aspect of the

main elements, the writers copy the scheme according to a commercial formula already exploited until the

n���usea.Y to tell of this, Shia Labeouf, without a doubt the best of the function (its historical humor has no price), it

is diluted - and with it, the little interest that offered the plot-before the progressive prominence of the military. And

I hope I'm not expressing myself badly, I'm not saying that the film is bad because the military is not our taste

(you know, here likes not one) but because the character of Labeouf was the one who could take the soul to

history, the helpless citizen who suddenly becomes involved in a transcendent mission. That is, the

uniqueness of the work. All this remains in the gutter when, especially in the last third, the film

becomes a plagiarism and rehash of bad films like? Independence day? and similar. When the cinema is not

cinema, but a prefabricated showcase for the less demanding young audience. The film is not boring, it is

proof. It has good moments of humor, even say that it is motivated by a healthy parody of uses and customs

in the current "American way of life". The pitorreo, in this sense, is constant, and includes even thecredits

final. Eye to the patch: it's not that the film does not take itself seriously. First of all, the film is pitorrealove

and mocks the viewer, and especially those whogood adventure films, good movies designed for

teenagers, there has been and, hopefully, there will be.

" 0

" Irresistible (although maybe it should be called Unbearable) Ann Turner is one of those directors with little filmography on her back who is well wrapped up in some

heavy weight of the industry. Otherwise it is not understandable that he manages to count for one of his first works

with actors of the prestige of Sam Nelly and above all, Susan Sarandon. Until now, he has shown to have atalent

rather scarceand his films seem more telefilms than authentic cinematographic productions. And is that

Irresistible is a by-product that not even the talent of its protagonists manages to rescue from

mediocrity, and the only really irresistible of this film are the desires that enter you leave the room

in a short time to begin. It's a kind of drama with suspense, or in reverse, I would not know

exactly. The argument revolves around a woman who thinks that her husband's work partner intends to

keep her house, her car and even her husband. The anguish he experiences in the generalized belief

that he is paranoid is the central axis of the film. The tired and monotonous tempo, together with a practicallyguide,

flatmake of Irresistible a vulgar film, which will surely pass without grief or glory through the billboards ,

and of which nobody will remember a few hours after having seen it. Special mention deserves Susan Sarandon, who

seems to have fallen into disgrace and does not count recently for the big studios, having to settle

for minor productions, like this one. Perhaps the most suitable place for Irresistible is the shelf of the

video clubs; but that's it, well cornered, lest someone get confused and rent it. Although each one is

free to throw the money as it seems.

" 0

" Get scared and in what way. REC will be a before and after in the genre. Nothing to do with the soft story that the orphanage proposes to us, REC begins without presentations, bareback and

takes us by the hand of the Intriguing reporter until the first bite of the old woman, who honestlyme

impressedby the realism with which it is shot. It is true that the camera's We'veBlair

seen it before in theWitch project, but nothing to see. The project next to REC is a

chapter of the Smurfs at 3:30 in the afternoon. Yes, in the project the tension is chewed, but the ending is the

closest thing to a coitus interruptus. I scare you for more than an hour and then I leave you in a

hot spot. Fortunately, REC gets scared and in what way. The scene of the lost girl is impressive, the

camera approaching her face is priceless. Personally I had never seen such a close-up of terror.

Magnificent work once more of Balaguer���, not so magnificent act of some actors, something forced. And the

plot that I can tell you, ���absurd ?, the truth is that I do not care, for plots I read a book.

Film-spectacle of terror to 100%. At the moment we are already seeing the residue that is leaving this film in theothers.

film industry in films like Cloverfield (Monstruoso) and manyThey will follow the technique of the genius

of Spanish terror. Balaguer��� and ol���.

" 1

" Do not take your pipiolos to the movies to watch the movie! In addition to getting tired and giving them the afternoon, they are not going to let the movie

enjoy their armchair companions.

I had my reservations about how Pixar was going to give life to something as inanimate as a car, the truth is that the

project I loved since I started to hear about it and maybe, and together with Superman Returns it has been

of the films of this year 2006 that I have waited with more impatience, a similar phenomenon lived with Big Fish that

ended obsessing me in such a way, that it even appeared in my dreams. Well, Cars the seventh film of

the house of the Flexo (Pixar), does not leave indifferent, is so well made, the characters so well defined and so

tremendously animated, that one can not remain indifferent to such a great creation. Not even his political

dubbing (with the voices of Antonio Lobato, Fernando Alonso, Immaculate Galv���n.) Demeans the film, since it

is even an incentive more than the film to discover who is hidden behind the character that we see on the

screen, until the mini-cameo by Michael Schumacher. On the other hand, there are 2 factors that do not make the

film a perfect tape, one is the bottom that is gives half of the second act, where I do not know very well why the

tape seems to stagnate, thank God, get back quickly the march; but if a load is made

, the other reason is an excess of morality Disney that was not in the Incredibles (Previous Pixar tape)

and that here seems to load the inks in excess, and that is a small dose, or charge of morality, but

pretending to capture lessons every 20 frames is a bit tiresome. Leaving aside the 2factors

negativeof the tape, I would like to focus on how well the motor world is shaped, from the first

minute of the film to the end, all are tributes, announcements, brands, even the world of NASCAR (that in

Spain we do not know ) are shown on the screen with an astonishing sophistication, and that is that John Lasseter is a

lover of the culture of the 4 wheels and this helps, a lot to the realization of the film. �cula, by the way, the

short that accompanies the tape is the funniest thing I've seen in Pixar since the acclaimed For the Birds

(Pajaritos), and the end of the film with that tribute to the Lasseter tapes is well worth a laugh

(like the ones that I suffered in my flesh). Ah! I forgot; parents of creatures less than 4 years old ���Do not take

your pipiolos to the movies to watch the movie! In addition to getting tired and giving them the afternoon, they are not going to let the movie enjoy

their armchair companions, because between their snot, cries and "" mama / papa I pee "" they empathize the

enjoyment of the movie, go, go to the movies and the cr���o ��� they leave you with the grandma, t���ao kangaroo! I

said

" 1

" Sorry, bad, pretentious, with huge mistakes of gui���n, is ideal show to see, forget andhere

nothing has happened.

Anything today ad���a call horror movies, honestly the film is boring, pretentious, badly

shot, worse written and much worse, perhaps the only good thing that the film has ���cula was the news that

in the filming the 2 actors could not see each other, that the story of the film, and is that, as happens inother

manyfilms of this style, you throw away a good part of the footage thinking how stupidly stupid are the

protagonists and how you want them, with a certain hatred that both of them will get killed as soon as possible; Especially when the

story does not give for more. A couple who are about to divorce are lost (typical) and will give aMotel

Roadwhere they seem to be dedicated to shooting snuff movies with everything that incautious one that lodges there, reading

these lines one does not need to know more of so infamous spectacle. Not similar to Thesis (they already wanted), nor to

Murder in 8 mm (they would like), or anything decent, where you try to give a claustrophobic air, and the only thing that

is achieved is more a comedy than a horror thriller that may give some fear , and see that this

subscriber is quite scary and easily impressionable. The soundtrack of Michael Fakesch falls into thesounds

commonheard again and again in the tapes of this caliber, music that pretends to enter through the Odos to

be scary, but it's so like honestly do not consigue.Lamentable, bad, pretentious, with huge failures

gui n isideal spectacle to see, forget and nothing has happened here.

" 0

" Adventures pouring a script with the "" most difficult "" in each sequence, riddled witheffects

special, and with two young debutantes.

Formerly known as Jumanji 2, since it is based on the second book in history. At first it

was expected that Robin Williams returned to his role of the first film, but in the end he did not accept. Filming

should have taken place in 2001, but it was finally delayed until 2005. At the beginning of the project, Ken Ralston, the

visual effects supervisor for Jumanji, was going to make his directorial debut with this film. A few years later, Dennis

Dugan joined the production as a director but then left him and was replaced by Jon Favreau. Adventures

in abundance a script with the "" most difficult "" in each sequence, riddled with special effects, and with

two young debutantes (to whom we have seen as secondary in the odd movie, Tim Robbins appears

in a small role (the father of the protagonists) and Kristen Stewart who we saw starring with Jodie

Foster David Fincher's thriller "" The room of the "panic" is the older sister (much more grown up than in

the previous movie) of the two little ones. A soundtrack full of moments heroic

exceptionally accompanies the images on screen.

" 0

" One of the most intelligent and fresh comedies of recent times, with a cast of actors as

unknown as wonderful and with one of those scripts, modÃlicos and antolÃgicos, that bring remembrance of the

great comedies of enredo de Hol lywood.

I have a tremendous bitch with that expression, "" tolerance"" referring to immigrants. Being better than

intolerance, of course, I do not think being tolerant of foreigners and persons of another color

another race is enough. Tolerance means to support, admit and endure that exist, but nothing more.

It means leaving them apart, not mixing with them, drawing a dividing line that separates us. We here and

you there, quietly and without embarrassment. However, there is a neighborhood in Madrid, Lavapi���s, which has taken a step

that goes far beyond Tolerance, as the great Fernando Colomo tells us in his delicious,

refreshing, utopian, carefree and happy film "" The next east. "" Now that the billboard is dying, With the

only support of the pirates of the Caribbean, all of us who endure in August in the cities and all those who

return from their vacations should go in droves to enjoy one of the most comedies intelligent and fresh

of the last times, with a cast of actors as unknown as wonderful and with one of those scripts,

modÃlicos and antolÃgicos, that bring memory of the great comedies of enredo of the Hollywood more classic.Two

Brothers Ca���ny Abel. One is handsome, posh and tr���pala. She has made her lover blangladesh��� pregnant and puts land

in the way, with her wife and daughters. The other is a book pringao. A clumsy and inept chubby with a heart so

big it does not fit in his chest. He will assume the role that his brother has fled by legs and will enter fully

into the intricacies of an Islamic, traditional and conservative family of immigrants from Bangladesh who are trying to

survive in 21st century Madrid Based on laughter, jokes, gags, replies and counter-replies to each one more

ingenious, caustic and hilarious, Colomo talks about topics as topical as the clash of

civilizations, racism and xenophobia, blissful tolerance, the exploitation of the most disadvantaged,

fear of loneliness and immigration. And he does it with a joy and an impudence that show that, to talk

about the great issues that affect humanity, it is not imperative to get serious and solemn. Thecharacters

mainare luxury, the secondary ones, with the butcher. in front, unparalleled and the actors that give them life

is the colossal height that the script demands, with interpretations full of nuances and

expressiveness. "" The next orient "" is a film that claims, above all, the joy of living. One

of those films that reconcile you with the best cinema, critical and scrutinizing of thereality

socialof a country, but shot from the humor, the intelligence, the wisdom and the experience of Fernando

Colomo, a rare avis in the Spanish cinematographic panorama: ���se he rolls what he wants, that tells the

stories he wants and that he does it as he wants. Dear Fernando, After laughing with the jaw with "" The

next east "" there is only one thing left to say: at your feet, teacher.

" 1

" Clumsy, easy, long, predictable, depressing, not at all hilarious, monotonous, overbearing, long, cheesy,

rambunctious, cazurra, dumb, expressionless, bland, long, honeyed, bored, The holiday does not come afloat nor for the

actors' group.

Romantic comedy has given huge titles in the past (Philadelphia Stories) or in the present (

My Best Friend's Wedding) and it's popped out of clichés. Nancy Meyers is not Howard Hawks or Billy Wilder or George

Cukor. Cameron D���az, still a monster, is not Katherine Hepburn. Jack Black is not Cary Grant. And now the film (today

I jump to the bullfighter the usual tone of my prose and go starkly to the jugular of the matter so that the

blood springs soon, spreads across the carpet and, before the sharpness and the vertigo of the tremebundo red, the

possible tail that is going to attend the function gives up and moves to another one, engros���ndola) .Torpe, easy, long,

predictable, depressive, not hilarious, monotonous, cargante, long, cheesy, ramplona, ​​cazurra, dumb, expressionless,

bland, long, mellow, boring, The holiday does not come afloat or by the roster of actors with tir���n (Jude Law,

Kate Winslet, Cameron D���az, Jack Black) or by the apparent management of its director in the gender issues (Ya

abord��� with something of better fortune When you least expect it or what women think about). More: thefollies

sentimentalof the girls and girls of the nuisance cease to interest soon. There is a character of interest,

well written, that connects immediately with the demanding philosopher who looks beyond an elegant production,

which it is. I refer to the character of the ineffable and already talludito Eli Wallach, who acts as counselor of the character

of Winslet as a screenwriter and retired from Golden Hollywood. In short, a lost time. I promise to make up for my

shading DVD and lose two hours at R���o Bravo, by John Ford. I love Deanborracho paper

Martin's. And even sang, I think. Ah, ��� I said it's very long?

" 0

" A tremendous movie, well shot, built on a gui���ns���lido, without gaps. Everything in it surprises and

leaves a very good taste in the mouth.

Composed Guillermo del Toro, a tremendous film, well shot, built on a gui���ns���lido, without gaps,

which makes it perhaps the best of the Mexican director, (With permission of "" Cronos "", to my taste his other better

work), and I say composes and does not direct, because, like Juan Palomo, he does everything, directs, scripts and produces,

a film that, based on the stories that imagined in his childhood, mixed with the cruel and already distant post-war,

leaves the viewer with his mouth open, and even, what noses, wanting much more. In fact, this poor

mortal, looks forward to the third installment of this, curious trilogy, which began with "" El Espinazo del Diablo ""

(another of those master piece of the orondo director) and to bring ��� by title "" 3993 "" uniting a story, again

of the civil war with another one of actuality, and with a nexus of union between the two. I can not leave anyone in the

inkwell , from Sergi L���pez, like the captain Vidal, whom you come to hate and hate from the beginning to the

end of the projection, a Maribel Verd��� that has changed completely the inept and bobous concept that he had

of her as an actress, Ariadna Gil, that the few minutes that appear on the screen, paints, like nobody else, the

suffering of a mother, who well knows that she suffers, without I doubt to protect the little Ophelia, interpreted in

a masterly way (and see that except Dakota Fanning, never a child actor had come to surprise me er so much),

by the debutant Ivana Baquero, Alex Angulo, as the doctor of double morals (perhaps his best interpretation

since "" The Day of the Beast "" Alex de la Iglesia), and I could not forget Doug Jones, the man with the thousand

faces, in the service of Del Toro, with whom I had already worked in "" Hellboy "" as Abe Sapiens, the companion of

adventures of the red imp created by Mike Mignola, giving life in this film to the title Faun, before

I forget, a thousand and one critics have come to the conclusion Deln of the similarity of this film with the work of Lewis

Caroll, "" Alice in the Wonderland. "" I have always loved the movies of missions, of those where,

the protagonists have to do one and a thousand different things, this is one of them, and that double slope,

mixing fantasy with harsh reality, is a success, especially when reality is hard and cold. to which

rock and fantasattrica and disgusting (maybe that the reason why the film is not for children) .Both

the characterization Den of the characters, like that dark picture, the sound and even what one can get to

feel by the protagonists is amazing, one from the first minute rests on the motivations of Ophelia,

the stubbornness of Vidal, and in the merciless struggle of Mercedes to get away with it. In short, it is not necessary to be

surprised too much if I say that the film has enchanted me, and that everything in it surprises and leaves a very good

taste. .

" 1

" Poor bad, even boring, it did not surprise me that they have taken centuries (or rather leave it for the summer) to

release it.

������Welcome to the summer refritos! That there was no originality among many of theproducts

North Americanwas known by all, and is that, from a time to this part, what is not copied from the cinema nip���n, is

plagiarized by other films. �culas, but sequels, superh���roes or the mother who pari���, then with saying that it is a

tribute (affair fixed) .This tape pretends to be, without achieving it, what I already got "" Hostel "" (and its

sequel) by Eli Roth. That is, a group of young people with pretensions to have fun are cheated and turned into

guinea pigs (never better said) of Indian. John Stockwell is beginning to see "" the duster "" with this type of

cinema, and is that, in his hands (and shoulders) are tapes like the insufferable "" On the edge of the waves "", or the

summer "" Lethal immersion "" ���Ser��� this a worthy successor of Uwe Bowl with this shabby / summery cinema? Josh

Duhamel, habitual of the series "" Las Vegas "" and lately more famous in the cinema thanks to "" Transformers "" and Melissa

George (who I remember as one of the villains of the series "" Alias ​​"" and as a woman of Ryan Reynolds, in "" Terror

en Amityville "" (remake of the 70s film), lead a cast, of those in which one waits from the

first minute of footage to give them the more "" kill "" better and if it can be in the most cruel and

bloodthirsty, better than better. good the pretext of the sale of organs, so in vogue in these times that

we are and more in Brazil and hispanoamÃrica in general (with its dark urban legends), but the impunity of the

surgeon is the same as the rich murderers Potential Tarantino product (and that unlike

"" Hostel "" this does not produce). The tourist offices of Brazil and Slovakia will be very content with these

films, for the time being I thought of going to Brazil, but when they start to kill people I take the

first flight for Barajas.Mala mal���sima, until boring, it did not surprise me that they have taken centuries (or rather to leave it

for the summer) in premiering it.

" 0

" If I had to define in a word a? Babel? I would say: emotional. It is magnificent, and as such, it is one of the

best products made this year. It is advised to see and is advised, above all, to feel.

If I had to define in one word "" Babel "" would say: emotional. It is a film of feelings, of

human relationships, of human miseries and tragedies, after all. After spending the last weeks

watching empty films and with crude contents, "" Babel "" has been a cinematic respite. I breathe

for knowing that film is still made that tells important stories. I think that it has already been part of his understanding in

"" Amores Perros "" and "" 21 grams "" has come with "" Babel "" to articulate a film witha priori crossed lives

unconnected. By catching yourself after the first frames you understand that Morocco, Mexico and Japan are not as

far as you think. Maybe I remember something like "" Crash "", because the drama surrounds the life of each one of the

characters that make up the film, but do not get confused, in "" Babel "" stories are not told. racism and

prejudice, in "" Babel "" stories of human beings come to the limit, frustration,Susan

irresponsibility and sadness.(Cate Blanchett) and Richard (Brad Pitt) They travel through Morocco,

however we never know why they are there, and what has taken them to that point on the planet. However,

that is not the important thing, but their relationship, which will be fragile, will be put to the test after a dramatic accident,

in which ��� an authentic family of the country involved. In Japan, Chieko, a deaf girl, spends her worst

moments: still a virgin, desperately looking for love, and must deal with the fatal death of her mother, which

affects her and her father in different versions. Finally, in San Diego, two children are left in the care of a

Mexican maid, who, in view of the long stay of her parents outside, will make the decision to

take the children to the wedding of their son in Mexico with a final worthy of infarction. I would like to elongate more in

the synopsis, but it would be revealing aspects of the film that I prefer to stay in surprise, just as it happened to

me when I started the film. Undoubtedly, all the characters make decisions, wrong and with fatal consequences

in most cases, but they are not decisions that we do not take any of us. Undoubtedly, the story of

the Mexican caregiver and the American children gives me goose bumps, as I think how easy it is to trust

someone who can screw up. The story in Morocco demonstrates the simplicity of arevs

fortuitousand the Japan gives me the sadness of not knowing whether one around us is in full each libre.Muy

my regret, and after several misunderstandings with Brad Pitt I must admit that it is in the hands of

I���arritu. It manages to maintain a dramatic tension, as it should be, throughout its segment and its final collapse

is far from those ridiculous tears of "" Legends of Passion "". I would not be surprised if he enteredtickets

the academyfor the upcoming Oscars. His best counterpoint is Cate Blanchett, of which I can say that he rarely

disappoints me. Rinko Kikuchi, who plays the Japanese deaf girl performs the saddest act I

've seen in recent years, and I speak of emotional sadness. This girl is dusting and trnasmite without sayingNothing

a word.matters that in "" Babel "" change from Moroccan to English, then to Spanish. ol and then, to the

Japanese. I���arritu makes all those languages ​​flow as one to teach us that language is only

phonically different words, since the human soul has the same chiaroscuro Where are you from? It is

magnificent, and as such, it is one of the best products made this year. It is advised to see and is advised, above

all, FEEL.

" 1

" When he enters the subject, he does not find the path of anguish, it seems that he could have

taken much more juice out of the script because he leaves a gap in the viewer.

Correct though foreseeable film of terror of the eighties that has multiple parallelisms with diabolical

attraction of the great rosemary. The subject of the scientist who is out of control of an experiment is treated for the last

time by RICHARD FLANKLIN who had already highlighted in the genre with the very superior PATRICK or the second part

of PSYCHOSIS. Among the performers, two very succulent names stand out with a young girl ELISHABETH SHUE who

years later jumped to stardom for LEAVING LAS VEGAS and the always terrific TERENCE STAMP seen in the last

few years. Enos in productions of all kinds such as PRISCILLA or the English falcon.The film struggles to take off even

though it is seen with interest thanks to the behavior of the animals that are the true stars of the function.

When it enters the subject it does not finish finding the way of the anguish, it seems that it could have

taken much more juice to the guide because it leaves an emptiness ��� in the spectator. In any case, good interpretations,

fantastic views, well in their technical aspects from the photography to the music and elegant staging.

" 0

" Simple romantic comedy, where music is the main course and where there is no chemistry between the

protagonists (and is that the character of Barrymore does not believe anyone ... )

I do not know why I did not take it because I do not know what motive, I found myself the other day with my work companions talking

about movies, of course, ��� coming out this tape to shine, one of those that so much likes to "" my half rib "" and

of which I try to flee like soul that the devil takes, taken by the curiosity, by the panic and for some

other dark object of desire from which I will not try again so that no one calls me misogynist sexist, he agreed to

see her, and my opinion once finished his subsequent viewing did not change a bit of what he thought before he had

seen it. Hugh Grant and Drew Barrymore compose a sweet comedy, easy to watch, as easy to

forget, one that you watch without much interest, in any TV channel at the time of the after-dinner, and that

while he debates with the family the last goal of Beckham, he can without looking up from the coffee that accompanies him,

follow the thread of it. Maybe, the only thing I liked about it was the soundtrack, and more by repetition over

and over again of the topics, than by the taste itself. , and is that both repeat and repeat, makes one

end the movie singing the main theme of it, that Pop Goes My Heart whose video reminds many of

those who accompanied my childhood musical or my later adolescence and when I unraveled musically from

children's music or what was heard at home; but no, I'm not here to talk about music, especially when it's a topic

I could not write more than 2 lines in a row. In short, summarizing, a simple romantic comedy, where

music is the main course and where there is no chemistry between the protagonists (and is that the character of

Barrymore does not believe anyone .).

" 0

" A film with a surprising theme that gets so tired with paranoia. Some people say that "" the experiments are better done at home and with soda. just in case "", and in this case theynot

canbe more accurate, because in this movie there are things that they like, that interest and that you feel to see it

saying! GUAO VAYA IDEA M�� �S ORIGINAL! and I've even come to compare it with another film that had a

rather stormy season, (mostly because of the theme of temporary paranoia) called "" Donnie Darko. "" However

, there are times when it plays to curl the curl, to that triple somersault without a network, to forgive me for going

back to the popular wisdom "" what little pleases and how angry "" and here is what we have to go back So

many times it becomes tiresome or annoying to the spectator. Again I say that the script seems

excellent, (except the odd lacuna) that the theme seems quite right, but how about Once some

situations are somewhat forced, maybe it's that I'm getting older or is that I expectedfrom this

something differentmovie and see that when I go to see a film class I usually plan and Do not let the

final result influence my opinion, but. This time it was not like that. Also, if that was added to the film

, Ashton Kutcher (yes, the boy who made himself into gossip-like comedies and that

now goes by the boyfriend of Demi Moore with which they have been 20 years apart! ah��� is na!) that I fall

frankly like a kick in the lower belly! In short, we are synthesizing, that they are not

hours and I still have some more things to do around here. A film with a surprising theme that gets

tiresome with so much paranoia

" 0

" The spectator who is prudish or who feels rejected when contemplating pornography will not endure three minutes of

projection. The cure of scares will enjoy a funny film that speaks of all of us at some time

in our lives.

Three years ago, Michael Winterbottom inaugurated with 9 songs what we could call "indie-porn",cinema

independentwith numerous scenes of explicit sex. The film showed openly the exchange of flu dedos

of a couple that combined this activity with going from concert to concert. The sex in this film - of great

silences - was pure exhibition to the sevice of a plot without feet or head. Everything that was superfluous and free

in the previous one makes sense in the excellent Shortbus. The director signs a comedy that could well have been

released by Robert Altman or Woody Allen. John Cameron Mitchell, shows sex, but in all its

splendor: lonely sex, sex to escape from loneliness, group sex? but as a vehicle to express the

emotional situation of each character, not as an impious excuse to show meat. The shortbus of the title is the

name given to buses that carry school for children with difficulties who need more attention

and the libertine club where the protagonists meet. In this place everyone can give free rein to their

fantasies. There a gay couple meet in search of a third party to fan their relationship, ansexual

anorgansiccounselor and a dominatrice unable to maintain emotional bond with any human being without the l� ��tigo in the

hand.In general, lost souls and bodies that are. As background New York that, as one of the

characters says, is the city where people come to redeem their sins. And speaking of sins, this film

contains lots: fellatio, ejaculations, cunnilingus, sodom���a? nothing is insinuated, it is live sex. Theis prudish

spectator whoor who feels rejected when contemplating pornography will not hold a three minute projection.

The cure of scares will enjoy a funny film that speaks of all of us at some time in our

lives. But to say that Shortbus is pornography, is like saying that Eating, drinking, loving is a film aboutgastronomy

Asian. I feel much more wounded in my sensibility when I watch on the big screenbacchanalia

Mel Gibson gore, for example, what genital feasts, but I am so rare and cantankerous. I want to point

too I do not agree with the advertising claim phrases on this tape: If Almod���var rolled for the

first time, would he make this movie? No way. The more or less daring scenes of Pepi Luci Bom or Labyrinth of

passions were pure provocation and transgression at a certain historical moment. In Shortbus there is no bad taste

of any kind, as there is not in the bed of two lovers.

" 1

" The Prestige is a movie that entertains, and since it is conceived as such, I think it deserves no more

judgment than the intended one. And it fulfills, with a note, its objective.

If we made a simile between cinema and magic, we could make many similarities. And of course,

differences. 'The Prestige' is cinema with magic, and trick. A good story, that never leaves theaside

characters, and that gives you everything that is intended: entertainment. The problem is that it seems that from the

beginning, we are saying that we are facing this trick . A trick, it has to be said, that seems more like

a succession of them. But it is relatively easy to notice him in the course of the film. And if not?

Better, more you will enjoy the tape. Two 19th-century London magicians, in the wake of the tragic death

of one of their women, begin a struggle to end the race ( and life) of the other. Argument maybe simple

for some, but with the presentation that Nolan makes of the film, and thanks to its protagonists (great

cast), makes the film more than interesting, until the point of being highly recommendable, that is,

for a mere enjoyment of the 'magic' cinema. A remarkable aspect of this last film by the filmmaker Christopher

Nolan is his continuous interest. It's because the viewer is attentive to the screen. Like a magic trick, yes. And

although at the beginning the rhythm may be a little slow, and in fact, it is possible that he has some footage, the

expectation increases thanks to good strokes from the director, the gui���n, the excellent

ambience and the quality of the performances: Hugh Jackman and Christian Bale is the height, as well as

Michael Caine (as always), although it is true that the role of Scarlett Johansson is not as important as

for its brilliance (or was it just to show off?) The Prestige is a film that entertains, and

since it is conceived as such, I think it does not deserve more judgment than the intended one. And it fulfills, with a note, its

objective.

" 1

" Gui���n quite badly topped, that opens roads that do not close, presents characters that do not contribute anything and that

leaves in the most absolute indefinition others.

He did not have references about this film but his actors' group and the fact that he is andirector

almost new(we have to support those who start) decided to go see it. Without being a major mistake, I have to

admit that it was not a satisfactory experience. "" Vete de m��� "", directed by Víctor Garc���a Le���n tells the

following story (extracted from the press dossier): Santiago (Juan Diego) has never been the protagonist of anything?

neither theater, nor cinema? not even of his own life. But Santiago never thought that housing hisin his home

thirty-year son Guillermo (Juan Diego Botto)for a few days would change his life so much? As

expected, the highlight of the show is interpretations. Juan Diego offers a recital of the

reasons why he is considered one of the great actors of our country and winner, for this role, of the

Silver Shell of the San Sebastian Festival. At his side, Juan Diego Botto, without being bad, does not offer anything

special because of a little and very badly defined character. In general, the rest of the actors make the grade,

especially Cristina Plazas for her naturalness and her serene beauty that make her, for me, the

discovery of the film. Everything else it seems to me to fail because of a badly finished script, that

opens paths that do not close, it presents characters that do not contribute anything and that leaves in the most absolute indefinition

others that do not we got to know their motivations to do what they do. For example, the character of

Rosa Mar���a Sard��� does not contribute anything to the story. It is very difficult to overcome the ballast of a gui���n as��� and the director,

co- author of the script along with Jon���s Trueba, does not get it. His style is sober and pretends not to attract attention

but that, with a bad gui���n, is like doing hara-kiri before the public. In spite of everything, I want to believe that there are

reasons for hope: the direction of actors is good, there are situations that could give a lot of well-

developed games and there is also an evident desire to offer an adult cinema for an adult audience. That's it,long

asas we look for success through boring, low-budget tapes without a hook, as is the case, it

seems difficult to me. Easy to move away from the crisis that, on a permanent basis, seems to threaten our cinema.

" 0

" Serve to revive the debate on the need for monarchy, and on the personalities of Elizabeth II

and Lady Di.

Stephen Frears, once fierce chronicler of savage capitalism that was promoted by Prime Minister Margareth

Thatcher during the 1980s in England, with titles such as "My beautiful laundry" "" or "" Samy and Rose are

riding it "", come back with this fancy TV movie that is "" The Queen "" A week of black week, the six days that

made it wobble British royalty, which was unleashed with the death of the popular Princess Diana, on31

August, 1997. And Stephen Frears, as Prime Minister Tony Blair (Michael Sheen), labor, presented

in First instance as a reformer and modernizer of the English government, it almost ends up becoming the fan

number, not of Lady Di, without this haughty, elegant and se���orial Isabel II, who interprets Helenso well.

MirrenDiscretion and dignity. However, more than an admirer of the moniker, and despite the fact that she shows n

sympathetic, and in a certain way endearing, to the creatures that make her up as Prince Carlos (Alex

Jennings), Prince Felipe, husband of the Queen (James Cromwell) or the queen mother (Sylvia Syms), Stephen

Frears seems to have a great time in this recreation of a historical fact that put in check, before his own

people, the royalty.With an Isabel II educated in outdated forms and completely removed from the feeling and ways

of thinking of its people. That he wishes to act with "" discretion and dignity "", without publicly expressing or mourning the

death of his daughter-in-law, and without disguising, in privacy and with "" discretion "", the hatred I had for him.

But that will have no choice but to yield to the requests of citizens, to the pressures of the media and

the advice of Prime Minister Tony Blair, to show his, in no way, mourning the

death of Diana in public. "" That imbecile Blair! And in addition, your t��� has cooled down ", exclaims her husband, with his

back to reality, a refugee, with all the family, in Balmoral's summer residence, he said. Going

hunting and taking infusions. Example of one of the pillars of an ancient almost millenary institution, or a

symbol still necessary for the strengthening of a nation, depending on how you look at it. Duel of popularity. At the funeral

of the mourned Lady Di there will be two million people and, in the front line, names like Elton John, Steven

Spielberg, Tom Cruise, Nicole Kidman or Tom Hanks. And the ceremony was followed, in a spontaneous reaction, by

millions and millions of spectators around the world. A power of convocation, and a popularity, unimaginable

to the royal family. Before what is coming, even the queen will be identified with an elegant deer with

a horn of 14 antlers, as majestic as unique in its species, maybe destined to be extinguished soon. While

the members of the new reformed labor party call them "freeloaders" that cost millions of

pounds to the taxpayers, the scenes with Cherie Blair (Helen McCrory), the wife of the prime

minister, biting and antimon I radical rquica, for example, in the visit to the queen, with poses of reverence and

looks of respect so forced and ironic, as patosas, while Isabel II contemplates it with a certain contempt

but, that is, maintaining "" dignity. "" For the rest, Stephen Frears' performance is absolutely flat,

based on the gui��� and the good work of his actors. "" The queen "" will serve to revive the debate on the

need for the monarchy, and on the personalities of Elizabeth II, reigns "" dignified and discreet "" in her rancid

hierarchy; and Lady Di, the "" princess of the town "" with a hook for a world in need of them.

" 0

" A pretty anodyne and simple story, that despite having a couple of good moments, does not leave a good

taste in our mouths. It is a failed comedy that will not delight the public, except for the worshipers of Santiago

Segura and some other very accommodating spectator.

The truth is that the new production of Santiago Segura has a good hook: ���l. From there and with a

trailer that made me interested in this new proposal, I approached the room for what I thought was going to be an

interesting comedy, but nothing further of reality. The film of ���scar Aibar becomes astory

rather anodyne and simple, that in spite of having a couple of good moments, does not leave us with a good taste as

we did in previous proposals of the director of Evilio. And one of those good moments, is the starring

actor and director Nacho Vigalondo centano. By way of a cameo and in the same underground games room in

which Choque (his last short film) was developed, he plays the leader of a group of pretty pranksters. The

truth is that it is a good point of the film and more when I had no knowledge of its existence. Johnny

(Santiago Segura) is another character that can give us a smile, although the alwaysmeets and

more thanis Enrique Villn in a very reducido.Junto these actors paper we find thecast

principalof Jordi Vilches, Brbara Muoz and Eduardo Garcia as members of the team that will

face the championship of the dancing machine, and finally a Jos��� Corbacho turned into an envious

son of a bitch, very well interpreted. As defects , to say that those who have ever played with the "" carpet ""

that the playstation offers us and know what the topic is, will find that they do not agree at all with their

dance steps that appears on the screen of the game, except in the cases in which they show inserts of

plans details of the a machine revealing the results and the points that are obtained. However small (or

large) this failure may seem, the truth is that you could have tried to correct it in some other way, from

learning something about the game to perform the choreography or dissimulating it more, and I say this because the

choreographies and the steps that are marked are very professional (some made by doubles when onlyvisible

the feet are, but in others we can see how the actors have had to learn to move and coordinate their

movements). In short "" The dancing machine "" is a failed comedy that will not make the delights of the public,

except for the worshipers of Santiago Segura and some other very obliging spectator.

" 0

" With a simple plot, a slow and absurd development that bores the most painted and a good dose of

frivolity in the treatment of things, The Holiday is a production that seems to have been done copying and

pasting scenes and di delogos from other movies.

Just in case the Christmas was not a time full of traditions of all kinds, it's been many years now that the

American film industry contributes its bit by dedicating itself to bombard us with roman comedies. Quenticas that

are released during these dates. They tend to be films of simple gui���n, final predictable and saturated with

little ingenious jokes, in which the life of the protagonists, incarnated almost always by familiar faces

, changes radically in a record time . Nancy Myers already showed that she dominated the genre with titles

like When you least expect it or What women think, and The Holiday intends to follow the trail of success

and social acceptance that they assumed their previous works. But let's not deceive ourselves; we are facing a

film in which all the existing topics are used, the extreme sensitivity and to which not even

the most decent interpretation of Cameron D���az, Kate Winslet and Jude Law is able to give the minimum

credibility and quality. With a simple plot, a slow and absurd development that bores the most painted and a

good dose of frivolity in the treatment of things, The Holiday is a production that seems to have been

made by copying and pasting scenes and di���logos of other films, and far from being emotive, it ends up provoking the

hilarity of the spectator in the supposedly tender scenes, while the c nomicas do not manage to start

the m��� Smile of smile. To make matters worse, the presence of the always abject and grotesque Jack Black,

contributes to make more disgusting the view of this millionaire disproved. To forget.

" 0

" A masterpiece calculated from beginning to end and above all very, but very "fincheriana". There are those who think that geniuses do not exist. I include myself within this group, although sometimes I hesitate to

spend next to those who think that David Fincher is a genius, and therefore, that there are geniuses. Whether the

director of Se7 is a genius or not, the question is that his new and highly anticipated film is chilling, it is

practically perfect. Perhaps its best aspect is the staging, worthy of all the recognition and

knowledge on the part of many directors. Zodiac, so it is called, so suggestive and minimalist, the

film is absolutizing disconcerting, great in all its aspects, obsessive, millimeter and round. In Se7

two very different policemen entered a dark world full of sins and obsessions with tremendous endings.

As you all know, having seen the film or not, its end, at this moment already mythical, is one of the

most chilling and devastating of the last years, due to the surprise factor. In Zodiac everything is different. The

other film is, in some way, dedicated to the viewer, it was more commercial (and that does not mean bad! ���I

consider that Se7en is a masterpiece!), And its ��� Last film, by some way to say it, is more intimate,

obsessive and dense. It is unquestionable that the two works are insurmountable, overwhelming from beginning to end, but

there is a very clear difference between them, and that is that the first one is dedicated to all kinds of public, whether they arefans

Fincheror not. , and the second is directed exclusively for these. I, who consider that having seen four

of his six films is necessary to assess whether a director catches me or not, I find that Zodiac is

absolute, a masterpiece calculated from start to finish and above all, very, but very "" Fincheriana "" .As��� as in

the great, but not great, The Game a character was introduced in his own empty mind to realize, in

the end, that the life he has led been somewhat useless, in the film in question, in his third

"" chapter "" specifically, the character played by Jake Gylenhaal is subjected to an inordinate obsession. Acercan

about the zodiac killer. And it is that, like the other film, the one who is obsessed is not only the

protagonist but also us. More than obsessing, what I think we feel when we see Zodiac (or

generalizing, any film by the director) is a sensation of insight, of moral trapping. Or I, at

least, came out with this impression of cinema, and it still lasts. Its end is nothing more than a conclusion that did not fit allsubmitted

that we have justto, an eternal, but not heavy, mental torture full of unknown symbols and

characters as complex as in the real life. It has to be said that the film is inexhaustible, with scenes of

violence, perhaps not as extreme as Se7en's, but more profound. I must highlight, first of all, all the

sequences of the murders, since perhaps two of them are two of the best murders never filmed.

The film begins with an aerial image of San Francisco, at night. Then, the camera happens to get inside

a car while you see the dark and very busy streets. In this same car is where a couple of

young people travel, which will influence the whole outcome of the film. From there, thescene begins

murder, shot with an accuracy never seen before and with a really impressive tension. Later, theappears

second murder, also devastating and chilling. Attentive to the disturbing scene behind themurderer?

tree The scenario of the film is based on the novel by Robert Graysmith, the main character of the film,

also .N Really, to think that it was he who became obsessed until he left his family behind, that he was the writer of

a later novel (that appears in one of the last scenes of the film) strange. Fortunately,

or not, who has written the film is called James Vanderbilt, and we could qualify his written work as a

true masterpiece. There is hardly any small fissure, everything is perfect, everything is calculated to the

thousandth. Incredible is the experience of observing that throughout the entire film there is not a single drop in

rhythm. Moreover, the film's rhythm is frenzied, claustrophobic and overwhelming. From beginning to end you feel a

sense of immediacy that is absolutely heartbreaking. Zodiac, as a whole, is even more intense and intriguing

(despite knowing its outcome) than many other films with surprise ending. It is clear that the direction of the maestro

David Fincher is the best, or even the best of the film, with a mise en scène and a

general tension that is appreciated once you have He left the movie theater, his eyes still hanging from the

screen in case something else happens. I will never forget about the car scene and the woman with the baby. It is

Fincher's own, typical of a genius with a mind as perverse as disconcerting. The acting work is simply

dazzling. Highlight, above all, Robert Downey Jr. on a paper made to measure, complex to its

denouement and with some very realistic thoughts. His interpretation is the one that has told me the most, the one that interested me the most

, but I would not want to stop mentioning Mark Ruffalo and Anthony Edwards, an aut Cute couple of

police totally peculiar and very, but very well compinchada. Do not miss the scene in which they say goodbye,

simple but effective. The one that does not just convince me, then, is the protagonist (of the last part), Jake

Gyllenhaal, whom I find a magnificent actor and I do not doubt that here is wrong. On the contrary, in Zodiac its

interpretation is almost prodigious, but I think that the paper is not quite well drawn, or so I think am.

I hate obsessive people, and I suppose that's why I picked him up with his character in the most conclusive part of the

movie. And so, the whole cast, including the brief but very good performances of Brian Cox and

Chlo��� Sevigny. And finally, highlight the section techno, where everything is absolutmanete superb. The photograph,

unsurpassed. All planes and sequences are too intelligently shot. The assembly, original and

caluclad���simo (look at that kind of collage in motion where he mixes the investigation with the signs of the

zodiac). And music, from an inspiring David Shire, incredible at all times (I love the songs

belonging to the different ���pocas). So in a nutshell, we have a brilliant film, terrifying,

creepy, trapping and overwhelming. Everything in Zodiac is magnificent, everything comes out of the darkness of the

film, with a calculated staging and a superb script. Do not miss it, ya���nm���s, if you arefans

Mr. Fincher, now an absolute genius. I have changed my mind: there are geniuses.

" 1

" Maybe from the 2 films that make up the film, it was the one that interested me the most, and that is that the image of

Rose McGowan Ethics Paige Matthews of "" Charmed "") with a machine gun instead of one of his legs,

I already woke up a certain curiosity and curiosity, feel an extraordinary precedent in a movie theater, shabby /of

worthywhich it is worth not forgetting.

Maybe the 2 films that make up the film were the ones that interested me the most, and that is the image of

Rose McGowan (the already mythical one Paige Matthews of "" Charmed "") with a machine gun instead of one of his legs,

I was already awakened by curiosity and curiosity. To say that in "" Grindhouse "" everything is taken care of, from itstrailers

nonexistentto the blurred image of the celluloid , everything smells like that roy cinema of continuous session that many of us

have been able to enjoy in our childhood, that double program where it was possible to mix any film and watch

them from the afternoon until the evening, reenganch Going with what you could not see. Rodriguez composes a

debt film in part of his previous work, (I mean the excellent "" Sin City "", where the cameoseach

followother everywhere, and is that the star appearances of Bruce Willis as well as that of Tarantino (the other

artist of this film), feel n an extraordinary precedent in a cinema, shabby / worthy of the one that is worth

not forgetting; by the way, before I forget, we can also enjoy, even if only in a couple of

scenes of the presence of Stacy Ferguson, the singer of the "" Black Eyes Peas "" giving life to one "" jamona "" that appears

on the tape.The author of "" El Mariachi "" (among others), fills the gore tape without cutting, in fact at

times it is mÃschemic that disgusting or tr Magical, since the casquer���a appears again and again on the

screen, without the slightest hint of concern towards the audience, who jellies and congratulates himself with the disembowelled flesh

that appears everywhere. of Rose McGowan, who certainly will not go to the annals of the cinema with her

performance, but if with her musician, it is worth mentioning Freddy Rodr���guez, with her character of Wray , a hero

of action, of old, in the purest Van Damme, Stallone and company style. Especially disturbing is the role of

Sea Shelton law, with a horror / horror face for much of the footage, and that the presence

of Rodriguez's camera right in front of his big blue eyes comes as a ring to the finger. By the way, something that

we will lose in Spain, it is the lack of rolls (which here is patent, ridiculous and even funny) that annul the

possibility of following the argument in a way that one has to imagine (or believe) what we They count, without being

able to have seen it previously. Simply great, ingeniously simple.

" 1

" A film that is based solely on a certain formal skill on the part of the director and the charismatic

acting of the three protagonists, with the rest of the story being tremendously predictable.

The American cinema has accustomed us to transfer to the big screen real stories in anway

extremely Manichaean, or perhaps it would be just fair to say partially adjusted to reality, to teach us

about assumptions values ​​that go beyond any morally autocratic approach and direct theirgaze

outward, or remain half (or sometimes not even) in the non-condescending gaze towards their own

shortcomings and errors.New Yorker Richard Shepard's new film delves into a story based on an article

by Scott K. Anderson about the unpunished freedom of certain war criminals in the former Yugoslavia, in this

case, one of the most Peligrososs dangerous, nicknamed "" El Zorro "" and from which no one seems to know his whereabouts. The plot of the

film is precisely the search by journalists of such a dangerous character, being an

opportunity �� Unique for all of them, but especially for Simon (Richard Gere), to achieve absolute glory

in a world so given to consume people in the vor���gine of dependence on immediate results. Simon was

fired and lives in wars throughout the world, as a mercenary of information, while his

former cameraman, Duck (Terrence Howard), is dragged by complicity and empathy. �aa this new adventure, despite

having an ideal job and devoid of all physical risk. They are joined by Benjamin (Jesse Eisenberg), the

son of a powerful mandam���s of the chain for which Duck works. During his journey to find "" El Zorro "",

in which we will discover that not only the immediacy of the news is at stake, they will experience various setbacks and

will risk their lives to achieve such a feat. The work of Shepard in the directiondignifies

slightlya film whose script, written by the same director, shows signs of an absolute incoherence, being

a story full of t Icos. The staging is more than correct at the technical level, although without great

fanfare, but the usual resolutions that compensate for this mediocreare common throughout the film.

gui���n, one of those cases where the skill of the creator (although in this case it does not go much beyond the

simple technical correction) brings forward in a decent way a product that with a more worked libretto, and less

given to efectismos or inconsistencies in the tone or the development of the action, would have been much more

satisfactory. It is scary to think that it would have happened if in addition, the director of the function would have been of the same

baseness as the developed history. It is not coincidence that Shepard previously directed to this "" The shadow of the

hunter "", a highly recommendable and demystifying film like "" Matador "", which already showed an

interesting ability to narrate through the staging, something that lately seems to have

disappeared in the great majority of American directors. It is remarkable, and one point in his favor, the

effective work of the three main actors, both Howard and Eisenberg show a complicity

teacher-student worthy of recommendation for all those films that tried, and not they succeeded, with

moments that demonstrate the implication by both actors, being somewhat expected for a player as gifted

as Terrence Howard, buta surprise in the case of Jesse Eisenberg, whose share an cdotica

(on a per inconsequential and another by secondary) two popular horror films as "" The curse "" and ""

forest "" (commands to Wes Craven and M .Night Shyamalan respectively), did not presage the ease and

solvency that shows us in the role of inexperienced new reporter. I leave for the end the work of Richard Gere,

an actor who never got to excite me, but surprisingly for a server, stands in this new

film in a character with charisma, who knows how to convey that disenchanted tone that is presupposed to someone who

had everything, and no longer owns anything. A true surprise. Of the rest of the actors, it is better not to speak, because, are

the cases of the police of the UN, named Boris, which represent the repetitive ticsespecially insane.

of the ignorant and foolish character until exhaustion, or the role reserved for the actress DianeKruger, who makes

the disheveled, lower-class aspect of the paper so unbelievable. In addition, as I commented earlier, the

word tone acquires a particularly relevant meaning in this new film from the Buddhist Gere There is a

disturbing contrast, because of its lag of intentions and results, between what the film intends to tell and the

tone of the story. While the whole story has dramatic overtones, as it could not be otherwise taking into

account that we are talking about the history of a war criminal, on the other hand there is a

grandiloquent and sarcasm in the background. ��stico that ruins all intention to find a balance in the story.

It turns out in bad taste many contrasts from one scene to another, or resorting to the most hackneyed scenes of this

type of productions (like the encounter in the mountain between the character of Simon and a former colleague). In addition,

halfway through the film, the film goes from being a story of reporters in search of the news, to a vengeance

perpetrated by Simon, which does nothing more than to seek a hit that already matched

this thriller with certain elements of the urban western (three men hunting for another, with a reward of 5

million dollars for its head). All this, together with a final tremendously anticlimatic and not very consistent with

what the story required, and without counting the obvious and innocent vision on the part of the American cinema of its

darkest organizations, they give us result a film that is based solely on a certain formal skill

on the part of the director and the charismatic acting of the three protagonists, being the rest of the story

tremendously foreseeable and lacking in all depth or complaint of events and characters, which

so required �an. A film that despite possessing the gift of passenger entertainment, carries a certain burden that

prevents or even empathize with the story. A failed film and therefore, a true pity.

" 0

" The little ones in the house will be the ones who enjoy the most and have a good time with our new friend Remy. In

all honesty, it's one of the best movies of the summer. If you have not seen her yet, I recommend you

go see her.

Today I will talk about a movie from one of my favorite genres, the Animation. This film is entitled

Ratatouille, and it has been produced for Disney by the Pixar Animation studio. Just knowing that it is a

Pixar production, we can already imagine that it is a well made film, full of visual effects and very

colorful, just like other movies were coming out of it. I study like Cars, Finding Nemo, The Incredibles

or Toy Story. History takes us to France, more specifically to Paris where a rat (a simple rat,

named Remy) has a great talent natural for the kitchen, he dreams of becoming a great Chef, on his

way he meets a clean and clumsy dishes for the kitchen, Linguini, that joining forces the two, will

get to become the best chef from all over France, thanks to the criticism of the most feared cooking critic of

the Pa���s.In my opinion the film is a bit long, they are almost 2 hours, and that is excessive for anfilm

animationbecause it is impossibleachieve the same pace throughout the pel cula, despite not reaching a

grandsimo success atbox office, I think technically outperforms its films? rival? like the Simpsons, or Shrek

third. It can be put a few sticks, as it has no gag addressed to an adult audience as its

competitors, but I think that you can forgive. Like all Pixar films, it has a moral, and it is

to advance and strive to exceed our limits and achieve our dreams. To conclude, the

little ones of the Home will be the ones who will enjoy the most and have a good time with our new friend Remy. In

all honesty, it's one of the best movies of the summer. If you have not seen her yet, I recommend you go see her.

" 1

"The argument is so short that it can be summed up in: very bad bad guys kidnap children to

take their pets and a girl with good good guys free them. bears who fight andfinally

the bearwins,

an adaptation of Philip Pullman's book, Northern Lights, for the American children's audience

, Hollywood producers are still looking for another bombshell. ��or of the rings', but seeing the

results, they will have to keep trying, here they adapt, possibly the best story of the trilogy with

rather painful results. I made a good fantasy movie. The filmbig at the

was not thatend, I was prepared with food, drink and sweets for more than two hours and they stayed in a

few hours and three hours. And despite everything, the spawn was long, and I say spawn, because it's

about combining familiar faces, with aesthetic effects (decorations) and somemade animal quarrel

computer-. Fuck, if Shrek has more dynamism than this crap. If you have seen the trailer, you have already seen it all.

Because the dialogues are not wasted. They have eliminated all political or religious reference (which is not

that there were many.) But they try to explain the story to all the public, with which we have a lot of

meaningless dialogues, which They bore children and become unbearable for adults. To give an example, in

a moment of maximum tension (���?) My daughter was trying to see the color of the jelly I was eating.

Well if children are not interested in adults less. The argument is so cut that can be summarized as:

very bad bad boys kidnap children to take their pets and a child. with good very good ones they

release them. Ah! and there are some bears that fight and in the end the good bear wins. They promise continuation. Fear gives me. Of the

actors I can say, if the one that works best is the bear made by computer. Special mention for Nicole

Kidman, if she keeps on doing things with her body she will end up looking like the mummy, more and more aseptic and without

personality. We no longer know if it is her or her wax statue. An embalmer could also capture its beauty

and leave it unchanged forever. Fuck, she was redhead and freckled, and now she's blonde and she has completelyskin

white. and we laughed at Michael Jackson. Chris Weitz runs with a script he has done himself. So he is the one

responsible for the mess. Until now he had dedicated himself to production and directed somecomedy

bland. This work is great, but as it seems that he pays for it, well, t���o. By the way, they haveapparently

called it The golden compass, because, the name of Northern Lights was caught by another movie from

years ago and they did not get the permissions to use it. As much as it gives, I suppose that in the future it will be possible to make

another version more faithful to the novel. This endeavor to make films for children It's getting tiresome. If the story

is not for children, why infantilise it? Do you not realize that the success of the Lord of the Rings is to

respect minimally if not the novel at least the concept? Soon we will see up to the nursery version of the

Kamasutra. The thing is very bad, and the one that is for children does not justify doing a job so little care. For

that reason and for destroying a great novel, it deserves one of the first zeros of the year.

" 0

" Nothing remarkable: dust of stars, a lot of dust, many stars, a lot of guitar riff and a lot

of adrenaline rock rush.

There is nothing new under the sun or in the armchair of a cinema: 9 songs we have already seen. It does not bring novelties: it uses

the wide and pompous baggage of references in the history of cinema and formulates a hypothetical media scandal

that subsides as soon as one truly weighs the degree of provocation of his proposal.is

Winterbottomrupturist to the point where he stops being a routine, reformer of an existing discourse that had its

exquisite c anit at the end of the sixties and in the first seventies: flower power, hippies, guitar riffs and

LSD highs to synchronize the body with the free spirit of the cosmos.9 songs is sex, drugs and rock and

roll. Ian Dury is missing. For the rest, here is a stubborn apology of the skin as almost the only vehicle of

communication between a couple. The underground, indie or whatever you want to call it has points of collapse

everywhere because (maybe) this is not a movie, or at least a movie in the way I

understand the movies. ���culas, but a curious hybrid, boring, at times electric and, in the end, disappointing between the

documentary about rock stars on stage and hardcore eroticism (or softcore porn). If I put

the MTV and see a concert of Black Rebel Motorcycle Club or Franz Ferdinand (whose albums I own) it would not be

worse. This time, at least, I saw it in DVD format and I did not have to leave the cinema in a bad mood.

" 0

" At the cinema's exit, after these credit titles with the beautiful song I sing chant trist, by

Lluis Llach, the people took the tickets ���grimas with handkerchiefs (which they had already prepared).

Who was Salvador Puig Antich? This question is not one that was asked too much for several years

after his death. Today, in the 21st century, the most unknown director Manuel Huerga (Ant���rtida)

poses this question and carries it out cinematographically, putting the t Title of Salvador. Some time ago

a Spanish filmmaker did not raise the Franco era so thoroughly, and I think it is very opportune that nowadays people

speak of such a person as Puig Anitch. And this film what he does is an honor to him, a summary of hislife

perfectly narrated. Perhaps the best part is the one that takes place in the prison, where the protagonist,

masterfully played by Daniel Br���hl (who gets the Goya!), Feels, evidently , only at times

accompanied by the one who at first was carrying more than bad guard of the prison, interpreted by a superb

Leonardo Sbaraglia. The life of Salvador Puig Antich It begins with a hope that, when stopped,

vanishes, like everyone who goes to prison. But he, a strong and decisive man, will not give up until

he sees that there is no possible solution, and that the death penalty awaits him. The film is divided into twoparts

clearly differentiated: the beginnings of Salvador as an anarchist and his arrest and stay in prison for

several years. It is a film totally depressing, sad, sensitive (not sensitive) and very beautiful. The problem, for

me, is that I did not live in the Franco era or what happened with Puig Antich, so it has been a bit more difficult for

me. easy to understand I think I'll wait a few years to see her again. But I must admit that, despite all

this, I found an exceptional and very emotional film. Of the interpretations, apart from the mentioned ones

of Br���hl and Sbaraglia, I would highlight those of the beautiful Ingrid Rubio, Leonor Watling, Celso Bugallo (although hardly

appears less than two minutes and do not speak ), Bea Segura (one of the sisters of Puig Antich) and Trist���n Ulloa (that

although I do not like her very much, I do not know why, she does not do it badly). , after those credit titles

with the beautiful song I si canto trist, by Lluis Llach, people used to get rid of their tears with pa �� �uelos (which theyalready

hadprepared). It was really very beautiful.

" 1

" Mediocrity along four "" comic strips "" that claim to cover much more than they really

can.

Giovanni Veronesi returns to the fray with a new installment of his Manuale D���amore. This time, and after the

excellent results harvested by the first part, has a cast more sounded, in which Carlorepeats

Verdoneand appear as dazzling female beauties Monica Bellucci and Elsa Pataky that follows trying to

look like an actress and sometimes even succeeds. This second Manuale uses the formula of counting several

(four in this case) different and independent stories. This is a method that I have never liked because

, as I think, one of the maximum virtues of a film is to have a continuity in the plot and that the

connection between Entren between its different frames and subframes is, at least, acceptable. Grosso modo, the first story

tells the sweeping love that emerges from an accident towards his physiotherapist; the second deals with a younggirl

Italian-Spanishwho returns to Rome to present her son to her father; the third, of a gay couple; and the fourth

on a marriage that goes to an artificial insemination clinic. Four "" comic strips "" compressed in just

under two hours, although it is not that they gave much more. The interpretations are correct,

especially that of a Monica Bellucci of which our Elsa Pataky may have learned a lot. It is appreciated,

that yes, the air of European comedy, so different in the tempos and the ways of the typical American. In

any case, and having a long week of carnival ahead, I would not be the one who put me in a movie

theater to see this movie. Although of course, if the situation requires pastry, the occasion is painted bald.

" 0

" Talent has given way to monetary gluttony; appears at times, but the joy wedoes not occur

had with the other 2 memorable deliveries.

The miracle was not achieved, although it was not foreseeable that an epiphany of butterflies in the mouth of the stomach would

produce amazement, which is the first command of the text line of the good cinema Good cinema was in the first

installment: irreverence for the adult's sense of smell, tenderness and good feelings for the children's parishioner and an

excellent guide that tried to take Disney from the throne of animation. .N Box office and criticism confirmed the

daring. The visual findings of the past, the high level of dialogue and the bad mood of that

deconstruction of traditional stories -that would have seemed to Propp a great daring- It does not appear

in this third installment almost anywhere. The "" almost "" allows Shrek Third not to be horrifying and to be seen

with some pleasure: just do not demand much. The inventory of characters has grown, but all are

predictable. What in the first two stories was subversive irreverence, here is a tropel���a ofgags

burnedthat never bother (it is true), but that produce the strange sensation n that we are witnessing

a blatant mental flatulence whose most obvious purpose is to drain our pockets without, in exchange,us

offeringwhat nostalgia promised, that is, the eschatology. ��a smart, the humorous criticism, the happy

encounter between the adult cinema - in this case, animated - and the children's cinema, so reviled, so turned into

merchandise, in fungible and despicable material during so long. This has sounded unused to me,

but I'm not disappointed either to not recommend it. There would be two or three antholy scenes to

justify the journey. I remember now a simply great: the melo���a melod���aa the Disney that suddenly

rears up and heels, without appreciable break, to the demonic screams of Robert Plant in a of his

wild vocal epiphanies. Perhaps it is there, in the formidable musical selection - from Damian Rice toWings

Paul McCartney's- where the still restless charm of this prodigious summer sales exercise resides. .

" 0

" The most striking, realistic, human, moving, courageous, tragic, intense and direct film of the

last years.

I would dare to say that United 93 is the most striking, realistic, human, moving, courageous,

tricky, intense and direct film of the last years. �os With so many positive adjectives you can see thatfilm

Paul Greengras'does not lack anything, it's perfect. As you all know, United 93 tells the true and real story

of the hijacking of the plane 93 on September 11 in the United States. But, along with three other flights, also

hijacked by Islamic terrorists, he was the only one who did not achieve his goal, and all thanks to the

courage and courage of his passengers The film, narrated in real time, is divided into two intense parts. In the first

fragment the events take place from the point of view of the control towers, which are terrified

as their country is in danger: the World Trade Center and the Pent���gon have been attacked by three planes and soon

They discover that the plane 93 has also been hijacked. The second shows the events on this plane of

which we all know their destination. This courageous proposal, carried out by the already named Paul Greengras

(English director of authentic quality entertainment such as Bloody sunday and The myth of Bourne), does not intend to

tell events in a patriotic way. Tica and sensitive as surely as Oliver Stone will do with the not yet

released World Trade Center. What he wants is to show us the terrible move that such kidnappings cause

for the control centers and the entire country and at the same time submerge us in an airplane full of passengers who know the

fate that awaits them, and that is why , they will fight knowing that destiny will be the same even if their enemies

die: death. Not only that, but he also wants, in a general way, to show us how the world is today

: in a chaos. Highlight mainly, next to the direction of the great Greengras, the cast of unknown

actors. Some of them are relatives of the victims, others interpret themselves (like Patrick St

Esprit) and others who simply do not know them. Of these, Christian Clemenson (who in

the last minutes of his life talks to his wife and decides, upon learning that they have attacked more buildings with

airplanes, to create a plan for assassinate the terrorists), Ben Sliney (the one in the photo below, who plays

himself), Trish Gates (the blonde stewardess), Cheyenne Jackson (the passenger in the cap who almost missed the

flight) and several more of which now I do not know the name. But in general it is a csting of the most successful in which

everyone fulfills their duty: to create realism. The film is filmed as a report, with the camera on the shoulders

(a very successful thing since it gives a touch of impressive realism), and therefore, with anphotograph

unconvincing(although lately several directors are using it in their films, such as Fernando Meirelles,

Michael Winterbottom or Michael Mann). As technical aspects, I must also highlight the elaborate editing and the

wonderful soundtrack of the irregular John Powell. This is a hard and cruel film. In many moments you

get goosebumps or you get a tear. It is purely exciting. The most interesting thing about it is that it is not

one of those stories based on real events that tell you everything that happened to perfection. It's not like that,

because you do not know exactly what happened inside that plane either. Without the relatives of the deceased passengers

or the air traffic controllers, United 93 would not exist. It is a totally necessary film to know exactly what is

happening here, in the world. It shows you the reactions of people to such events, the

nervousness of both those on earth and those in the air, and shows you a sense of

immediacy that is absolutely unsettling. This is a masterful recreation of some facts that unfortunately have

existed. We are facing the most moving and tragic film (based on a real event) of the last few years or

even decades. Before a masterpiece.

" 1

" A love story of the old ones, of the pretty ones, of which without saying anything, everything is said Having seen the original version of 1933 scarcely a couple of days ago as it says, It was expected

that I would pass all the footage (which is a lot) making comparisons, and I have to say that although the

1933 version worked perfectly with its 100 minute minutes, this version It works equally well with his

monstrous 180 minutes, reaching to develop parts of the plot that was missing in the first film. One

of these parts is the wonderful love story that arises between the beautiful Naomi Watts and the Kong beast, a

love story from before, from the beautiful ones, of which without saying anything, everything is said, and it has been this

aspect of the film that has truly made me fall in love (valga the redundancy). Two moments to remember:

The sunrises, and the ice skating. With respect to the special effects, it must be said that Mr.

Jackson has exceeded a little, especially in the beginning of the film when we It introduces thecontext of the

New York30s and where it uses the computer for things that really do not have to be done

digitally, but it is something that for those not very experienced will go unnoticed, instead the dinarians and Other infected

bugs that populate Skull Island are very successful, but the jewel in the

crown is the giant monkey, Kong, which especially in the short shots is perfect, immaculate , with

all the details, and reaching a quite surprising degree of reality. All this, along with some

decent performances, good music and a fairly fluid rhythm, make this work, the film

palomitera par excellence of Christmas.

" 1

" A film that primarily deals with the fears of people, a dark, dark, black, black

film that confirms Nolan as a great director and that leaves a very good taste in the mouth of the spectator.

Last night I had the chance to see this magnificent film by Christopher Nolan that I will now comment on. Howalready

Ihave precedents. I prefer that those who have not seen the film stopped reading. The rest of humanity that

has already seen it, you can continue reading. As Jack the Ripper said: we are going in parts. Let's discuss everything

in its proper place. One of the attractions of this film was its impressive cast, which even the

most secondary character had a known actor, and I have to say that the deal is incredible. All the

actors are characterized very well, and fit into their characters as gloves. The best of the film without a

doubt Liam Neeson (Henri Ducard) and Michael Caine (Alfred Pennyworth), two actors for whom I feel weakness, and

who in this film offer chilling and magni Ficas, the first as a mentor to Bruce

Wayne, and the second as the family steward. Gary Oldman (James Gordon) seems taken fromviñets

Batman's. Year One and put on the screen without hesitation. Morgan Freeman (Lucius Fox) has a littlerole

used, but it does not diminish emotion or quality to his interpretation. Katie Holmes is perhaps the only 'but'

of the resparto. the girl is fine (both in its interpretation and in the rest of things), but it does not make me

credible, it's too young. Cillian Murphy (Dr. Jonathan Crane) gives a much more serious and stylish look to

Arkham than was given to him in Batman Forever. And the rest of the cast: Rutger Hauer (Richard Earle), Ken Watanabe

(Ra's Al Ghul or not) and Tom Wilkinson (Carmine Falcone) are also very good in their roles. A m��� Christian

Bale has never convinced me as Bruce Wayne / Batman, but I must say that he makes a very very credibleinterpretation

and appropriate(although there may be times that Patrick Bateman of American Psycho seems) , but even so, I have not

seemed as good as the rest of the cast. By the way,that in the end there is nothing between the Holmes and

thank goodnessBale, because they do not even hit with tail. The dubbing. What to say about a film that changes all thevoices

recognizableof the actors for others? Well that really is fucking mother. I have foundvery correct

the dubbing, but I would also like to see it in VO (I always say the same, and in the end n��� of n���). The only thing that wouldme

squealis that when Bale dresses in Batman, one of two: either squeezes the suit, or picks up cold in the throat,

because it comes out a hoarse voice that there are moments that touch the absurd. Speaking of music, the fact that two

composers of height as Hans Zimmer and James Newton Howard took charge of it was a veryincentive

big, but without neglecting its indisputable quality as a score, it to say that it could be improvable, and that

the influences of both a composer and the other are noticed in some cuts of the soundtrack. In

spite of this, a wonderful composition that fits perfectly with the rhythm and composition of

Christopher Nolan as director. With regard to directing, really nothing what to object the film speaks for

itself, some scenes, some plans, a trepidantes rhythm, but we must know how to recognize the errors: the scenes

of action (the jousts, nor more no less) are somewhat confusing, there are times when you really do not see

what is happening on the screen. The gui���n, another of the star ingredients of the film. I went with

the idea that I was not going to like it, because with what I saw in the trailer, it seemed like a film too zen, I

do not know, a kind of Seven A�� Enos in the Tibet with Batman, but Mr. David S. Goyer (author of the three

Blades and Dark City) and Christopher Nolan have done a really good job, a dark film , with some

brilliant dialogues, that excite, and with situations that drink directly from the essence of Batman. And that

final guide. puts the hairs of punta.En summary, a film that primarily deals with the fears of people,

a dark film, dark, black, black, confirming Nolan as a great director and that leaves a very

good taste in the mouth of the spectator. Undoubtedly, one of the best films of the year. Most likely, the best

movie in the Batman saga. and maybe, over time, the best superhero film ever made.

" 1

" The argument is not interesting, the actors are overworked and neither convince nor make you laugh and the well-

known Woody Allen jokes are already beginning to smell like the Madrid metro wagons at rush hour.

When you have always been told that you are a genius, there must come a time when you believe it yourself. And

when you think you are a genius, arrogance and arrogance must cloud the objective view of the quality

of a job. Something similar happens a lot with the so-called liberal professions and, specifically, with

special virulence in the world of cinema. How many actors do we know that their biggest contribution to the camera is to

teach carnaza? And how many directors, forgetting that their product is going to be distributed in a movie theater and

not in the living room of their house, are enraptured by the compliments made by theirvassals

Pseudo-intellectual? All this proleg���meno comes to the case to try to explain how a supposed director of the

quality of Woody Allen may have made a film as exaggeratedly boring as Scoop. Honestly,

this is not one of my favorite directors but it is that the fudge I witnessed a few days ago in the cinema is of

considerable dimensions. To begin the base is not very good since the argument is not interesting (a

journalism student receives from the beyond the tip-off about the identity of a serial killer), this

idea is taken too linearly, so much, that in the middle of the movie You already know what the ending will be. The

actors are overworked and neither convince nor make you laugh (in fact, it's something Woodyhas always done

Allen, let's not forget that besides s tobelieved a good director is also a good actor thinks, because supposedly

see a man so ugly with a face as expressionless going to cause a lot of laughter) .All this comes

accompanied ��ado by the well-known Woody Allen jokes that are already beginning to smell like the subway cars

of Madrid at rush hour. If we mix all these elements in a shaker we will obtain a poor result,

boring and of doubtful quality or, what is the same, Scoop.

" 0

" This is a small and delicate piece in which all the details merge into a single objective: to pass

authentic fear along with the horror that its protagonists live.

Even though the billboards are splashed every year of abundant films that promise fear, it

is increasingly difficult to find one that really d��� aut� Cute terror. And that is precisely what

Greg Mclean achieves with his film "Wolf Creek." It is difficult to talk about it without revealing anything of his argument and,

on the other hand, it is better not to do so to attend to the surprises that Mr. Mclean has reserved for us. In

essence it is a trip made by three young people during their stay in Australia that will be interrupted

by something unexpected. Although many see this film as an imitation, others that were successful in their

time, I think "" Wolf Creek "" is very ingenious and that Mclean uses precisely those other references so

that the viewer can confess in his seat thinking that he knows what is going to happen and thus be able to surprise andDuring

terrify him.the first part of the film, we attend a r� Fast but effective presentation of the three

young protagonists who begin their adventure through the wonderful and grandiose landscapes of Australia. Although

everything seems calm and controlled, there is something that bothers us: like the protagonists, something disturbs us

but we do not know why. As the events unfold, and although everything is quiet, we have the

feeling that something bad can happen at any moment. And so it happens in a second part very well

linked and finished in which all the elements fit perfectly, and where, without a doubt, we will spendmoments.

anxious and terrifyingThe coherence of the gui��� and the extraordinary Interpretation of the actors save

many others do not (and will not) arrive at that. A thriller, which drinks from many sources, (everyone cites ""Dogs

Straw"" and "" Deliverance "") so the plot and the story is, besides ���s of excessively theatrical, very predictable

in some cuts of the same. I liked the change of planes, in many of the images where the

camera with a lens change moves from one character to another, it will be a bullshit, but I liked it. On the

other hand, lately the fashion of including actors of certain renown in films is being given "" made in spain ""

to make the sale to other countries easier and more bearable for the film, one of the problems with which

the Spanish cinema is to be distributed. ���n.It is a pity, that this Garrulos Vs Foreigners is left with an

inconclusive ending, where it is not possible to go deeply into the motivations of each other, and where we have so little

information. ci���n on the motivations of the characters, that one has to invent and imagine, to get

something clear of it.

" 0

" It would sadden me to think that the Academy grants this film the Oscar for the best of the year. It would sadden me to think that the Academy grants this film Oscar at the best of the year. It is the first of

the five nominees that I have occasion to see, but it does not leave the list too high. It has supposed to me, to a certain

extent, a slight disappointment, because in spite of all the good thing that has been told of the film, it hardly has three

things worth mentioning: a striking premise for sold at the box office (the love story of the two

cowboys), the consistent interpretation of Heath Ledger (worthy of the Oscar) and the fabulous address of Ang

Lee. Yes, the story is told with the master's taiwan���s mastery; another to sing is that the content of its

fabulous forms is empty, as in this case, is very tricky. The story is, as the English would say,

"tricky", cheat. It is not loyal to the viewer. Try to create in us the sensation that thelives

heterosexualof the cowboys are m���seras, boring, insubstantial, regretful, and that they live in them, forced

by a reality of the decade of the 60's unfair And of course, their encounters in the scrub forest are the

escape route to achieve happiness. That is what I call conditioning the viewer to justify an action

that on the other hand does not need justification. They say that history speaks of love. Pse. I do not think that Jack

Twist in Mexico was love. Let's go in parts. What things does the film try to tell us? Apparently, he tries to

sell that love is superior to any circumstance or condition, and that is capable of sprouting between two

rude cowboys. I did not see the need to paint the western rose, but if we want to see a treatise on love, it is

enough to see how John Wayne looks at his brother's wife in "" Centaurs of the desert "", glances loaded with

feelings, but with a shrunken heart to know that it is his wife, and that above feelings is the

family. F���jense, with a look we have understood as much as seeing Ennis and Jack inside the tent

And as in itself the story does not count anything else, apart from the treaty of tempo cinematographic and photography

that in itself constitutes the tape, the rest is empty, pure emptiness destined to be filled with our digestion of

the doses of contrarieties that Ang Lee is prescribing us with dropper. Certainly, I was not excited,

but I do not think it's a horror film either. Maybe we have to see it so that when someone comes with untiring

enthusiasm to tell us about it, we know exactly that it is not so bad.

" 0

" Great film with which to enjoy the light Latin American comedy, which again shows

that the lack of resources usually becomes an incentive that sharpens the ingenuity.

The truth is that some time ago I wanted to see Brave Time, but between one thing and another it has been several

months until a good day of last week decided to serve me a gin and tonic, put on my shoes and sit in

front of the TV to enjoy or suffer the film. I already had a good image of one of its protagonists,

Diego Peretti, who had seen another work, No sos vos, soy yo, that left an excellent taste in my mouth. The

Argentine environment, the accent of its people and the freshness of its characters embarrassed me from the beginning. The

dialogues seemed to me magnificently constructed, showing a mastery of the language, the double meaning and

the irony that was already beginning to be lost in the world of current celluloid. The complicity between Peretti and

Luque transmits confidence and naturalness, as the relationship of any pair of good friends. At times, the

background guide is simple, because although it fulfills its function of painlessly portraying the corruption of the

police forces of the Argentine state, it could have been better assembled, because in this case the sum of

the parts is better than the total. By this I mean that it is the typical film from which, with the passing of

time, concrete scenes are remembered but the plot is forgotten. With everything and with that, I think it's a great

film with which to re disfrutandor enjoying the light Latin American comedy, which shows again that the lack

of resources tends to become an incentive that sharpens the genius of creators that more than compensate for the economic

deficiencies that the South American film industry suffers.

" 1

" Curious black film tape, set in the 50s, although developed in 2 planes, it does not become

round because it gets lost along the way.

Curious black film tape, set in the 50s, although developed in 2 planes, it does not become

round because it gets lost along the way, and is that, the slowness in some moments, the inability to close the

Thousand frames that open and a dull ending, which matters little to the viewer, are a ballast of 2 hours in duration,

which promised a lot at the beginning, but which, in the end, remains nothing.Adrien Brody is again the same as

we saw in "" The Pianist "", far from the hero of "" King Kong "" by Peter Jack $ are, on the other hand is Ben Affleck, that

someone said some time , that after "" Jersey Girl "" this man would be able to act, in "" Hollywoodland "" (for

which he won the Volpi Cup at the Venezia Festival) he manages to make the character of George Reeves,

"" initiator "" of the already mythical "" Superman's Curse "", I do not want to leave out Diane Lane, who is no longer a

child. a, but has not lost It gives of its brutal beauty and sensuality, amen of an excellent interpretative level, that

transmits in screen leaving almost "" Out "" to Ben and Adrien. An excellent secondary school, headed by

Bob Hoskins, as well as enough television faces, close the cast.Other point against is his score, dull,

very dull, with a boring score, which manages to get in the viewer a sense ofmusical drowsiness

permanent.

" 0

" In short, I think the film was well achieved. But of course, I'm not the one to determine. I'm

like a woman talking about football. They do not-listen to me.

Well, as one of the few non-fanatic people in the series who already watched the movie (in addition to the parents of

fanatical children, but do not count), I feel privileged to say some things about her

over the radically subjective mantle of fanaticism. First of all, I do not know what fans

of a movie series expect. cula A longer chapter, a more closed structure, some made a little more transcendent,

the limitation of the jokes-c�� They are so sectarian, they always leave me out. And nothing more. Those who hoped

that Homer had in the film some transcendental truth to expose the world, were of course acting

irrationally because of fanaticism. And they would have left disillusioned. I think it's obvious the appeal to a

different public in the film than in the series. A wider public, not necessarily following the series, a

more childish public of moments. This is seen above all in the quotations and allusions to the real world -

characteristic feature of the series if there are any - which are much more accessible in the film than in the series. In the latter,

the American characters are perhaps not so well known outside, quotations from films more or less cult,

etc. In the film are Spiderman, Harry Potter, Tom Hanks, Green Day, Titanic. The difference is clear. An addition

to the obvious of the change of the series to the film was the constant menci���ny alusi���na the film as such. Not

only through the use of certain cinematic clichés but through explicit jokes, from the mouths of the

characters. I found it an interesting and above all worthy resource as soon as it became

self-parody. Finally, I think there was a good deal of transcendentality in the film regarding the series.

Rupture of things that in the series always stayed the same, I say. A surprise effect well placed and measured. Inot

willgive examples to not tell you that Bruce Willis is dead. In short, I think the film was well

achieved. But of course, I'm not the one to determine. I'm like a woman talking about football. They do not-listen to me.

" 1

" An irregular and interesting debut almost in equal parts for a Nacho Cerd��� that begins its journey in

the long format and that continues to be a brave and safe bet for the future of cinema more terrifying of

this country.

Nacho presented the film and dedicated it to his parents who were in the room. It was rumored that thescreening

pressin the morning had not gone too well, but in the afternoon, in this other session, the public

He was cheerful and expectant, cheering even the initial credits. A large part of the technical team and the

two main actors, Anastasia Hille and Karen Roden, who do a great and hard work in the

film, also accompanied the projection. The film, which is the debut as a feature film by its author, is

endowed with a very remarkable technical invoice and the camera by Xavi Gim���nez is already, without any doubt and bymerits

own, a contrasted quality signature. Gim���nez has already participated in one of the previous works of Cerd���,

"" The Awakening "" (1990), "" Aftermath "" (1994), and "" G���nesis " "(1998). The latter are two medium-length films closely linked

to the genre Gore, who knew how to find their audience and find a place in fantastic and horror festivals as

small works of worship. Filmax is the sponsor of this first feature film by Nacho Cerd���, a feature film that,

unfortunately, is once again a perfect showcase of the virtues and defects of the producer's

horror productions, which are not only almost all photographed by the same cameraman, but in

addition, they all end up looking a bit like cut by the same patron. From "" The abandoned "" I was hooked

above all the principle, where a mysterious and disturbing atmosphere predominates, allied to an efficient work

in the direction of art. We immerse ourselves in a brilliant composition full of poetic and disturbing planes.

However, right away, you can see a certain abuse of obsessively dark and obscure

sets, broken old dolls, baby moans and a whole series of very recognizable clichés within the genre. A

ubiquitous sound effects to a volume totally out of mother and an endless succession offrights

gimmicks and freebegin, unfortunately, severely irritate viewing. The story, moreover,hits

inexplicablyan extraordinary low in the middle of the footage, where the plot, once the cards are shown,

stagnates and the surprises, after such a mess of disorganized and caustic effects. Attic, they no longer have theeffect

desired. By the time the film tries to surprise in its final outcome, it is already too late, although

it is true that some of my favorite scenes are concentrated precisely in this section. Cerd���,

however, shows great talent, becomes great and shows his teeth when it comes to disturbing, provoking,

suggesting, in some of those reflective moments, in recreation. of a very successful oppressive atmosphere, of

tension and suspense, as for example when the protagonists seem to wait together resigned to theirdestination

final, without a doubt, one of the best moments of all the film. The audience, something cold, dismissed the

film with shy applause that contrasted with the enthusiasm of the beginning of the evening, and I stayed

the sensation of having seen something that could have been spectacular, but that stayed a little along the way, in

an exercise perhaps too artificial and confusing. An irregular and interesting debut almost in equal parts for

a Nacho Cerd��� who begins his career in the long format and continues to be a brave andbet

surefor the future of the most terrifying cinema of this country

" 0

" Claustrophobic, almost without exteriors and using only a couple of sets, despite the two and a half hours of

length the narrative is fragile, using intelligence and moderation the voice in off and avoiding at all times the

melodrama.

The film is based on the famous personal diary written by Anne Frank during her stay in a room

in Amsterdam, hidden with her family and other Jews escaping from the Nazis, during the course of the

second world war. The coexistence for almost three years (12/6/42 to 4/8/44) of eight people in the same

conditions and in a very small space, gave rise to all kinds of situations, enriched by the

pr� look ��stina and vivacious of the adolescent Ana. That look full of strength and passion that Ana had in her life and in

her art, was very well transferred by the director George Stevens (Shane, Giant) , which allows the viewer to

empathize with all the characters alike (a fact that does not occur with the reading of the book), and a fidelity to the

text that in this case is for others positive.Claustrof� ��bica, almost without exteriors and using only a couple of

sets, despite the two and a half hours of length the narration is fragile, using intelligence and restraint

the voice in off and avoiding at all times the melodrama, as in the end where there is the arrest of

people, giving poetry class and good taste. Despite being made almost fifteen years after the

publication of the book, it is less explicit than here in relation to the protagonist's sexuality,

practically nonexistent in the film beyond a hint of a kiss, although we agree that the book

is not very bold for these times, much worse for the time. Other high points are first and foremost, the

excellent photography by William C. Mellor, in an intense black and white and beautiful game of contrasts, visible

even in the photos that accompany the text . The music of Alfred Newman, overloaded, but used in small

doses. The performances are also good and even, with Joseph Schildkraut standing out as Ana's father, Ana

herself (Millie Perkins) and the recognizable Shelley Winters as Mrs. Van Daan, a character that seems

to lead, by its interpretation and characteristics, in the mother of Lolita of Stanley Kubrick. The diary of Anne

Frank produces the same feeling of uprooting, resignation and tension that other films that deal with the same

topic, where the concentration camps are shown, located without clashing - perhaps less spectacular but not

less felt - than the best contemporary exponents of the genre: The Pianist by Roman Polanski and

Schindler's List by Steven Spielberg.

" 1

" A great movie that maybe disappoints those who seek a thriller like the others but who will like,

I hope a lot, those who seek good cinema.

I have to thank, once again, the Warner Bros Espa���aya muchocine.net the invitation to the press pass,

two weeks ago, of "" Zodiac "", the new movie This film is one of the best directors of the

day: David Fincher. The film tells the stories of the assassin of the Zodiac and the subsequent investigation of

these by the police and journalists. A simple look at the synopsis comes to understand the reasons

that led Fincher to make this his next project. The crime, the unhealthy environment, the macabre are

present in the story and are captured on screen effectively. Especially spooky and unsettling are

the scenes of the crimes, capable of putting the spectator in tension as only Fincher and a few

more know how to do. An oppressive atmosphere that the director also moves other moments of the story. But

no one expects "" Zodiac "" a new "" Seven "" because it is two films with few elements in common. It is

clear that Fincher does not like to repeat himself and advocates here more for the topic of investigation, for thejourney

innerexperienced by the characters, rather than for the Thriller of suspense to use. It is helped in his work

by the milim���trico gui���n of James Vanderbilt, based on the book by Robert Graysmith, which is able to leave no

loose ends in a very broad history and that lasts for many years. This gives the film a certain air of

"biopic" which is its biggest problem as it can cause a certain distance between the viewer and the story. In

any case, the scriptwriter must be aware of this problem because it adds a couple of subtle touches to the

story that make it more round. A great script, I insist, that it draws brilliantly

flesh and blood characters, nothing flat and that they are magnificently interpreted. Jake Gyllenhaal is a good actor who

maybe lacks a charisma (that face does not help much) but in this case it suits his

character. Also Mark Ruffalo and Anthony Edwards offer good performances but may be

overshadowed by the talent and charisma of a Robert Downey Jr. who is living one of his best moments. In

more secondary roles, but I also offer solid interpretations, we can see Brian Cox (in a paper

originally awarded to Gary Oldman), John Carroll Lynch, Elias Koteas or Chlo��� Sevigny. But, if the rest was

not enough, the element that I liked the most, the one that raised it above many other films, is

its rhythm. Rarely two hours and forty minutes have passed by me so quickly. The story progresses

so naturally, in such a fluid way and catches you in such a way that when you realize you are watching the

final credits. This detail proves, for me, ���, the brilliance of the directing and editing work (of Angus

Wall) of a film of which I would also highlight David Shire's original soundtrack and theselection

musical. In short, a great movie that may disappoint those who seek a thriller like the others

but who will like, I hope a lot, the that they look for cinema of the good one. Final valuation of moonfleet.es: 8,5 on

10.

" 1

" Scenes of action without respite with an actor in form in spite of the step of the a��� os, with a blunt gui���n, it

is a real pleasure to feel again the misadventures of the great character again in action but with

less hair and more wrinkles.

Apparently the nostalgic are in luck with the new trend of Hollywood to recover the

heroes of action of anta���o.Stallone who dusts off his characters to whom he owes the fame "" Rocky and Rambo ""

within a few dates we will have Harrison Ford playing the great Indiana Jones again. As I see it; It can

sometimes be projects destined to resurrect the career of the shining star, because whatever it is, it is

to be grateful. McLane was always one of my favorite characters for his inaccuracy, his lips always

pronouncing tacos a hundred times time and able to get in the worst lÃos leaving graceful in that

chulesca.Bruce Willis returns with his character most celebrated by the hand of the director of Underworld that hits

the point of giving him or with the same techniques of action leaving aside technological advances. Scenes of

action without respite with an actor in form despite the passage of the a��� os, with a blunt gui���n, it is a real

pleasure to feel again the misadventures of the great character again in action but with less hair and more wrinkles.

To put a but I did not like the interpretation of the bad "" Timothy Olyphant "" known thanks to the

Deadwood series that at no time is up to the charisma of previous villains such as Jeremy

Irons. A 8.

" 1

" Recommended for all those fans of youthful terror ... Teen-horror film that without looking for many complications drinks from a thousand sources, from the original movie

(of which this is a remake) of Vincent Price, from which he takes the name for the villain of the day, the

film itself is another genre, where young people who are completely oustanding are falling in hands of the

murderer of the place. Maybe the "" original "" is the way to die, and is that now the color character is not the

first to die. Elisha Cuthbert and Paris Hilton quite well both, showing heart and Paris doing some

humor about "" the reason for which she is famous "" (her famous video on the internet), in short, that you do not have to ask for pears

to the elm (impressive those of Cuthbert). Recommended for all those fans of youthful terror .

" 0

" Entertaining but finally something disappointing horror / fantastic film. An entertaining film of terror more or less fantastic that nevertheless remains clearly below what

could have been And it is that it does not finish convincing at all, in spite of that the time passes and the interest does not decay

throughout the footage. A somewhat lengthy footage for what is told, the truth. The best thing about the film, apart from

its effective special effects, is that the written script has managed to give cinematographic form to a story

short of the famous Stephen King, lengthening with effects and situations a narration that apparently did not give

for tando.Y they do it well until the last minutes, dosing the tension and supposed terror, with elements

that go appearing little by little, getting some impacts that go on crescendo as theadvances

argument. It's not that they're for rockets, but I know they entertain and make you not leave the movie.

But I think that the situations become excessive in the end, lengthening the footage unnecessarily, until you

get to a somewhat bland epilogue. For its part, the protagonist, an omnipresent John Cusack, does it with his

customary professionalism, although in some moments he passes in his terror and in the face of what happens to him.

Let's say that more or less at the beginning, when you cut with the window of the room, you get scared too much,

when it was still not so much, I think. Although, of course, I say that I was sitting comfortably in the

chair, if necessary. And in addition, it is not his fault, but the scriptwriter.In general lines is a film that gives the

approved and approaches the good, but scarce, may have reached the notable with a little m�� Imagination.

But it's not bad.

" 0

" Contains a couple of beautiful scenes thanks to some worked special effects, but succumb to the

general incoherence, boredom, saturation, excess and aggression of some thunderouseffects

soundthat only they invite to run away.

Confused, disproportionate, contrived, languid, noisy, insipid, empty, failed, incongruous and absurd, with

flat characters and a plot trite, shabby, rusty, relegated , revised, remamado, conventional and without

contributions or original ideas. Pretentiously pretentious on the outside and merely macarra on the inside. I could

pass quietly through one of the bad and psychedelic trips of one of the protagonists of the great and so

distant Trainpotting, but what I know is, with certainty, is a pastiche without taste nor criterion, a waste, a waste

of time and money for the unfortunate that like me, are unfortunately attracted by the

juggling and the colors of this nefarious and disappointing cinematographic proposal. It contains a couple of

beautiful scenes thanks to some special effects, but succumb to the general incoherence,

boredom, saturation, excess and the aggression of some thunderous sound effects that only invite you to

leave running

" 0

" It is impossible not to enjoy with this film those that we enjoyed with every small hook of thecolt

Italian. A cari���oso and exciting tribute to a living myth.

Nobody, absolutely nobody, gave a hard for this Rocky; no one believed that Stallone was able to return

the saga to what were his first deliveries, just as no one gave a hard because Rockyin his

stood uplast fight; But Stallone has achieved it, has created a product that is as good as thewas at the time

saga. It's a gold pin for a saga that did not deserve to finish in Rocky V. It's impossible not to enjoy with this

film those that we enjoyed with each little one with each Italian colt hook. "" Rocky Balboa "" is a

nostalgic view of the myth, perhaps sometimes excessively charged with nostalgia, but its defects are

also part of its virtues; we see a Rocky full of ghosts from the past, more hurt by the blows of

life than by those of the cuadril���tero, who only have the memories of a brighter past and a punching of

anecdotes to tell the customers of his bar. It is a continuous return to the past, a tribute to Rocky andhimself

Stallone, a beautiful and sometimes silly but very honest reflection on the old glories and the passage of

time. Stallone's work with this film is commendable. cula It could have been limited to sell us a fight of an

old Rocky and with problems with drugs, with the famous turn; but his love for the characterhim

preventedand had to give a decent ending to the saga. Perhaps the most negative point of the film is that the rival

lacks charisma and is not up to the task, but it does not matter, because the absolute protagonist of this film is Rocky.

It is ultimately a caring and exciting tribute to a living myth.

" 1

" Who had the gift of seeing the future as the character of Nicolas Cage. With such a capacity, weourselves

could savemany hot flashes that we endured in a movie theater.

The day an executive came up with the idea that he could use the expression "" inspired by? "" Instead of

"" based on? "" Was a great day for Hollywood. An ideal subterfuge with which to cover the backs before the

public by the infinity of tropel���as made with novels, plays or even real facts and

hist���ricos.La science fiction has been one of the main victims, since there are innumerable cases in which

a good idea becomes a film of vulgar action. E- + this is the case of Next, which isinspired

freelyby a free story by Philip K. Dick entitled The Golden Man. It turns out that a magician from third of Las

Vegas, which puts his musician Nicolas Cage and little else, he has the gift of seeing his future with two minutes in

advance. This quality makes an FBI agent, played by Julianne Moore, ask for help to

avoid a nuclear catastrophe. But alas, the poor devil just wants to live a happy and quiet life with a

woman, to whom Jessica Biel's vase puts her curves, with which she is obsessed. Whoever expects to see a

work of science fiction that deals with transcendental and philosophical topics can already forget about Next. On the other

hand, those who are looking for a film in which the plot is a mere excuse to make way for an

endless sequence of action and visual effects would enjoy it with Next . The gui���n there is no where to

grab it even if it goes with the best predisposition, and if that was not enough the tape is extremely tricky. And

if not, look at the patch with that end, which will leave the mouth open to a viewer, and these, in a vain

attempt to find a reasonably reasonable explanation, mark the screen without leaving your astonishment. Who

had the gift of seeing the future as the character of Nicolas Cage. With such capacity, we couldourselves

savemany hot flashes that we endure in a movie theater or on the sof��� of our house.

" 0

" It has not disappointed me at all, but I still have the doubt of what else this film would have contributed if I

had not read the book.

I came to this movie with two completely personal problems. First, I just read the book and

second, that the movie was shot in the city where I was born (Barcelona) and where I live (Girona). I passed the

film comparing with the book and looking for the locations, respectively, and so there is no one who

completely enters the movie. Saving these problems, of which the movie is not at fault , the movie

is very good. As an adaptation it is sufficiently faithful to the book, and the few changes that there are, I think are

good decisions. It shortens the part where Jean-Baptiste Grenouille, the protagonist, spends years of solitude in

a cave in a mountain, accentuating his murderous nature, and the aspects strictly cinematographic, such as

interpretations, music, photography and ambience, are excellent. Maybe it fails in the abuse of the

narrator, who is too present, and explains things to us who have read the book are obvious and

perhaps would be better if Inslo hinted at.Total, that to be a long awaited movie has not disappointed me at

all, but I have the doubt of what else I would have contributed this film if I had not I took the book and

if it had been shot in places I did not know.

" 1

" Pixar returns to position itself as a great factor that achieves a great victory over Dreamworks. In

terms of cinematographic quality, its product surpasses the very same Shrek, flagship of its rival.

Brad Bird has directed "" The incredibles "" in 1984 and his work had been very good. In general, we know that

Pixar has better ideas than Dreamworks in how to work animation scripts. "" Ratatouille "" comes

to the screens mounted on a hellish hype that made me doubt a lot of their a priori values. It

is not that one is distrustful, but you know that big studios invest more money in advertising

when they know that your product is mediocre? Since word of mouth is not going to work, they inject money into the

media so that everyone is tempted and they go to see their film. Well, fortunately "" Ratatouille "" is not of this

class. Of course, the cast must say that I was pleasantly surprised (first of all, I want to tell you that as

usual, I saw the English version, so I refer to the characters according to their original dubbing), it is a

film where the voices are accurate and the good humor depends on the chemistry that occurs between the im� ��genes and

those who lend their voices, in that aspect, the film is remarkable. But let's move on to history itself,

Remy (Patton Oswalt, precise tone and performance) lives in Paris, loves the kitchen and his dream is to work in the best

restaurant in the world. world, has exceptional conditions to combine spices, ingredients and know the best

product for your work. Sure, there's a problem, Remy, it's a rat! Here is the first script of the script. Our friendly

rodent seems to represent an odd case, as if it were a "declassed" "subject belonging to a

social segment and because of those things of destiny, he stands out in abilities that characterize a higher stratum

than his. And that seems inaccessible to his possibilities. Well, Remy is a rat that accidentally will

meet a Linguini (Lou Romano, sensitive and very funny), a young human who also wants to be a chef, but

knows nothing about cooking and above all, is sent to work at a restaurant that had been owned by the

legendary Gusteau (Brad Garret, ghostly!), a prestigious chef who was loved by all of France until his

death. There, his assistant continues to run the place and accept Linguini among their ranks, well. Linguini and

Remy !!! There is a secret that could change the destiny of all (which we will not reveal here), and the plot becomes more

complex as it progresses in a natural and well-patterned manner. Linguini meets Remy and although there is no dialogue

between them verbally, the symbiotic communication they show is very well achieved. Between the two willeach

complementother, some will fall in love (Colette in the sweet Janeane Garofalo) and surprise with excellent

dishes to the amazement of her employer, Skinner (I told them that it was the sober Ian Holm?) who feels that Linguini

hides something dark that could end his business. "" Ratatouille "", I did not think it was a movie for guys.

I mean, not for little guys. His guide shows signs of sophistication ranging from the place chosen to

unleash the conflict (a Parisian restaurant) to an evident problem of racism and intolerance (the subject of

confrontations between humans and rodents). It seems to me that there is a lot of work in history and adults

really enjoy this addition to the story that is what gives flight to the film and broadens its spectrum. In that

sense, Pixar returns to position itself as a great factor that achieves a great victory over Dreamworks in

terms of cinematographic quality, its product surpasses the very same Shrek, flagship of its rival.

"" Ratatouille "" appeals to us with that naivety that films have in which the search to find a place

in the world is the paramount issue. Of the best for the whole family, although laughter andsituations do not abound

extreme(although there are some), this is a very friendly tape for the occasional spectator and a delight for

those predisposed to sit at this table to taste this exquisite delicacy .

" 1

" I cry as if the boyfriend had died, but the story has neither ton nor son and raises a series of

inconsistencies that make it a great nonsense

I just returned from watching the announced movie ���cula The House of the Lake (2006) that marked the reunion of one of

the most popular cinematographic couples: Sandra Bullock and Keanu Reeves and this editor can not but

express her opinion next: ���PLOP! (Condorito style, ��� I demand an explanation!) In the last post, a comment

left by another of our editors, Oli, indicated that the film was hyperromantic and effectively, I

have to agree. I must even confess that I cried as if the groom had died or

run over my favorite pet. Peroooo The story has neither ton nor son and raises a series of

inconsistencies that basically make it a great nonsense. That's it, a great romantic tonter���as���per.bought

Imyself with the impossible love reference that makes the book Persuasion of my favorite author now and

always, Jane Austen (author of the fabulous Pride and Prejudice that was adapted for the big screen

last year). Kate (Bullock), a lonely doctor and Alex (Reeves), a rom The only architect, they are perfecteach

forother. They both love the lake house and own the same bitch (Jack). But, the great but of this

story is that Alex lives in 2004 and Kate in 2006 in the period that is being known through correspondence

through the buz���n " "Magic" "of the lake house. Already from the approach without further explanation we can

note how rock \* can be the story. For that reason, I will see her, go with the intention of seeing a fantasy and

do not try to understand this illogical plot. Her love that begins in 2004 is going to have to overcome the test of

time and wait until 2008 to materialize. Why not in 2006, when Kate falls in love with Alex?

Well, by pure whim of the scriptwriter. V���anla and they will realize why I say it. In fact it is more dramatic and

romantic that the protagonist had waited for her for four years. Well, that made me run like crazy. It really

is an Austen effect, which seems to be having a lot of success today. I was

struck by the director, the Argentine Alejandro Agresti, who seems to have gone into the ranks of Hollywood with

great support. For more references, he was the director of One Night with Sabrina Love. Another thing that hasme

left: OHHH, is the fact that Sandra Bullock and Keanu Reeves have not aged anything since they did Speed

in 2004, m Des of a decade ago. ���Pact with the devil? Another point in favor of the film is the beautiful

photography and the architectural beauties that it shows us of the city of Chicago. A great actress in arole

secondaryof history is Shohreh Aghdashloo to whom We already saw a remarkable performance in The House of Sand and

Fog. The casting of La casa del lago went very well until they chose the best actor, Ebon Moss-Bachrach,

as Alex's dreaming brother. Also little exploited is the love-hate story of both brothers with

their father, but hey, maybe it's a problem of editing, in which they have cut more scenes of those that

had to meet a defined footage. This is a speculation since the yearsremain a mystery

of Alex's disappearance, prior to 2004,. Fact: The film is based on another Korean film Il Mare or Siworae.

I would like to see this original version, there it is a little more coherent.

" 0

" Sometimes, the computer science, an excellent assembly and a director with claw, do wonders. The pity is that they

forget the script. For sample, a button.

Spider-man and Sam Raimi have run aground, because the third installment on the hero Marvel arècnido

offers nothing new to the viewer with respect to the previous. It seems that, to face Spider-man 3, the director

has built a kind of DIY with several of the concepts already discussed in thetwo

first, which, to my whole mind, seems to me too repetitive. s: he would say that, apart from

repetitive, it is boring, since, at all times, he prefers the melodramatic effect over the

spectacularity of his action scenes. There are, there are, but with too many dead times (and

unnecessary) between them. A curious contradiction, because this happens precisely in the chapter that more

attention has been devoted to its (perfect) special effects. In fact, at this moment, Spider-man 3 is thefilm

most expensivein the history of cinema. The only remarkable story novelties are found in that announced

dark side of the hero (very forced and poorly explained) and, first of all, in the focus of the relationship between Peter

Parker (Spider-man's alter ego) and his girlfriend, Mary Jane Jackson, after he discovered his double

personality. The rest is more of the same, starting with the rivalry created between the protagonist and the

vengeful son of the Green Goblin, Harry Osborn, who, following in the footsteps of his father, will evoke the

adventures of ��� This is to get rid of the ara���a man And as it seems that a single villain per film is not enough

for the ambitions of today's Hollywood, Raimi loads the inks of his product with two more perverse types. One

is the man who ended the life of his uncle, the other, a resentful photographer who, after feeling humiliated by

Parker, will plan the death of this one. Too many disparate concepts - and not very well grouped - so that the story

is well basted. I have always considered myself a defender (layer and sword) of the first two titles of the

series, especially the second, which He had an excellent script that, in this case, is missed.

Maybe that's why this installment has disappointed me so much. I expected much more from a Sam Raimi who,

unfortunately, seems to have settled too much - and easily - with the character, forgetting to draw a

well-defined story and conform Just so, with showing, again and again, the same scenes as always. In the

end, one ends up getting tired of those (well) filmed sequences in which Spider-man, as anTarzin

urban, is jumping from skyscraper to skyscraper. And more so if Tobey Maguire -for the first time since he gave life

to the character-, gives the impression of not being very comfortable in his role. In any case, it is undeniable that, a

Despite its shortcomings, the film has unique and worthy moments of a filmmaker who (when he wants) knows how to put the

camera properly. A good example of this is at the moment when the superhero must save

a woman who, because of a runaway crane and placed on top of a large building, is on the verge of falling

into emptiness Sometimes, the computer science, an excellent assembly and a director with claw, do wonders. The pity is that

they forget the script. For sample, a button.

" 0

" The issue that really should raise is the price of pain-how much is a daughter dead on

a plane of the eleventh September?

The character of Adam Sandler lost his wife and three daughters in one of the planes of September 11.

The question is: would we care whether you lost them in a traffic accident, or on an 11M train?

I regret cynicism, but the answer is no. There are pains and pains. And Dr. Fineman suffers the pain of all

the pain, suffers the open wound of a grieving nation, suffers a pain of epic proportions, the pain of

a nation that gets used to it. � thinking that it was the largest in the world and he woke up knowing that he was vulnerable. The

argument is articulated in a narrative scheme similar to the one Wenders chose in "" Par��� s, Texas "". The

protagonist self-destructs in an endless ceremony until in the end he can talk and recompose with a

speech the shreds of his life that he has been showing in front of the screen. That is why Fineman is allowed

everything. That's why nobody leaves him alone. The landlady, the friend, the administrator of the immense fortune that she took as a

victim of 9/11, the therapist. everyone endures their extravagances and they chase after him. Why? In order to

tell in front of the camera the suffering that was for him the loss of his family as if it were a

television show? The megaphone of a confession It is not enough for a pain of suchproportions

excessive. It is necessary to go further. It is necessary that the police stop him and a trial be held against

him and his mental health be questioned. It is necessary that the wife's parents attack him and Fineman

becomes a victim of his silent pain ("silent"?). It is necessary for the public thecatharsis

collective, the bath of tears with which he so desires to flood his disconsolate victim. But the subject that really

should raise is that of the price of pain - how long is a daughter dead on a plane on11

September? How long is the brother killed in the Gulf War? How much is a firefighter trapped in the

twin towers? ���and a victim of Katrina? Actor and director have already worked together in "" Aggressive Executive "". There

worked the lesson of unloading the anger that we carry inside, the lesson of not saving anything. But we already

learned it well. You did not need a review to show it, too, to the healthy dentist who plays Cheadle.

" 0

" In cinematographic terms, this production is clumsy, treacherous and fuller, with a hodgepodge that they

call montage

Live fast and die faster still . If we look at the subtitle that we just invented, this film

can be criticized quickly: useful, irregular and scrap cult. But do not think that it has seemed

completely unfortunate since it is loyal to its principles and complies with everything that is proposed, from the first

commandment: provoke all those who spend their money on movie tickets. Now, this is not art but a

product that does not come badly from time to time. It does not matter that it was shot without order, with dozens

of flash-backs and pulling advertising resources and light video clips; chaos reigns in Domino and Tony Scott

(Ridley's brother d���scolo) takes him by flag, spiced up with a bath of humor and chuler���a, memories of

Beverly Hills 90210 included. In cinematographic terms, this production is clumsy, treacherous and fuller,

with a hodgepodge that they call montage that denotes the wrong (or not, and this is the funny thing) that is � the

head of titles such as Top gun, Spy game, Red tide and Fantastico. But like any film of the style

(born Assassins, Love at point-blank range, Pulp Fiction), Domino will have detractors and followers in equal parts. I have to

admit that the story of this little girl led by evil -and interestingly- path caught me from

the first moment, partly because of her parodic tone. the realization of the television program about the

squadron of search-wrongdoers- and its very light social focus, evident in the dialectic lesson racial, with

blacks and other pseudo-reds. The surprise of the unpredictable is the only reason why one can digest the

changes of rhythm, the disinterest of the second part, the impossible planes, the accelerations that leave us

breathless and the slowdowns and frozen moments in opposition. It's not an easy dish, so come to

this line, raise the number of slanderers, sure. In the world of fiction, the label of? Based onevents

real? It gives the story that certain vehemence status is told, although it is not a guarantee of good practice

either, since, for inslite, the life of the authentic Domino Harvey, who died before seeing the result. She

gave her consent so that they would tell her frantic way around the world but, as in any fiction that tries to

capture spectators, there is more action than answers to all the questions that we ask. we make about this woman of

arms to take. Scott is limited to offering us a couple of pictures so we can keep quiet, without

becoming the questioners who would destroy their iconoclast long. There is no style to hold on to, only

interpretations, so the best thing about the tape - leaning back towards the most critical - is undoubtedly the

chorus and its protagonist: beautiful damsel put to mercenary to which it costs to recognize in his paper of macarrilla

with studies, hunting rewards that looks with disdain the past years that lived ascent in some heels. An

excellent work, that of Keira Knightley, in a curious film, Domino, that will go unnoticed, a perception

that one has as she writes about this film made from scraps, some better fabrics than

others.

" 0

" Coto Matamoros film about a multiple murder in a circus that torments the only survivor, a

clown named Plautus. If a professional had done it, he would say that it is like hitting a father, but being the

work of an amateur, he will say that it is like hitting God. First, and I hope last, geek drama.

Tonight I wanted to see one of those movies with which you can get hundreds of bad jokes,scenes

incredible(of the bad) and things like that. That's why I have in the deuvedeteca jewelry like this one from Plauto. So said

seems like an interesting movie, but if I tell you that the scriptwriter is Coto Matamoros you will understand that I had

a juicy motive in front of me. But it turns out that the cast of geeks that go through the screen, they

do in dramatic roles. I swear, the Nuria Berm���dez felaciona (come on, that sucks) dramatically. For

my children. The truth is that we must recognize the scriptwriter who is documented on the subject, trying

to put a moral about how bad cocaine is loosening unaccustomed sphincters. Well, maybe

it was not the idea, but if getting into the napias you end up tertuliano selling miseries or making movies

geeks, I do not know if the message was "" drug addicts like me, that look how far I have arrived in life "". That country

people, that pa���s. The film is about a crime committed in a circus, that is not alive neither the bearded woman,

nor the man bullets, even the bullfighter firefighter. To the bewilderment of the police, a clown named Plautus, is

presented as guilty, that the two seconds stops being so to become an informant. So they put

a flashback to tell us what happened. I have little to tell. Since Santiago Segura was given to

take his buddies in the movies, anyone thinks he can do it. Here we have those characters that

went through television selling their miseries. Well, at least I've made it clear that what they say on

TV is true, because with how bad they act everything must be true. The film has left me cold, like the picture

of the woman who is sprawled who say she does not have sex and I think she is a pixilated Japanese porn movie, that I

wanted dirty jokes and lumpy humor. , and it turns out that they have been involved in a drama. As if you put an elephant in

a cacharrer���a.Resumiendo, Coto Matamoros film about a multiple murder in a circus that torments the

only survivor, a clown named Plautus. If a professional had done it, he would say that it is like hitting a

father, but being the work of an amateur, he will say that it is like hitting God. First, and I hope last, drama

geek.Besitos.PD: Looked from a distance, it has subtle touches of humor, like putting lamepenes to Nuria

Ber, calling the Dioni vans, or catching a drug dealer with me. s nose that Dumbo.PD2: What to hit God is

a phrase of the film, that I would not think of a blasphemy as���.PD3: I forgot, Nuria Berm��� dez dies

of a knife in the cheek, that from K���rate to death in Torremolinos and the ninjas removing the guts that

were like a kind of fat rope, I have not seen anything worse. PD4: Good things have , like the apotheosis of

naked women. Not to mention Dioni in his underpants. Art in Motion.

" 0

" ���300 is a movie or a comic book ?. Hard question pardiez. He looks like a living belle, with a lot of little

figures moving between pose and pose. But what is definitely a tru���om���s in this endless list ...

The film is based on a comic by Frank Miller, which also did not reach me impact too much The most

interesting was the presentation, in the form of a hardcover book in landscape format, and as usual since

its Sin City era, in a glorious black and white. He tells us the most well-known battle of the Greek Spartans,

with certain historical errors that we can forgive for that of artistic and narrative licenses. but in

the end, it is not more than a comic that tells a battle. It does not give for more.As��� that already from the beginning it depends on

where you come: either you have read the comic or not. If you have read it, you know what you will find, and the only thing

you can say is whether it is true or not, and if you have not read it. Well, do not do it, because the film is still vi���eta

vi���eta the comic. This reminds me of Akira's movie. This movie was exact to the comic, but the good thing that it

had was that two hours of film were equivalent to a hundred of tomes, with which they cost then (and

now I suppose) in time and money. Without any added value. And this is what happens to the movie '300'. Itnot

doescontribute anything to the comic. I even think it costs me less to read the comic than to see the movie. From a comic, you

get a movie from the pile. It is totally unnecessary. It is watching a bland video clip of a song: if you already

liked it, you will not like it anymore, otherwise you will go through everything. It is incomprehensible to me as it has been able to awaken so many

passions. Not more than comic in motion, and the same licenses that allow a comic: for

example, the gore scene Beefcakedismembering the enemy plenty Leonidas in the movie, the characters

est They are deformed both in factions and in physiognomy in their desire to resemble the comic, the combats are

spectacular but unreal, the enemies are ass fools. The charm that could get to have the comic is

lost to take it to the big screen. And the best are the di���logos. that if I can not kneel because my

back hurts to massacre your soldiers. that if we fight for freedom. I thought thatpamphletswere going to fall

pro-Americanfrom heaven. I'm not a historian, and I do not know if you could really say something like that, but for

God's sake! They could have told it in another way !!! Chirr���a so much that I almost have to leave the cinema withears. The

sorestory can impact, especially the North American public, accustomed to the vapid

biographies of his nobels and his boring wars (what if against the Indians or against themselves). Buthistory

Europeanhas a lot more stories and a lot more impact than this one. Now, if you have not read anything and

you believe everything that television says, then you will hallucinate t���o.At least it is better than the adaptation of Sin

City, which I do not have forces to see again. and that luckily I've almost managed to forget already. But this only

means that being bad of need could still be worse. The director, Zack Snyde, is becoming a

specialist in shooting exactly as they say. An errand we go. He has made the remake of 'The Dawn of the

Dead', nailed to the original and now '300' nailed to the original. You can catch him for the remake of 'The

orphanage', so those who like them will continue to like him because he will do exactly the same thing. The actors make me

extremely tired, especially the Butler with the amount of grimaces that puts in all the peli.As��� that little

more I can count. initially not even the courage to make a criticism was to see it and forget it. I havelost

alreadyso many hours watching fucking cinema that I do not even flinch anymore.

" 0

" Despite being entertaining and charismatic that are its protagonists, Ocean���s Thirteen will become

part of the list of third parties that should never be shot.

This time the guys from Ocean meet to get revenge on the owner of a casino, played by Al Pacino, who

has betrayed his friend Reuben. At first I was surprised that they were moved by the revenge, although as

the movie went on I understood it, although in reality in this film the least thing is the motivation that

the characters, it does not matter why, it matters the c.mo.Ocean���s eleven was a good remake of the Gang

of Eleven, fun, witty and entertaining, the second part was also a funny movie, this

third uses the same formula of the other two, same style and same protagonists, exploiting the same

formula ad nauseam can tire the spectators, however, You can spend an entertaining time

watching it, especially for those who have not seen the other two. The cast is very powerful, George Clooney and Brad

Pitt bring the elegance and charisma that characterizes them, accompanied by a group ofthat already

kidswanted a lot of movies, with the exception of Matt Damon, an Orlando Bloom baking actor and other

deadpan actors, who in an inexplicable way have triumphed in the movies. Special Mention deserves Al Pacino,

the "" bad of the film "", whose character recalls at certain times that he played in Pactar with the

Devil. There are two things that are missing in this film: the feminine presence that in the other deliveries

contributed Julia Roberts and Catherine Zeta Jones and the sense of humor that characterized especially the second

installment, the cerebral vein of Clooney and Brad Pitt is �� wasted and was one of the best assets thatcould

Soderbergplay. Despite being entertaining and charismatic, Ocean���s Thirteen

will become part of from the list of third parties that should never have been shot.

" 0

" Juno is the share of independent films in this awards season, because the film itself

has nothing to make it stand out from the rest.

For the past four years, it has always been the end of an independent film among the favorites for

the prizes in the United States. Lost in Translation, Sideways, Crash, Good Night, and Good Luck or Pequea

Miss Sunshine examples have been the most recientes.En this year, the representative of independent cinema inface

of Oscar has been Juno, and although it seems somewhat cruel description, is the truth. What has been said must be

understood in its context, and is that very rarely the awards and nominations are fair. At first glance,

Juno can be seen as the typical teen film or as a realistic and intelligent comedy in thesense

most pejorativeof the term. The truth is that it is more the second than the first, although in the script of Diablo Cody

there is a great amount of common and typical places, and a complete absence of intelligent humor. The script

also highlights, surprisingly, by its cursiler���ay ���o���er���a, both in the development and evolution of some

characters blurred, as in their language. Jason Reitman has lost the sharp and scathing vision that he showed in

Thanks for Smoking, and cited the prudish and idealized vision of the American society that offers the gui ���n by

Diablo Cody (the sequence in the pro-abortion association is simply blushing). For her part, Ellen Page,

who nonetheless performs an interpretation of the most natural, happy and fresh, does not justify the nomination she has

obtained for the Oscar Award. independent cinema in this season of awards, because the

film itself has nothing to make it stand out over the others. It is a hybrid between the typicalcomedy

teenand a high comedy full of iron��� and subtlety.

" 0

" From the first frame is an intense experience. Very inspired by black movies andstories

detective. But also in David Lynch and Sergio Leone.

You have to pay attention to all the inspired details of this film. From the first frame it is an

intense experience. Very inspired by black movies and detective stories. But also in David Lynch

and Sergio Leone. Rian Johnson also built a peculiar universe by placing the drama in a high

school {at the institute ���?}. Everything is tinged with adolescent anguish. Use the rhythms and forms of Hammet but become

fresh and new. For example, the language, there are phrases taken directly from the Halt���n Malt���s as the

signal that the girl should give in the parking lot "" Largo. Short. Long. Short"". But there are others like this. "" I

gave Jed to him to be eaten, not to feed you. " Not only are they clever phrases, they show who Brendan is,

the protagonist, whom his ex-girlfriend describes as "he sits there back and hates everyone". Brendan infiltrates

the mafia that moves the drugs to find out what happened to his girl. The interpretation of Joseph

Gordon-Levitt is great, and at no time falls neither in caricature, nor in parody. He is a complex character,

weak and brave but not necessarily noble. Survive their good beatings. Lukas Haas is the typical bad guy in the

cape and bast, but instead of negotiating with bourbon in a living room, he does it in his mother's kitchen with cereal and

apple juice. Johnson first wrote a short novel that he has now made public on the internet, and it took him

6 years to make the film. It was financed by his friends and his family. This is definitely author's cinema, but

cin���filo author. Must be seen on the big screen and paying close attention to not lose any detail. It's more,

I'm sure it should be seen more than once.

" 1

" This documentary slaps us with a reality to open our eyes to those who still do not believe what is

happening. Now our job is to get "" how to do "" a revolution.

Zeitgeist, is the title of a political documentary that makes your hair stand on end before a

reality that nobody wants to see why it is there. It is a documentary that is distributed on the internet and that you can

enjoy on its official website since it is subtitled in several languages. Based on a great phrase by Jimi

Hendrix: "WHEN the power of LOVE exceeds LOVE for power, the WORLD will know PEACE "", Zeitgeist shows 3

views on religion (church), the survival of the strongest in society and power.

documentary slaps us with a reality to open the eyes of those who still do not believe what is

happening. "They must find it difficult. those who have taken authority as truth instead of truth as

authority "" Produced by Peter Joseph, it was created non-profit to inspire people to start looking at

the world from a more critical perspective. " Ethics and understand that things are not like most people believe. The

information in Zeitgeist is the result of a long-term investigation. The period of the investigation and the

basic sources used / referred to in it and the interactive transcription are included in the official

site.Projects are as accurate and recommended as this is. They make me want to bring to light a certain documentary that I have

saved and that will make more than one tremble. After this our job is to get "" how to do "" or

"" gestar " "a revolution. That is the message. Reveal yourselves, believe in yourselves, while you believe in others, you will be

yours, be free.

" 1

" Hard, bloody, tense, it keeps you stuck to the chair at all times. Last night I was enjoying on DVD of a film classics. Well, or a film that some would

consider a classic. Valeee, I consider her a classic on my personal list. Highway to Hell (The

Hitcher in original version). The first thing that comes to my mind, hours after seeing it, is that I am

used to the current cinema, with five consecutive endings and endlessly stretched films, which I cut short and

direct. Short, because at no time did I get bored, despite being a much slower film

than today, with some scenes where simply the protagonist Jim Halsey (Thomas Howell ) goes

sleeping in the car while the kilometers pass. And the feeling of being there, is achieved, because the

camera does not move by leaps, and the scene lasts more than a minute. The truth is that you enjoy going backonce in

to a movie like thisa while. Direct, because there are no great grandiloquent dialogues, or scenes where the bad guy

seems to be killing someone, and threatens, threatens, and does not kill him. No, here the violence is direct. John Ryder, that

is, Rutger Hauher in his best role (yes, I like him more than Roy) is a constant threat, that you do not know why he

acted like that, only that he does it. He is dangerous, sycophantic, cruel and especially enjoys making Halsey suffer.

Notmention some brilliant scene, as when she lies on the bed of the motel, along with Nash (Jenniferasleep

Jason Heigh)and begins to caress until it wakes up in a scene that would be the top of the

pel �cula, if not for the next scene, where the police surround Ryder who is in the cabin of a

trailer, with Nash tied to it by the legs, and with his arms tied to the trailer, about to be

dismembered, yes. Lift the clutch foot, which would happen too if the police shoot you. Tensi���n through

the clouds, while Halsey goes up to talk to Ryder. Shot in 1986, he shows us theroads

desertedof Texas, in the best tradition of US road movies, with car chases and accidents

perfectly shot, a gallery of characters we barely see, as they appear and disappear,

but even so, we imagine ourselves perfectly, in just two strokes, while the story focuses on the

three characters Main. In short, hard, bloody, tense, it keeps you stuck to the chair at all times,

both when there is a chase with shots, and in the dialogues between Ryder and Halsey. One of the best

serial killers in the history of cinema, unjustly forgotten in those lists we see constantly of

bad guys.

" 1

" A very hard movie, with a masterful script and an incredible development. There are very good films, good, bad, very bad, Signals, etc. . There are films that like a group of

people with certain criteria, those same to another group makes them vomit. But there are movies that,

regardless of whether you like them or not, you have to say "" what movie "". This is one of them. The film

is about the different racial groups that are in the city of Los Angeles. Ancar collision

initialleads us to an incredible plot about how people interact and how each of our acts

ends up triggering some events or others. A xen���fobo policeman, another heck, a pair of black thieves, a

pair of "respectable" whites, an inspector with ideals, a good Hispanic, a Persian (iran���) a little

schizophrenic, etc. Each and every one of them is related to a specific event of the film. And this

is what it is about. Explaining this movie is impossible. This has to be seen. It gives very bad roll, during almost all her, until

the point of wanting to stop seeing it. But I have to take off my hat and say, often movie. The plot

intertwines in an incredible way, without becoming heavy but distressing. The actors are sublime, in roles of

horrible people who have been absorbed by an unjust and cruel city. And the script is very good, what more

can I say? In short, a very hard movie, with a masterful script and incredible development. ��ble It's just a

pretty scene, in which I cried like a cupcake. Wonderful.

" 1

" Without a doubt, the final result (and especially the initial one) is an authentic waste. It is well known that bad movies abound in films, especially in the last few years. ���os There is nothing

worse than going to the movies, with (or even without) good expectations and finding authentic trash. Well that,

exactly that, is Hostel.Produced by Tarantino, directed and written (why did you do it?) By Eli Roth

(Cabin Fever), Hostel is presented to us as a gore movie, Bloody, cruel. But in reality, this is

a film with a deplorable, really regrettable script, and a real foolish deception. Certainly whatto me.

happenedHow can a film of no more than an hour and a half have such a slow start, dispensable,

lacking in interest? Is it empty? Two American students travel across the European continent, meet an island���s and

go in search of quick and easy sex. Europe is presented as a separate, chaotic world, exemplified in

Amsterdam, where there is no more life, from the point of view of the film, or of those students, than cannabis

and the whores.For bizarre coincidences, they end up in Slovakia, and after more nonsense and hollow scenes,

we arrive at what was originally believed to be the real story : a hostel where tourists are kidnapped to

kill them at pleasure. But no, that those gore fanciers are not created, that good scenesare seen

of the genrehere. Only some things, which can be seen perfectly in other movies, much more successful (Saw and

Saw II, to say some). The end is perhaps, the least regrettable of the whole film, and that is totally

foreseeable and meaningless (for those who have seen it: ���habr��� scene m���sp�� �sima that of the children?

Really hilarious.) The cast, with absence of stars (which is appreciated), does not go beyond young people

doing young The direction goes along with the film, that is, totally linear, with ���sustos?

typical. Leaving the cinema with the feeling of swindling is what happens when you watch this movie. A real bore

, and, allowing me to repeat myself, really painful script, which is, sure, far from any

positive expectation created on the film. Sadly, I do not know what ��� more to say about this movie. Only that, without a

doubt, the final result (and especially the initial one) is a real rubbish.

" 0

" Nazis, intrigue and passion in one of the films that occupies a place in my particular podium of the

filmography of maestro Hitchcock. A delight

An unconventional espionage film, with the outstanding performances of Cary Grant and Ingrid

Bergman. And I'm surprised that I like it, because I am an avowed fan of his style, I do not find many

similarities with other films of his. The audiovisual aspect is the same one that hasused to us

always been; but in the guide introduces innovations. Here there is neither a Byzantine plot norsituations

improbable; the suspense is created with the minimum number of elements (a key and a bottle) as if it had

chosen to make the "" more difficult "" at the time to get our hearts in a fist. He also

introduces the amorous component very well in the film, making use of his enormous creativity: mocking the

censorship, which at that time prevented kisses of several seconds on the screen, He makes Cary Grant and Ingrid

Bergman speak one to one centimeter of the other and constantly spikes. This produces a much more

"dirty" effect on the screen than a screw kiss. At the same time, in that terrifying scene the protagonists talk abouttopics

completely inconsequential, which makes it stand out much more. Hitchcock here proves that apart from the genius of

intrigue, it was also an offstage in romantic scenes. The character of "" the bad guy "" is portrayed with

much m Psychological depth than the thrillers of conspiracies and spies to use. As a fun fact,

"" Chained "" is actually the only film with Science-Fiction tints in Hitchcock's entire filmography

since something really happened curious. In the famous conversations with Truffaut, the Master of the Suspense reveals

that he had been looking for money since 1944 to make the film, but no study wanted to produce it because it

contained in his gui� ,N, an atomic bomb, something that no one thought would come to be invented. Only a few years later

the Manhattan Project became public and the Americans unleashed the massacres of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Only

then the savvy producers, convinced that it was plausible to manufacture nuclear weapons, decided to

finance "" Chained "".

" 1

" Absolutely delirious, with some great dialogues, and above all, the best pursuit of cars seen in

years in a movie theater, and that it is a sequence? classic and analogous ?, how thewere filmed

persecutionsthirty years ago.

Difficult to focus on something concrete to talk about Quentin Tarantino's ultimate madness, Death Proof, and that's

always good. I'm going to put aside the trailers, the double program and everything that is Grindhouse, not only

because it was a historic bump in American lands (incomprehensible, I would add) but because not even all

double and reestrenarn programkeep both films as in Europe, at a directors cut. That

is, because Grindhouse has been a dream we once dreamed, but when we woke up what we had was each

film separately. It's been what we've been listening to these months for theevent

cinematographicof the year (I personally placed it above Transformers, Pirates, etc., this is CINEMA) I am going

to try to be clear now that we have been able to witness a pass organized by the people of Aurum, their

distributor in Spain. At the height of expectation: outstanding.Mike (Ma-gis-tral Kurt Russell) is

Stuntmana psychopath son of a bitch who travels the roads with his warm, an authentic m� Killing machine, looking for

young girls to kill and, if they are good, so much better. That the girls are spectacular is

normal in a movie of these characteristics, what is not normal is that the friend Quentin has so manycontacts

handsome, because Miss Poitier (go? Legs!), Rosario, Zoe or Mary Elizabeth is shining. Absolutely

delirious, with some great dialogues (in spite of some serious type that alleges insignificance, only depending on how you

look at it), and above all, the best pursuit of seen cars in years in a movie theater, and that it is a

"classic and analogous" sequence, as the persecutions were shot thirty years ago, something of whatshould

the Wachowskilearn, for example. Of course, meta-realities (the character of the Dawson leads from "" polyton "" the

"" Broken nerves "" from Herrman who already uses Tarantino in his Kill Hill), film shoots, a a new dance to

remember (more subtle in tone than that of Travolta and Uma, or that of Michael Reservoir Madsen) and a

completely timeless atmosphere end up curdling so perfectly, so infallibly, I'm afraid not

because we're in front of one of the great movies of the year, but in front of a reality that is proof of any doubt,

because for many fregaos in which it goes, no matter how many favors it makes, for many rubbish in which

his name appears (Ojo, no Hostel or Running Scared will enter there), Quentin Tarantino is one of the

most talented guys that has given the American cinema in, its history? Death Proof is the debut of Tarantino

as a director of photography, and the only thing I can say is that it shows that the Knoxville has worked with

guys like Robert Richardson (Kill Hill, The Aviator, JFK?) and that has seen a lot, probably all, the

slasher and giallos had and for having, a whole encyclopedia on "" How to illuminate a good B /series movie

Z"". Another (very) important point falls, as in all his filmography (for what was going to be less?) In the music that

accompanies the im? genes, and Death Proof starts with a Jack Nietzsche track called The Last Race, that's

nothing. Then I say, the best DJ in Hollywood is recreated as he did not since Pulp Fiction, both in music

and in the images. Oh, by the way, before finishing, I would like to emphasize that the best and most untidywreck

carwith human lives in between, cinematographically speaking, of the last ones times, it's in

Death Proof. And the end is, simply, unforgettable and antol���gico. The only negative note will be the unknowns of

the fake trailers, because it would be a pity to lose them and at the moment we do not have official news (1), just the

rumor that Planet Terror, which I have not yet seen in its extended version (but it is a delirious

retro-pulp with very good moments but, ah��� est��� the problem is a film one hundred percent Rodr���guez, with what

that entails for good and for bad) will come with the one of Machete, directed by Rodr���guez himself and that I could

stretch to the length. The rest of titles are: -Werewolf women of the SS (by Rob Zombie) -Don? T (by Edgar

Shaun of the Dead Wright and a narration of Will "" Arrested Development "" Arnett that I'll make you cry with laughter)

-Thanksgiving (for Eli Roth, an outstanding job, and gorno, of course) Thank you, Quentin, thank you.

" 1

" Knowing that the title, unfairly, will go unnoticed in the torrent of premieres on the

billboard, we can only strongly recommend his assistance to this war as an observer at home

no man's land.

Ingredients to make a good cake: three solid actors, a conflictive situation and a director with

an accurate look ready to roll without putting a stop to the interpretative flow. We add the idea that there is no

argument more interesting than life itself, so the actors are puppets in a theater that we know

well. One of them adopts the role of the one who receives the slaps from the other two. It is Juan Diego, who makes us

believe that he deals with the situation that is posed to him, because he even has the chance to focus on guiding

the theater and the leisure industry. This is a bittersweet film of parents and children: it is the second as the director

of the pupil of Jos��� Luis Garc���a S���nchez and traces a problem of enormous proportions when a son decides to occupy

the home of his father. From there, the pathetic existence as we know it, with its miseries, that

make grace, and its successes, which also provoke laughter. Few films distill a humor as subtle and real

as this exercise starring a not so young compulsive liar and an adult whose life is falling apart, or

is arranged, depending on how you look. The melodramatic tone connects with the idea of ​​fun that has the person in charge of

the excellent More Sorrow That Glory? Its premiere as a filmmaker and screenwriter-. The meta-theatrical gallery ofcharacters

secondarysupports the chemical moments, although beyond this, their reactions are the logic of every witness at

��� nito We are also: we see how the family, once unstructured, dissects member to

member, lover of the head of the family included. The naturalist approach, realistic, is not diluted until the end,

with a curious and suggestive sequence of which we will not give more details. In it is of course the veteran

actor from Seville who now plays the role of father lost in his principles. He supports almost all the weight

of the footage, without forgetting the plot skeleton designed by Jon���s Trueba. Knowing that the title,

unfairly, will go unnoticed in the torrent of premieres on the billboard, we can onlyrecommend

stronglyhis assistance to this homemade war as an observer in no man's land .

" 1

" If I had not returned, nothing would have happened either. For the fans of the most famous pugil of the cinema, to the rest,

excepting what I have mentioned, of the most forgettable.

Sheltered in a more than repetitive soundtrack, we have this last episode (which comes to remember the

last chapters of a television series) of the saga "" Rocky "" starring by Stallone, here more like aold

decrepit and chubbyman, than by the shadow of what was once one of the most famous actors in the action

genre. Un.A story that does not lead anywhere, and that is, I have not been interested, nor excited, nor have I minded

the least, this forced return of Balboa to the big screen, where you have to wait more than 30 min. so that

something memorable happens and where the action is taken only to the pugilistic scenes. I am clear that neither

Stallone is Eastwood, nor the 6th delivery of Rocky is "" Million Dollar Baby "" , but is that in this film not even

Sly becomes shadow of the Oscar-winning Hillary Swank; to talk about the boxing film that I have in mind fresher.

On the other hand, we must highlight the pugilistic scenes, which make one start to punch the

chair, as well as the presentation, with the protection of the American HBO chain (namely the pasta that would have been

left by its presence on screen), in a film that would never have that to have done. For the fans of the

most famous pugil of the cinema, to the rest, excepting what I have mentioned, of the most forgettable.

" 0

" After the risky but very successful Match Point, Allen returns to his most classic comedy in amovie

seemingly simple, but so well done , nice and nice to see that can end up being one of his

best movies.

Scoop could be translated as exclusive or scoop and is a word that applies in the world of

journalism. In the new film by Woody Allen, the scoop is revealed to a student ofjournalism

novice(a Scarlett Johansson who personally reminds me of Marilyn Monroe in some of her

shriller and innocent performances) from a ghostly appearance from beyond: a recently dead journalist

during his trip to the other world (a beautiful and dark image of the ship captained by death) that a

rich London can be the perpetrator of a series of murders that have taken place in the city and it occurshim to

togive the young woman exclusive journalist. During her research, with which a conjuror on

tour (Woody Allen) will help her, the young woman will fall in love with the alleged murderer and the plot is served.Scoop connects

directly with the magn ... �fica Mysterious murder in Manhattan (1993) within the filmography of the teacher

Woody Allen, especially for the mixture of genres (romantic comedy and police intrigue) and for the fact of

putting inexperienced characters to investigate murders. The novelty here is that the character of Allen, the magician

Splendini, remains completely aloof from the romantic plot to offer only the typical

chemical and clumsy counterpoint. of his characters, by the way, that the end of his character may have to talk,

depending on how it is interpreted. After the risky but very successful Match Point (2005) (on the that itnot

isdisputed whether or not it is a masterpiece, that that is undoubted, but if the movie is more allenian than any other or

represents a total change of style) Allen returns to his most classic comedy Music in a seeminglymovie

simpler, but so well done, nice and nice to see that it can end up being one of his best

movies.

" 1

" From the deepest indifference to the most unbreakable sleep It seems that, from a time here, narrate the life of a historical / important person to fill the

gap of ideas is becoming a gratuitous resource too hackneyed and with results not always

convincing. "" Luther "", the film that occupies us, is one of the clearest examples of this. It is a work

that has an impeccable technical invoice, but that does not go beyond the purely technical boasts and a couple

of ideas without deepening , as is happening lately with this type of (super) productions with a biopic

character. The film ends up being very irregular, and manages to lose its limited interest until for the most

renegade followers of Catholic beliefs. It could be said that the totality of his footage is only

interesting from the moment he tries to unmask the fraud and bribery of the Church, a fraud that takes

advantage of the misfortunes, lacks, convictions and illusions of the people with the only and pure af���n of

profit. But, how could it be otherwise, what we have described here has already been seen hundreds of times in film and

literature. Without going any further, films like "" Stigmata "" already showed the quote from: "" The Kingdom of God is

inside you, not in wooden constructions. and stone. Part a trunk of le���ay ah��� I am, raise a stone and

you will find me. "" Eric Till, father of this creature, pretends that our particular Luther is not reflected

as a simple rebel, but, barely, ends up succumbing. His intention to place him as a standard-bearer

does not end up convincing or moving. We only managed to immersein the idea that the character is not

ourselvesmore than another victim of the inevitable. A victim of the fallacy that surrounds us when trying to

unmask the Church, a task, at times, close to the utopian after centuries of power. And, why not

say it, with possible consequences as unnecessary as destructive to humanity. For this,

Luther, in certain scenes, could sneak as a misunderstood classical, both by his followers as for its

detractors. Thus, as on the first occasion, our inexorable fate leads us to error. And the consequences. And to

the guilt. But also the obtaining of new courses. Unfortunately, as I said at the beginning of my criticism, the

film does not tell us anything that we do not already know. And it is his main mistake: that shortage in the section of

originality, so evident today in products of this mood. And the distribution does not help to supply their

many needs. It is little more than correct in its entirety, with a Fiennes that does not interpret beyond its

intense gaze. Not even the great Bruno Ganz (representing the sanity that supports Luther) stands out above

the average. In short, a work that has interesting points but already very sobado, and that remains half

in almost everything. He does not go deep into what is necessary in the character or in the historical rigor that she herself

begins. And, as a consequence, it ends up producing the most absolute indifference. And, in many

spectators, even the most unbreakable sleep.

" 0

" The film is so darn bad that you end up taking it with you, getting a good time at the

cost of a bad movie. Is this bad? Man, laughter is never bad.

There are films that, from the bad that they end up turning out to be nice because everything in them provokes laughter. In this

regard I will always remember a subproduct entitled 'Dead Heat' starring Kiefer Sutherland and that

should enter the annals of history for being the most fun mess you can see. His guide is so

bad and is full of so many incongruities and with some dialogues so absolutely delirious that one does not stop

laughing in the whole movie. And no, it's not a comedy. 'Skizo' could enter fully into this group of films since

viewing is a truly rewarding experience, but not because the film is good, but on

the contrary. The film is so darn bad that you end up taking it with you, managing to have a good

time at the cost of a bad movie. Is this bad? Man, laughter is never bad. The film tells how Gorka, a

young bartender at the institute's bar, wants to impress the girl he likes, a daughter of a rich pap��� who in

principle would not notice a waiter (when those of this profession are the ones who tie in this world). For

this reason, the brilliant idea of ​​hiring a guy to scare her a bit, and our

protagonist appears at the right moment to defend her, and so she is taken with her daughter gnaw But the

thing is twisted and the matter ends up becoming a kidnapping with a request for rescue included and stay in

an old house in the middle of the forest and where a curious character lives. film aims to be a

horror film with the figure of the typical psychokiller. Or at least it pretends it in its final part, since until that

moment the film is absolutely nothing. The starting point is totally incredible and ridiculous, not to

mention how they carry out a plan that is still ridiculous. The characters hardly exist, since they are not

even drawn. We have a waiter with the face of someone who does not need to organize everything he organizes to

impress a girl who from the beginning is clear that she is interested in him. Ok, the script tries to

show that he does not realize that fundamental detail, but it is not believable at any time.

Then we have a smart, stupid girl who wants to have everything. A badass who can not speak. And finally a

patient with very particular schizophrenia, and from there comes the mini-title of the film, which even in that they have

saved since there is a scarcity of alarming means, although This should not be an impediment to making a

good movie. Unfortunately it's not like that. One of the biggest problems of the film is the ridiculous character

played by ���scar Jaenada, a cheeky pimp who gives it to you. I do not know if the director's intention was to

be funny at certain times. I would like to think that yes, but it is that practically all the

phrases of this personage are out of place and ends up disconcerting. And if there was an intent to do

comedy about this character, then there is not a single gag that works. Everything in him is ridiculous and

laughter is passed on to the shame of others. In addition, Jaenada is totally exaggerated in his interpretation, and although the

pimps talk about the way he talks, it is not believable and is like a goop that He does not marry the rest

of the film but he accompanied us for a long time. And a film of these characteristics must first of all have

credibility. Regarding Eloy Azor���n, it is a very careful one, and Bea Segura is verybut nothing

cutemore . In addition, both star in some on momentosricos moments, which are by far the worst of a film that is already

horrible. The work of Jes���s Ponce is limited to filming four characters, and one more that comes out there, and to

try to create a climate of terror or anguish that does not exist. The schizophrenic character is simply a

helper who does not frighten or give anything, and about whom the film does not work or the least, and there they could have

developed a good plot, which does not happen because the film does not know where to focus. A full-fledged mess,

and that ignoring what he said at the beginning, can make you have a good time if you take it with you. If

not, it will be a real ordeal. In either case, the opportunity for a second viewing is something

that no one will think about.

" 0

" A funny tape at times, well done, but it lacks dramatic force and real ingenuity

that goes beyond the gimmicky blows in a gui���n loaded with tacos and vulgar claims for undemanding publics

.

The hallmark of Die Hard was John McClane, an improvised hero in unexpected situations. The precedents

followed the same idea, and in particular the second was already an insipid and beastly repetitionmasterpiece

of John McCtiernan's. It had its logic to rescue the hero and place him in novel circumstances. This time he is no longer

in the wrong place and time, but in his city together with his profession colleagues and weekend hangovers

. As usual, McClane is a normal guy, but the plot, in this case, does not seem intended for the

character in question, and in fact, the script of this movie suffered several modifications due to the theft of

ideas towards other similar productions. The beginning is quite overwhelming, someone claims the presence of

McClane while blackmailing placing bombs. Zeus soon enters action, a character played by Samuel

L. Jackson, sour character and a sense of humor that collide against the no less vehemence sarcasm

of John McClane. Simon says. A macabre guessing game that allows you to establish a triple chemistry between the

McClane-Zeus day and the coldness of Sim���n (Jeremy Irons). In that sphere, let's say that the script presents a

wit and a fluency that, at least, works quite well in the case of a film of action,

corseted g�� Cinematographic genre that can hardly offer us something creative or meritorious from a

static and intellectual perspective. Actually, the film offers little apart from the pompousness of some

scenes and the Correct realization of McCtiernan, which manages to keep pace in a story that extends

for too many minutes to tell a story too simple and worthy of any typical slop of the

genre (a story id ���nea to shoot a bad sequel to the saga "" Lethal Weapon ""). The di selogos are reduced to

things like "" .the one of you do not touch the cojones that I put a ray in your ass "" or "" I'm going to put the truck in your

ass "" or "I'm like the duracell mu���equito." Anyway, it seems that these expressions have permeated an

important sector of the audience, and qualify as an "ingenious gui���n" to what does not happen to be fun in a specific

field of the B series , and in case of need of empty entertainment so as not to squeeze the mollera. The

story, as we have said, simple, predictable, repeat the idea of the first Die Hard. Like Hans Grubber,

Simon feigns psychic ideals to mislead and conceal a theft. Then the plot divides the action into different

subactions that get longer and, often, lose intensity due to the excess of superfluous details, and that is the

main problem of the film; a badly structured guideline - for what is left over and for what it lacks - that

raises diverse actions (the persecution of McClane on the one hand, that of Zeus on the other, the theft of thereserve

federalof New York, and the school under threat of bomb) without articulating them in a cohesive dramatic whole. He

lacks, precisely, dramatic incentives that do justice to the vicissitudes of McClane, which in his

two precedents were always wrapped in commendable dramatic tension. That is, it seems a product worthy

of Steven Seagal or Stallone more than the humanized hero and incarnated by Bruce Willis. In short, atape

funnyat times, well done, but lacks dramatic force and of real ingenuity that goes beyond

the gimmicky blows in a gui���n loaded with tacos and vulgar claims for undemanding publics. John

McClane, in the first Die Hard of McCtiernan, meant to raise a genre with a tendency to mediocrity as it is

the cinema of action, the category of epic and craft. McCtiernan returned to assume the direction and brought us

the harsh reality. As we already mentioned, Die Hard is a cinematic miracle, and the genre of action - twenty

years later - is still waiting for an answer that Do him justice. Because, we insist, the masterpieces that

have dignified a specific genre have not been made to be revered and to retreat before them, but to

approach them or, in the best of possibilities, be overcome .

" 0

" Second part of the trilogy about some guys who want to maintain the level of strength between good and

evil. Lacks action and has a too convoluted script for what is expected from these films. Of those that

need further explanation.

Here I should make a reference to guardians of the night, which is the first part of what we have in

hand, but to paraphrase a little friend, very memorable should not be , because I do not remember anything about her.

What I've heard is that Russian production (that's clear because the posters are in cirrus) is

a trilogy and they want to equip Matrix. I think that the director thinks he's doing a remake

of the Neo and the mother who paired him, but no, not much. The movie is about a guy called Ant���n (Ant���n,

pirulero, each one, everyone, who learns his game, and whoever does not learn it, will pay a pledge, Ant���n) that I

think He is a guardian of the day and has to patrol with a company that is a kind of chosen. In

these that fight against a guard of the night that turns out to be the son of Ant���n (pirulero) with what there is

a roll about parents and children. All this spiced up by the search of the chalk of the destiny, that I say that it

is cutrez to look for a chalk, but good. Certainly, for a change, I have to say that I have not learned

the history well. On the one hand, the aesthetics is very successful, with a soundtrack of the type of video clip, but you do not get to

know what they're talking about. That is, they suddenly change to a kind of parallel world, but you do not understand

how they have arrived, or exactly what they paint there or what their meaning is. The action theme has seemed

very mediocre, three fights of anything, some even cutronas and nothing more. I expected something full offights

unnecessaryfor special effects, something I always like, but nothing. It is more, nor the scene of the

car by the building finishes being spectacular. Resumiendo, second part of the trilogy on types

that want to maintain the level of forces between good and evil. Lacks action and has a tooscript

convolutedfor what is expected from these films. Of those that need further explanation.Besitos.PD: The

léssica scene is so rare that does not excite the staff. PD2: The little ball if cool, look at where.

" 0

" A film of exquisite form and disturbing background, with a cast of actors in a state of grace.

Starring Tommy Lee Jones, Charlize Theron, Susan Sarandon, James Franco, Jason Patric, Josh Brolin,

Jonathan Tucker, Rick Gonzalez, Barry Corbin and Frances Fisher, In the Valley of Elah is the second

feature after Crash by Paul Haggis, who has collaborated with Clint Eastwood in the screenplays of Million dollar

baby and the dialect made up of Flags of our parents and Letters from Iwo Jima. The film tells the

story of Hank, veteran of the Vietnam War, who he must investigate the disappearance of his son Mike, a

soldier stationed in Iraq who mysteriously absents himself without permission from his base. With the help of Detective

Sanders and his wife, he will relive the boy's experiences in the Middle East. What he discovers will make him

even question his own military career. In recent months, a large number of films have delved intoin

the conflictthe Middle East in general, and in the American military intervention in particular;

titles like Redacted, Lions for lambs, The shadow of the kingdom or The battle of Haditha are some examples, and

In the valley of Elah must add to this growing list, although with some puntualizaciones.Y is that,

unlike of most of the aforementioned titles, Paul Haggis' new feature film has the gift

of timelessness, since his criticism is not focused on a specific military conflict, but in the consequences

of that conflict, so we could well translate its moral at any time and place. Although, let's

face it, any minimally successful film should intrinsically possess that quality, but in

the valley of Elah it would perhaps be found. more close to films like Born on the Fourth of July than of Apocalypse

now, Platoon or The metal jacket, and that is perhaps what makes her different. With a Tommy Lee Jones in the role

of the typical patriotic father Made In Usa as main protagonist, In the valley of Elah inoculates his criticism

against all armed conflict and its less visible consequences through of the investigation of the disappearance

of a soldier after his return from Iraq, in a plot of calm rhythm that, fortunately, does not abuse the increasingly

recurrent 180-degree turns , in favor of a greater deepening of its characters. And is that if

something fits to stand out in the Valley of Elah, is the remarkable interpretation of his cast, especially Tommy Lee

Jones, Charlize Theron and Susan Sarandon almost anecdotal but, as it has been habitual, steals anyone who

gets in front of any plane as soon as they leave two spans of land. So, in the valley of Elah

is shown as much as an open criticism of any armed conflict, as a severe warning to the

less visible consequences of such conflicts, as a touch of attention to the excess of patriotism and

pride, national and personal, inoculated in the American society since its birth and that, more and more ,

derives in a desaz���n and a disappointment that, unfortunately, is usually discovered when it is already too late. Highly

recommended

" 1

" Heder and Ferrell are ideal as a couple and Ben Stiller supports the role of producer

as he did in the Tenacious D film.

My annual appointment with Will Ferrell, Plissken and nosoyrosamariacalaf is once again a success, as it was with the

fun Talladega Nights. As a manager of Ferrell's fan club, he could not be happier: Blades of

glory is his best movie. ��cula from Anchorman, and that's saying a lot. Chazz Michael Micahels (Ferrell) and Jimmy

MacElroy (Heder) are banned for life from the competition. but by a vacuum in the regulation they are allowed to

compete as a couple. From there, a host of spectacular choreographies and the parrot with the "" Loto de

Hierro "" ", one of the most awesome gags of recent times. It's nice to see how well surrounded

Ferrell is surrounded by CRACKS like Will" "Arrested" "Arnett, in a very excessive role as the archrival Stranz Van

Waldenberg, Jenna "" Office "" Fischer, Carig T. "" Poltergeist "" Nelson or Amy "" Arrested too "" Poehler. Of course

Jon "" Napoleon "" Heder is at the height. Heder and Ferrell are ideal as a couple and Ben Stiller supports

dollars as a producer as he did in Tenacious movie DEspectacular, fast andAnother

hilarious.of those I can see on DVD before it reaches our cinemas, although the subtitles

are yellow ..

" 1

" In Forest of shadows the tension arrives late and without reasons that make it credible. In this sense, thefailures

gui���nare fat���dicos, depreciating what could have been a suggestive film. It will be for the next one,

Koldo.

First long of Kolba Serra from Bilbao, but not his first experience. In 1993 he made his first short film

Sick of you, with which he won at the Cinema Jove in Valencia. They are followed by La noche de autos, H���chame !, and Amor de

madre (1999) and El tren de la bruja (2003), all very juicy. With this last one he won many prizes, among them

the Meli���s de Oro for the Best European Short Film of Fantastic Cinema of 2003. He has also given the television spot

(Licor 43, Bizkaia Tourism, Galicia Calidade) and video clips (The Dream of Morpheus, OBK, Extremoduro, Sinister

Total) as a director, assistant director, scriptwriter and storyboard artist. The boy also gives

graphic design, as a poster for film festivals and short film shows. He has published an album of

comics called The Beast of the Day. In short, Koldo knows the trade, although he needs many more notches in his

review. In times of creative dryness, we hope that new filmmakers will take us out of the darkness andus

dazzlewith their first raw fresh and unprejudiced. Passed with Amen���bar or the little one of the Trueba, and

Koldo Serra has been presented in the media as a promising debutant who is on the way to give us good

moments of cinema? By the way, Amen� ��bar also debuted with a thriller, a sweet genius but very difficult to get

the attention of the public, perhaps by the saturation-. I do not doubt that Koldo is on the right track. The truth is

that the technical invoice of Forest of shadows is outstanding, and the debutante is noted that knows how to take the

camera where it is needed. And Gipuzkoa's exteriors are magical. But stop counting. The casting is

deficient - except for Oldman and Homar -, as well as the dubbing (penes painful o���ra Aitana!). The

actors who play the brothers? A debutante Jon Ari���o; Andr���s Gertrudix, who at times is the most credible;

and K���ndido Uranga- from comic. Aitana is-in addition to unrecognizable-insipid, like Paddy Considine,

that no matter how hard it is, the entire tape remains a memo. Only Virginie Ledoyen - a Natalie

Portman to the French- the tables are noticed, although Koldo misses it; It would have been great to use it

to lift the action, running through those forests of Artikutza. Oldman and Homar are tremendous wherever they

go, although the script does not give much more. Kdodo takes from philosophical referents two very superior tapes of

which he says Drink your Shadow Forest: Defense (Boorman, 1972) and Straw Dogs (Peckinpah, 1971). And it is true, they

are direct references, so direct that there are scenes from the script written by Koldo and a colleague, who survive

from the originals. See if not the scene in which a sensual Virginie Ledoyen wet her blouse in a fountain,

revealing her small but turgid nipples, like those of Susan George in Straw Dogs - before the mand? An untrammeled delbula

of what looked like the fool of the town? An excellent David Warner in Straw Dogs-, and later in

front of all the locals of the bar, and everything to get attention? In your pusil���nime hubby. Whoever has

seen Straw Dogs knows what we're talking about. Only in the tape of Peckinpah the tension grows slowly

but effectively, which we do not see in Bosque de sombras. This is greatly contributed by the fact thatexcessively

the presentation of the characters and their emotional conflicts isprolonged. Except for the initial scene in the bar, after

an hour of film nothing has happened, and we are expecting anything. It is late to hurry the drama that

is going to unchain. No less close to Straw Dogs want to look like the scenes of the attempted rape of

the appearance of the group before the door of the house. Regarding Defense, we find similarities not only in the

chosen environment and poorly used by Koldo to create restlessness in the spectator, but also in theidea

equally wastedthat human beings become beasts when survival (defense)

is about. In Forest of shades, the environment does not appear as hostile as it seems from the beginning of the

Defense of Boorman. The presentation of the locals in the bar is ���o���a, geriatric. However many faces

the actors put on, we do not feel that there is going to be something fat and frightening, beyond the teaser that we

saw on TV. In Dogs of straw, Peckinpah stealthily but steadily approaching the tragedy through

the dispassionate relationship between the writer and his wife, and the acts of exhibitionism of this before a group

of locals excited to see the housewife walking naked through the windows of the house. In Forest of shadows the

tension arrives late and without reasons that make it credible. In this sense, the gui���n failures are fat���dicos, depreciating

what could have been a suggestive film. If Koldo had left the gui���na someone more

capable or enlightened, everything would have been resolved in another way. A correct photograph withlandscapes is not enough

dazzlingto attract the attention of a public towards a genre so difficult to copy, and how much more. ��s,

surmountable. Even so, it entertains, that is always half of what a director should expect from any

creation. It will be for the next one, Koldo.

" 0

" Oldboy is one of the reasons why movies make our lives happier. Masterpiece of

cinema. Do you need anything else?

I've seen Oldboy nothing else get up. It had been a while since he started a day like this. I finished it tenago

minutesand I have the impression that it is not the best time to write something, but I can not handle it at will

in these matters and I have finished here, in front of my computer, conjured to manifest my absolute fascination for

one of the best movies I've seen in my entire life. I am not influenced by anything I have read nor

am I moved by the special circumstances that have contributed to my being able to see it (I am home,

low, I am alone, there is no noise , the world seems to have ceased to exist for two hours). It may be

that something that I have not just reasoned has moved me to overestimate this perfect CINE time that I just had.

Oldboy is one of the reasons why cinema makes our lives happier, even better.

Watching it, I have detached myself from any cin���fila contamination that could have brought after having enough

movies. At times, it seems that it was the first movie. Asian cinema is taking the reins that

western cinema (European or American) have been abandoning for some time, surrendering to a certain law that

subordinates quality with the box. The higher the quality, the lower the income. I understand that Oldboy is not consumable dish

easily. It contains scenes that can hurt the cacareaa sensibility of the spectator. Which does not stop being

a solemn bullshit: you can hurt the sensitivity of the wanderings of Pajares and Esteso by the bingo of Franco

and not why they will put any label to their ghosts. Oldboy reminded me of Almod���var and Tarantino.

For some or other reasons. It also made me think of the long-suffering Greek tragedy that accompanies us throughout the

bizarre history of literature because in Greece the arguments were designed and then the only thing we have done

It has been to adapt them to the times and modify them so that they seem innocuous. The story he tells us is that of

Oh Dae Su: a guy who has fifteen years to release him with some slight clues that will lead him to the

reason for his captivity. The reader does not need to have seen the film more data. The stunted hero of

history, like a Count of modern Monte Cristo, submits his revenge to the revelation of the truth of his

confinement. That plot, very cleverly spun, acquires, at the end, in the scene of the ���tico, lyrical dyes,

Shakespearean .. Although only to reach that end and understand it, it is worth It is worth attending all that

is told to us before. And Park Chan-Wook counts a lot and he does it with an overwhelming job: lateral travellings,

the wide angle to emphasize the moods of the disturbed protagonist .. And now I'm going to have breakfast, although

not live octopus. Some already know.

" 1

" The snakes flood the plane in an inordinate amount, carnival, which sometimes almost makes you smile at

the size of the nonsense ...

To have fun with "" Snakes on the avi "N "" you have to make a small effort. You have to go to the movies forgetting

that something has been shot between the films of the seventies and now. The film does not have the

credibility that today's viewer asks for, so I can only recommend it to the nostalgic. I

understand that bloggers took part in the decisions of the producers. I wonder if they gave him

that gore air so delirious. The film begins as an episode of Vacations at Sea, with a parade of

characters that will travel and suffer on the flight. Each one is characterized by an easy conflict to

remember and completely from cardboard. The snakes flood the plane in an inordinate amount,

carnivalesque, which sometimes almost makes you smile because of the size of the nonsense you have in front of your eyes. It

is the plan of a mobster who wants to kill a witness who will testify against him. It is not important. If you

are still able to have fun with airports, and forget the parody of the Zucker, or with

tar���ntulas, pira���as and other monsters, yes��� He has to stop asking for plausibility for an hour and a half and

take part in the party.

" 0

" A tangible demonstration that with ingenuity and good taste, any subject can be treated jocularly,

however delicate it may be.

Although the comedy has never been the genre that I liked, except for specific exceptions,

Red Phone. We fly to Moscow has been one of the films that has impressed me the most, in a veryway

pleasant. The surrealistic humor, absurd, and above all based on the trivialization of a problem thatin

gripped the worldthat historical context, kept me immersed throughout the entire length of this magnificent

Stanley comedy Kubrick. Basically, the argument is based on the anti-Soviet paranoia of angeneral

American, which leads him to order a nuclear attack against Moscow without consulting anyone. Quickly, the

government is set in motion to try to avoid the holocaust. The ridicule of the military, which appear

as bellicose brainless, and the simplification and minimization of the figure of the politicians before these,

reach glorious points in the scenes starred by a vehement George C. Scott, which gives great

dynamism to the brilliant dialogues that make up the different scenes. A fun, entertaining and

extremely ingenious to deal with such a delicate issue as the cold war, which so often was about

to lead the world to disaster.

" 1

" We must save the small pitfall of the use of a narrative structure of cinema no longer in use, which,

moreover, does not fit with the secondary school's stage of the film, but, in turn, that is his greatest

achievement and originality: to give us back the memory of the great films of the forties and fifties.

We are facing a disconcerting movie even for those of us who are accustomed to see classic black cinema. Itnot

isso difficult to imagine a lonely private detective, with no family and few friends, or afemme fatale

self-destructive. In a black and white cinema environment of the forties these characters are normal.

But when we set the story in a high school, with issues of drugs, murders and

revenge, it baffles. It's hard to believe how the class nerd gets involved in investigating a murky affair in

which his ex-girlfriend has got into the bad guys in the class. Of course they could have explained it to us as an

episode of Beverly Hills, 90210, but if we have a history of black cinema and some black film characters, and,

above all, we pay tribute to classic black cinema , because we have to tell it as if it were black cinema, even if

we are in the environment of a secondary school. The narrative point of view is also very classic,

we know exactly what the main character knows, and that's why at first we do not understand anything, then the

plot is somewhat complex, but the puzzle is solved in a way masterful and everything fits, especially those

hidden motivations of the characters that you have to guess to finish understanding them. To highlight the script, the

performances and the beauty of Nora Zehetner, the photography and the use of so many details (we hear the synchronized

sound of the footsteps in a chase just before our protagonist takes off his shoes, or the

insistent comparison of letters between the notes that our protagonist receives) that invite to a review

to discover what else this film offers us. Total, that we must overcome the small obstacle of using a

narrative structure that has not been used , in addition, does not fit with the movie's scenario cula, but, in turn,

it is his greatest achievement and originality: restore the memory of the great films of the forties and

fifties.

" 1

" Babel is universal, it jumps from continents, it changes language and flies any type ofthe air

frontier throughthanks to a visual terrorism that injects oxygen into the Image in a time calledreductionism

libertarian.

One might think that the third film by Alejandro Gonz���lez I���arritu is the poorly solved synthesis of the

worst defects of his previous works, Amores Perros and in more measure 21 Grams, or that even Babel is the

unhealed wound of a new cut cinema that takes the butterfly effect to the most exasperated limits of its

own reality, under the alibi of a globalized world, to the interconnected force and definitely

disoriented. In fact it would be difficult to assume that the gallery of vineyards of the suffering of others that make up Babel

follows the logic of a capricious guide that explores the border Last of the possible, instead of responding to the

probable.But what separates Babel from films, such as, Crash, with which it shares form and substance (

fear in our days). �as), is that his manipulative collection of coincidences finally responds to a plurality

of answers, pronounced in many live (and dead) languages, for a quasi-infinite number of cultures;

while, on the other hand, Haggish became a unique and simplistic response under the illusory illusion of

that same plurality in its interrelated histories. The director of Amores Perros has filmed with Babel el

colof���na a trilogy about the pain marked by the modern rewriting of the Greek tragedy through

the fractured narrative. But his last work has a fundamental difference with the previous two, it is

pol���glota not by necessity but by vocation, that is to say that in spite of the torture that inflicts on its characters it is

deeply hopeful. It is universal, it jumps from continents, it changes its language and it flies through the air

any type of frontiers thanks to a visual terrorism that injects oxygen into the Image in a time called

libertarian reductionism. His stark story merges the vital adventures of his characters in a point of

multiple readings and many more directions under an inviolable axiom: the only way to escape what we

call fear, is through ���s of love and true pain. Something that all cultures share speak the

language they speak.

" 1

" An attempt to mix several genres that has been left in a disaster without a head or a head and that can not be

felt by more than trying.

With the only reference of being a film set in the Austro-Hungarian empire and in the middle of the pre-

Celtic period, he faced the viewing of The Awakening of Love, a work by the British John Irvin, whom many will

remember for The Fourth Angel or When the trumpets are silent. The film tells the story of a female boarding school

far from any population, in which the girls are ruthlessly educated since childhood with the sole purpose of

turning them into dancers of classical dance. Mixing a large number of parallel stories, playing to the

dismissal, without clarifying anything at any time and with a lack of amazing narrative resources, The awakening

of love is one of those films that are halfway between the drama of vindication homosexual,

suspense, the historical (pseudo) genre and a host of them , resulting in the end a disconcerting product,

somewhat absurd and that does not close any of the stories it opens, nor ends up being clarified in any of its

aspects.Narrated with a tone that at times is of extreme hardness,lengthensscenes

unpleasantlyunpleasant, while it takes time to those who could make it understand something of this desprop���sito,

in which neither the time, nor the characters or anything, are able to assemble. The only thing that can besaved

highlighted andfrom burning, are the interpretations of its protagonists, including Jacqueline Bisset,

who appears as the head of the cast without being in a disservice to his long career on the part of the management. ;

because the reality is that in a film like this, the more late one appears in the credits, the better. Finally, to

say that the recreation of scenarios is not bad, though excessively gloomy. A casta���a pilonga that

bores the most painted.

" 0

" In summary, one of the best films of the year and probably the best comedy. The wait has been

worth it.

I could not stand it anymore. After seeing a handful of times Shaun of the dead and Spaced discovered that I could not wait

until almost October to see Hot Fuzz, so even before the possible press pass ( to which I must go if or

if especially if one of the mequetrefes comes) I bought the American dvd conveniently subtitled to

Castilian. And I started Hot Fuzz. Wright likes quick editing as much as the classic, and what begins

as a police comedy becomes an Agatha Christie film without forgetting that there are few, very few,

directors / writers that shape couples' problems so effectively. If they had been doing it for 15 years,

they were not going to start getting worse now. And it follows the tone of pleasant comedy, with infinite influences to all

the genres and to have. until it becomes Cluedo. And the thing improves because, let's not forget,

Edgar Wright & Cia have created one of Grindhouse's most fake trailers: Do not. It is clear that with

Hot Fuzz they had plenty of time to prepare it and that means that in HF there is blood. Not inquantities

insultingbut the one that exists is spectacular. Quality metalanguage and maybe similar (to ratitos) with Kiss

Kiss Bang Bang that with Shaun of the dead. In short, one of the best films of the year and probably the

best comedy. The wait was worth it.

" 1

" "" Juno "" is a positive, entertaining, and with charming characters. Thanks to ascript

brilliant, Reitman gets an immediate connection with the public.

At least once a year, the indie cinema becomes fashionable with the appearance of a film that breaks box

offices and awakens passions wherever it treads. "" American Splendor "", "" Little Miss Sunshine "", or "" ���Olv���date of M���! "" Are

just some examples of such a fruitful current cinematographic, whose quality has been amply

demonstrated in the form of nominations and awards of all kinds, as well as in the unanimous support by critics and public.

Now It's the turn of "" Juno "", which continues the path of its predecessors (it has four

Oscar nominations, including best film and script, and is one of the the most watched films of thebox office

current US) becoming the (in) expected success of the year. Directed by Jason Reitman, the film

introduces us to Juno MacGuff (Ellen Page, more than convincing), a sixteen-year-old schoolgirl who becomes

pregnant with one of her classmates (Michael Cera) . When deciding to go ahead with the gestation, it looks for

a couple that adopts the baby when it is born, and this is how it knows the Loring (Jennifer Garner and Jason Bateman),

apparently happy and perfect marriage. But that depends on the point of view you look at. At this point

everyone knows what a movie like "Juno" can offer. Because if something characterizes thecinema

American independent, it is the excessive similarity between its productions, mainly at the visual and

auditory level, although they do not stop resembling each other many of the stories that are told in them.As���, a the three

minutes of the beginning of Reitman's film, one has already been done with the indie style, through a couple of

acoustic songs by Belle & Sebastian or The Kinks, some t�� Entrance titles to the most pure

"American Splendor" style, and such beautiful and austere plans as effective and impersonal. The same goes for the

characters and the situation in which they are stuck . As it happened in "" Little Miss Sunshine "" (to give only one

example), nobody in "" Juno "" stands out for its heroism or class, rather the opposite. They are ordinary people

, close, to whom something happens that could well happen to anyone, and as anyone

tries to find a solution. As if that were not enough, the protagonist can not stop reminding Natalie Portman in

"" Something in Common "" (not only talk and think the same, but also dress very similarly), as well as the

role of could have interpreted perfectly by Zach Braff. So, what has this movie to have

received such a lot of praise? Well, today's ad, the formula continues to work perfectly. Because in the

end, what matters about a film is the story that counts, and that of "" Juno "" is a positive,

entertaining, and with charming characters. Thanks to a brilliant script, in charge of (attention to the name)

Diablo Cody, Reitman gets an immediate connection with the public, who immediately accepts the rules of the game and

He lets himself be entertained and moved in equal parts to the sound of a marvelous soundtrack. Of course, a great part of

that achievement is due to actors in a state of grace, of the first to the last, with special emphasis on the

surprising Ellen Page, which shows that it's "" Hard Candy "was" not only a breath of inspiration, but

especially in the prodigious couple Loring, who for a server is by far the best in all of

pel ���cula.Habr��� some who complain about certain exhaustion of the machine, but the truth is that more than one

director would like to achieve so much, with so little. Simply exquisite.

" 1

" Bored, long and with a villain that makes McClane look like the motherfucker of the story, The Jungle 4

is the worst possible sequel.

Some cyber-terrorists attack US and U and the government sends a cop to look for a hacker. From there, aus

hundred and thirty minutes of BLUE film await, and that's because Len Wiseman makes BLUE movies. And

boring. If the movie was titled Total Chaos and the cop responded to the name of Harry Jones would approve by the

hair to have a couple of scenes action molonas. Probably would also have blood. But no. The movie is

called The Jungle 4.0 and the wood is John McClane. And that touches me the cojones.Aburrida, very long (only a minute

longer than the first, but you know what I'm saying, right?) And with a villain that makes McClane

It seems like the motherfucker of the story, The Jungle 4.o is the worst possible sequel, it does not contribute absolutely anything and what

is worse, it loads the identity signs of the saga.McClane seems Jeff Talley and does not wear a T-shirt of

suspenders ys���, Talley's thing is for the hair. We went from Sam Zeus Jackson to Justin Long, who does not manage to plug in

the character and the worst of all comes with the action: in Jungle 1, Mr. Takagi's head was blown up in the

meeting room; in the second part, McClane took one eye out of CigarroPuro, the one in Porky's, and in the third part,

a guy in half, etc ... so there is blood if some character is cut off. and period. And it has a thousandtimes

dead. And you have half an hour left. And it's boring. Len Wiseman is the guy who directed Underworld and he shows it in a

couple of scenes, here's a flying pee. It is the disappointment of the season and there is only one good

(forced) phrase that was the best cop in the cinema.

" 0

" It's a bit of a movie, but at least you laugh.Juntes��� the movie "" Dead or Alive "" with "" The Quest "" by Van Damme , provide all the nonsense that can be

put on a tape based on ping pong and we already have the last tontuna arrival of the USA, we already have tapes

on "" Prisoner Ball "" (Dodge Ball), and now it is about table tennis, in addition to having Dan Fogler,

Christopher Walken, George Lopez and Maggie QA Dan Fogler and we saw him yesterday accompanying Jessica Alba in "" Good

Luck Chuck "" , what about Christopher Walken begins to be worrisome, since he begins to appear in any

film, perhaps believing that with only his presence a project comes out "" palante "", the comic of Latin origin

George Lopez and the bellisma oriental actress Maggie Q. The argument does not give much, the gui���n either, and the

situations, do not give for more, typical tape to leave the brain outside, and there is no need to And more, sincerely, it

's one of those movies that when you finish you reconnect with the real world and you do not care what you've seen

on the screen. Resuming: It's a bit of a movie, but at less you laugh.

" 0

" It is not enough, evidently, with a brilliant ending: the group confirms that the saga is not in its

best cinematographic moment.

It was foreseeable: David Yates, the director of the fifth chapter of the Harry Potter series (and what is worse,

also the one of the next installment, according to the announcement), it was the most suitable for the most thriving young saga

of the early 21st century. Yates has a mediocre curriculum full of works for television, none

of which he declined, so it is strange to know what they saw in the Warner to hire him (and with rebound,

as in gymnastics.). Indeed, the whole first part is faded, without personality, the filmmaker trusting

in the knowledge that the viewer already has of the characters rather than in an authentic progression of the

plot. It is true that "" Harry Potter and the Order of F���nix "", in its literary version, is the weakest (next to the

second installment "" Harry Potter and the C� " ��mara Secreta "") of the series imagined by JK Rowling, but also it is

that of bad novels magnificent films have been made: the case of "" The Lady of Shanghai "" is recurring. Yates

limits himself, during the first hundred minutes, to putting into pictures the new adventures of the little one (well, notanymore

so much). Magician: his entry into the Order of the F���nix, after be attacked in the quiet streets of London by the

Dementors the ministerial refusal to believe in the return of Voldemort, according to Harry's story; the imposition

in the school of Hogwarts of an inquisitive sum, Dolores Umbridge, that will end up replacing the very same

Dumbledore, the father figure of the saga; the creation of the Army of Dumbledore, with the teenager Potter as

teacher; the first kiss with Cho, at the time the girlfriend of the boy Cedric, who died in the previous chapter, so

close to Harry. All this given in a weary way, without rhythm, without that tone between cheerful and unsettling that

characterized the first two chapters, and even the third. Luckily, from the moment when the

Weasley twins decide to make sleeves capirotes (what sense reaches, in this case, such phrase made.), Yates

seems to be encouraged and the last section of the film gains strength and strength, as if he had been waiting to take

his best clothes: bright scenes like the defection of the twins are developed in full

exams of the OWLs (which should be like the Selectivity here, but with more potions.) and, above all, the

key sequence that takes place in the secret room of the Ministry of Magic, with a visuallystage

very bright, with very high shelves that make up a variegated warehouse. n of prophecies enclosed in strange

burning balls, and that will lead to the well structured and easily monitorable (both virtues so scarce

at present in the scenes of action) sequence of the struggle between Voldemort and his mort���fag os, on the one hand, and

Dumbledore and his army of magician's apprentices, on the other. But obviously, it's not enough with aending

brilliant: the group confirms that the saga is not at its best cinematographic moment. Daniel Radcliffe

ratifies his limitations as an actor, however much he has obtained good criticism in his theatrical "" Equus ""

by Peter Shaffer; Emma Watson, the face of a Hermione Granger already with little girl curves, is emerging as the one

that is probably the most talented of the new stars discovered by the saga; Thecan not be said

sameof Rupert Grint, the freckled and red-haired Ron, who does not seem to go very far in his role as an actor.

Among the elders, it is always a pleasure to find a surprise, as in this case the splendid Dolores

Umbridge that composes the veteran Imelda Staunton, in a character that is truly odious that she makes unforgettable.

The rest follow at the usual height, with powerful people of the English scene like Michael Gambon, Maggie Smith or

Helena Bonham Carter; that's it, Emma Thompson looks like she's coming out of a theatrical end-of-

school performance. Did not there be another piece of paper for this, otherwise, excellent actress?

" 0

" Classic road movie with characters that are very deep, geographically speaking, and grotesque in their

description.

After the expectation caused by the excessive delay in its release, Transamerica is a stick in the wheel of

good intentions. Anyone who is suggestive and / or predisposed to recommend it or review it

favorably will find the task a bit difficult. It is true that the character played by Felicity

Huffman is a challenge of creation. From there, I assume, that the successful and award-winning protagonist of Desperate Housewives

has chosen it. It is more, seeing the crÃditos one appreciates its greater commitment when reading that its husband (William

Macy) is the producer of the history. As many other times I confess that I let mistakes (or horrors)

to enjoy the story without so much criticism, with Transamerica was not an easy task. My "" kindly "" view

tends to be given to cases of deep interest in the story beyond what is told, or its

endearing characters. In this case I could not find any gui���os anywhere. Concluding in aroad movie

classicwith very deep characters, geographically speaking, and grotesque in their description. When

Bree (Huffman), a transsexual ad���as of her desired change of sex, is contacted from prison by a son she did not

know, as a result of an adventure in the university, the visit to the quir� It gets complicated. Your therapist

forbids you to have surgery until you resolve your conflicts with paternity. A long way to Los Angeles,

several twists and turns on the route with visits to his family included and the logical friction with a teenager who does

not know Bree's condition and identity . I must admit that if this road movie had been filmed

anywhere but the United States, my sensation at seeing it would have been closer to the wishes of the new

director Duncan Tucker than to the exasperation that finally I felt Maybe it was because I had seen it

too much or because of personal issues, but the common places and the worn-out stereotypes of the inland

United States managed to exasperate me. As a study sample and character characterization, Transamerica is

a recommendable product to see and be surprised with the palette with which Felicity Huffman plays Bree.

Since a priori one presupposes opposite. Now if you thought to see her because Catalina Dlugi recommended it and that's

more than enough then please do not do it: There's a male frontal nude! Without offending

anyone's intelligence, I am forced to make this clarification given the amount of expressions of surprise and

anger that I heard in the room. A lot of unsuspecting spectators who in the end do nothing but

disrespect the rest.

" 0

" Gibson recovers the adventure cinema, the splendorous, the classic ... Abst���nganse l���nguidos de esp���ritu,

impressionable of heart and let the others They tell them how lucky they were to lose it.

What Mel Gibson proposes is a trip to a rise of peyote or one of its many lisergies due to excess of

ego, but Apocalypto is an absolute work of art, a multidisciplinary artifact that extracts the best ofcinema

adventurefromwhole history of cinema, which is history, to leave us so exhausted and satisfied,

complementamente drunk primitive jungle pride and grace of a prodigious mount alanguage,

known but revisited here with cunning, skill and hand ferrea so that everything goes perfect. Giblson

needed very little to go through the hills of Yucatny bill a Mayan blockbusters endangered

solely to the gourmand been content troop gore teenager with fuste.Apocalypto talks about many things,

but never doubles of pedagogical speaker of a time (the Mayan civilization) as much as some

have wanted to dismantle this amazing hall of pure and simple cinema with speeches that appeal more to the

absurd controversy. We do not go to the cinema (I, at least, never go to the cinema) to be taught what was the

life of the eunuchs or soldiers of Christ or of Hitler's troops in Stalingrad. It's not that I ignore all

that rich cultural tools: I appreciate it to the extent that learning is never superfluous and is worth more to be lyrically

and festively, but cinema (or literature) is fiction. Any Apocalypto exhuma fiction: the fiction dribbles

through all the lianas of the jungle and all the liters of blood that Gibson has had to buy on the Internet

so that the film is what pretty raw. Without that rawness, I'm afraid, we would not have believed it. I

believe And twinned to the belief goes my enjoyment in the movie theater. It had been a long time since two hours had passed

in ten minutes. ��� There is better criticism of a film Le��� that being the Mayan astronomers consummated should not catch them

by surprise an eclipse, as happens in the film. It is possible that they were accomplished astronomers, but the

eclipse is Gibson's mcguffin for Jaguar Claw to have a hundred more minutes of film for all of us to

enjoy with his jungle vigo. ���tico, with his career for life, for his courage and for his wife, who illuminates in

an apotheosis of rain an underwater son. You can not ask for more. He was also predictable and simple, linear

and voyeuristic. A���ado yo: it is explicit, pornographic in its solid sample of details and, very,

wiselyporquepica because our hero runner is the demiurge, the possible god, the man who has come into the world not to

let himself be robbed of life, although a small army of bloodthirsty men give theirs to execute a vengeance andGibson

consummate a whim.has recovered history ( or a story) of the Mayans, but what is narrated is

the History of Humanity, which is the survival of some by the interference of animals and other animals. To

end the plot, Gibson can not think of anything else but to give us a ration of Spanish boats on the beach:

as if we saw ourselves in the mirror, but Jaguar's Claw and his The family is clear: they are going to hide in the

forest and look for a new beginning. (Abstain yourselves from spirit, impressionable from your heart and let

others tell you how lucky they were to lose it)

" 1

" Sus images will now seem to us obsolete, outdated, but they will also catch us in their time

because? Lola Montes? It contains a very special essence. He would not let his viewing escape.

Before the criticism of "" Borat "", an im-pres-cin-di-ble recommendation. Surely we have all heard a hundred

thousand times of masterpieces such as "" Psycho "", "" 20001, a space odyssey "", "" Casablanca "", "" What the wind

took away � "", "" Citizen Kane "", "" With skirts already crazy "", "" At the end of the break ""? and we could continue to

cover hundreds, thousands of titles. But few have seen one of the most forgotten and great films in the

history of cinema. "" Lola Montes "" that the German Max Oph���ls, more remembered by the indisputable classics of

romanticism as "" Letter from an unknown "" (1948), "" The round "" (1950) or "" Madame de? "" (1953), rod��� de p

manerastuma.Precisamente, yesterday, Tuesday day 21, reedited on DVD "" Lola Montes "", which was during its premiere, in 1955,

the most expensive production of European cinema, and also a resounding box office failure. It recreates the life of a famous

courtesan of the 19th century, of Cuban origin, and endowed with an irresistible beauty and sensuality. Disengaged from

love, I decided to live freely, defying the norms of her time. He became a celebrity due to his

multiple lovers, which included sultans, tsars or kings, and his life ended up being exhibited in a

circus show where she herself is the Main starand power in a trapeze. With Lola Montes (1820? 1861)

. Loveerected in circus phenomenon, Max Oph? l's film begins. Narrated in an unconventional,

baroque, exquisite, elegant, full-color way and what? I never got to attract too much public. However, if you

look for any other comment you will also read wonders of this movie. And it's no wonder! Ophls draws a

parallel to grotesque proportions between the spectacle of life of Lola and taking place under a

tent full of dwarfs, it tightrope walkers, trapeze artists, dancers, horses, theatrical scenes or shadows

They project three curtains. It is the circus of life! Legend and reality are intermingled in the turbulent history

of an unrepeatable film that even shook governments. And as the master of ceremonies (Peter

Ustinov,? Unrecognizable!) Goes telling the lovemaking acrobatics and the social, and political, rise of the heroine

(Martine Carol, ���impagable!), M�� The steps are going up Lola in the trapeze number of their function. Humor is

always useful and with pleasure. For example, when King Ludwig I of Bavaria (Anton Walbrook) must choose the painter

of the portrait of Lola he does so according to the criterion of "" slowness "" of the work of the artist, and in this way achieve to

retain it m� It's time in his country. The 12 perfections. Or reflecting the fun vaiv���n, the chain of orders and

movement, which can trigger among his vassals the simple order of a character influential. For example,

in "" Madame de? "" Was a necklace of pearls lost in a theater of the opera, and in "" Lola Montes "" is the order of Luis

I to his servants to bring him, as soon as possible , thread and needle to sew the dress of the lady. And what is said, both

Martine Carol and Peter Ustinov are absolutely memorable. It also highlights the lyrics of the song that the

master of ceremonies dedicates to the prostitute and that says something like: "Lola has 12 perfections. 3 sweetnesses:

heart, fists and hands. 3 crazy things: eyes, hair and p���es. 3 briefs: arms, ears and nose. 3 curves:

figure, mouth and breasts. Men are condemned to offer you fortunes. And you offer your body, but you reserve

your soul. "His images will now seem to us obsolete, out of date, but also trapping us. In its

time, why? "" Lola Montes "" contains a very special essence. He would not let his viewing escape. Do not you believe me? You will be

surprised.

" 1

" Anyway, I join all those who recommend it, since they are roughly 1 hour and 45 minutes.

of time very well invested.

In the year 1988 Sabina plasm��� in a precise way "" The man in the gray suit "", a statement of intentions

of what could well be the character of Diego Peretti , which we already knew among others for the excellent "" No

sos vos, soy yo "", with which this film shares director; On the other hand, the film, which accompaniesmoments

seriouswith others of a sublime comedy, is, in broad strokes, a new bet of the Argentine cinema towards the

outside, especially when in this film it accompanied The protagonists Willy Toledo and Laura Pamplona, ​​the first

known for his participation in "" The other side of the bed "" (among others) and her for his 1000 appearances in

television series. The tape, such Once, it can become one of those little pearls of the 7th art, that sneak,

forced marches, into the collective memory, and that in this case, word of mouth, helps popularize so

great and funny (that milk) film. Comparing Peretti, we have Carolina Peleritti, as an antithesis of the

character of Aldo, being someone different, one of those neighbors, so normal, ordinary and peaceful

which one, quickly, you can falllove / encapricharse.El argument, facilnmente curious, plasma one stroke a

thousand and one referents, and we have from the strange manic Geek, we have seen in "" Madonna at 40 "", the

stupidly perverted friend (also represented in an infinity of tapes), all seasoned with a

"" sauce "" of ecstatically cosmic moments. I can not admit that the ribbon has haunted me, and that of

course and given my geek-collecting on DVD, this movie will be part of my "" DVD-teak "", but I will say that

some strange spring has activated inside me, and that I have taken a certain attachment / affection. In short, I join

all those who recommend it, since they are roughly 1 hour and 45 minutes. of time very well

invested.

" 1

" An overwhelming, beautiful, eager, tender, sober experience .... Isabel Coixet, Wim Wenders, Fernando Le���n de Aranoa, Mariano Barroso and Javier Corcuera, led by the

inspiration And the money of Javier Bardem, they have written in images the sadness of a world or its destruction because

of its indifference, its barbarism, its tired stubbornness to look the other way when we must put our hands

and raise hopes. The invisible are those who, being, can not be seen. They are not phantasmagoria or missing.

Your presence is your complaint. What these little documentaries show is the degree of isolation that

we have gone to to cope with the enormous weight of life, contaminated with haste, cradled in fright, manumitida

of its beauty to throw it to the fest n unworthy of a few who enjoy sentimental poverty yfsica

other muchos.Mujeres of Congo raped and ninguneadas, apocalpticos frmacos hiding daredevils business,

Colombian outcasts who seem Steinbeck characters , the exacerbated mortality in Bolivia and children who flee from

adult depravity and take refuge in their childhood and do not want to push a weapon. These invisible live in our

oblivion. They inhabit our memory, but we do not give them a voice: we throw them away, we discard them, we impose on them the rough

rope of what is not ours. I do not know if they concern us more now after having been invaded by the germ of

this documentary. It's just a documentary: unfortunately. These forgotten crises are covered by anonymous NGOs,

groups such as MSF (Doctors Without Borders) and individuals who are as willing as they are outside any kind of public relevance

that contributes to their work or their economic effort. ���mico so that something, in the background, change. The life

that comes after the film does not return us to the film: I suppose that in some way it also We proceed

with it as with everything that it shows us. We leave it in a pre-eminent place of our memories

for a time, but then we discard it as an experience and rename it in a separate chapter ofname

always very dubiousthat have to do with indifference, with the incommunicado Regrettably. Except

some (we all know someone close) who has taken the most precarious articles, the whole heart of the

world and the perfect smile to go there where their collaboration It is essential to readjust the design errors

of this world of ours, so dedicated to the most important when it is proposed.

" 1

" Movie essential for any lover of entertainment cinema. Patriotic humor that overflows irony and

doubtful taste for all pores, but that shows us that the public is intelligent enough to

discern between fiction and reality. In addition to accentuating the ditch that separates the viewer from the critic.

A few years ago they released this film, and it is still the second highest grossing Spanish cinema. In

spite of this, the criticism has dispelled her until the nausea the tape, tild���ndola of everything. This makes me think

that the spectators may have very different tastes than those who should advise us what to see and what

not to see. Can the viewer demand more Torrents and less Garcis? Can the viewer be

smart enough to choose what is really good? I do not know, I would worry if at the time of

criticizing it was against the third film more view of Spanish cinema. This, of course, does not affect the

crisis, nor the foreign cinema or anything like that, it sells without problem. The film is about Torrente, a

z���fio, ru���n, disgusting and all the negative qualifying adjectives possible, he lives in Marbella spending

millions and millions (he acquired them in the first movie). As all the capital is melted, he has to go back to

work, so he is involved in a conspiracy of a crazy magnate who wants to destroy Marbella if he does not

receive a few million dollars. ���Podr��� Torrente and his inseparable Cuco finish with Jose Luis Moreno and his monkey? Make

your bets, people. For me, Turn 2 was a radical change in the Spanish cinema scene. To

begin with, it was self-financed, which is already a small thing. Then we approached the typical North American cinema of

waste of media, but with characters from here, of those who make fun to the public. And he taught us that

second parties can be better than the first ones. Once Santiago Segura freed himself from having to

show us the virtues of Torrente, he armed a kind of thread (I dare not call him a gui���n) that helps him

to get thousands of hilarious moments, with characters of all the coats that are folded to your

wishes. The actions of Jose Luis Moreno, of bad bondiano total, or of Gabino Diego, who has become the

paradigm of simplic yonki of Spanish cinema, or Tony Leblanc, as a kind of patriarch left, They extol a

ribbon that sells itself. That does not need that nobody flatters it and that nobody sells it to you (and it watches thatSantiago

Safeundertook in doing it). A tape very popular with the Spanish public, which can hardly be

exported. Resuming, essential film for any lover of entertainment cinema.humor

Patrioticthat overflows irony and doubtful taste for all pores, but that shows us that the public isenough

intelligentto discern between fiction and reality. In addition to accentuate the ditch that separates the viewer

from the critic.Genial.Besitos.PD: I managed to do the criticism without referring to the first, which I think

marks a milestone in the Spanish film criticism, ha ha ha.Moments to remember: \*presentation

James Bond stylewith Torrent hanging from a fish. \* The first scene with Cuco at the wheel of the car. \* "" Who

has thrown a black into the pool? "" That says when they are bathing. \* The moment that Cuckoo wakes up in the bar

and asks for a zumito while raising his hand, seeing that he has a punctured shot on his arm while saying

"" Put me a zumito, which has lots of vitamins. "" \* The time with Cristina T���rrega "" Fuck no, I get tired, better a

sharp sword "". \* The scene of Tony Leblanc and the girl's panties. \* "" That reverse, that rev���s ""

Torrente says to Carlos Moy� ��. \* (Cuco disfr frazzled woman in the embassy) "" Cuco, t���pate, that you are putting

morcillona "" \* "" Franco, has died "" said by Cuco after the death of the dog of Torrente. \* "" We make some

straws "" says Torrente. "" With your hand or with your mouth? "" Answer cute. "" With your mouth? but you are a degenerate

. ummm Well, let's see how that is "" says Torrente while unbuttoning his fly. \* At the end, when

Torrente has to throw the missile into the sea and says "" to the sea? no kid, to Gibraltar! Spanish or nobody's! "". \* "" Doknow

youthat women have 5 mu���equitas? The barby (touching the chin), the dolls, the(touching her

bellybelly) and the chochona !!!!!! "" \* "" ���D��� that the Fary is God! Say your mother is a whore. Well, do not say that,

everyone knows. "

" 1

" Mafias light, popcorn with p���lvora. At least, and that is very welcome in these times of

ramblings and market semiotics, the film does not intend to send any message, has no

instructing intention.

This is the bad thing that cinema has: how easy it is to make cash with products of insulting mediocrity.

The murderer is a nonsense that does not reach the same levels of quality of films machine-gunned under his own

assumptions, but it is vacuous, repetitive, lacking any sense of aesthetics and, what is more

important, neatly hujrina of nerve. As if the director hired to settle the hassle, a certain

Philip G. Atwell, had left with premeditation, nocturnal and cinematographic alevos���a all interest in

astonishing his p� Public and would have opted (with how easy it is) to photocopy hundreds of stories of

revenge and redemption, camouflaged under the title of action cinema and projected as portentous showcases

for the spectator lover of bombs and other pyrotechnics of the pure and hard violence. Atwell, without running

over us, recreates with correction that world: the archetypes are perfect, the cabriolas of the gui���n (with that

unexpected ending, how not) declare themselves incompetent to follow certain l�� Reasonable narrative line and everything is

a pitiful, empty, pompous cinema exercise. One more. This chronicler of his vices does not enter that it

is the worst film of the year, which is not, nor by far, but it is important to warn a certain demanding public

about the inconvenience of engrossing with the very attractive trailer. Having seen this, it can be said

flatly that we have seen the whole movie. The good thing about the cinema is that we have many films

to see. The murderer does not smudge our file. It is understood that, on occasion, we want to see lightness,

exoticism, unarmed cinema of transcendence. Then there is the commercial trick, for whoever sees it, to bring together

two experts in jumping and kicking in recent years, Jet Li and Jason Statham. . There they

cure him with bandages. I did not see El ,nico, but a friend told me a summary that could be useful for this

new-age, stupid and dizzying nonsense. This excess of bullets (kicks, in honor of the truth, there are not too many, less

bad) muddies a noble genre that is caramelizing, turning into a pastiche sweetened withadrenaline

cheap. At least, and that is very welcome in these times of ramblings and market semiotics,

the film does not intend to send any message, has no instructing intention. It only covers the respectable

sector of mental dissipation tapes, as a friend of mine said, but the praiseworthy purpose is drowned in the

heavy identity game. false, honor codes lied and (I'm preparing) the infumable closure.

" 0

" Melodrama with humor, naturalist stamp, social portrait, in short, cinema of ideas, of feelings, ofscript

overwhelming...

The costumbrismo offers a type of cinema to the verit���, graceful in its very estimable function of prefiguring astory

naturalist, colorful and entertaining, not twisted, convinced of the eminently narrative essence of his proposal.

The inventory of avatars never exceeds the daily routine of a spectator invariably involved in a plot that is

almost always close, intimate, borders on the biographical. We can all go through what we see just as almost nobody experiences

the things that Bruce Willis lives in his crystal jungles or in the typical adventures of Peter O'toole

in his Lawrence of Arabia. The abundant m�� � Stephen Stephen's story is to handle the story of Roddy Doyle (author of

"" The Barrytown "", trilogy whose first and most important part was that "" The commintments "" from the front row

Alan Parker and with an almost identical distribution to this Irish café) and to extract the powerful localist charge (

Dublin, 80) and to deliver a universal work, of f Easy recognition, of immediate empathy, without

to condescend to the political or to be shipwrecked in the typical, never ceasing to supply us with truth, truth that

oscillates between the dramatic and the cosmic without tipping in excess for any Of the two. The kind reader can

be sure that there are generous portions of both. Frears returned home, the BBC, after checking in

"" Hero by accident "", a farce to the Capra that does not He had glory in Hollywood, but that does not detract from the fullness

of his work. In this British environment, Frears is allowed licenses and subtleties, gui���os with sarcasm and sweetness or

emotion in abundance. Everything is allowed. Unlike the other master of the costumbrista (Ken Loach),

Frears does not overwhelm, does not overwhelm with miserable pictures, with dark portraits of the impoverished society and its

social corpses. The imposing performance of Colm Meany as a grieving father for the pregnancy of his daughter (and his

refusal to give the name of the father) gives the film a very considerable deposit of humanity and that makes this

"brat" "(The snapper, such is the t��� original title in English) is entertaining cinema, very well done and of

indelible memory in our cin���fila memory. With few wickers, you can make great chairs.

" 1

" In short, a new way to start the Bond saga, with better screen presence. The man returns ...

All those who tore their clothes before the election of Daniel Craigh as a new Bond, now must

go biting their tongues (and poisoning themselves at the same time), never a Bond was as brutal as Craigh is,ever

nobody hastransmitted so much in so little, as he has done this, and never a film of the saga bond has

seemed so interesting, well shot and fun at the same time. he remembers those of old, but not to Timothy

Dalton, or to Pierce Brosna, bond's metrosexuals, but to an ironic bond, bastard and ill-faced, which brings in

check even the very Q, a bond debtor to Sean Connery or Roger Moore; the tape also has a big bad

, as is Le Chifre, one that, like darth Maul in Star Wars, with its single presence already produces

dread. At this point, it shows that the movie I have loved it, from the credit titles, with the great

opening in B / N and the theme of Chris Cornell the man that was behind groups like Soundgarden, Temple of

the Dog or now Audioslave. Maybe, the 2 negative notes that I give to the film are, that I could go through

any other action tape, if it were not for the eternal franchise 007 , (Where is the main theme?),

And that the presence of Eva Green, however much she has been promoted as the best bond girl, honestly

does not seem to me that her presence, nor her attractiveness, is re���ido with the rest of the ladies who populated the screen. In short

, a new way to start the Bond saga, with better screen presence.

" 1

" A film of ruptures, of dreams, and of all that is this life that we have had to live, shot in a

sober way, without much artifice.

Everyone had told me about this film, its incredible dialogues, a raw, hard and

dramatic story, in which many of the that fortunately or unfortunately we have spent some time taking care of our

parents until their last days, we can feel identified. This is the story of the character played by

Quim Guti���rrez, almost a debutante, with a career forged in the Catalan television series, a boy who

tries to hold on as a red nail to any destination, not the one who unfortunately has to live, accompanied

by Marta Etura, perhaps best of the film and is that your character enters through the eyes, stays in the

stomach and ends in the brain, sad, concise, making you understand all their motivations. of

ruptures, dreams, and everything that is this life that we have lived, shot in a sober, without

much artifi cio (pa 'que), with a beautiful soundtrack, which helps sovereignly well to follow the pulse of the

story. With secondary ones of exception, namely, Ra���l Ar���valo, Antonio de la Torre, Roberto Enr���quez, or

even the final cameo of the now television Alex O'Dogherty. In short, a tape that had been recommended to me and

that I had to have seen much earlier, since it is almost perfect.

" 1

" You can not get the gay flag and four fashionable slogans on sexual freedom in the midst of a

product whose humor is to flatter the macho instincts of the least demanding public.

It is not strange that homosexuals celebrate a day of gay pride in view of the fact that we celebrate the

other 364. The hero proclaims his joy of being gay. h���tero in the middle of the jokes he makes, and, until recently,

in their institutions. The idea that all possible couples have the right to join in holy matrimony is

as serious as the idea that all soldiers are entitled to a decoration even if they do not go to war.

However, gays defend it by heart and sword, and in Spain, Canada, Belgium, South Africa or the Netherlands they

have conquered it. Defending things like this is part, according to some, of modernity. That's why films are shot

to look modern. But as they are not, the dandruff spots fall everywhere. John Ford seems ancase

unusual. Ethan Edwards is not a citizen outraged against the racism of his country, it is Ford himself trying to

wash his dirty rags in public. That is why he is more authentic when he shoots the eyes of aIndian

deadand denies him entry into heaven than when he ends up accepting his niece. The criticism of racism

is authentic because it comes from a racist. A similar similarity, but at a chavacano level, is what the

creators of "" I declare to you husband and husband "" with the world of homophobia. Adam Sandler is a fireman so close

to his friend that he is willing to marry him to secure the pension of his children. Sandler's problem is

that he is not gay, but the man out of the world. Something similar to an Andr���s Pajares in Hollywood. Instead of

showing off his testosterone binge with Adriana Vega, Nadiuska or Susana Estrada, Sandler has Jessica Biel.

The interminable scene in which Jessica Biel lets him touch her tits thinking that he is gay and he gloats in

front of the public that he knows he is not gay is without a doubt one of the conditions that put Adam Sandler in the

contract to produce the film. Lacking inspiration, they shot the idea of ​​Alonso Mill���n in "" You will not want

the neighbor of the fifth. "" It's not just about the movie If there is no grace, it has little; The problem is thatis

itnot clear to whom it is directed. You can not get the gay flag and four fashionable slogans on

sexual freedom in the midst of a product whose humor is to flatter the macho instincts of the least

demanding public.

" 0

" A gross comedy imitation characterized by the uncouth humor, bad taste and lack of class that

tend to distill Adam Sandler's pseudo-chemical roles.

Since the world had little punishment with Jim Carrey and his uncouth grimaces, Hollywood had considered

sending us a second avenging angel, even more repellent and anchored in the time that first. This specimen

receives the name of Adam Sandler, and can be seen by the billboards every certain period of time, in which it

leaves its burrow to remind us all that there can always be something worse than the last thing we have

seen. On this occasion, appears on the screen accompanied by Kevin James, which helps to make the disproportion is

still greater than what already of itself. It represents a film that uses homosexuals to laugh at and not

with them. I say this because I declare you husband and husband is not more than a series of topics gathered (and not of

Geyper), in which it is not repaired to offend the dignity of whoever is necessary in order to try start a

smile to the viewer, although the result provokes more grimaces of displeasure than anything else.Grosso modo, the

story tells the adventures of two foolish golfers (and heterosexuals) after meeting casually decide

to get married to get a grant That is granted to gay couples. In order to pass for it, they resort to

all the bad taste stereotypes, surrounding themselves with the reinmen and histri���nicos characters that ri���nse you of Paco

Mart���nez Soria dressed in a fur coat and wig spoiled in La t���a de Carlos.For more inri, his

advertising campaign in the United States includes allusions to the defense of the normalization of homosexuality that they say

represents the movie Come on, they pretend to make believe that everything they do to fight against

homophobia. At least they have not had the misfortune to use that argument in Europe; Maybe because here

people still think. Although after two or three years of Education for the Citizenship and otherreforms

educationalof different governments (of all colors) maybe clunky like �� This will end up being

considered masterpieces also in the Old Continent.

" 0

" You have to bother a bit to adapt it, here the writer wrote five random comics and I remove a few

ideas, nothing more

If you are a fan of good action cinema , fantastic, or you just like a good movie of

entertainment, even if you have not read the comics, either everything published or just some loose, then. do not

go to see it. If you are a true x-men fan, and vibrated with emotion just thinking about watching thesaga

F���nix Oscurain cinema, then ... do not go see it. If you're bored, and you have absolutely nothing to

do, then ... rent the first part or the second one on DVD, and miss Bryan Singer, but do not go and

see it !!! ��� Exaggerated? Can be. But it is the criticism that I think of doing now that I have arrived home, and I

start writing about the film. The worst thing is that it occurred to me to write it while I was watching the film, how

disconnected I was from what was happening on the screen. As a movie, it has no rhythm, it is completely

impossible to find a common thread that interests you, that will carry the spectator off, a good against

bad, or a save the world. Something that is essential in this type of cinema. We are not going to see these movies

to hear intelligent dialogues or big arguments. We want them to give us an excuse to risk their lives,

forget the girl we love to run to fight or at least, a reason to leave our life in the

urbanization. We want to forget that we are sitting in a movie theater, and follow M���ximo or William Wallace

with a sword in his hand. And no, of that nada.La truth, X-Men 3 does not have anything of that. Above, if you wanted

some characters that made you vibrate for them, although you would not think more than eating popcorn, well neither.

Do not give a damn what happens to them (especially since M���stica removes her from the movie in ascene

stupid, and if it's not M���stica, I do not want to know anything anymore, hala ) or stop happening. So, a disaster. And if

you are a hard-working and unconditional fan of the X-Men, you better not even read the synopsis of the cinema's entrance. How to

destroy the Saga of F���nix Oscura, and turn it into a stupid story. As the lack of blood (film for

children and breasts, which go with them to watch that they see their children) makes Wolverine lose all grace. How to

eliminate characters because the director does not like them, in stupid ways. How to put up free fights that do not

make sense. How to put a scene with ONE sentinel, only to appear in the trailer and coax the

fans (I swear I think that's why this scene is, to put it in the trailer and nothing more). How to change the

personalities of the characters in the comic, in all cases worse. Come on, that is a horrible adaptation. Because

yes, even if it's a comic and not a novel worthy of a N���bel, you also have to bother adapting it, not

transcribing it exactly, which is impossible, but if you bother a bit to adapt it, and here ��� The writer wrote

five random comics and removed a few ideas, nothing more. In summary: The worst of the three films. How to

miss a story, for not having things clear. I seem to be watching one offamous

Kevin Smith'slectures, explaining that the producer wanted Mystica to appear in paintless balls,

that there must be many bad mutants dressed in punks, and that the San Francisco Bridge had Quea to float

in the air. That's how the movie came out.

" 0

" Rec turns out to be a good film on the subject, quite realistic (as realistic ascan be

a film about the living dead) well carried and with an intensity and tension. Ques that achieved.

A Spanish film, of zombies, of the director of "" Operation Triumph: the film "" and with a style that is

a plagiarism to the Project of Blair's wich. The truth is that with this letter of presentation many eludir���n see

this movie thinking that they will meet a cutrez casposa and infumableBut nothing is further from

reality. REC turns out to be a good film on the subject, quite realistic (as realistic ascan

a film about the living deadbe) well carried and with an intensity and tension. I know that achieved.

Proof of this is that the typical scares of "" sure will happen now "" get scared but happens what

seems to happen. The most foreseeable scares get the jump of the spectator. The film poses

a format that, without being original at all, is very bold, since it is shot entirely in the first person, and

all we see is through the camera of a journalist. There will be somebody who will say, and not without a certain reason, that itnot

isvery credible that the journalist does not stop recording, and that the first zombie that camera ends up lying on the

floor , but hey, it is a concession of realism in favor of the narrative, which in this case is quite

necessary. The approach is quite simple: a team of journalists; The reporter and the cameraman are

recording the typical program "" Public Mirror "" or "" Callejeros "" (various news programs) and the

report It leads to the place where all the action takes place. And there, little by little, the thinggoes

graduallyfrom "" place where something strange happens "" to "" total crisis "", as in any good movie of the genre I would

dare say that this film is going to be one of those movies that you love or hate, because it plays with

pretty experimental things and there are details that, although I particularly liked them , may be

boring. Nor does it play very in favor of the film, and that is what I mean, the beginning of the film, where the

first 10 minutes presage a stroke. But no, nothing at all, the viewer who has a little patience

will find a great film of great tension and totally claustrophobic. Valid as endorsement that of 7

people who went to the movies, to 7 we thought it was a wonderful film, and if we consider that we were a

group of people with very different cinematographic tastes, and even at times opposed, that should give some

clue about REC.And well, interestingly, it looks like being one of those films that win on a small screen

, but despite that I recommend to the readers that they are not crappy and they see it in the movies, that the film

deserves it.

" 1

" Harting of psychopaths at this point: true satiety of this brute gang of mindless people who do not

skimp on their efforts to score notches on the handle of their Toledo steel. Under the fill, there is not a

bad movie. Neither good.

I am very much on the sidelines of the sadistic and chacacana-like feats with which thepsychopaths

Leatherfaceor this Michael Myers have supplied the terror of the eighties (Carpenter, Hooper, Craven) and the new

terror of modern boasts, but fed by these ancient children (Zombie, Aja). I consideraspectator

myselfsensible, as far as I can, little inclined to excessive enthusiasm unless circumstances recommend a

good dose of euphoria and sound nonsense, comfortably installed in the certainty that cinema is a

formidable entertainment, a sublime art and a sump accomplice of all those who do not consider it

entertainment or, of course, art when formulated. I rather let myself be carried away by very primal emotions, which I

inevitably transform out of the cinema and later (now) mute in impressions, in notes that maybe

they only put on the screen. ��logo to the spectator (me) with the chronicler, with the stubborn scribe. Needless to say, me

too. So a film like this, rejoicing in the vicious batch of body count orthodoxy,

gore light or aberration in the form of multiple murderers , has not left me trembling, nor have I been

bothered by the aura of mythical film (Halloween night, John Carpenter, 1978). This prequel without

complexes, machine-gunned by the vigorous pulse of Rob Zombie, does not spare violence orto what would

stickhave been easy, that is, to compose a film exercise for teenagers with acne and alg ... He was brainless,

easily impressionable, and his retina greedy with axes, mechanical saws, and all the paraphernalia of masks

so beloved by the troop of brutes that occupy us. It rather outlines an honest assault on a foreseeable history

of childhood disastrous, extraordinarily salpimentada of all the Freudian topics that the kind readeralready

hasseen in dozens of films cut by the same commercial scissors. This part of an absolute master of his

vices: Zombie worships the slasher, pampers him, grants him privileges of noble genre, and does not enter into considering whether it

is or not because there are no despicable formats (I understand) Neither minor genres and everything is left to rock by the ingenuity,

the magisterium or simply the creative value of those who invoice it. Zombie, whose music is not holy of any of

my abundant devotions, is (on the contrary) a director with punch, we would say, one of those who has

understood without excessive time in the industry ��� convulsive way it works and how it is possible to marry

entertaining, salable, consumable cinema without further cultural considerations or subterfuges and, for an added reason, a

technical, narrative and even acting more than decent. Nothing here alarms for its mediocrity, nothing is

(however) bad of solemnity and there are even moments of estimable cinema, well planned and reckoned with solvency.

This is why Halloween, the origin leaves a bittersweet memory. Much, in short, thinking how little

it spared. The film sets the autopilot when the setting of the knives and masks leaves his

penitentiary and it is dragged (it is perhaps many minutes) to its ungovernable end where Myers does not die no matter how

much he gets stuck the scriptwriter and a regiment of infanter���ao of ordinary rambos. That end,

run over to the na���sea, is the one that bothers, the one that reduces the pleasant (more or less) attraction of its passable

start and its entertaining intermission. The dreadful vision of Brad Douriz and Malcolm

McDowell, formidable actors pigeonholed in series B, if not C or Z or the one that the kind reader decides and

habitual of the always appreciable fund of catalog of our videoclubs, compiled by chance to capture

Myers. And that's where it's impossible not to think what a good couple of perverse people would be, what a waste of talent

for evil giving them these kind papers, of men who defend a cause and they die or they see theirdie

own peoplefor it, but that has been my private cinéfila aberration (open here) and does not require, in any way, a

phonological endorsement. In the rest, it will be necessary to wait for Zombie to mature more and perhaps in that learning capture

other more personal essences and stop twisting the topic, the cl Physicists (for whom so the nomenclature) and the

mythical films. Construct, however, my passion (moderate) by John Carpenter. In short, afalls. It's been a

review of the tape of 78long time (too much) that I do not see it.

" 0

" Voyeuristic exercise with infinite perspectives and amazing details. I understand those who think that this film is pedantic, slow, boring and dense like a potato purée.

I admit that the dialogues are irritating because of what little they have, for what is supposedly banal. The

photography is also completely naturalistic, touching the look of the domestic video, although without thetrembling

typicalof the camera in hand. The rhythm is heavy, lethargic, without concessions, in a long footage, very stretched

and with dispensable scenes. In addition, this is not a previously chewed story and there is no

effort to accompany the viewer towards a clear message, towards a concrete end. I also share

the opinions that accuse Haneke of taking as the starting point of his film the intriguing principle of

"" Lost Highway "" by David Linch. It's really like that. In both, the protagonist couple receives strangetapes

videowhere, they and their house, are recorded by a stranger. But it is also true that Cach��� moves away at

once and takes a very different direction. Cach��� is a voyeuristic exercise with an infinite number of perspectives and

amazing details, which also has enough virtues, at least as many as

there are many other spectators, among whom I include myself, who ��� that they have experienced an interesting

and different sensation, a very gratifying and intelligent film session. Cach��� does not invite or entertain thegratuitously

viewer. It is not a story portrayed from the best camera angles, it is not a neon advertisement, nor a

plate of hot food. It is a peephole from which you can spy. A peephole in the cold street, by which

you can look through from an uncomfortable posture. The actions do not go to the point. We observe, for example,

how the protagonist enters the scene, drops a coin, uses a coffee machine, waits for it, sucks it, goes

to the window, sips again and reflects. But who spies out the window, does not receive a summary of the

best actions of his neighbor opposite. Who spies, shares silences, complete actions,

dead moments, moments of apathy, images that we usually do not observe in the usual cinematographic language.

The same happens here with the conversations. We never find concrete dialogues, necessary orinformation. In addition

concise, the moments that one does not select or that can not be chosen, never answer all of

our questions. They do not usually explain everything, nor do they necessarily provide an answer for each of

our issues. And in this case, and only at the end of the film, we can get to understand what

the two hours of film have really been about. I think that Cach��� is about the naive cruelty of children and

adolescents. On the, many times, terrible and inevitable consequences of our actions throughout

life. Of how we carry our faults, errors and sins and how, then, all of these,affect

evensubsequent generations. Cach��� talks about guilt, morals, fear and

selfishness. It makes a totally neutral social criticism. It exposes the subjects without positioning itself at all. I was able to intuit, in

addition, a kind of parallel message on which, until now, I have not found any reflection in any

other place. Perhaps for this reason it is only a personal perception: (Refrain from reading below

who has not yet seen the movie. As the couple discovers the disappearance of their son,are observed in the background

images on the television about the current disaster in Iraq. Perhaps it is also coincidence that the

co-stars are also of Muslim origin. But everything could be understood as well as a metaphor, where the

rich and intellectual Western protagonist punishes, betrays and truncates in the past the life of the poor, and at the same

time, the future of his descendants, after ���s, strive to ignore and belittle the possible pain

caused and claim a victimizing feeling. The protagonist feels terrified, bewildered, aggressive,

when the consequences of his actions in some way splash his well-off and secure lifestyle. Michael Haneke

asks us: Who is here? the real victim? Maybe the terrorists are part of our family.

Maybe we are the terrorists. Perhaps our precious lifestyle is not the most appropriate, just or

perfect. The protagonist is insensitive when it comes to recognizing his guilt and does not hesitate to deceive his

own wife, to lie without delay to his own people, to hide the information that can blame him. Our

society, our news, our television, do not hesitate to lie, to not tell the whole truth, to

invite us to consume, unconcerned, and to continue as long as possible with this one "" sue��� " or

American "" of selfishness and evasion. In addition, in parallel, we see images of suicide bombings in Iraq,

while for the co-protagonist, the only possible way to carry out his justified revenge, is by implicating

and making a direct witness to the protagonist of his suicide.Cach��� invites us to reflect, to think, and in exchange does not

yield an apex to the spectator. I understand those who only seem a superb co���azo. And above all I understand

those who speak here of a masterful film. I can only say that I entered the game, apost��� and enjoyed it

very pleasantly.

" 1

" Bergman in its purest form. Hard at the same time sensitive, cryptic and heartbreaking. The day I set out to see "" The Spring of the Maiden "", by Ingmar Bergman was a little scared, as if after

the expectation. I have heard comments about the criticism of the great Swedish film. When I finished

the projection, I stayed a while in silence, reflecting, and that's when I decided to continue

discovering the work of the Nordic director. "" The seventh seal "" first and then "" Wild strawberries "", which is the

film that these lines deal with. Wild grapes introduce us fully in the mind of a doctor who

attends his retirement and who throughout the trip to the university where the honors will be held (which he

decides to do at the last minute by car after a strange dream) makes an inner journey through what has been his

life. A life full of chiaroscuros, like any other person's. A great man for the majority, but not

for his son, whom he always judged harshly. Not for his daughter-in-law, or even for the person who seems

closest to him, who is his housekeeper. Bergman shows us the decline of a superb man, disciplined and hard,

but also evokes moments of tenderness of his youth, in his summer home. It is a duality that is

probably found within each of us, but it is difficult to portray with the mastery and

sensitivity that Bergman does here.As���, straddling the real and the surreal, shows us the weaknesses

of a strong, severe man, but at the same time he contemplates how life has escaped from his hands without

having demonstrated that he is a person as capable of love as any other person. All this adorned by an

extraordinary interpretation and a magnificent handling of the shadows and the lights in a time in which the

means, evidently, were not those of now. And finally, the open end, typical in Swedish. Although

maybe the general script is lacking in some consistency. As if there were things left in the inkwell. Something

that probably made for the viewer to reflect on those small gaps that seem to exist. At

least, this is what I thought, although, of course, I'm sure many things escape me, because, for What to

deny, Bergman was a director who was hard to understand in its entirety.

" 1

" That same ease, and freshness, in the treatment of the characters and situations is what predominates

throughout the whole footage, a narration so fluid and forceful that one comes to the cr�� Final deeds with a

thought: we have just seen the total adventure, paradigm of the seventh art as a medical instrument.

According to an original idea of ​​George Lucas, Steven Spielberg signed here one of his most round films,

paradigm of modern adventure cinema and presentation of Indiana Jones, the model of adventurous hero who

has most influenced the minds of fans during the last decades. The intention was to recover astyle

classic. Basic taking as a reference the cinema and the film of the 30s and 40s. The result was, in effect, a

return to adventure films that, in addition, achieved to reformulate the style and myth of the hero in tune with the

new demands of emerging mass culture, and a film industry willing to exploitto the maximum

new possibilities. First of all, "" In search of the lost ark "" is the strongest expression thathas never had

the cinemain its most profitable: the show Desculo devoid of any other intention than to

entertain the viewer with a succession of passages filmed in such a way that they excite and cause amazement, not

only for a visual delight that is an immediate consequence of the impeccable handling of the tempos and the rhythm, also

by the perfect structure that is linking some situations with others, in a series of action scenes that

become pure cinema when at the service of a simple and seamless narrative. In this way, the film

does not demand anything from the viewer, we are talking about a product that is easy to consume, but made with art.First

measures: a group of travelers in an Amazon rainforest , a mysterious character with a jacket and hat directs the

retinue, always with his back or above the camera, we will not see his face until moments later, when

one of the companions tries to betray him, then the buzzing of a whip is heard and

the face of the anonymous hero emerges from the jungle gloom. The presentation of Indiana reinforces the mysterious and subtle halo that

is (that should be) proper to every charismatic hero. The subsequent sequence before the golden ���dolo, the

approach to the objective in attitude of barely concealed reverence, the inanimate and fascinated expression in the

gesture of Harrison Ford before taking the relic, in a few brief moments Spielberg characterizes the character and

makes a simple but forceful drawing of which will be protagonist and winner in the great search. He is the

archeologist who is passionate about antiques and who transmutes his appearance as an errant traveler into a respectableprofessor

universitydressed in a suit, "" gafotas "" and an object of desire on the part of some of his students Reflection of the

hero who, once hangs the whip, the jacket and the hat, appears to be one of the mont.n We already said it

elsewhere: the narrative is a art of synthesis, and above all, "" In search of the lost ark "" is a story in which

all the characters (despite being quite one-dimensional) are characterized with effective stroke, without

need to give unnecessary details that could hinder the rhythm of the narrative. Spielberg - along with

the praiseworthy work of that great screenwriter named Lawrence Kasdan - synthesizes the action of the show with a

succession of acts perpetrated by coherent characters and at the service of said action. .N From Belock,

antithesis of the hero, to Marion, through Shall��� (unforgettable gesture his farewell from the docks before

the departure on the Katanga ship) or the repulsive secret agent who cheats us He wore a coat hanger that

initially looked like a flagellating instrument. Everyone looks for the ark for reasons

clearly explained. Simplicity and conciseness, there are the keys to good cinema-show. Adding anconfigurationremains.

attractive and clawedof profilesSome critics have wanted to see flaws in this film, and they usually refer

to Spielberg's inability to create complex characters. Indeed, the characters are quite

one-dimensional, but in this specific area it is not necessary to have characters endowed with complexity

(depending on the intentions and contents of each film, that would have that analyze it). And - conclude these

cluetic critics - the film would have been much better if the characters had other nuances than the

archetype "" movie guy "", "" girl in the movie "" "," "the bad friend of the bad guys" "," "the friend of the

good guys" ", etc. Well, all this is stupid considering the scope and intentionality of the product. Synthesis

Synthesis Synthesis, damn it. That is to say, in this case, what, supposedly, the film could gain with the

(unnecessary) effort of director and scriptwriter in creating more complex characters, he would lose it in the rhythm ,

pulse and narrative ��� impetus, the continuity of action without respite and some dialogues at the service of the essential. That

is, the very essence of the film would be lost. This being one of the few times in which the pretensions

go hand in hand with the final result, there are all the considerations that require the product something that is not

part of its scope. Here, what is important is to give the story a character characterization related to the

structure of media and content, not depth. For the rest, it is a film that moves throughlands

archetypal, prone to the typical and the sensitive, but never falls into such defects. Perfect example of this

is the scene of Marion and Indiana on the boat, the kiss between the wounds of a battered Indiana and gru������n, a

moment of love but without falling into the usual so sensitive in scenes of this type. That same ease, and

freshness, in the treatment of the characters and situations is what predominates throughout the entire film,

a narration so fluid and forceful that one reaches the final credits with a thought: we have just seen

the total adventure, paradigm of the seventh art as a medical instrument.

" 1

" It's one of the best movies I've seen in a long time and I recommend it to everyone.

Loyalty, friendship, betrayal, love, fear, courage ... finally an essential movie.

It's been a few weeks since I saw this magnificent film, ���pera prima, by Florian Henckel Von Donnersmarck, who

deservedly won the Oscar for the best foreign film . If the world were fair and the ���scars

universal prizes, Ulrich M���he and Sebastian Koch would have taken the awards for best actor of this year. I do not know

what Forest Whitaker will be like in "" The Last King of Scotland "", but what Ulrich M���he does in this movie is

im- pre-sio-nan-te And Sebastian Koch is not far behind in talent, accompanied by a no less fantastic

Martina Gedeck. They remain in the memory frames of this film, shot in a very cl� Basic, simple

in appearance, without great stridency. As in the great cinema of always, what is most important is the story, what

is being told. The cinema is the vehicle with which it is narrated and, as in the great works, the best thing about the

technique is that it is not noticed, that you do not feel that it is there, Can history be what brings you? This is the case in this

film, which, however, has some moments of gui���n not so round and that could be dispensed with (the

child, a little simple to oppose purity-badness) or that could be more marked (until the end wenot

doknow how long the captain of the Stasi has been Gerd Wiesler spying on the couple formed by the

prestigious playwright and writer Georg Dreyman and the popular actress Christa-Maria Sieland, so it is a

bit difficult to understand such a "" quick "" identification among the principles of the military and the intellectual? The

time is contracted by cinematographic imperative duraci���ny and that the movie lasts more than two hours,

they fly by). They are some "" buts "" "A little punctilious, I admit, because the film is a work of precision,

in which the silences and the dialogues are perfect, the just , in aplan

cinematographic(with very classic plans) and a gray photo on the exterior, more in the

apartment - very appropriate to situate us in the German Democratic Republic of the 1980s and to see

how its espionage service, the Stasi, worked. It is one of the best films in the world. Queculas I've seen in a long time and I

recommend it to everyone. Loyalty, friendship, betrayal, love, fear, courage? they are transposed and

redefined throughout the film. Who is "loyal"? What is "loyal"? Who does not what? What does

"betrayal" mean? If we betray ourselves, is it the same to do it out of conviction or fear?

��� Survival or principles? ���Implication against injustice, at the risk of losing one's life, or uncomfortable

passivity? And it is that individual decisions affect what surrounds us, the History that we create.

Three characters teach us that there are many forms of courage and integrity in a small-great story, one

that reflects one of thousands of lives that make up what is later studied in books .

" 1

" Road to Perdition is black cinema. Pure cinema Sam Mendes seems that when he makes a film, he does it in a

big way. And to tell the truth, he succeeds.

The cinema is characterized precisely by being an art where all kinds of genres abound. Stories. There are many.

And also of all kinds. And when it comes to black cinema, of course there are. But, how long did

it not be written and above all directed a feature film so well? And with those fantastic

performances, Camino a la Perdici���n is film noir. Pure cinema Sam Mendes seems that when he makes a film,

he does it in a big way. And to tell the truth, he gets it. Why? Because it has an interesting plot. Because it was

accompanied by an adequate soundtrack. Because he has an excellent photograph. Because he knows how to take advantage of all the

resources. Because he knows what he is doing. And even though the beginning may be slow, from the moment

the story begins, this paused rhythm has moments of great intensity and emotion. The details

are magnificent. The fans and non-fans of the genre will enjoy it because Mendes knows how to combine the prevailing

seriousness of the film with great touches, typical of the greats, with a paternal-filial relationship that gu�� �to the

story, and that despite the marked coldness, gets excited.The way of shooting and telling the story is

so perfectionist, that leads to think that the director really did with the film what he wanted, As I

saw it in his mind: I took advantage of David Self's guide to the maximum, and gave him a personal touch, because after seeing his

last address In Jarhead, it can be said that the director's mark is considerable in his films. And the

truth is that precisely bad has not gone: it seems that I can make each film that directs, magnificent

works. And is that one of the pillars of the film is the section of interpretations. It has a luxurious cast, in

which each of the interpreters embroiders their paper. Excellent Paul Newman, great Jude Law and correct���simo Daniel

Craig. But without a doubt, the best of all is the incredible performance of Tom Hanks, who marks his best

record to date, full of expressions and gestures really admirable, convincing, and those who do not everyone

can arrive. A pleasant surprise All a hit. Because in reality, we are facing one of the best

films of black movies of recent times. A luxury. A work of art. Real cinema

" 1

" The worst thing is, perhaps, that the whole story revolves around characters who do not want to accept a gift

that makes their lives.

There is a scene in which Shrek has to give a talk to the young Arthur, so the sweet music rises

very high, Shrek turns around angrily and discovers that it is a Merlin montage that is � trying to create

atmosphere with the sound. But it is not about Merlin, it is the director who points out his own narrative traps

because he knows that he is addressing a public that is back of everything. The public of today speaks of cinema with the

same terms as a critic, knows the cinematographic resources and complains about the details, the

interpretations, the rhythm. Films like Shrek are addressed to this type of audience with theirmessage

metaling���istic. There are ferocious wolves, little pigs, gingerbread cookies, sleepy princesses that only know how to use the

trick of falling asleep to solve their problems, a congress of bad guys from Fairy tales that give free rein to

their resentment for the role they are playing do in life. They are not the characters of a story, they are the

characters of all the famous stories. Shrek collects topics to play with them. Others he turns around

to leave them in evidence, as for example, that of the evil and dirty ogre that has equally bad andogres

dirty, or that of Arturo that does not turn out to be a brave man, but a young loser of the insituto. The cat in boots is

a mockery of the sentimentality of the stories, when he puts pitiful little eyes of pussycat; the ass is the character

that laughs at himself. The three deliveries consist of putting us on guard against the tricks of fairy

tales. The endings serve to retell a fairy tale now that we have low defenses. Once it

has become clear that the spectators are not stupid, and we are tired of the old stories (if

possible from the ones made by their Disney competitors), the good and the bad face each other in a final battle

as in any other story "" Shrek Third "" adds a curious element to that battle. And is that Prince Charming,

which we should have translated for Prince Blue, and not Enchanting, is not satisfied with defeating his enemy

Shrek. He wants to do it inside a theater, in front of an audience, just like Ner���n who needed afire

realfor his poem, like Hamlet who needed to represent the Homicide of Claudio in front of Claudio. The

theater within the theater frightened Borges who saw a hole to the infinite. The case of this film seems to me

as elementary as that of the puppets who ask the children where the bad guy has gone, or thelaughter

cannedof the sitcoms. The final battle takes place in a theater for the film viewer to participate

in the story following the example of the spectator of the play. It is not the worst that can be said of

Shrek. The worst thing is, perhaps, that the whole story revolves around characters who do not want to accept a gift

that makes their lives. Arturo does not want to accept a crown and Shrek does not want to accept his role as father. I do not know

which of the two afflicts me the most.

" 0

" Commendable for his insightful portrait of the loneliness of a wealthy donjuan, already retired, who returns to the

past to find a meaning to life.

Broken Flowers is an existential road-movie, an intimate catalog of emotional adventures of aanti-hero

languid, deep, aware of his marginality (like Jim Jarmursch himself) and embarked on the very noble and

worthy task of looking for a child he does not know and who has news through a pink letter that reminds him of

the women he loves and to whom he will return to find him. This mild mcguffin is encouraged by a bizarre neighbor who is

fond of detective investigations, who ends up convincing him to leave the ostracism of his idyllic

life encapullada and perfect, except that the last girlfriend he left it, which is only altered by the

missive fuze of the plot. The very few act records of Murray, for whom the director wrote the

script, favor the lateness of the trip: his introspective decadence, his ability to exasperate our

desires for action to accelerate, but Jarmusch is not interested in classical patterns and feels more at

ease (Night on earth, qu? � more splendid film) in small episodes that are assembled so that, in

the end, they complete a unit that turns out to be the film we are seeing . Murray makes a mimic

extension of his work in Lost in Translation. His loneliness is reflected in the kitsch of his house, in his retirement, in

a peculiar way of understanding his relationship with the world. Don Johnston, the lover already removed from the romances,

living the pleÃ²cida retirement donjuanesca, makes the trip of return to his past with the perspective of which nothing

of which finds must modify in excess his h� Natural habitat, his sophisticated hi-fi, his big house for

solitary usufruct. Except the neighbor with ���nfulas of Sam Spade, all the characters of these broken flowers are

individuals overcome by routine, adocenados, sentimentally immature, as the own Johnston, whose girlfriend (

Julie Delphy) has left him for that reason. The other brides, the old ones, are evidence that the world

revolves and that no time spent was especially better because the already autumn galley that has returned never

finds traces of what was a love of youth but sad, if not pathetic, women on the very verge of

vital disenchantment. It does not matter if it's the sexy widow with her Lolita Haze to the lap (great and little exploited

Sharon Stone), the ex-hippy now happily inserted in the labor chain, the moody repellent or,

finally, the lesbian concerned about the animal rights (my beloved Jessica Lange). Oh,

forgot the girlfriend spread. Broken flowers is independent film, although I still have not clear what this is going to

say. I say this about independence because it moves viscerally away from another cinema that is more worked on in its

commercial representation, in its need to please above other artistic considerations. It is also

literary cinema, and that I know very clearly what it is: cinema forged from the word, written with the care of a

goldsmith who reinvented the nineteenth-century novels after It was a terrible fire that had wiped it from

all the bookstores, private funds and libraries of the wide and always alien world. The goldsmith is Jarmusch: his

material is not entirely linguistic. As a good filmmaker, he can suggest with a shot (the one at the beginning) what

is coming up as well as using looks, minimalist records of his actors and actresses to achieve what,

sometimes, the word does not reach. That is the magic of cinema. It is a charm. By that miracle life is

always beautiful, although we all have from time to time to navigate muddy waters and the days are left to rust

by the stale air of routine and tedium. I do not speak in the first person. Necessarily.

" 1

" Pleasant to see almost always, it is a comforting film although perhaps too pacato in its

approach, which reminds ar���fagas that of a telefilme paid for in the manner of the BBC ?.

Sometimes it is not understood why some films, with all the ballots to enjoy an acceptable

commercial career, remain on the shelves of the distributors. It is the case of this "" Tara Road "", a film

that, without being anything of the other Thursday, it is clear that it can interest a specific public, mostly of

middle age or even something bigger, because it raises issues that are close to it, and it is also served by a good

handful of well-known actors (MacDowell, Rea, Olivia Williams from "The Sixth Sense"). However, it has taken

two years to reach the Spanish screens, when any anticorperial bullshit (and without artistic value, it is

understood) premieres punctually. It presents Scottish film Gilles MacKinnon, filmed in Ireland and the United

States with not only Irish and Yankee interpreters, but also Germans (Jean-Marc Barr), in a This mixture does

not turn out to be, fortunately, the usual decaffeinated fruit salad with scraps from different parts of Europe

that are too often perpetrated in our continent. The plot revolves around two dramas: one, the

terrifying, absolute tragedy of the death of the only teenage son in a well-placed Yankee family; the

other, the trauma of separation, previous adultery and even offspring outside marriage, of ancouple

Irishin theory all happiness. From these dramas part the "tour de force" "of the film, the exchange of houses

between the two victims, which will allow them to reconnect with themselves in environments so different from their

usual ones, assuming that exchange something m�� It's a mere change of habitat: it also oxygenates their lives and

gives them something to live for. Pleasant to see almost always, it is a comforting film although perhaps too

pacato in its approach, which reminds ar���fagas that of a telefilm paid for "" in the manner of the BBC "".

" 0

" While Rodriguez's film is excellent and always seems cut by the same patron, it hurts me to say that

Tarantino's (as much as I've liked at Cannes), seems to me the most bland, vacuous and empty of his

filmography.

While Rodriguez's film is excellent and always seems cut by the same patron, it hurts me to say that

Tarantino's (as much as he liked at Cannes), seems to me to be the most bland, vacuous and emptiness of his filmography and

is that, however much it adds a new lack of rolls, in addition to an excellent start that reconcilates us with the

seventies cinema and therefore with the "" Black Explotation "", and even self-homage at some other time, with

scenes, very tarantinianas.Se lost in a tape with much dialogue and little, very little action, where in spite of

trying and filling it with good music (to my liking together with Cameron Crowe are the best "" bandsons ""

of the Hollywood scene), with another cameo of Quentin himself , and where in spite of repeating both McGowan

and Marley Shelton in small roles it does not manage to entertain the spectator. In addition, the presence of Kurt

Russell co The villain has little, very little entity and seems more a poor man, without any grace, than a "bad bad

guy" that gave us and generates something more than a well-known penalty from its first min. On screen, and the film is

taking a long time to catch a bit of rhythm. In short, the Tarantino segment of this

Grindhouse loses strength every minute that passes, defrauded, no doubt, after how well you spend it on

Rodriguez's tape.

" 0

" A quality proposal that exceeds the plot handicap that brought it close to the telefilm tone, thanks to

its delivered performances, the brilliant music of Glass and the correct performance of Eyre.

If we take a look at the career of the director of "" Diario de un esc���ndalo "", Richard Eyre, we will find,

among not too many films, that movie from 2001, entitled "" Iris "" and with which not a few things share the

tape that concerns us. Directed both with British sobriety and without too much fanfare, both "" Journal of a

scandal "" as previously "" Iris "", highlight mainly for a couple of reasons; his excellent and dramatic

female performances and his inspired soundtrack. Although "" Iris "" gave him an Oscar for Best Supporting Actor

to Jim Broadbent, that tape gave us colossal roles of two English actresses from different

���pocas, Judi Dench and Kate Winslet. Now, "" Diary of a scandal "" faces in a duel with capital letters, the

Australian Cate Blanchett (one of the actresses of the moment, for his abundant and successful roles) and again

to a immeasurable Judi Dench. Two generations of actresses in a state of grace. "" Diary of a scandal "" also

counts with the minimalist, Phillip Glass at the head of his soundtrack, which composes here one of his

better works, which may remind one of his last and most inspired works to date, "" The Hours "" by

Stephen Daldry. In the same way, the most intimate James Horner made one of the best compositions of his

Irregular career, for the little film by Richard Eyre, wrapping with his music the drama that

required "" Iris "". "" Diary of an esc�� �ndalo "" (perfect title), tells us the story of Sheba Hart (Blanchett), a

newly arrived teacher at a school, and who will maintain a relationship with one of their students, something that

Barbara Covett (Dench), a lesbian teacher who knows the secret, will take advantage of their ownbenefit

emotional. Patrick Marber, the playwright and screenwriter of "" Closer "", uncomfortable work on human relationships,

is here responsible for adapting Zo la's original novel? Heller, imprinting a

widely critical, dry and detestable view of history into the educational system, the relationships between the teachers and the

intimate lives of the protagonists, and all this through This is the story of the first-person narrative of the

character of Judi Dench, an old and irritable teacher eaten away by her loneliness and her hidden

lesbianism, with symptoms of mental disorder. The English actress is the great protagonist of the event, both

physically and emotionally. It is his reflections, his diary notes and the evolution of his "" forced "" relationship

with Blanchett that directs the direction of this interesting proposal, close to the reality of the

schools, of the taboos and complexes of unrecognized sexual conditions, loneliness, unhappiness

in the couple, temptations and the lowest and most despicable behaviors of the human being. The burial of a

lavishly framed photo of a cat (the only honest companion of Dench's character) and a diary are established

as metaphors of this history of unspeakable desires full of morality. A proposal of quality that

surpasses the plot handicap that brought it close to the telefilm tone, thanks to its delivered performances, the

brilliant music of Glass and the correct realization of Eyre. In its final part, we find, however, a plane

that is heading towards a course very different from what we have witnessed throughout the film. And is

that close the story with a return to start by the character of Dench, is something that can damage

the whole of the tape, and that is closer to a serial killer tape, that a story of madness and

sentimental needs emerged with the emergence of the beautiful Blanchett in a new school and in the lives of

those around her. "" Diary of a scandal "" achieved four jousts and deserved Oscar nominations, for Phillip

Glass, Judi Dench, Cate Blanchett and Patrick Marber, who are, together with the event director, the great creators

of the good result of this film of undeniable British phlegm.

" 1

" The Dalton Trumbo script, seamless, and rich in nuances. Superb di���logos. A film that is worth

seeing for many reasons. Great movie, splendidly directed by John Frankenheimer.

"" A Jew, tired of the life he leads, because he has no job, has abandoned his wife, because he could not have

children. it goes towards the capital. There he finds that the Cossacks treat the Jews mercilessly. One day,

go in the middle of the street to a drunk man about to die frozen. It helps you and saves your life. In

gratitude he gives her work and shelter. However, he is an anti-Semite. A certain day, a foreman of the anti-Semitehim

denouncesas a murderer of a child. He begins a struggle for his survival "". "" Outstanding premiere at

Metrocolor. Accused of a horrendous ritual crime, a man stands up against injustice. Alife event

real-inspires the most dramatic and absorbing of the cinematographic stories. "Thus the publicity ofexpressed.

the hand program of the Nuevo Teatro Circo, in Cartagena, wasthere by November of 1970. Estúpenda pel���cula,

splendidly directed by John Frankenheimer. It is very good and entertaining, although quite strong and cruel. The

interpreters highlight their qualities, deserving a chapter apart the great Alan Bates, with a true creation

of his character. He was nominated to Oscar for this work. Brilliant photography and ambience. The Daltonscript

Trumbo, seamless, and rich in nuances. Superb di���logos. A film that is worth seeing for many reasons.

" 1

" Essential film of classic cinema. Hitchcock immersed us in the anguish of a poor man who only

wanted to separate from his wife and ends up turning his life into hell. Tremedo clasic���n.

Alfred Hitchcock, of whom I will always remember the fear he gave me with the film The Birds, he had the

habit of going out in all his films. In a role of helper, but always left. Well, it seems to me, but

man, maybe I should select a few more papers. That in this leaves the train and give us a shot

of this guy's ass that I doubt is his best profile. If I were him, he would always take me out in jacuzzis

surrounded by ladies in leather and drinking champagne between her breasts, even if it was the movie of Los p���jaros, ha , ha, ha.

The film is about two strangers who meet casually on a train. One is a famous tennis player, who

is on the rise, the other is a terrible heir admirer of the first. Total, who engage in conversation and at a

given time, the heir tells him that if he kills the tennis player's wife, he has to kill his father. It is the

perfect crime, since there is nothing to link the crimes, let alone make the police suspect

that they have been. The tennis player doubts, but the bad that the heir does not. What can this humble servant say

about one of the masterpieces of cinema? I liked the film a lot, but of course you can tell it isage

early retirement(56 years nothing less). The idea is magnificent, putting on the table a very wellproblem

developed and executed. The actors do it wonderfully, and the picture is very effective, aided by the

soundtrack. But it also has little things that give a bit of laughter, given that once it would be "" evil "" but

now they are puerile. For example, to show us how bad the heir is, he can not think of anything else but

to poke the balloon of a child. Muahahahaha, which is the sound that the malignant ones make when laughing. Resuming,

essential film of classic cinema. Hitchcock immersed us in the anguish of a poor man who only

wanted to separate from his wife and ends up turning his life into hell. Tremedo clasic���n.

" 1

" Swedish cinema shows us, once again, that it can be as bad as any, including Spanish.

Uy, uy, uy, go towel with the sign of marras. A lady with orange hair who screams as if she were going to give you

a host and melt you. A guy with his hand cut in the fighting position, and a pale gentleman witharms

crossedwho looks like the bad guy. And a static Matrix, this one seems to be full of action, blows and others. Ha, ha,

ha, as always nothing to do with reality. The film is not what it is about. A lady comes out withhair

orangethat gives another a cube (not to scrub, but as a square but in three dimensions) and then they

beat her and they try to burn her. But she escapes and gets into a taxi where there is one with a silly face. The one

with the silly face then goes to a campus party like that and a girl dies in front of him, so everyone thinks it

's him. In these runs and leaves a fat man who tells him that he returns a movie or kicks him out of his house. And then he

remembers his past with the girl with the orange hair and in the end it ends and you think "" what's up? "" Nothing, that this

is a drama of a kid who does bad things in his youth and then they pass him invoice at maturity. Thecinema

Swedishshows us, once again, that it can be as bad as any, including Spanish, and that much

sexual liberation, but nothing of fish nipples resping���n. The actors are rare, weird, with the

taxi driver standing out, which could well be Spanish. I was waiting for all the movie that put the COPE or the Fary on the cassette,

but no, it did not happen. That's right, he led like those here. The action scenes are quite sad and pathetic,

apart from having scenes that could be disordered. That is, if they throw the scenes in the air and mount them in

another way, the movie would be the same poop. Resuming, cow poop in a Swedish drama that has nothing to

envy to any national or imported shit .

" 0

" Visual and pyrotechnic show of the first order, with a devilish rhythm and with absorbing and

addictive images

Now that channel Four returns us "" V "", the m� Ethics series of aliens starring that

sinister eater of small white mice, premieres on the granda screen "" V de Vendetta "", the film adaptation

of the novel gr�� �fica of Alan Moore and David Lloyd. I would like to start this review by saying that "" V de

Vendetta "". It's a movie like a pine tree! Extraordinary Excellent. Magnificent Colossal. Thus, all

those readers who fear a possible spoiler or argument boycott already know our opinion. But, without

going into the background, discuss some features of the film, which make it sensational and

wonderful. First, Natalie Portman. Personally, my cinematographic mythomania, or wearing a hat (Wayne,

Bogart, Mitchum, etc.) or is photographed in black and white, with those muses of the genre noir, disturbing and

disturbing (Lauren Bacall, Gloria Graham, Gene Tierney.) But since I saw "" Le���n the professional "" I was

captivated by a young actress. that the sea has grown well. In "" V de Vendetta "", Natalie is outstanding and the

film, taking into account that it is starring a subject camouflaged behind a porcelain mask,

needed the face visible human being was credible and identifiable. And that it was very special. Mission

accomplished. After, the film has been able to update the graphic novel on which it is based, talking about some

very topical issues. First of all, of the disastrous work carried out by the mass media

that, more than inform, make propaganda. Second, from the illegal detention camps, turning

Larkhill into a transcript of Abu Graib, sinister hoods included. Third, the fear of the other, the different,

the immigrant. And of the mega-macro-hyper government conspiracies to perpetuate themselves in power, reducing

the freedom of their citizens in the face of that alleged Freedom-Security dichotomy. And of the eternal politics about whether

violence is a legitimate method of self-defense or not. Where does the hero end and the activist begin? Where

is the limit between the latter and the terrorist? The questions posed by "" V deare many and far-reaching

vendetta "", and he does so through It's a visual and pyrotechnic show of the first order, with a devilish rhythm and

with absorbing and addictive images. As for things, if the background and the They are so good. Why has

Alan Moore, the father of the child, mounted in front of the final cinematographic product? Maybe because they

wanted to use his name to promote the film. Or, to say of others, because the character of V is less

subtle on the screen than in vi���eta, less ambiguous, m���sh���roe type Hollywood. Maybe that's the way it is, but to deny the

adaptation and ranting against the film, as Moore has done, seems excessive to me. Because the film is

excellent, because it points to hot topics, because it takes an unequivocal game for

democracy and freedom. And because Anuca and I had the time, like the Indians, in Neptune, enjoying an

old-fashioned adventure movie!

" 1

" I'll take the name of this director, Felix Viscarret, because I think it will give a lot to talk about and that

his peculiar style will be worth seeing in the films that he proposes.

I have been criticizing Alberto San Juan for many days, for being an actor who does not do much to

promote the films he does in the various interviews he has done, but I have to admit that

the ���ticas vanish from my mouth, as yesterday I saw this wonderful film, which plays one of the

best roles of his life, along with the Hours of Light. "Under the stars is a song to the second opportunity

we all have to redirect our lives, when, given the circumstances, they have had to make

decisions against our will. In the case of Alberto San Ju���n, he plays a trumpeter who had

to leave Estella (Navarra) to continue his career as a musician in Madrid. The death of his father, makes him

return to the village and relive all that hard childhood that had to endure with his brother. Also, some

magnificent interpretations of Alberto San Juan, Juli��� n Villagr���ny Emma Su���rez, we find astory

beautifulthat is told in a close way and whose photograph is worth seeing, reminding me very much of

Obaba's, next to this , the most significant of the film are the relationships established between each of

the characters, focusing on Alberto San Juan, who practically appears in all the scenes.

wonderful musical interpretation of Enrique Morente singing the main theme of the film to Raphael with

Aquarius and really, I'll take the name of the director, Felix Viscarret, because I think it will give much

to speak and that his peculiar style will be worth seeing in the films that propose

" 1

" One of the most strikingly beautiful films of the year. A futuristic emotive, hard,

shuddering in some moments, and on which you can continue talking for hours after leaving the cinema.

If only a few days ago I was telling you about the wonderful story about our past that Guillermo delhas made

Toro, now it is the turn of another Mexican director who has created a brilliant a book about our

future.Based on the homonymous novel by PD James, "" Children of Men "" (Children of Men) plunges us into the

world of 2027, where wars and terrorism are so only part of the problem. The greatest tragedy of

humanity is that women have lost the ability to have children. It has been 18 years since anybeing was born

humanand, therefore, the species is on the verge of extinction? One of the main virtues of the film is

that When I say that it immerses us in that world of the future, I mean exactly that. During the almost two hours

that the film lasts, and that certainly pass in a sigh, the viewer lives in that world. He is fully

aware of the tragedy of the lack of babies on the planet and the importance of having one born. In this

way, the hopeless nihilism of Theo (a magnificent Clive Owen), the desperate

struggle of Julian (the ever brilliant Julianne Moore) and the disreputable hope for changing the world of Jasper

( a Michael Caine that, no one doubts, is one of the greats). Several are the elements used by Alfonso

Cuar���n to get us so involved in history. The first of them is a brilliant artistic direction, cre���ble and

very realistic, that retains many similarities with the current world but clearly highlights the differences to

help the viewer to better imagine what � is what has happened between the present and that future. Anotherelement

importantis the special way of filming the film, with a preference for the camera in hand and the

plane-sequence that give a few moments a semi-documentary tone that brings an exciting andverismo

terrifying. Obviously this would not be possible without the imposing work of Emmanuel Lubezki, director of

photography to which he already owes an Oscar. Add to that a beautiful soundtrack, adjusted as a

glove at every moment of the film, and that goes from the "" Bring on the Lucie "" by John Lennon to the brilliantly

appropriate "" Kindertotenlieder "" by Gustav Mahler.The result: one of the movies Most strikingly beautiful years

of the year. A futuristic emotive, hard, shuddering in some moments, and on which you can continue

talking for hours after leaving the cinema.

" 1

" The specialist Tod Philips who already carried out Starsky and Hutch, trip of pirates, among others,

returns to serve a mediocrity of no grace where the development is terribly boring with moments that

border on vulgarity and void narrative agility.

Some actors seem obsessed with charging their careers or may need tothe turn

overduecheck. The actor BILLY BOB THORNTON has been carving out a career where he demonstrates his great

aptitudes in highly recommended titles as a simple plan or MONSTER BALL among so many others. Suddenly

almost consecutive chains two comedietas well below his talent in question of balls and the

current school of pringaos where he was accompanied by JHON HEADER an actor who pointed ways in NAPOLEON DINAMITE

but I think that will be typecast in comedies of little ���ndole.The specialist TOD PHILLIPS that I already carried

out STARSKI AND HUTH, trip of pirates among some other returns to serve a mediocrity of no grace where

the development is terribly boring with moments that border on the vulgarity with null narrative agility.

Some really lamentable interpreters together with a terrible guide leave this film at the height of the worst of the year.

" 0

" D���az Yanes' film does not convince because at no time does she find herself, narrates

stories and tells the story of a villain-hero , but it fails the fundamental idea that clearly defines all

the development and the human sense of adventure.

If when we talked about "" The Da Vinci Code "" we seemed to make the film subject to the book - and, therefore, not

differentiate and not understand that cinema and literature use different resources stylistic- it was the worst of

errors and, as a result, the result was gravel, here we have an attempt to put five books in awhole

140-something filmic. and make time in the history of Spanish cinema. A casta���a, come on, it has

everything to be it. But, what is Alatriste ?. Because I, honestly, do not perceive any clarity of ideas in the

meaning of their perpetrators. If you want to make a great film, it is essential to have a very clear

idea, concept and style. And "" Alatriste "" remains halfway to various things, without actually creating the

absolute essence and meaning in any of them. Is it an adventure movie? Something of that wants to be,

but to develop the climate and the tone of the adventure (the entertainment without ups and downs, the show, the

hero's odyssey that is located in the epicenter of all the plots and twists that surround it) is incompatible

with that slow pace, with harangues that do not come to mind and hinder the action (probably in thebook

originalby P���rez Reverte they made their paper, but here they are a burden) and, above all, with the absence of an

effective structure that develops and explains emotional links, motives, causes and effects of the facts,

actions or thoughts of the different characters and in the different situations that are presented to us,

too often, without us knowing why or without the spectator having a reason to be interested in the

fortune or the misfortunes of one and the other. That is to say, the narrative is quite disjointed, although perhaps notmuch

asas it seems, if we classify the film under a different concept than ""cinema

adventure"". "" Alatriste "" also It can be understood as a mosaic of a time or a whimsical documentary of

history-fiction in which the main character serves as thread for the plot and as an excuse to develop

a rich scenography and all the variety of profiles devoid of their own essence that appear on the

screen with the sole purpose of giving you play. In short, the film works a little better if I consider it

a "mosaic of time", not so much if it is an adventure film. (In contrast, Duelists, has something of the

two things and solves it rather better, by the way). But even so, I repeat, D���az Yanes' film does not

convince because at no time does she find herself, narrates stories and narrates the story of a

villain-hero, but he fails the fundamental idea that clearly defines all the development and the human sense of

adventure (soon we will talk about "" The Captain Blood "", for explain in more detail what I mean by

this). If to the absence of a content properly articulated in the development we add the tedium produced

by the slow rhythm, by unnecessary long shots, scenes that pass slowly but do not contribute anything to the

narration, and p�� The very use of ellipsis (I thought that ellipsis was a method to saveparts

expendablethat the spectator can presuppose, not to break the structure and the narrative fluidity), we

could arrive to a conclusion: it's a very bad movie. However, it is saved from burning by a brilliant

use of technical resources and a commendable discretion of the director: let's say that Yanes camera does not risk

a centimeter beyond the conventional, but maintains the dignity in almost all the footage, directs the

scenes of battles well (and with this the only thing I'm saying is that it does not make it worse than Peter Jackson , for

example, which also does not have much merit, by the way) and knows how to create a certain atmosphere with an

appropriate staging. The photography, the artistic direction, the costumes, the correct soundtrack, the

sporadic moments of emotional tension, etc., end up restoring dignity to a film that is

quite loose, insubstantial and empty, does not get to be so disastrous, according to what has been written in the last few

weeks. What I do not doubt is that "Alatriste" "" will end up being an inconsequential product in the Spanish

field and, more importantly, in the international one; a merely anecdotal product, interesting as a representation of

"" our golden century "" and to see it as a family admiring the worthy representations of illustriouspersonalities

historicalsuch as Quevedo, the Count Duke of Olivares or King Philip. But for that I think it would have been

better to do a television series of thirty chapters.

" 0

" Mr. Kevin Smith seems to be returning with his best cinema, at the height of his best film. It keeps the

best of Clerks and in addition to a dramatic plot that gives more depth and meaning everything that surrounds

Clerks.

More than ten years have passed since the premiere of Clerks, the beginning of an erratic cinematographic career, that of

Kevin Smith. Clerks surprised by its freshness, by brilliant di���logos and by being shot with four

duros. Now comes to our screens Clerks II unnecessary a priori sequel with which Kevin Smith wants to

return to his origins, after seeing it, not only does not seem unnecessary, but it exceeds the first and

even the does better Clerks II starts in front of the Quick Stop where Dante and Randall have been working for more than

ten years, then we see how the Quick Stop has suffered a fire. This forces them to look for newhorizons

work. His new place of work is at Mooby's, a hamburger where a newwill gather

panda of freakswhile Dante plans to leave New Jersey with his fiancee and rebuild his life. And Mr.

Kevin Smith seems to be coming back with his best cinema, at the height of his best film (Chasing Amy), because

in Clerks II, he keeps the best of Clerks and also ���ade a dramatic plot that gives more depth and

meaning everything that surrounds Clerks. That is to say there are still great doses of fun, unparalleled

gags on the Lord of the rings and the show with the donkey. But also the dramatic load gives a greater

depth to the characters and what surrounds them, magnificent reflections, about the passage of time, friendship,

etc? Because Clerks II is a story about misfit losers, but who are content to be what they

are because that is enough to be happy. A riot of love and sincerity by Kevin Smith for

characters that it is impossible not to love. By the way, impressive Rosario Dawson.

" 1

" The new cinematographic adventure of Mortadelo and Filem���n will go down in history not only because of the big box office

that it can do, but because it is one of the worst films. Spanish cinema films in decades.

There are many of us who think that good commercial cinema is in danger of extinction, like the Iberian lynx,finding

and thata worthy film that attracts the masses is very complicated. One of the best-remembered cases in Spanish

cinema is that of Mortadelo y Filem���n's The Great Adventure, in which Javier Fesser was able to collect and transmit

the essence of Ib personajes's characters �����ez, his humor and his surrealist point. So good and funny memories

contrast with the sensation of anguish and despair that causes in any film lover the second incursion

of Move it and Filem���n on the big screen. And is that having such a clear reference, the question that nobody can

answer is why Miguel Bardem has done so darn wrong? In his quest to copy the style

of Fesser, Bardem has passed three villages, and what were once small and subtle details of the surreal

world of Ib������ez, have now been turned into grotesque imitations that populate each frame. The spirit of the

characters is trampled and denigrated to unimaginable extremes. Fesser's humor, simple and ingenious at

the same time, disappears here completely in favor of a set of bad jokes and gags of a very good taste, which

they allow that to be the triumphant brilliance of their two protagonists. And there are sequences created with the sole

purpose of offering an excuse for the exhibition of Eduard Soto (authentic burricalva cat���strofe) or Pepe

Viyuela. But not dear and fearful reader, there are still more, and that is if it was not enough the pathetic spectacle that

is the film from beginning to end, Bardem dares with a couple of cinematic guides. Undoubtedly, Billy Wilder must

be right now revolving in his grave for such horrible desecration. The new cinematographic adventure of

Mortadelo and Filem���n will go down in history. only for the big box office that can do, but for being one of the

worst films of Spanish cinema in decades. And is that in the 50th anniversary of these endearing characters, could not

have devised a worse celebration. Poor Ib������ez must be throwing himself by the hair, of the few that

are clear to him.

" 0

" Classic French comedy full of originality that wastes ingenuity.A few years ago, The Dinner of the Idiots became an unexpected success of criticism and box office . His

crazy plot, full of unexpected twists and picturesque situations captivated the public. Now, the one who was

its director, Francis Veber, returns with El Juego de los Idiotas, another comedy full of mordacity, wit and

good humor. Pierre Levasseur is a billionaire who one day the reporters of the pink press photograph

along the street with his lover, a famous model. To avoid an expensive divorce, he can not think of anything other

than trying to convince his wife that the explosive blonde in the picture was not with him, but with Fran���ois Pignon,

a transient who I happened to pass by there and it was reflected in the instant. To give plausibility to

this whole montage, send Elena (her concubine) to live at Pignon's house, a modest accommodation forprotection

officialin a humble neighborhood in which the model will live in tragic situations. Cosmic and picturesque, to the delight of the

viewer. The cast is very compensated, although it is missing the sadly deceased Jacques Villeret,

protagonist of The Dinner of the Idiots. Gad Elmaleh, Alice Taglioni and Daniel Auteuil are perfect, and

Kristin Scott Thomas is unbeatable in her role as wife. The Game of the Idiots is a great movie,

with all the virtues of the best French comedy, and shows that to play it is not necessary to have a

cast full of histrions or fantastic situations. sticas. All it takes is a good guide, mental acuity and

actors who do not intend to focus all their attention on their character. And this film has all that, well, it

does.

" 1

" During a good part of the footage and I could only breathe easy when the final credits appeared

. Pat���tica, can not be summarized more in less ...

I had not sat down to read any criticism of the film that today brings us, but then to see her pathetic

way of promoting herself, I said to myself, come on I will not be hard on her and given that this week I will send her to see

some spanish tape that another one, we are going to give her a opportunityentering the field (little, so that we are

.. Beforegoing to cheat) and after investigating a bit about the network, I will say that after the painful promotion of the tape is

Kanzaman advertising agency, "" expert "" (see the quotes) in advertising American films

shot in Spain, and has the dubious honor of turning into shit everything he touches (go, as a king midas

al rev���s), his or rather, ours, are the promotion of such pathetic and painful films as "" The Kingdom of

heaven "", "" Instinct b Basic II "", "" Sexy Be ast "", "" Sahara "". so it is not strange that even his screenwriter has

renegade the same script from the tape. In short, as they say in the new programs of "" yellow humor ""

������Alr !!N !! The tape is already beginning badly, and that is, I do not know about you, but when I see an aggression a woman, even though she

knows it is false, I get very bad host, I can not help it, and although I know that I usually have an acid humor and

in which I sometimes joke about it, believe me, everything is front. Well, the tape already starts badly, but

not only that, but the stupid pint of TV, starring 2 familiar faces of the small screen,

barely decorated, with an illumination So dark that I had to change on more than one occasion the contractor of the

monitor to appreciate something, trying to sit chair where there is none, with unnecessary planes and devoid

of any sense, both cinematographic and narrative, and a thousand and one more experts, make this film a

pathetic spectacle that is not necessary to contemplate more than a few minutes, Honestly, I said that I hit the

arrows on my remote control >> for a good part of the footage and I could only breathe easy when

the final credit titles appeared. , I do not see the logic that money is spent on making this film

shit, and then we complain that the Spanish cinema is in crisis.

" 0

" Stream of images, dialogues and confusing situations with echoes and resonances of that 'suspects

habitual'

mythology ��� It would be true that Spike Lee, the cojonera fly of African-American cinema par excellence, had a classic

thriller, a history of cops and robbers, been rolled out, no more? I wanted to believe it, but I could not. Those

who follow these reviews know that I like movies committed to reality and the society thatus

surrounds, but they also know that, beyond the content of the film , what really matters to me is that the

story is well told. And well shot. That's why, although a good part of Lee's last projects were

interesting on paper, his celluloid expression was unsuccessful, boring and rather insipid. So

I wanted to see the good of Spike in front of a genre film, beyond one of his inevitable movies

of theses on the violated rights of the poor black man of modern America.The interest to see ""Plan

Hidden"" was growing as criteria as solvent as Jos��� Luis Mu ���oz, ���lvaro, Rash and Miranda

were glossing their kindnesses and strengths, but the unstoppable desire to go to the Cinema 2000 of Neptuneme

invadedwhen Miranda himself, in the midst of a generous barbecue, connected us ��� through the

mobile with that musical joy that is the song "" Chaiyya Chaiyya Bollywood Joint "", performed by Sapna Awasthi

and Sukhwinder Singh, who opens and closes the movie ���cula.Por therefore, nothing more to return from Sitges, Anuca and I went to

see the movie of Spike Lee. and we really enjoy it as young kids, seeing us swept along by the

torrent of images, di���logos and confusing situations prepared by the film's scriptwriter, with echoes and

resonances of that "" usual suspects "" mythology, but past the post-9/11 traumatic, theWar

Iraqand the kidnapping and execution of hostages by the Taliban. But let's go with a little order. And

concert. Suddenly, in the central office of a well-known American bank, located in the heart of New

York, masked guys enter and commit a robbery, staying with more than fifty hostages, between

workers and customers. The police are mobilized (and how that police of Mayor Giulianni mobilizes, with

trucks, cars, assault commandos, etc.) and sends one of his specialists in kidnappings. and thebegins. A

l comienzaol basadoo based on the clinician who is who and why he is doing what he is doing ? Enter ancient

secrets buried, intriguing and enigmatic external negotiators, space-time games and a wide

battery of narrative resources of all kinds that make the two hours of footage are passed in a sigh.

Cast of actors is awesome. From Denzel Washington to Christopher Plummer through an amazing

Jodie Foster, the always disturbing Willem Dafoe and the coryceous Clive Owen. Even ex-footballer Vinnie Jones

lets see his face, turned into an assault police.

" 1

" Fred Claus is dispensable but possibly less annoying than the thirteenth part of the one that wants to

present Disney this Christmas.

Christmas gags are pretty disappointing. And that in the poster they appear Vince Vaughn, Paul

Giamatti, Rachel Weisz, Kevin Spacey, Kathy Bates, Miranda Richardson, or John Michael Higgins, is a hook that

few cin���filos can let pass but in reality it is like those traps for rabbits You know that if you get to

eat the carrot the door will fall and you will stay locked in the cage waiting to receive the coup de

grace. Fred is Santa's older brother. As we all know, the Saints are frozen in time and all

their relatives and spouses are benefited by this divine prerogative. But just like the fat San Nicolas

is a good guy his older brother who has lived in his shadow since childhood has spent hundreds of yearsgrabbing

malviviendo andwhile his younger brother won the respect of the American based on leaving gifts

on Christmas Eve. But in these times neither the business of Christmas is safe and bad bad Kevin

Spacey is person to make an inspection at the polo and close the bar. The happy event coincides

with the forced visit of Fred in search of money what puts on a silver platter the head of the fat man

dressed in red. If we compare Fred Claus with the rest of the films of the genre possibly It would come off well

because in a certain way despite its puerile and white humor it has what few others, that is to say that group of

actors that can make it more pleasant and solvent. I must admit that there are three verycin���filos moments

entertainingthat managed to get me a sincere smile: the support group of siblings no self

(Baldwininana autocr���tica and the red cloak moment to the same Lex Luthor and the favorite by all the

antinovide���os: the physical attack towards the figure of Santa Claus with head up included. In summary,

Fred Claus is dispensable but possibly less annoying than the thirteenth part of the one that wants to present

Disney this Christmas.

" 0

" The worst film of the 21st century, or maybe this digital chronicler had a bad day and he needs a second

pass ...

There is no subliminal speech, there is not even speech. blockbuster vocation with a

colorful string of topics that prevent the free flow of blood through the spectator's brain, which is at

all times considered imbecile. during an unfortunate hor I was torn between

the uncertainty about my true cin���filo stamina and the certainty that the exhibition would end up causing

me irreparable damage. Qu���s��� me: perhaps in future I can not enjoy Fritz Lang or the good

Swedish films of art and essay (God keep Master Bergman). Maybe I just can not be sure, my

sensibility has gotten all the wrong and I can no longer, oh, be engrossed with my usualfilm rations

good. ��� What is the good cinema for this digital amanuensis? Well, whatever excites me: everything here that

astonishes me. A m��� this carioca outburst of brainless tourists (it does not matter if they are notadolescents

excessively hormones) has seemed to me one of the most hollow films in the history of cinema.This night

I look for Vincent Minnelli: Cautivos del mal, 1952. Kirk Douglas and a ravishing femme fatale called

Lana Turner. I have seen it enough times, but I know that it still has the capacity to make me happy. That's

the cinema. This of tourists is not cinema: it is visual onanism. The curious reader is warned. I do not know the

end, but I have not been trying to reach that climax maybe necessary to warn the moral force of the

plot.

" 0

" Typical work of this 21st century recently lit. Generous gift for future generations to illustrate the

derailment of this society now. Emotional gift also for those who live here and we find this

terrible mirror of our differences and our similarities ...

Babel is a fine exercise in research on the isolation. Emotional and moving, at times

grandiloquent, this third film by Gonz���lez I���arritu completes what the author called "" the trilogy of

pain "" together with Amores dogs and 21 grams. The brittle narrative of his argument underscores the

fragmentary nature of the human condition: good and evil do not exist as a systematizable nomenclature, everything

molds and unravels as subtle and, Sometimes, intangible threads. An event that occurred in the past

can inevitably condition the future. A fortuitous gesture (the gift of a Winchester that atourist

Japanesemakes to a Moroccan guide) can condition an immense range of other events, also incidental, to ��� after you

. This butterfly effect acquires in Babel enormous dramatic dimensions, based onfeelings

universaland developed with forcefulness, without tenderness, splendidly resting on a sincere speech

that speaks, among many other things, of pain and happiness escagada (the marriage that goes to Morocco to see

if there, being alone, they meet) or the improbable concatenation of coincidences that can control

our plÃcida life and our soft surroundings.To tell all This, Gonz���lez I���arritu mounts three films in

one: it is nothing new since Amores perros or 21 grams also developed this narrative technique with

different results. Morocco, Japan and the border of Mexico and the United States are the scenarios to

place the pieces of this crossword racial, intercultural, globalized and biblical that ends up seizing

all our capacity for amazement until we were baffled by the lightness of being, as Kundera said, and

by the bombastic magnificence of chance. All the characters of Babel are marked by an error: the Moroccan

children is and the triangle shot, the Mexican chacha that does not take the parental authorization to get the children out of the USA

, the Japanese deaf-mute girl who has not overcome her incommunicado the loss of his mother, the

American marriage that seeks to revive his love in the gray postcard of the Atlas. This cinema has no

expiration date: it entrenches itself in imperfect, but emotional virtues. It is true that Gonz���lez I���arritu is already burdened

with this narrative model excessively anchored in a formal and linguistically surpassed pattern, but

still We feel a comez���n, a sweet rapture in the perfect images of this Mexican artist who

knows how to get into the Tokyo neon that drag his greedy camera down the dusty roads of the Maghreb. In his

demírito, some elongated episode (the wedding in Mexico) or the excessive time that he dedicates to thegirl

Japanese, whose contest (being relevant) does not mark the tone of the events on which the film

rests. This does not harm the general impression: that we are attending a masterpiece orchestrated

with trade and sentiment and that explicitly, badly that we regret, the barbarism of the world, their disenchantment .. In a

necessary aside, I note the pleasant feeling of cache reduction that divas like Brad Pitthave offered

or Cate Blanchettto take charge of their characters and do it in an honest way and exempt from the glamor to which

we are accustomed. The t���mden Gonz���lez I������rritu-Arriaga, director and screenwriter, seems to have agreed to a

separation. The same is appropriate. The combined pain-emotion-tragedy is already sufficiently exploited. Only by

the very meticulous process of assembling the film would it deserve the chapter consisting of the History of the Cinema with

independence that it is being nourished by so much prize and it is there (it will be necessary to correct or

increase the post) to knock down heavyweights (Eastwood, Scorsese) in the ���scars to come.

" 1

" Two hours of precious images without any content. No plot, no script, no words. Authentic

relaxation for my muscles with basically soporific results.

Get my money back I just attended the screening of a new cinematographic experiment which I

did not know, it's about getting your attention by premiering a film called "" Marie Antoinette "" (here ��� "" Mar���a Antoinette,

The Teenage Queen ""), and directed by Sof���a Coppola, but really companions, when you are sitting in front

of the screen , you plug in dormidina through a script, which you would swear is made up of three folios. Where

is the Coppola of "" Lost in Translation? "??, because here it is, but radicalized to 100%. I do not lie to you when Iyou

tellthat until well past 25 minutes the voice of Kirsten Dunst is not heard. Nor do I lie to you when I say that you

have to spend another 20 to complete 3 sentences in a row. Sof���a Coppola has tried to tell the

story of a teenager, princess and later queen, who is supposed to be not very different from the others:

carefree, partying and, with possible, a wasteful of cop���n. However, with all these

elements, the story is slow, without emotion and boring in most of its footage. In the film tells the

story of how Mar���a Antonieta pas�� � his years in the Palace of Versailles, focusing on something as stupid as

the attitude of Louis XVI for not touching a hair. The French Revolution is played in passing, and facts as

important as the execution of the King, the Queen herself or a truculent aspect as the

head of the best friend of Mar��� A was impaled and exposed to the queen herself should be of little importance to

the director. Quite the contrary, Coppola is dedicated to outline a stupid queen and a flat encephalogram.

Possibly, and in order to put something of cane to the subject Sof���a Coppola has decided to adorn all the set with

music of New Order, leaving from this union the scene m�� It's significant of the whole film, in which Mar��� and

her court get out of hand in the halls of Versailles as if it were a rave. Still, if I have to throw myself an

hour and a half to see it, put it in the trailer and we're done. Is it necessary two hours in total to

tell the spirit of the protagonist's reveler? He liked clothes, drinks, games and sex, and that's

the way to tell it, it's the most pretentious I've seen in a long time. Looking for some history of the queen

of France, I find myself with "" Look at how she spends her time in her palace. "" If there is one thing that can not be

crossed out, the director is that lack detail. The image and atmosphere of the film is very successful,

reminding me a lot of the aesthetics that several scenes of "" Lost in Translation "" had, because Coppola he

recreates himself again and again in people who are unemployed and how everything moves around him, but once again, the plot blows

everything up. The lack of sexual interest of Mar maridoa's husband takes longer than necessary and after a

while, all that beautiful versallesque aesthetics at the beginning It turns into something redundant and burdensome. If you have

to think about the interpretations of the film, here it goes: Kirsten Dunst gives the same depth to her character as to

an ashtray. I do not know if Coppola herself is responsible for not dwelling more on the historical character,

but so much carelessness and pasotism inside the character is not believed. If we keep in mind that

Mar���a Antonieta did not go down in history for nothing. Jason Scwartzman, Mar���a's husband, passed by there. They

said to him: "" put on a suit of time and make pusil���nime "". It embroiders in both roles, and the chemistry between both

characters is what has to be: null. The only one that deserves my attention is Asia Argento, and even then her

interpretation is flat. In conclusion, "" Mar���a Antonieta . The adolescent queen "" has meant for me almost two

hours of precious images without any content. No plot, no script, no words. Authentic relaxation

for my muscles with basically soporific results. If you go through constant action, this is your

movie. For me it's a tease. Did not the booed Coppola come from Cannes?

" 0

" Far above the spectacular and palomitero, The host effectively exorcises the fears and desires of

Korean contemporary society, inoculated by the deadly virus of apathy and despair.

Turn off the TV and eat at ease! The genre of terror has given us rare but exceptional moments of good

political cinema? In my memory are the night of the living dead (Romero, 1968) or the invasion of the body

snatchers (Siegel, 1956), and also the priceless M, the D vampsseldorf vampire (Lang, 1931) - who, although they

might not be in tune with the sensibility of a public not receptive to flirt good show with

intellectual metaphor, at least the enjoyment of the staging always thank you. This is the case

of The host, one more than a good political film, and one no less convincing and enjoyable (at times, but how many

times!) Pel� ��cula de terror.As in CrÃnica of a serial killer, Joon-Ho (not to confuse him, please, with John

Woo) showed us that he knew how to intelligently combine a thriller with intentions that transcend thethemes

pilgrimof that adolescent genre, to give us a work that distills without fireworks a fierce

criticism of the institutional backwardness and corruption that its country is experiencing, South Korea . However, while on

that occasion Joon-Ho leads his narrative towards a poignant and bitter narrative, without offering us hopes or

refuges to which to take our courage, in The host seems convinced that only from below, from the

construction of a real active citizenship, can your country attack the Leviathan that numbs and convinces you that

the best option is to keep quiet and wait for the virus (nonexistent, by the way) of the delay and defeatism to

dissipate. In this sense, the protagonist family represented in the film becomes a meta A plural and

lucid story about the mood of the Korean citizen: the clumsy, annoyed and almost always asleep father; the

graduate unemployed, idealistic and ashamed of his impoverished family; the sister medalist, who always acts

late, condemned to sad bronze? And the girl, that girl presented by the director as the most capable of biting

the beast from within and without cowardice, is the hope of a Korea as numb as its protagonist, so

convinced of its uselessness as that father awakened only by the tragedy of watching his daughter die. Just as

in his previous film, the Korean filmmaker puts several fingers in the wound about the situation without subtlety. In

your country. Only the start and the closing of this movie say it all. An official brought from the ally and

envied the United States? Is worthy of Charlot the scene in which the medical team squares and simulates effectiveness

to see how his American counterpart arrives - it is (let's not forget) the trigger of the tragedy, added to the

feeling of inferiority and the obsession of the Korean citizen. The director's position on

American interventionism is very clear, as is the vision of fragile,

corrupt and unprofessional institutions that make up reality. In this regard, appreciate the causticity of the

scene in which the official wearing his yellow jumpsuit turns on the television to inform those

affected. The host can not therefore be taken as a movie. �cula of terror to use (American), although scenes

like the attack of the beast in the park or the terrifying regurgitations of the animal in thewell

sewerare worthy of Tibur���no Alien (as��� this is how the poster andvideos show us this film

promotional). Far above the spectacular and palomitero (which for these reasons alone is aproposal

greatto enjoy two sabbatical hours), The host effectively exorcises the fears and desires of

contemporary society. Korean line, and by extension, as did the stylized V of vendetta, of all

western (and westernized) countries, inoculated by the deadly virus of inattention and despair

Perhaps the most beautiful part of the film is the scene in which the father (the whole family) struggles to get

his daughter out of the beast's entrails. And that rain that wraps everything in the films of Joon-Ho, as washing, to

those who soak, of the darkness that surrounds them (in the oriental iconography the water seems to possess that double

function). �n messenger of fatality? The ring or Dark water-, and in turn restitution of order). And that

father, approaching the child that his daughter rescued and that he will adopt as his own. And, above all, that

iconoclastic and ironic end, worthy of Billy Wilder.

" 1

" After watching the film, you will not want to know more about Da Vinci or his works. There is no need to give the plot a lot of thought: Robert Langdom is a student of the ancient symbology and is

entangled in the assassination of the master of the Priory by Opus Dei, behind there are many intrigues

about the descent of Jesus and the dark intentions of the Iglesia.La film does not manage to awaken the interest

of the spectator, much less aspires to become a "" taquillazo "" and it loses the rhythm becoming

boring at times and when it accelerates it does not give you time to process and understand what you are trying to show.

He just drowned in the expectations and family of the "" Da Vinci Code. "" Robert "" Hanks "" Langdom starts the

film in front of an audience presenting religious symbols to show that many things are not what

they seem to ask what does such a symbol mean? and when you try to think there is no time because less than half a

second the answers are already listed. And Sophie is still Amelie a simple spectator. When escaping the

plane SILAS does not protest.- Nobody remembers the lost friends. At least his grandfather was not his grandfather. After

watching the film you will not want to know more about Da Vinci or his works.

" 0

" This documentary, with an exceptional narrator, summarizes briefly the best matches of all the

selections, with special interest in the final phase, where the drama of the semifinals joins the lottery� ��a

of the penalties. Football a tutti-plen.

Lately the DVD market is not surprising with quite juicy sports launches, and that is,

for football fans, the World Cup presents a great event that happens every 4 years (come on, as

the Olympics) and where the best footballers come together to make our lives more fun (more than suffered,

as seen). This documentary, with an exceptional narrator , (the great 007, I'm not talking about Daniel Craigh, but

Pierce Brosnan), summarizes briefly the best matches of all the teams, with special interest in the

final phase, where the drama of the semifinals joins the lottery of the penalties. A tape that can not

miss on the shelves of any fan of the king sport, and that will delight all those who

had to suffer the World Cup in "" The sixth "" accompanied by Andr���s Montes and SALIIIINAAASSS !!

" 1

" It will please the little ones of the house more than the older ones, who are a mess saturated with this kind of

stories.

Every summer we receive an animation tape that will be the one that "" stands out "" on the screen, this one, also

made by computer, as usual, although drinking from the more classical sources of the

same, as are the "" Cartoon "" of Tex Avery along with conventional animation. A comedy for the whole

family, with enough jokes and quite humor "" blow and thump "" that starts the p���tio of seats more than a

loud laugh, however the film becomes very short (hour and a quarter with titles of credit included) and

the feeling that the script leaves things in the inkwell is the dominant note in the audience once thefinished.

projection isinterest to see the dubbing of the "" famosetes of turn "" who again do it in "" Madagascar ""

but as I have seen in VOS I can not judge. Wait for the DVD to do it. A movie that will please the little ones

of the house that the older ones, that are a film saturated with this type of stories.

" 0

" What at first seems like an adventure story that recalls Deliverance in a female version

becomes one of the most terrifying experiences of cinema in recent years. thanks to the talent of a

director to follow.

Whenever they ask me; What horror movie did you enjoy most at the movies? I do not think it, the word THE

DESCENT comes dizzyingly to my mind. NEIL MARSHALL already had an interesting premiere in the very drinking DOG

SOLDIERS that mixed action, humor, GORE with good results. In this his second film not a drop of comedy

guiding us to a pure terror without concessions to the viewer, with a script that for once leaves the topics

aside to focus on well-built characters. A great point in their favor is the splendid work of their

female cast led by SHAUNA MCDONALD of the series SPOOKS and NATALIE MENDOZA that also comes from the

television where it stands out in the culebron HOTEL BABYLON. The interiors of the caverns are really

chilling helped by the cold photography, the music is effective to destroy the nerves in thatcarousel

bloodywhere the deterioration of human relationships is m��� It is important that the cannibal monsters

resemble the GOLLUM of the Lord of the Rings. What at first seems like an adventure story that reminds the

DELIVERANCE in the female version becomes a of the most frightening experiences of cinema in recent

years thanks to the talent of a director to follow in its next release DOOMSDAY. That same year the premiere of the

Damned cavern of almost same subject but much worse development.

" 1

" Remarkable and innovative in an old-fashioned industry such as Spanish, fresh (not original) and a

sign that good cinema does not serve media or budgets, but to the imagination of its

creators.

After his triumphant passage through the International Festival of Sitges 2007, harvesting up to 5 awards, we

reach the conventional screens the last proposal of patriotic terror, in this case directed to two hands by

Jaume Balaguer�� � and Paco Plaza, in an unusual story in its proposal but tremendously conventional in its

concept. The idea of ​​directing a film, and also of scarce budget, altogether, may seem at first

something extra Anorand abnormal, but considering that Balaguer��� is a filmmaker who has shown his great values

in the creation of terrifying atmospheres, with great vigor in the laying of scene and the creation of moments of

pure horror, and that Plaza is a director more endowed for the narrative progression than those moments of

claw, the election seemed It was completely successful. Reviewing the career of Balaguer��� we find ourselves with a

series of films, which despite being irregular in their great majority (in my opinion their best film, it is still

their � ��pera prima "" Los sin nombre ""), like the failed "" Darkness "" or more interesting, but not round,

"" Fr���giles "" and the tv-movie " "To enter to live" ". For his part Plaza offered us works like "" The second name "" and

"" Romasanta "", both very valuable but lacking in narrative claw as I commented before, being somewhat

distant for the viewer due to the lack of an attachment with the story, in the biggest flaw of his films,

which in this [REC] seems to have been solved. The story could not be simpler, a team of reporters

formed by a journalist and his wife. ��mara, accompanied on a routine night a team of firefighters who come to a

building in the heart of Barcelona, ​​turning out to be something they did not expect, and provoking a series of events

that provoke a staggered violence of the ���s terror���fica.Durante all the footage, one of the strengths

of the film lies in the realistic tone of the reactions of the characters, all well shown in their

daily routine, showing in a fresh and natural way all reactions to the series of

Acon upcoming technologies, which, given that it is a film in which thethemselves

creatorshave acknowledged that gave much freedom to the actors when it comes to improvidar their reactions, being

some of them even hyperrealistic not knowing what was waiting for them in the filming of each scene, it is

absolutely commendable and one of the great successes of the film. On the other hand, the work behind the scenes of

Balaguer��� and Plaza only appears in a few occasions , allowing the story to pass naturally and

without interference, which is also worth noting, especially when certain filmmakers always try to

leave their brand, even though the story is not logically. In a proposal like this, talking about

the script would be absurd because everything is limited to the events that take place naturally,

giving the sensation Follow some guidelines little enslaved by a written guide, or at least detailed. But all

this does not mean that there should not be a narrative progression, and here is wherefails slightly

REC, the whole story is a constant cl���max, and that does not contribute to the narrative development of history,is to

thatsay, its greatest virtue, which is to maintain in a constant and unrestrained tension the whole story, endowing it with an

exacerbated realism, palpable and so physical that pr�� It basically attacks the screen and the viewing by the

viewer, it turns against because there comes a moment in which, with the exception of the brilliant last 20

minutes, the story becomes something foreseeable, both in its history and in a series of scares that the spectator

already expects, although always in tension, that is undeniable. Also, it possesses a certain tone of black humor, such as

interviews on the from the character of the reporter to the inhabitants of the building, in which they give free rein

to instincts such as Racism towards the Chinese neighbors, or a ruthless view of the programs of

event criticism, through that immoral and to a certain extent overbearing reporter incarnated in a remarkable way by Manuela

Velasco ( not in vain, has exercised a similar job for television in real life). Perhaps another flaw of the

film, and there is already a taste of a server for the narration. In classical, it consists in that constant

movement of the camera that ends up dizzy a little and provoke a sensation of confusion, I imagine that it is

sought after. of the influences of another genre film that has had a lot of repercussion

lately, the first film by JABayona about haunted houses and spirits from beyond the grave (excellent in my

opinion). n but weighed a bit by the common places of the genre, as I mentioned in his day), butare not less

referencesto other films in REC, although that if, maybe they pass more unnoticed, or are more tolerated by the

public because they are less popular. To start the creators themselves have recognized the

influence (copy I would say seeing both proposals) of a small amateur video published online, and that

is available in such ef���meros media as Youtube, on a supposed angel fallen in a rural area of

our country, and this becomes evident in the final sequence. Other obvious influences, the second part of

"" Demons "" by Lamberto Bava, with that apartment infested with zombies, or other various and typical references like

"" Night of the living dead "". There has even been talk of the influence of that little exceptional work

on the mechanisms of fear and popular mythology that was the essential "" The Blair Witch Project ""

(still misunderstood today by many who could not see its symbolism), but in this case only the texture of

amateur recording could find its similarity with that, since while the film of Myrick and Sanchez was

all subtlety and pure symbolism, in REC the medium is used to create a palpable reality without alibis. In

short, a remarkable film, an org���astic cl���max of violence that for 80 minutes we It introduces fully in the

form of a media breach in the reality of a series of characters trapped by the pure terror that takes

over their neighborhood, a work that with its great virtues, and despite slight flaws, it becomes

a fresh and living sample of good horror movies, with a That is less frightening, except for its

brilliant last 20 minutes, of what they wanted to sell us in that video about the reactions of the staff in a

certain film festival that was very close and that so many awards were given to this film.Notable and novel in an

anquilosada industry like the Spanish, fresh (that is not original) and that supposes a sample more than the goodcinema

fantasticdoes not attend media or budgets, but to the imagination of its creators.

" 1

" Since I was a child I heard my father hear about "" in wars no one wins "" and once again the view of

this film I can not be more in agreement, since there are neither winners nor losers, onlyfamilies

broken, humiliated people ...

Bryan De Palma after his "" Femme Fatale "" (that removing Rebecca Rojmin, it seemed a little roll) and "" TheDahlia

Black"" (which I found curious, although disappointing) is aimed at the genre of the false documentary to compose

here a rather constructive criticism to the prevailing patriotism and war that in these days is being waged in the

Middle East, where again and my mouth hurts to say it the citizens of Iraq are less "" poor things ""

than is believed in the USA, on the other hand, and like in "" Hearts of iron "" reflect, in a way more than

television (and in the middle of YouTube era), one of the unfortunate events that took place in 2006 in full or

war conflict, when some American soldiers, trying to avenge the death of one of theirmembers

squad, raped and murdered a girl, and charged the whole family of this without any kind of

regard or resquemores.Dede I've heard my father say that "in wars no one wins" and

once again the view of this film I can not be m��� s in agreement, since there are neither winners nor

losers, only broken families, humiliated people, and cadaverous dainties in bags. Among the characters

(perfectly embodied by a group of unknown actors) we have all kinds of stereotypes, the Latino

(here is the camera of this documentary), the flip-flops of the war, and the sensitive one, in addition to the fact that

the roles are exchanged as the action; On the other hand, De Palma affects too much in a kind

of puritanism in some moments, and brutality in others, leaving the tape lame and, like Robert

Reford in "" Lions for Lambs "" not getting involved at all when he should , and at other times

implying more than necessary. Between the revenge of some and the attacks of others it is dedicated to protect itself in a

species of whiting that bites its tail, and that unfortunately, it plasma what, in small ���a (and great stay)

is a war. Maybe the best is (and I'm left with a textual phrase) "" It's better to have a reason for your

friend to die in your arms, not to watch fly in a million pieces. "" In short, another prism of the fearful

and current war in Iraq.

" 1

" I do not think a Superman is needed today, there is a lack of order in the world and fewer sons of bitches.

Selfishness is what moves the world, and I doubt that Superman can never eradicate.

I was about 10 years old when my daddy took me to the movies to watch Superman. To hear that music has made me relive

those moments and a chill has taken over my whole being. What a moment! It has been going back in time But

something is wrong, this movie is not just the reflection of what was the first. Superman for me will always be Cristopher

Reeve and Lois Lane that delgadurria with an angelic face. Times change, yes, and now the Superman is a gay

with tup��� and the Lois Lane a hysterical with a huge ego that is half imbecile. If we look closely, we have the

protagonist, in addition to Superman, a family with two parents with a child. Something typical insociety

Americanwhere most families are divorced and children have several parents.But we go

in parts, analyzing such pasquin.Superman: In this film is told without wanting the story of

Jesus Christ. In fact there is an image of Superman in the heavens with his arms outstretched and his head low as if he

were on the cross. His mission on earth is to save man, then, as in the bible, he is beaten by the

bad guys (Calvary) and when he thinks he is dead, he is resurrected as Lazaro. The end of the movie is already traca,

when he speaks with his son and he releases words from the Bible, from the father and son (God?

Jesus Christ). I, as I have been in OPUS DEI for so long, see immediately when there are such things. By the way,

why does Superman fly with both fists forward? I should go like a plane, with my arms outstretched,

right? If I did not start circling like a missile? hala, the physics to shit. Clark Kent: It's the descojono that

nobody realizes that Superman is the. Just some glasses and hair in another way and no one wonders if he can be

the one. Today more than ever appearances deceive more than we believe. Lois Lane: One of those "" triumphant "" with

a house with hydroplane in the portico of his house, in the middle of New York. Cagate.The old Lois Lane was more

quiet, this is a hysterical that just listening to me makes my hair stand on end. By the way, the ostias that

gets into the plane are of ordago, and then leave unharmed, it is the descojono.Lex Luthor: Not bad but they

have given very little field. Could have given much more spacey crack game. They have focused on the boring and

soporific relationship of Lois Lane and Superman and the Superman has not been seen using his powers much. Let it

stop flirting and more goal to go down there The son: but what paranoia is this that he has a Superman son?want to

Do youmake the movie Superman and Son later? What a presentation of the son, killing a bad guy from a pianazo. Superman

kills? Oops how the times change, a child killing an adult in a movie for children. Other things: The movienot

hastaken into account numerous laws of physics, it is totally impossible to raise a plane or a huge ground mass

from such a tiny point. That that said that of "" give me a point of support and move the earth "" is

passed through the lining the Superman, because not only does not have support, but everything would fall down the sides, not

finding consistency in the point where the force exerts. The scene of violence where the bad guys test with

Superman is disgusting and any child can have nightmares with that. The kryptonite, someone explain it to me,

was not something that took away the powers to Superman at a long distance? If he is touching it all the time when he

takes the rock out of the ground because it does not fall on him? Oh, it stays in a coma, look what things.

Superman seems to be immortal and when he is, no one kills him.Menu movie potatoMore things: at firstpee

Superman saves onlypeople, for example a bank or people from New York City, as well as

French and Germans . You see that the rest of the world does not matter, that they screw up Africa, and that people continue to

go hungry. I do not think a Superman is needed today, there is a lack of order in the world and fewer sons

of bitches. Selfishness is what moves the world, and I doubt that Superman can ever eradicate it.

" 0

" Interesting proposal by Paul Haggis that surely will not last long in theaters. If there is a possibility it is very

advisable to visit the room to enjoy such superb interpretations.

Tommy Lee Jones is going to earn the nickname of Iron Man as he continues to choose the roles he chooses

lately. First start with In the Valley of Elah to continue with the tape of the Coen. In bothdoes not change

the rictusmost of the time. But also in both cases it is brilliant. Another that has been cast in the

two films is Josh Brolin, who in this retains a discreet background but has had a round year

completed with American Ganster) and that has become a fundamental piece of the gear of everytape

qualitythat boasts. In the Valley of Elah a father looks for clues about the disappearance of his son after his return

from Iraq. He is a very conscientious father since he is the second son who loses and in addition the whole family has

an important military tradition so he will be constant and incisive in all the steps of his investigation. .N He will be

helped by a young police officer who, after initial hesitation, ends up seeing thatdeath truly

Michael'slooks more than suspicious. The official and unofficial investigation along with the videos of

the deceased soldier's mobile will get to fit little by little the pieces of a pretty soulless puzzle of

the cruelties of the human race. its clear independent look (exclusively in terms of investment

made) the solvency of gui��� and actors achieves an almost perfect finish in this military thriller that leaves

little rest to the viewer. Alternate confessional moments intimate with the harshness of a reality between

war and everyday life that is difficult to fit. Interesting proposal by Paul Haggis that surely

lasts little in theaters. If there is a possibility it is very advisable to visit the room to enjoy such superb

interpretations. He dares not to apologize for the good and the bad in a subject as raked as war,

or the kindness of man.

"1"

Once home,reflect from the visual replicas of the earthquake that we vivido.En continuous and overwhelming balance between hope and agony, this intense work that tells us

so announced tomorrow is already here. The beginning, vibrant and concise, gives us the keys of what we will see: a London

of 2027 similar to the current one. a priori. The skilled Alfonso Cuar���n introduces us to the overwhelming story with

few plans and no unnecessary digital devices. It does not need more than a quick and accurate

panoramic and some other informative document that could be broadcasted on current television.

intensity and looking for the real tone at all times, the film hits us a hard blow, to us who are

sitting in an armchair and what we see seems far away. The end of humanity is no longer in the hands

of aliens or robots. We may not die either because of a large earthquake or the impact of a

meteorite; we will be the culprits and the terrible thing is the tranquility with which we see it. Like V de

Vendetta and 28 days later, the disturbing Children of Men settles in London, a western capital

where I missed that the phenomenon of immigration leads to beastly consequences, in a step beyond that

given by Michael Winterbottom in the indispensable Code 46. We do not forget the gui���os to

terrorism and the manipulation of citizens as puppets at the hands of the rulers. This book

enlarges everything but is narrated in such a credible way that it scares. It is more, we can even imagine the end,

because we do not need answers to the questions raised. The camera in hand does not stop shooting for

minutes that become eternal. These are the so-called sequence planes that, supported by the thunderous sound, contribute

to the feeling of being inside a terrible simulated adventure. Clive Owen (Closer, Sin City,

Hidden Plan) and the convincing Clare-Hope Ashitey are our guides for this sometimes poetic and always

tremendous world, photographed in a sad and expressive way, with gray tones and blue The coloring is given by the

interpretations of Michael Caine and Julianne Moore. They provide the point of comedy necessary for the

tragedy to have more value. I did not pass through my hands the homonymous book of PD James, but I have been told that

any resemblance to him was just a coincidence. It ratifies our idea that we are dealing with twoforms of

differentexpression. As for the substance, it is not that the text had more philosophical andcontent

humanistic, but that Cuar���n bets on suspense and action, weapons ���micros that contribute to the message

arrives almost without warning and the bofet���n is more sounded. Once at home, we will reflect on the responses

of the visual earthquake that we have experienced.

" 1

" Well, pretty good. A good movie in which to spend the money, which, besides being spectacular,

heroic, amazing, etc., is very entertaining. But is it missing? to become very good. A pity

Remember a movie that you liked, but that would have left you with a strange sensation? I do notif Imyself

knowexplain. I mean a film that is not outstanding, but instead of enthusing them, they leftbehind

something? I dont know? like? "" Yes, it's very good "" but in the end you know that you are missing something that you do not know very well what

it is and why you have not finished catching it? "" That one. "" It's that, I do not know. I liked the film, and I enjoyed it.

But? something is missing What is it? Well, I think it's the set of some things. Let's go in parts. As for

Snyder's address, well, good. Pretty good, more than correct. No one can blame this man

that the way the film is shot is bad. It has style. Although maybe it's something ���videoclipera? But very

correct. Perhaps in some moments it abuses certain resources, such as the slow camera, and the

quick-slow-quick-slow, but as they do not clash too much, they do not become an

ordeal. The battles are They are very well shot (although sometimes not so well mounted), it is obvious that they have

put a lot of enthusiasm at the time of shooting them. Well, the film is almost in its 60% battles. And although it is

missing something more dialogue, the battles, are very entertaining. As for the actors? Well, the truth is, theynot

couldsay that they do it badly. Each and every one of the actors (although some of themoveract

sometimes) fulfill their role very well. Especially Gerard Butler (The Phantom of the Opera) and Lena Headey (The

Brothers Grimm). The first, splendid as Rey Le���nidas, knowing how to give the character a strength and a

charisma that make the character fall well to the public (also because it is one of the few characters that are not

like a goat). The second, fulfills its role with great, although sometimes somewhat bland, but

usually (especially in the final stretch) excellent. As for the gui���n? The di���logos are very scarce. Although not

to the extreme of "" Apocalypto "". But sometimes they are missing, since the film leans too much on

the images. As for the special effects? Well, over valued. Although no one with two fingers

can say that they are bad, sometimes they are something? loose (the wolf, some landscapes, the rhinos?). Inot

dounderstand how people can marvel at these special effects when we see others that are far superior. But

even so they give the film a very particular aesthetic, and what is more important, almost traced to that of the

comic. I would like to comment on the (poor) work of those responsible for makeup. Although in the

vast majority of cases correct, in others, quite false (as happens with the character of Ephialtes, or

some of the many deformed that appear in the film). The soundtrack, quite successful, molds

perfectly with the images, in an outstanding way. And the most machaconas parts are here justified

before the large number of battle scenes. As for the policy of the "" attack against the Iranian culture ""?

well? I thought they exaggerated? but no. Although the film does not pretend to be faithful historically, they show the

Iranian culture something "effeminate", I do not know? something? Well, the best thing is that you look at the photo above, where

Xerxes (the bad guy) "" fools "" with Le���nidas (he's supposed to be negotiating, but after seeing the film, Inot

'mso clear). Yeah, yeah, I know it looks like it was taken from a gay cavalcade (more specifically from the Dragfloat

Queen), that's why I told you that the film is historically rigorous (nor does he pretend, as I said). That is why

we should not take it too seriously in this regard. For this reason I advise you: that no one is going to see the film

thinking that you are going to see a faithful account of the battle of the Term���pilas, that is in the history books, what

the film ���cula account is all fiction. As for the film as ���, in general. Well, that's fine, pretty good. A

good movie in which to spend the money, which, besides being spectacular, heroic, amazing, etc., is very

entertaining. But it lacks "" something "" to become very good. A pity As for those who claim that it

is a masterpiece and so on. well, they are a little exaggerated. The movie is good. But to that extreme?

" 1

" It is not more than Dickens' Christmas Tale, where a man's moral is changed, discovering his

past, his present and his future, only this time, in Instead of ghosts, spirits or specters, we have a remote

control.

The only apparent originality is the plot excuse: a miserable man (Adam Sandler), bored with his

life and his family, discovers how he can change his life through such a common object. Comon as a remote

control, whose typical functions (stop, lower the volume, change chapters, etc.?) Logically apply to

your environment. Everything else is already seen; the story is not more than Dickens' Christmas Tale, whereis

a man's moralchanged by discovering his past, his present and his future, only this time, instead of

ghosts, spirits or specters, we have a remote control and the character of Christopher Walken. What happens

is that nothing here fits or makes sense, and also, it is absurd comedy with the typical American conservative seal

of preserving the family above all. After five minutes of projection and we have forgotten

history and we are dedicated to find the thanks to the jokes, that, look where you have them. It will be

because the humor that is presented to us is not as white as we can expect in an argument of such morality, and

sexual and scatological references and swear words, without reaching the levels of the Farrelli,

Of course, they are quite present. Avoid it if you can, but if you see it, just laugh and do not think.

" 0

" In conclusion a great movie that reminds us that there are many reasons to live but also

many ideas that are worth dying for.

I have seen this movie again in my house, I went to see it at the cinema, and it still seems like anfilm

excellent. And it is not only because of the plot, the excellent performance of Daniel Br���hl, of the actresses whothe

playrole of their sisters, of a better day Tristan Ulloa, by Leonor Watling ( one of my weaknesses), by Ingrid

Rubio (an acriz totally untapped by Spanish cinema) and by a brilliant Leonardo Sbaraglia.La fotografÃa

and the recreation of these years in which the Dictatorship was already beginning to thump is very good. For me, the best

part is the initial one, where the anarchist group, the MIL, is shown, although it is condemnable in

its acts (there would still be a need to live in those years). to understand them better), undoubtedly, in his ideas is

understandable, and in his struggle, in his courage and his audacity to remain out of reach of the entireapparatus.

Franco policeOnce in the jail, Daniel Br���hl and Leonardo Sbaraglia raise the interpretive level to

very high levels. Great the transformation of the second, the basketball games in the courtyard of the jail, the

conversations. But a scene that marks the film is that of the arrival of the executioner of the vile club and the

final scene of its execution. Cruel, terrifying and infinitely sad and real. The relationship with Leonor Watling is

interesting, but the truly important relationship is that of the protagonsita with Ingrid Rubio. As

I said one of the best and least used of Spanish cinema, it is good. In conclusion a great

movie that reminds us that there are many reasons to live but also many ideas for which it is

worth dying.

" 1

" has a gui���n such a rich mixture of genres that make it an unclassifiable film, but who

wants to classify pleasure?

Wilder had the maximum of never bored. His proverbial weapon was intelligence: his films

waste it, without exception. We note it in the monumental serious work (The Crucifix of the Gods, Days Without

Footprint, Perdition, Witness of Charge) and in the fascinating work of physics (With skirts already the crazy, One, two, three,

The temptation lives above). The apartment is located between laughter and crying. It is installed without difficulty in the

most hilarious comedy and soon after it is dropped with arguments of classic tragedy with all of the

law. It has a gui���n such a rich mixture of genres that make it an unclassifiable film, but who

wants to classify pleasure. The talent of Billy Wilder as a screenwriter delights in acquiringsupplies

narrativein any of these genres and links them with so much precision and with so much technical aplomb that

we attend (as those who do not want the thing) to the closest we can have of what, pompously, we could

call pure cinema, that is, life. The apartment portrays the restitution of dignity in an anodyne man who, out

of love, always out of love, lets himself be invaded by others: he allows them to ignore him, to manipulate him at ease so

that he does not to be noticed and perhaps with the secret purpose of doing good, without looking at whether that exercise of

kindness is going to place him in a difficult territory, in a limbo of idiots. The visual style of the film

embraces a portentous black and white, the work of Alexandre Trauner, Wilder's habitual andartistic director

superb, able to imagine and capture the huge office that illustrates mediocrity and life Mechanical by Buddy

Baxter, our enterprising fool. This bitter culture is nourished by seamless performances where Lemmon

shines at a huge height and where Shirley MacLaine, new after his commendable first great role in But Who

Killed Harry, by Master Hitchcock, shapes with astonishment to naturality. What Wilder achieves with the apartment

is to introduce lyricism, beauty, tenderness into a plot of measured extravagance, into a recital of

absolute pessimism (he himself was an accomplished pessimist who believed, Above all and in spite of that

obstinate belief, in the moral height of the individual.Buddy Baxter, our enter���able protagonist, has a

huge moral height. It is a good one. A man without cynicism (as opposed to its creator). A perfect

character of the comedies of humanity of the best times of Frank Capra. One sees Lemmon and warns that

James Stewart could also have worn the sweet tooth of the play. He is sweet, scathing, sad,

cheerful, even sentimental. There is a nice point of empalago in the treatment of events.

Sometimes, we irritated by the kindness of Buddy. In others, we trust that it will change. We get Wilder so we

get into his story that Buddy Baxter is us and the identification occurs at an

absolutely intimate, irrevocable level. The love he feels is the love that we have all felt at times. The

connivance with the bosses and the double standards of their boss is the feeling that we have had, at some

point, all of us when we have witnessed any injustice in our society, so bizarre,

hypocritical. , false in which Wilder, if he lived now, would enjoy it because it contains in a superlative way all the

ingredients that he introduced in his narrative corpus and to which he elevated to very high levels of clarividiente

maestr�� Sea.It is said that in Shakespeare is the whole map of human feeling. Also in Wilder. There

are many in the apartment. It is enough to let yourself be carried away by its tender history of late loves and fairies in blocks of

concrete that you find, between the eleventh and twelfth floors, for example, your prince, who does not know your

blue nature and wanders the corridors, meditative, unattended charm, dreaming of a world (who will

deny it) better: cleaner, more fair.

" 1

" The culminating work of Paco Mart���nez Soria. Tremendous film for evenings of tedium and soporBueno, so you can see that a critic of post���n like me (of medium hair for others) lives of its readers, I have

decided to listen. I could have continued with the author's films that you like so much, or with the criticism of

bondage melodramas that dazzle you, but let's give a little turn. Since the week is long and the movies

that I see do not always interest you, we are going to return to those films that all of you have seen. Let's see if you can animate

and comment a little on great Spanish film classics. To begin and go preparing for what

can be this, we have what many consider the culminating work of Paco Mart���nez Soria, so to enjoy.

By the way, the star system for these special cases has changed, as you can see. The

film is about Don Rodrigo, a man who goes to the bank to collect 257 pesetas. Total, that at the time of the

cashier transaction - Don Rodrigo a robber enters the bank and takes everything inside,

including his 257 pesetas. After a while of fuss and stifling, Don Ricardo discovers that therascals

workerof the entity do not want to return their 257 pesetas because they have been removed when they were no longer

owned by the bank. This begins an odyssey that laughs t��� of the classics, with an untied Don Ricardo thatus

showsthat the values ​​of perseverance and that justice always wins. Don Paco Mart���nez Soria gets stuck in

the costume of the noble brute Don Ricardo to defend the rights of the citizens of a pi��� in the Spain of the

skin of a bull. Fight against giants until achieving what he wanted, his coveted 257 pesetas. On the way he

loses more than that amount, but what is just is fair. Well, this is a tremendous film for afternoons of

boredom and drowsiness. The argument engages from the first moment, for its strength and forcefulness, in addition to

getting us all to be Don Ricardo and we want justice to prevail. The situations that this

nice Spanish gentleman lives are the most crazy, including a crazy hunt. A culminating moment,

for me, is when a guard finishes him and when he recognizes he wants to get rid of the fine and he flatly refuses.

Riete t��� of the cry "" Libeeeeeertaaaaaad "" of Braveheart. Only a Viva Espa���aa full of lungs was missing. Resuming,

seen anacrinically, we have a light film to help us catch the rhythm of the siesta. , but

for the honks (screams) that hit throughout her. If you see in the time, tremendous criticism of society

(come on, I say, I'm not so old as to have lived that time). Four golden dandruff, not reaching by

the hairs to the total dandruff.

" 1

" Ratatouille is from his viewing a classic factory as they are already Toy Story, Finding Nemo or

Incredibles.

Pixar demonstrates once again, and with astonishing ease, why it is the queen of digital animation cinema,

not because of an increasingly successful visual quality, but also because n by the quality of his scripts, which corroborates

again that the comedy to the purest classic style is even possible without having to fall into the easy joke or be

irreverent and also It makes it clear that one can be emotional and extol values ​​such as love, friendship, family

or self-improvement, leaving aside the typical Disney lifestyle. Through the footsteps of arat

very specialwe witness the pursuit of a dream, that of being a cook, that will be achieved through a human, a

loser who suddenly sees his luck change when he turns from night to morning into an expert chef, a fame

that will soon come to him great and that will endanger the trained team by both, inseparable since one

depends on the other. Exceptional storyline is the one that supposes the relationship between these two characters and howis

the communication between bothestablished, that although it would have been easier to opt for a v���am ���s traditional, the

bet that is taken here is risky, but also brings coherence to the film and apoint of

differentview.Point and apart is the technical and visual quality of the film where Pixar manages to overcome again and by

far the "hardest" "still" that each film supposes. One of the great challenges was being able to represent

foods and foods in a realistic way, the texture, the color, the shape and the movement. And go if you get it,

but do not abuse it, if we can see many vegetables such as onions, celery, potatoes, and more, all of them

perfectly defined and almost real, as well as cooked dishes, sauces, etc. . Perhaps the unfinished business is

still to achieve something more realistic in people, instead of opting for such caricatured faces,

I suppose that some will come in that it is possible to make an animated film where the human characters come to

seem real. After that with Cars the Pixar loosed a little, very little, this Ratatouille puts

the studio back in the m�� �s alto and its director Brad Bird as one of the best animation directors at the moment.

Ratatouille is from his viewing a classic of the factory as they are already Toy Story, Finding Nemo or

Incredibles.

" 1

" It's entertaining, and it's touching at times, but it does not quite come together At any place you read about "" Thumbsucker "" they'll tell you the same thing: "" It's about a guy who, at 17

, he still sucks his finger "". And yes, that's true, but, evidently, that's just the beginning. "" Thumbsucker "" is

one of those North American films, in the line of "" T���, me and all the others "", that tell the tragedies of

everyday life through characters that are unique within their normality. "" Dramatic comedy "", some

call it. In any case, Mike Mills' first feature film directorial work starts from the

thumbs-up of the main character and ends up covering issues such asrelationships

familyor life dissatisfaction. And it's entertaining, and it's touching at times, but it does not

quite come together at all. The film is based on a novel by Walter Kirn that I do not know. I do not know how

the book will be, but its adaptation has a fundamental problem: the guide delves into aspects that it then

abandons completely, such as the treatment of the protagonist before his problem. Without going to assess the criticism

that the film seems to want to do about psychiatric drugs, which I do not share, it turns out that the

director converts the subject of the medication. And the drugs in a fundamental axis, to then forget about him

as if such a thing. I was not very clear why something that seems to be so important at one point ceases to be

fifteen minutes later. On the other hand, the interpretations of the actors are good, although they are not used

in some cases and, personally, I think that the role of Keanu Reeves could have been much better exploited.

Come on, that "" Thumbsucker "" has its fun, but I expected more. The truth, I prefer that it is Todd Solondz who

tells me the dramas of happy families.

" 0

" Another adaptation of the writer Stephen King, that although it is not completely bad, it ends up being a

film with a good base unused and a journey of madness that ends up being not so much.

Yesterday the festival of Sitges ended with the film 1408, which promised a lot but ended up being an

unsuccessful attempt to deepen the descents to the infernos of its protagonist. A writer is dedicated to

travel and write about various scenarios where supposedly there are ghosts, but without ever finding any

indication of it. Room 1408 of a New York hotel will be your next challenge, but what you will live there will

have nothing to do with your failed previous experiences and the room will turn into a

nightmare from which I can not escape. Another adaptation of the writer Stephen King, that although it is not entirely

bad, if it ends up being a film with a good base untapped and a journey of madness that ends up being not

so much. The film proposes a character to which the room will be subjected to harsh tests to break it down,

strange events, ghosts of the past that will make their appearance, heat, cold. �o intense, no possibility of

escape, everything is very good but at no moment does it manage to transmit to the spectator the sensation of tension,

claustrophobia and fear of having to a, he even makes the mistake of allowing himself to be frightened by another scare that does not

come to mind. It can be seen, but one expected something more than a film that promised to be at the head of

this year's terror.One year, in M� ���s All��� de Ori���n, I have tried to follow the most accurate possible of the festival

and everything that I have been watching, commenting on each film as best as possible and giving my humble opinion. I hope that I

served you at least to have a reference, then we will agree or not, but that is another song.

" 0

" I hope that if there is a third party, send a kick to the director and the script team and take

care of the franchise, someone who knows how to give us a more adult film and a show. ass better than seen

so far.

To say that this sequel is better than its predecessor would be to say a lot, because the truth is that it moves within

the same patterns, affects the same mistakes and shortcomings and the only thing that improves are theeffects

special, something m�� Logras achieved due to your larger budget. Even though its director Tim Story promised us

that this second part was going to be much better, the truth is that it has become a loose continuation of an already

loose first part. Our 4 protagonists they move by null motivations, something that in the first

part was more defined, and here they are militated only to have stupid conversations with children's di ,logos,

Johnny Storm is still the same pimp pools that before and in this sequel he decides to conquer a cold

army soldier who always gives him pumpkins until he discovers that he also has his little heart, and

ends up falling in love, one of the many tonter� There are plenty of gui���n left over, La Cosa continues with her tacky polispan costume

and with her constant tantrums with Johnny that have no kind of grace anymore, Sue Richards does more than woman

vase than anything else, and lives more concerned about their wedding than salt Go around the world, go superheroine, and

finally Reed Richards who seems to have a better time making junk and investigating than getting into bed

with his wife, which is already a crime with the woman who has, this one he worries more to save the world than his wedding

and he goes hiding from his wife, who every time he catches him investigating has a couple crisis. Some

characters that are a compendium of clichés very tired and tired, and totally devoid of any interest. But

the problem is not only that the characters are poorly defined and interpreted and are in profile flat, is that the

approach and development of the film is also flat and simple, it lacks rhythm and action, the family seems a

group of puppets that at no time come to believe they are able to save the world or anything for many

powers that have and if we add the tease of having a Galactus in the final scene

represented as a giant hurricane, the result is much m��� s low than expected and the feeling that, in

other hands, the film would have given much more than yes. I hope that if there is a third part of a

kick to the director this and the scriptwriting team and take care of the franchise, someone who can give us a movie

. As an adult and a better show than the one seen so far, I think that Los Fant���sticos deserves it.

" 0

" More of the same, but worse. Already estA.To say of those who are enthusiastic with stories like those counted here, The search 1.0 (delivery Disney

affiliated with the fashion of templars, treasures and various Rosicrucians) supposed a fresh air in the lnguido panorama of

adolescent cinema with ���nfulas to entertain the eventual adult. I subscribe that such a zero point left me a

pleasant impression because I recognized an interest in renewing the genre and producing something always desirable: that people

go to the cinema and leave with the deep sensation that he has not been deceived and that the time, among the many that make

our lives shaky, has been pleasant and even recommendable. I understand that sometimes this is enough that I say so that the

cinema, understood as pure evasion, sustains the fragile leisure building in its own time, our

plenipotentiary gadgets, band wide in the pocket of the jacket and adrenaline speed downloads with nohalf-hearted

other effort than aclick. That's why I went to see this delivery two zero point with a sincere out of

enthusiasm. I knew they could give me a cat for a hare, as they say; I knew that the clever Disney geniuses

could set up a theme park in the form of frames, a kind of sanctuary for the loop: everything that has

been tested and has given results should not be modified. In the absence of sumptuous treasures (there are, how not) it

was about finding an unexpected turn, an ace in the jeweled sleeve of the producer's jerifaltes, who did not

hesitate to pull a checkbook to bring Helen Mirren or Ed Harris, who along with Jon Voight or Nicolas Cage

collaborated to give cin���filo packaging (alas, qu��� hip���rbole) to the then demonstrable engendrillo. What is at issue, in

the background, is to bill a family cinema free of folds, well packaged and adorned with a lightweight encyclical

background, of cult taste and, in the end, f�� Easily removable. What was once passion for

archeology, a mixture of Kipling, London, the best Verne and even a wisp of urban Indiana Jones, is here a

Christmas filling not entirely from ���able, but repetitive ad nauseam and lacking, here is the real pain, of the

most adventurous spirit of the first franchise. They have not known or have not wanted to give a dramatic body

and have been content to present situations that do not differ only from those already contemplated in the

work that opens the series (as there are ��� Search, do not doubt this) and that are also based on pillars of

very weak credibility (that of looking for the lost honor and restitution of the surname to the place that corresponds to it in

History, be this what it has to be, that there is no room for entering into this domestic review). The patriotic scent does not

leave the sensitive spectator get carried away by the mere fascination of the ups and downs of the adventure: there is an

excess of montuno nationalism, which attempts against a minimal sense of that history to which they push us as if

it were a cap Title of the daily session of the Congress of the United States of America. In the absence of

several centuries of history, the American people amplifies the title of the show that theirs, succinctly

, has to occupy pages in school textbooks. There is in this film an unbearable (at

times) hodgepodge of chapters that, when engaged, chirp in excess and disorient thepursuit

reasonableof the only truly important: entertain without manipulating , to offer a worthy show (itnot

isthat this one is not) without offending anyone who, apart from the necessary dose of evasion, wants the required

training. It is one thing not to tell the truth and another, very different, symbolically punishable taken to its extreme,

to try to catch butterflies in flight when what stands on the ground is a report and nothing orchestrated

fly swarm. The deceit, the scarce effort of the managers of the plot, lies also in the

fragility with which we are presented with the clues, the keys, the secrets revealed and leading to the

final pyrotechnics, which I will tell here, but that Turteltaub solves with the same aquatic and baroque texture with

which he finalized the previous delivery. Jerry Bruckheimer, the new Midas of the visual pyrotechnics andbox office

greedy, has put his divine eye on a product of proven acceptance among the chiquiller���ae even

among the sometimes undemanding adult section. It is unforgivable that the movie acquires brags and let itself be

contaminated by the same excellent sins of the first one when we have already done an hour of footage: until then

everything is boring, everything is carried away by a know what to do that exasperates the public ivoid of action and that

contributes to forget before the foreseen this deceptive Christmas candy of espíritu family and breath

mercantile to boredom. Only (I insist) the mejunje acquires a lasting flavor when the action is

run over and the characters (lacking a true link, pushed to advance in the plot as soldiers,

as puppets vapid) they enter caves (Mount Rushmore) that hide passages, traps, keys and - in

short - the operatic and guignolian relict of archetypes that usually adorn all the films of the

genre. To enter the oval office by the face and the reckless daring of walking through Buckhingham Palace without

the estuary police machinery of his Majesty alert of the mess sounds excess, to cast a

parliament of t��� at ��� with the President of the United States and kidnapping him for three minutes to entangle him

in a slimy affair sounds like Disney House brand roll. Hence that shameful feeling (one is good,

deep down) of feeling disappointed, reasonably disappointed. More: all the treasures that appear in these

films, kind and patient reader, are in caves. Until then, everything is perfect. Mother Nature offerss���tanos

fathomless, oblivious to the intrusiveness of the curious citizenship and the casual attitude of an inspired, but it is a

treasure hunterscam that all the treasures (I repeat) are safe for centuries. An uncomfortable eye and waiting for Nicolas

Cage, what a hair, what gestures, and that everything falls apart. Even the oil placed ad hoc in a wonderful cistern and

that illuminates the scene sounds formidablely to animated fantasy of yesterday and today. I can not avoid (a couple of

days ago I saw her) remember the laughter (I alone, with no one supporting me) that I gave when the Indians' gold

illuminated the screen of the room. What a fill. What astonishing satiety. What a grotesque. What you want to make money and

what I tried to justify the gain. Addendum: and I have not told anything on page 47, but that is already part of the

delivery 3.0 and that will arrive with the next polvorones.

" 0

" It will suppose a promotion of the love of good cinema, since the unwary who fall into their networks, the next time they

hear about it, they will run away in the film library m�� It's close to envisioning the work of geniuses such as

Bergman, Fellini or Kurosawa.

Submerged as we are in the vor���gine of the Christmas holidays, the cinemas are preparing for a tough battle

to decide which movie will be the one that reigns in this ��� little vacation Traditionally they were animated tapes,

but that changed five years ago when two of the most important film sagas of the last a llegaron

arrived. os: The Lord of the Rings and Harry Potter. And given the enormous benefits that the trilogy based on

Tolkien's work will bring, Fox brings us Eragon, a new ���pico-fantastic story with which he tries to continue with that

good data of The film is based on the novel by Christopher Paolini, a teenager when he started

writing it, who came to the fore in the same year that The Return was released. King. As the brilliant

Groucho Marx would say, what a coincidence that so many coincidences happen coincidentally, because the work of Paolini (still

unfinished, since the third volume of the trilogy is missing) is prima sister of the great work of Tolkien. The

story takes us to Alagasia a fantstica land which governs the cruel king Galbatorix (John Malkovich).

The few who oppose him find their hope in Eragon (Edward Speleers), a young peasant who is

chosen to be a new Dragoneur Rider, the only person who could challenge the cruel king. With such

wicks one would expect an exciting treble tape, although the reality is disappointing. To say that Eragon has

a teenage, even childish, temper is to fall short and insult the intelligence of the youngest. That the

film is intended for children is evident, for more than the producers, in a spectacular pirouette, they have

endeavored to sell it as a thrilling story of fantasy and adventure. The argument, ofsimplicity

insulting, will bore both small and old, and will provoke more than a strategic withdrawal in the middle of the

projection. . Stefan Fangmeier, a former technician of the Industrial Light and Magic, confronts such a monumental burden

by the simplest path, and instead of seeking innovation in the visual aspects, he limits himself to copy

(many planes are identical) the work of Peter Jackson in The Lord of the Rings. As if the ordeal was not

enough, the unknown Edward Speleers contributes enthusiastically and remarkably to prolong the agonies of the

spectators with his insufferable interpretation. Of Jeremy Irons, John Malkovich and Robert Carlylebetter not

wetalk. We must admit that Eragon will suppose a promotion of the love of good cinema, since the unwary who fall into

their networks, the next time they hear from her, she would run away in the closest film library to watch

the work of geniuses such as Bergman, Fellini or Kurosawa.

" 0

" Under the direction of Greg McLean, it is worth highlighting the final section of the film. In broad daylight the

hunter pursues his prey. And, in the absence of cinema, v���sceras. And the spectator continues digesting so much cruelty,

even when?

The list is very high. Accustomed the viewer to see anything on screen, cruel andscenes

sadhave crossed the genre of terror (it is enough to remember the final scene in HANNIBAL, withbrain

Ray's semi-openLiotta). The public expects the most novel impact, most extra���o���s intense. arriving at a

moment where he is not surprised, nothing surprises him. In recent years the horror genre has revisited

successful formulas of the 80s, with the background gore and with the remake as a graceful exit to a crisis of

originality. So, in the absence of new stories, the main objective is to impact (as does television

or internet). Except for JEEPER CREEPERS, the vast majority of semi-productions -independent has bet

on the classic and well-known story of young lost in an inhospitable place and that, inevitably,

have to face crazy or family of crazy, thirsty for meat and blood. The current horror cinema drinks

directly from emblematic works such as 2000 MANIACOS, THE KILLING OF TEXAS and THE HILLS HAVE EYES. Thus,emerges

for example, the devil HOSTEL. And, from time to time, the Australian cinema (as an extension of anyproduction

North American) contributes its bit to the genre. Singular proposals were in his day movies such as

TOTAL CALM or HIGHWAY TO HELL. With WOLF CREEK, the same thing does not happen. The same story: three friends who

decide to spend their vacations in a place called Wolf Creek, have a mishap with the car and accept the help

of the strange man named Mick Taylor. From there, you can imagine. And if we add to all this the

"based on real events", we return to what I was saying at the beginning. The horror cinema in particular is

making use of a purely mediatic language, moving away (sadly) from the cinematic. In this case, it

conveys the idea that what we are seeing is reality (as it happens with TV Big Brother). Nothing beyond

the reality (worth the redundancy). Under the direction of Greg McLean, it is worth highlighting the final section of the

film. In broad daylight the hunter pursues his prey. And, in the absence of cinema, v���sceras. And the spectator

continues digesting so much cruelty, even when?

" 0

" If someone ever speaks ill of my first performance will mean several things, including that has been

released, which is a reason for celebration in this our country.

If someone ever speaks ill of my first performance will mean several things, among them that has been released,

which is a reason for celebration in this our country. Shadow Forest, Koldoanticipated first performance

Serra's highly(I highly recommend Mother's Love, I like it more than the multi-awarded El tren de la bruja) is

halfway between the tribute sense and the personal debut. A story that does not exist, characters we do not

know and a cold resolution without claw do not help improve the work. Positive aspects for example, Oldman and

Considine are fine ( not very) and Homar has a role with many secrets and secrets that unfortunately wenot

willknow jam���s.No yes, I expected something more claw and a little more chicha, especially in the"section

SPOILER trigger "" the move and". However, despite its flaws, I'm sure Serra har

something big soon.

" 0

" In some moments it becomes predictable, namely, the good, the bad, a spiked leaf ��� what will happen? No

need to wait long, to guess, the vehicle of "" the bad guys "" is a truck where to end the tape then?

At the time, when I saw "" Casino Royale "", the new adventures of the new 007 I said and I quote "" could

go through any other action tape, if it were not for the eternal franchise 007 "", add thefranchise

007to the "" Die Hard "" (your name in VO) and we have cleared the equation, and that is, we are facing a tape

more than action that, carried out, once again by Bruce Willis, that after his success in this saga he was fed up to make

films of this kind, and accompanied Justin Long, a kid who has gone from less to more in this of accompanying

stars on screen, and we will end up seeing in the soup. The plot, fleetingly inspired by an article

of a magazine (hey no novels are needed already in this film.), we must go with the times, revolves around

a group of computer terrorists (French, who has badly sat the States that France there is no given

his French arm on the subject of Iraq), which pretend, to make the Chaos theory that Jeff Goldbum already formulated in

"" Jurisdictional Park "" is a game of children, compared with the one that they want to roll these in Washington. It is also true

that informatically it is "" a ghost movie "" and that is, for a server that has a good time part of hisday

workingsurrounded by "" idems "" do not believe many of the things that, covered in the broadest of the computer,

appears on screen, by much conception of the unreality that one tries, and pretends, to put itself in situation. It is

impossible to see this scene and not to let go !! AMOS COME YAAAA !! , and that is, in this type of cinema one has to be

with the mind ready to receive all kinds of ANIMATED FANTASIES OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY. By Bruce Willis not only ifpass

the years, but also the kilos, and he looks older, broken and in some scenes with the face of "" I can not live with my

life "", on the other hand, and seeing the good work of the character played by Mary Elizabeth Winstead (her daughter on the

screen) One can think of a good Spin Off, starring Baby Mclane, give ideas to this world of

Hollywood, lacking them. Once again the music is again, once more. s, what badly accompanies

recent action movies, thunderous, and uncoordinated, okay, I understand that it is teenagers who pay their

entrance to see such a great show , but it is that one ends with pain of ears of so much noise that pretends to be music.

Many times we complain that in the American cinema, they treat the spectator as if he were a fool,

explaining things over and over again, however, in this film it is the opposite, well that is that

at 10 min. there is already a shoot-out, and they have put us "" in flour "", but would not it have been better to explain the

deaths of the first minutes? Especially funny are 2 references that themovie

most current actionbuff will find on the screen, one a Terminator (his figure detonates the bomb of Justin's home) and another one to

Spawn, (a failure at the box office, figure to which Mclane starts "" without wanting "" an arm). Timothy Olyphant does not arrive

at any time to be a major villain, does not even reach the height of bet���na her predecessors, Maggie Q is no more

than the typical villanous vase and Kevin Smith (lately in any self-respecting film) here makes a

brief, almost fleeting appearance, which hardly contributes anything to the plot, in addition to the excellent product placement of

"" Microsoft "" and Xbox, with that covert advertising of the Gears of Wars, which appears on the scene 2 times and almost without

coming to mind. At times it becomes predictable , namely, the good, the bad, a spiked leaf ���

what to do? No need to wait long, to guess, the vehicle of "" the bad guys "" is a truck where to end the

tape then? A LITTLE OF ORIGINALITY, BY TUTATIS !! In short, summarizing, DISAPPOINTING, DISAPPOINTING, EXTREMELY

DISAPPOINTING.

" 0

" Greengrass dissects the film with tension and clinical spirit, so that as it moves forward, without losing

nerve or falling into the morbid, it will be gaining in emotionality and over all in an anguish that seems ours.

It is an extreme difficulty to recover through fiction, the story of a tragedy that was narrated in

real time by the televisions of the whole world and whose images have been assimilated en masse by our

media iconography Paul Greengrass, for his own vision of September 11, reduces all

possibilities to get the only valid, which is the crÃnica of what happened that day, without more

implications than to pay tribute to the victims; the one that tells the story of United 93, the onlyairplane

kidnappedthat did not reach its goal of United 93 could say that in a certain sense it is a kind of

making off about what CNN could count; therefore to the detriment of the visible, perpetrates in the entrancesboth

ofthe bases of operations and those of Flight 93. Greengrass dissects the film with tension and spirit

cl� Unique, so that as you move forward, without losing nerve or falling into the morbid, go gaining in emotionality and

especially in an anguish that seems ours. That is the key to this collective history of anonymous faces

called United 93: its honesty, so brutal that it surprises the profound naturalness of its images that

CNN would like for itself.

" 1

" Cinema is cheating, after all. Haneke dominates the cinematographic medium, but makes fun of a spectator

whom he manipulates with style. The cinema is manipulation, after all.

The intellectuals, in France, are legi������n, they are heroes, they are admirable, they are respected. The Gallic intellectual is

relieved of the mundane commitment to the routines of a Stakhanovite and proletarian work and is occupied in a

microphone or given a column to live exempt from the vulgarity of the vulgar and that altar despotrique

with dispassion against the discourse of the social, the political plot and the forms of culture. The

protagonist of this film, Georges Laurent, played magnificently by Daniel Auteil, is that hero: the

character who does not build his life under the avatar of the classic classic mode , but that climbs in the

society as the warrior of anta���oy occupies an irreplaceable place, the place of the critic. That, in Spain, is

still unthinkable. France, in terms of secularism, in these fringes of culture, has been forty years ahead of us.

Haneke, the director, is one more critic: one who he has enthralled the public revelation of thecorrection

politicalunder which they palpitate, festers, lies, disasters, miseries and barbaries of varied fur. Haneke

raises a fable about the hostility of the Welfare State, a moral tale about the fragility of this

Europe of alliances and pacts fragmented by too powerful local imperatives, represented by a man

of letters, a recognized intellectual who notices how something or someone films him and send him the tapes of that

recording. This feeling of being spied produces a series of foreseeable consequences, but one departs from the

logic, which is what supports the bulk of the plot of the film. Laurent begins to question very seriously his

life to the point of investigating with quasi-selective vocation about his own existence, about his own past.

Theirs is the last of France since World War II sealed the wounds of centuries of

resignations and fractures sociales.Embutido a bombastic design thriller, Cach exhibits ms convincing

mastery of the narrative. The plot is opening new frames and closing others accurately. The degree of

suspense is, however, abruptly aborted. It is not possible to liven up a film of this political depth without

commercial concessions, at times, appearing too light. As if Haneke knew that he must

lower the doctrinal and apocalyptic tone and allow bits of sanity, fresh air, comets that fly the

hope of redemption. The language, excessively el���ptico, fragmented, as broken to post, requires taking

a very active position in the viewing of the film: fiction and reality, the traditional instruments

of literary composition , they are enshrined here formidably. Video tapes are traps of the real,bombs

ideologicalthat dynamite the rich book life of a fully functional, integrated marriage and, above

all, , fictitiously armored before the rigors of reality. When the mechanisms of protection are deactivated,

life becomes a thriller, adopts nuances of pure suspense and ends, obliged and stubbornly, questioning the

true nature of the human soul, which connects the banal with the tragic , the strictly cultural with the

pathological. The film closes without closing: it proposes everything without giving valid solutions. There is a feeling of

deception. Cinema is cheating, after all. Haneke dominates the cinematographic medium, but makes fun of a

spectator whom he manipulates with style. The cinema is manipulation, after all.

" 0

" It is a film with a clear pretension of shameless mimicry, of imitating garbage without

reformulation but not sustained in a greater imagination or creativity. With which the goal is

complete: trash is and as such should be treated.

First segment of a production divided into two parts designed with the exclusive purpose of recovering and remixing

all the flavor and aesthetics (?) Of the films called "" z series "" , including the imitation of the

structure in the typical "" continuous session "", including trailers of similar films in theme and purpose, both

at the beginning and at the end of the basic narrative. Robert Rodriguez opens this dialect-tribute to the trash cinema,

which moves in the field of the evocation of subgroups and clichés "underground", especially thefilm

horrorstarring the zombies that appear here Gog a "" anything goes "" not remain indifferent to

ningn spectator who go to theaters with or without knowledge of cause. Obviously, to a film in

which Rodriguez does not intend anything other than to have fun recreating a frenzied show of hemoglobin combined with

science fiction, sex, black humor and odd allusions post -popular, we can not ask you to offer

intellectual or artistic values ​​beyond that scope, but what is done is still a recreation carried

out by two capricious filmmakers and masters of the kisch review; The only thing that they raise is a hyp���rbole

of a subgenre forgotten by the industry several decades ago. In some moments, said hip���rbole reaches

the magnitude of a macabre wit and sadism that in no way deviate from the conventional model and that we have already

seen in hundreds of equally bad films. A film for shabby-bizarre fun, cinema

subjected to a garbage treatment under the nostalgic inspiration, and it is reasonable to think that a large part

of the spectators will come out In the cinema with a smile of satisfaction. However, for aesthetic purposes, we

must also recognize that it is a nice joke that some cretins will sell it to us as if it were a work

of art. Extraordinary statements require impeccable arguments. Some unsuspecting people will say that

the absence of pretensions is a trick in their favor, which is totally wrong. It is a film with a

clear pretension of shameless mimicry, of imitating garbage without any reformulation (the only thing it

does is multiply the effects and the effectivity, but not sustained in a greater imagination or creativity -

saving some punctual moment, let's say, for example, the unforgettable "" girl leg of stick-machine gun "" - but

in a bigger economic budget ). With which the goal is complete: trash is and as such should be

treated.

" 0

" Taking advantage of the good reception of clunkers as? Hostel ?, and with no geographical and historical knowledge,

the American scriptwriters, once again, insist on insulting international intelligence.

Disappointing, even for the most fervent subgreen lovers.

Species of end-of-career project that, inexplicably, obtained financing and subsequent distribution.

Taking advantage of the good reception of clunkers as "" Hostel "", and with no geographical and historical knowledge, the

American scriptwriters, once again, insist on insulting international intelligence. Disappointing,

even for the most fervent subgreen lovers. Based on the typical formula of "what seemed like paradisiacal

vacations, they became a nightmare," in the paranoid obsession of the Americans. for

always being in danger, especially in those places where the magic words "" I am a citizen of

the United States of America "" mean nothing, and in the exploitation of international fears; Tourists is not

just any horror film. In reality, it is nothing more than a crude compilation of all kinds of situations

and dialogues inherent to this kind of stories, supported in the classic faces of "" we will all die "" that,

due to their implausibility, lead, irremissibly, to the tedious mockery. For that reason, in many passages,

John Stockwell's film (���dolo del aire in his youth) does not reach the category of "" film "", translating into a

kind of end-of-career project that, inexplicably, obtained financing and subsequent distribution,

perhaps, to take advantage of the rubbish of clunkers as the saga of Hostel.Su gui���n? from beginning to end- not only

presents as the paradigm of disbelief, but that, in a systematic way, he insists on insulting the

intelligence and the common sense of the spectator. In this regard, we admit the unlikely possibility that a

group of brainless adolescents, after suffering an accident that places them in the middle of nowhere, will focus all

their energies and concerns on how to enjoy the gastronomic and sexual pleasures of a place that they do not

know (meaning the plan of a used condom). However "" the occurrence "" is executed by

eight forties, must be the pear lemon. In the same way, we accept the existence of a luxurious mansion

that is located in the interior of the most absolute poverty, although it belongs to the uncle of a humble young man who was

found in the beach. Of course, that this house is equipped with security cameras of the latest technology,

rich delicacies, rum and jeans of the exact size of a of the protagonists, have to be

more than enough reasons to start suspecting its inhabitants. It gives the feeling that the children of the USA

never read La Casita de Chocolate. As the Swedes did, they are bound and

gagged, in the purest style of Apocalypto. On the other hand, it would be no more if Stockwell were to

explain at what exact point of the Brazilian geography the sea and the jungle come together, what in ten hours of

hiking the intensity of the sunlight remains unchanged and at what historical moment the Swedes,

Australians and Americans loot Brazilian rubber and sugar. (With this last premise, fear would have to

give Spaniards summer in Latin America). Not counting the bad taste that places the action somewhere in

Brazil, as if in the Bush empire there were no such practices, psychopaths and nationalists

"" altruists "". For this reason, it does not even convince the supposed social criticism that it proposes, nor the original

twist that is observed in the mythic guia de Coma, the famous history of Robin Cook, who will take

Michael Crichton to the screens. The development of the plot, on the other hand, the result of a precise and exasperating

irregularity, crowned by the uncertain measurement of the times, contributes to finish off an ill-fated product,

totally dispensable for the history of cinema, which should never have gone beyond its borders. nor see the light.

It surprises the simplicity with which the outcome is approached, as well as the impudence with which thefactor is truncated

surprise, the unhealthy recreation of the native hinds, the painful planning of the events. Theis also given

factthat even the magnificent underwater scenes lose their brilliance by being

repetitive, incurring another guiding error, which makes it possible for the foreigners get to mock the

locals in their own caves. A film, in short, that will not convince lovers of suspense, or

terror, or the followers of Peter Jackson, master Gore A story that even the addicts and

unconditional of some of these genres can not defend.

" 0

" The movie is a fun and exciting story of muggers and policemen. Highly recommended to have

a good quality time.

We could recently read that Spike Lee's new movie had been number one at the American box office. The

first director of this "independent" director. Well, yesterday I was able to attend the preview of this film, with

invitations through and that I greatly appreciate my friend from Vigo;) Inside Man (here horrifically entitled

Hidden Plan) could be described as one of these turns of some directors as personal as Woody Allen

with his Match Point or Cronenberg with A History of Violence. They are directors (or authors, for those who prefer

a touch "European" ") who contributed their style and demonstrated their talent in films that we could call

gender and that are tremendously attractive . In addition, they are a confirmation of the versatility of these

filmmakers. Because Spike Lee's new film belongs to the police genre. And the truth is always appreciated the hand

of someone who has style for this kind of stories. The plot begins when the character of Clive Owen

plans a robbery to a bank. But it is a perfect plan. Obviously we do not know anything about the plan. Denzel Washington

is an inspector who has to deal with the situation, since the robber has hostages. Willem Dafoe is the head

of special forces and works closely with him. However, the owner of the bank, Christopher Plummer,

wants to recover something from that branch and for that he sends a mysterious and attractive Jodie Foster. The film is

a fun and exciting story of muggers and police. Why fun? Because there are moments of

authentic humor that sadly can be real. It gives the sensation. On the other hand it is based on stereotypes of the

calculating robber but not at all bad and the honest, naive and somewhat tontines policemen. The

interpretations are more than correct, although the character of Owen must be most frustrating because you can barely

see his face during the movie. ���One signature of an auteur cinema But of an interesting and exciting situation

like the robbery of a bank with hostages, the movie happens to have moments of irregular rhythm. On the other hand, you

can not miss the social criticism of Lee with minifrases and minipersonajes vindicating, but hey, you

know that with money you can adopt any speech and leave anything. To not reveal anything

important, the film , which lasts two hours and little, gives a turn in the final half hour that aims to make sense of

everything that happened. The ending is "" moderately "" surprising, correct and at the height of this type of films that

aims to give a plot surprise. Does this get it? with some other but. There are many questions

and doubts, especially the character of Owen, but in fact it gives a little bit because the scriptwriter prefers to

portray the true bad guys in this story in a subtle but clear way for the viewer. Some may

end the film a bit fly and dissatisfied, but the balance will be positive because what he has seen has the

hand of Lee and has signed a more than decent entertainment. It is highly recommended to have a good

quality time. Eye to the music of Terence Blanchard (the John Williams of Spike Lee): very in its line but very

interesting.

" 1

" It does not convince either lifelong moviegoers or video gamewho want to see on the

connoisseursbig screen the existential hot flashes of their hero, lost in a ghost town

Without knowing yet if we attend a dramatized film or video game, Silent Hill does not convince either lifelong moviegoers or video game console users

who want to see on the big screen the

existential hot flashes of their heroine, lost in a ghost town in search of a daughter. Nor does he sink as he would

like his narrative discourse in the romantic traditions of the Propp story. Miss the dramatic texture

of the characters, who come out here and there with practically nothing to contribute to the plot. It abuses the

aesthetic mtv of expensive video clip in two hours and little apotheosis of superficiality. I'm left with thefog

sublimethat covers Silent Hill. Whoever goes to the cinema to find pure gore, will discover a l���nguido hybrid whose

structure is dispersed, if not emptied. That the protagonist is a woman, to the director's comment, gave a

greater credibility to his mission, that is, to find the lost daughter. Ara���ar those sentimental fringes, rush that

constructivist vision of cheap melodrama, rather than give packaging to the product, frivolizes it, leaves it at aheight

sad. We did not go to see movies either, commented a friend. We could have lost more time at home, taking

from the video library, The Grapes of Wrath, by John Ford. Tonight I'm going to put it on and enjoy another

vision of the Deep America, so trite, but this time with infinite sweetness and Art, so, in May ���sculas.

Blessed is the cinema that has jewels to alleviate the soul.

" 0

" Although the film begins as a deep exploration of the soul of the current woman, the plot soon

leads to the pure follet���n.

Since its inception, cinema has always been linked in a very special way to literature, both

classical and contemporary. There are authors especially loved by the cinema, whose works tend

to be easily taken to the big screen, in most cases for purely commercial reasons, with the

intention of dragging a large number of loyal readers and potential spectators. Almudena Grandes is one

of those writers, since five of her novels have made cinematic versions. Atlas ofGeography

Humanmeans the return of Azucena Rodr���guez to the cinema after m��� It's ten years of absence, and he does so by facing the

challenge of adapting the novel by Almudena Grandes. The story focuses on the lives of four women, Ana (Cuca

Escribano), Fran (Rosa Vila), Rosa (Montse Germ���n) and Marisa (Mar���a Bouzas), and their emotional problems.

Although the film begins as a deep exploration of the soul of the current woman, the plot soon

drifts to more rugged paths, and finally ends in the pure follet (or culebr��). ,N, as you prefer). The greatest

virtue of the film is the sensation of verisimilitude and reality that it transpires, with characters that are well-

constructed and easily recognizable to the viewer, with whom you can feel identified. To this they

contribute very notably his quartet of protagonists, very well directed by Azucena Rodr���guez, and that they

realize some really excellent interpretations, and we hope that they do not forget them inthe

front ofGoya.Atlas de Geograf���a Humana, in spite of being a sentimental leaflet, is still an acceptable

film that can be seen as long as it has the predisposition of the public. And watch out for the gui���os to

Almudena Grandes and Gerardo Herrero with Los Difficult Difficulties, and Unaware of Joaqu���n Oristrell.

" 0

" Irregular film of science fiction. Second of the adventures of the ���h���roe? Riddick, who began his career in the entertaining series B "" Pitch

Black "" Here, following the character we have very different facts, that is, it is not a continuation but

simply uses the same character to tell another thing, although, logically, David Twohy, its creator,

continually makes reference to his past (even seeing scenes of Pitch Black) to show us his evolution

and its origin, its origin.In "" Cr .nicas. "", it is noted that there is more budget, and it is used above all in the

artistic direction and special effects . Normal in this genre. Artistic direction is irregular,

taking advantage of (it seemed to me) decorated with the first. But the interiors of the ships are very successful.

As for the story itself, which is what I'm always interested in a film, it

has everything. From moments of filling with ghosts (one gets tired a little bit that the protagonist is

almost impossible to touch a hair in the fights and if it is achieved, in spite of the brutal blows, it does not become morewound

than a littlewithout importance) and scriptual inconsistencies to tutiple, to scenes well filmed with

tension and sense of the show. All this to reach a, for my taste, satisfactory final, ambiguous and

designed for a third party, of course. The interpretations, in general lines, are normal although

hard, although contemplate Thandie Newton is a joy. Always a good actress, each film more beautiful. To

emphasize the di���logos between the personage of Newton and her husband, who remind me, and it is not a joke,ap���ginas

Shakespearean; and especially the character of the Purifier. A curious and very beautiful character, exemplified

by Linus Roache. In short, irregular and improvable but entertaining, although somewhat chaotic. Wait

(I'm not in a hurry, really) the third part.

" 0

" A person who can be shot and interpreted with mastery. Effective and forceful. An authentic Dragon Khan

located inside a tunnel of terror, with the only drawback that there are no harnesses or

safety belts here ...

A m��� Jaume Balaguer��� has always left me indifferent. Darkness was SO loose that I almostasleep in the cinema

fell(in fact, a colleague of mine did), and scared, more or less. Frgiles was correct, but neither did he,

at least in me, fulfill his goal of frightening; it made me laugh, because the final bisho was a poorly made copy ofof

the typical ghostly spectersthe -overrated- Japanese horror movie, which is so � fashionable -copy-

now. Not to mention OT: The movie. And Los sin nombre, I have not seen her yet.But REC, her last creation with

Paco Plaza, has left me fascinated. and distressed xD.The dynamic catalanovalenciano day successfully recycle

a genre that needed several electroshocks to give pull in this business of entertainment.

One of the electros that they use for this film, is the format of the false documentary camera in hand, to the

Project of the Witch of Blair. And as I said, FUNCIONA.Actualmente, very few people are scared to see

four or five zombies hungry for blood and monsters chasing the staff. But just as thehave shot

film Balaguer��� and Plaza, they get all (at least 98%) of the room to surrender to a climax of tension in

darkness, hysteria and uncertainty. They make the viewer restless and nervous; that

shrinks in the chair and covers his eyes. or, that he stays completely in tune with the projection, without

blinking and without losing any detail, no shadow, no fright. All for not knowing completely

where the shots will go. Because we are facing a film that has foreseeable situations that in the end do not

end up being, and then surprise you from behind. And that in a film of this genre is very much appreciated. The

rhythm is a non-stop; it does not decay at any time. Only a quarter of an hour of relaxation in the eighty minutes of

footage. The rest, a group who can be shot and interpreted with mastery. Effective and forceful. A real

Dragon Khan located inside a tunnel of terror, with the only drawback that there are no harnesses

or safety belts here, nor witches have brooms to hit you , only his own hands and his disgusting

fauces. We are, for his very good atmosphere and because it is so fucking funny and entertaining, before one of the

best horror films of the day. each, and one of the best Spanish films of the year, shadingin

the commercial title of The Orphanagea surprisingly admirable way.

" 1

" If in the first two you've already had enough to see pranks in Tokyo, the skid is taken. Your partner will

thank you not to think of her to accompany you to see her.

Ideal movie to take the movies to your summer league and know first that at���, films with

emotional content and gui���n worked, neither fu nor fa. In the first ten minutes a busty blonde is auctioned

between her boyfriend and the prota for who wins a street race stay with her. Take it now Thus, it is as easy

to criticize this film as to say that in the cinema there are rows of seats. Sean is a high school kid (

his interpreter Lucas Black is 24 a ���os?) Who, after getting into a gang of illegal races, must take a trip

to Tokyo to live with his father and avoid prison. There he met another type of car racing, much more

dangerous, where the Japanese mafia is the last to have the word. In Spain the t��� has been avoided to translate.title

original, Tokyo Drift, since its literal sense would be "" Tokyo's drift "". That's what the movie is about, if in

the first two you've had enough of seeing capers and nitrous injection, in Tokyo the skid takes, and this

third part has a race between bad bad and good Vandal that is just skidding in a parking lot.

An ode to safe driving. I do not know if there is a points card in Japan, but only the protagonist already

owes 300 points before finishing the film. The grace of the film is to make as many

traffic violations as possible, as if your commission were synonymous with "" I am the best "" If the

protagonist flees from the USA to avoid jail, in Tokyo he perpetrates twice as many crimes, so he would

need a prison of those in which they put Claire Danes and Kate Beckinsale in another film. The debutante

Nathalie Kelley is Neela, the little sweetie that gets between the eye and the eye until she gets it based on little

runs and spinning. Normal, being the sister of the bad-mafioso, a graduate in maths is not going. It's

ironic, to see this movie you have to go as Homer Simpson: empty the brain and grab a beer.

Testosterone goes everywhere, the script is null and macho is like a film of Pajares-esteso, but

again, the brain cow, a beer is taken, and the movie of the week. It has been number 1 in the

Neanderthal Box Office. Your girlfriend-wife-partner will thank you not to think of her to accompany you to see her.

" 0

" A masterpiece of comedy and, moreover, a jewel of Cinema. His extravagance, his absurd logic and his very

high sense of dialogue endure in the memory of the cin���filo.

Howard Hawks said that the authentic drama is terribly close to being a comedy that, in general, has

been a minor genre within the history of cinema and even of the Literature. The number of filmmakers who have

dedicated their talent to "" screwball comedy "" goes from Hawks himself to Lubitsch, including Leo McCarey, Gregory

LaCava, Billy Wilder, George Cukor, Preston Sturges or Frank Capra and the actors who have immortalized thatcinema

crazy, of powerful visual gags and dizzying parliaments have been Jack Lemmon, Cary Grant, Katherine

Hepburn, Walter Matthau, Charles Coburn, Marilyn Monroe or Gary Cooper. I feel rejuvenated is a masterpiece

of comedy and, in addition, a jewel of Cinema. His extravagance, his absurd logic and his very high sense

of dialogue endure in the memory of the cin���filo. This light operetta of monkeys who postulate as

alchemists of eternal youth and acetate stockings is the quintessential genre along with La fiera de mi

ni���a, also by Hawks and with similar cast . In a Cary Grant is an introverted college professor who

lives to rebuild a dinosaur skeleton and get money for the museum he governs. In I feel

rejuvenated, Grant is an abstracted and responsible scientist who believes he has found the formula of eternal

youth, although reality confesses that it has been Rodolfo, the monkey of Indians, the primate imitator who , when

trajinar with test tubes and flasks, it gives with the holy grail of the eternal life. Hecht, Lederer and Diamond, who would later be

Billy Wilder's narrative escort in their best works, elaborate a fabulous script that would have charmed

Darwin and that, under a string, shows with iron� ��to the future of science and the inevitable interference of theworld

businessto take advantage of its progress and make cash at its expense. The title itself in English (Monkey Business,

monkeys business) uncritically introduces the guignolesco, bufo and sexy parade of the plot. A Marilyn Monroe

prude, stuffed in a narrow skirt until the coronary strangulation leaves her tits, pointing to

infinity with those fasteners of the ,pocas, so open and bid, steal (flat to flat) any

interest in what he says. Then there is the scene in which he plants his leg in front of the timorous professor Bernaby

Fulton so that he appreciates the quality of the stockings that he himself has invented. "Miss Laurel wasme

showingher acetates," Grant babbles before the brew manufactured by the chimpanzee

rejuvenates him, takes the Monroe out for a ride in a convertible or skids like a kid Theseregressions

agefavor that all the actors exhibit their more circus records. Even Charles Coburn himself,

impeccable always, makes the goose when Ginger Rogers, turned into a girl - I add that he never stopped being -

puts a fish under his belt. n. The mad pace, the continuous shaking of unlikely situations,

but here logic become the engine of a fast-paced action, which does not let you breathe. In these times, in

the movies made now that we have had to enjoy, are there any Hawks?

" 1

" Lynch gives us an unbeatable lesson on how to tell a story. Blue Velvet is an author's Thriller, a

shrewd radiograph of the idlic America, a spasm of the soul.

In the films of David Lynch there is always a moral imbalance, a kind of dissonance that, incases

extreme, gives the seasoned spectator a great spectacle of perversion, of twisting, but

Lynch never falls into the chabacano, you never allow the licentious gratuitousness of spoiling frivolities,

feelings of a flat nature: everything in it tends to convulse, everything is strutted to the

anomaly. Ah��� resides his singularity and his unquestionable voice in the cinema of the last almost thirty years. His

journey as director is a hazardous journey to the gloom of the human soul, a thorough journey through vice,

for sin, for loneliness and anguish: like a Tom Waits who leans on the bar of a bar and

sings / recounts the fights of the body, the spasms of the soul and the darkness of the heart. Lynch to

transmit atmospheres, sensations, colors: "" The world is strange "", says a character from Blue Velvet and

the ear cut off in the grass, like premonition What is going to continue, all that parade

of characters on the verge of madness or madmen in possession of an exact awareness of their blunder. As long as

Lynch has control over the final process of his work, there is products to wait very much height or

depth, authentic film, visceral, delivered from his v dizziness. That happened with Blue Velvet. Lynch was coming to make

Dune, which was a huge disaster. Dino de Laurentiis, the producer, vowed never to have a hallucinated man again,

according to what he said in the press, and David vowed not to have such a short-sighted man, although probably neither of

them I expressed with this semantic sweetness. Everything was a lie: they saw each other again in this film and the producer

decided to take his mistake in Dune and give the director carte blanche to make the film he wanted.

Fortunately. A sinuous camera travels the comfort of a comfortable street of family homes. We are

in Lumbort, a lumber town that seems painted so that Lynch refunds it with his palette of colors. Everything is

security, security. The human ear in the grass of the garden, while Bobby Vinton reels the

immortal Blue velvet, returns us to Lynch's brain, to his rupturist iconography, to his pact with the

twisted. An old man has what looks like a heart attack: the obstruction of his hose is the collapse of his heart

in a great shot of graphic concision. Jeffrey (Kyle MacLachlan) begins here to penetrate hell

itself. l be the driver of that shared hell that makes your perfect world steady girlfriend here)

(Laura Dern'sgreat totter when entering a rogue world of sadomasochism, cabaret and lightputiclub

thatincarnate Dorothy Vallens (Isabella Rossellini) and Frank Booth (Dennis Hopper), club singer and

crazed drug dealer, respectively. Jeffrey is the astonished voyeur of what, but unable to

look the other way. His eye is ours: his astonishment, ours. Jeffrey, without wanting it all, invests

as a researcher of the real: he scrutinizes what is visible to find what is cut off, the ears on the grass, whatnot

shouldbe, but it appears. The sickly color tone, the risky use of the ���sica, that at all times directs

the scale of feelings that are acquiring, as the dark plot progresses, all the protagonists. Then

Tarantino or Scorsese have used with equal talent the score, the soundtrack, but here the handling of the songs

is masterful. What counts Blue Velvet is the mask of the idlic America, its failure, the sweetened

wrapping and the bile flowing like a poison underneath, although Lynch gives us a lesson unbeatable of how to tell

a story (a kidnapping, let's say) and assume, as duped spectators, that history could not have

been told in any other way. I think that is the magic of a director. And Lynch is (at least here) to

a very high degree. And he has one of the best endings I've seen: a sudden return to where

we started, a tremendous denial of everything that We have seen. As if Tom Waits stooped to tell us the

numen that enlightens him and confessed to us, between bourbon and cigar puff, even if he says he does not drink and that he already smokes,

all the secrets of his wild, rotten heart �� Unique And the birds are trilling and the world is still spinning even though

we have witnessed a session of malignant beauty. The world is strange.

" 1

" Clich���st���picos Americans in a comedy that does not bring anything new to the genre, resulting insufficient and more

predictable. Run away now that you can.

The truth is that I expected much more from Todd Phillips in his return to the crazy American comedy after the

undervalued Road Trip, but School of pringaos is nothing more than a bullshit in the form of a movie . You will passoffices

through the ticketwithout pain or glory (except for your target audience) and go directly to the shelves of

our video stores where you will probably enjoy more success in the form of something to rent a Saturday

afternoon. Only with the title, -as always another last translation- can we predict that it awaits us. It is true

that you are not looking for a masterpiece in this type of film, but a minimum of entertainment and ingenious gags

that help you to disconnect for 90 minutes. And that's what this feature film lacks. With a humor of the

m���st���pico, the film is developed along a silly gui���n without any spark or comedy. Only the

interpretation of Billy Bob Thornton - with the voice of Dr.House - and a cameo by Ben Stiller is the most remarkable of

this tru���o devoid of grace. The main character overflows stupidity and indifference in equal parts, without

any funny scene; which if only a couple of secondary occasions succeed. Clich���st���picos

Americans in a comedy that brings nothing new to the genre, resulting insidious and predictable. Run away

now that you can.

" 0

" Felicity Huffman is fine, but not at all as great as some cackle. It is curious to see how even the cinema itself is torn between different pseudo-waves turned intofashion

temporary. It is enough that one throw the first stone so that the screen becomes a massive stoning.

Like everything in this world, it has its pros and cons. "" Transamerica "" plays a little with all those factors that

surround the supposedly sudden, innovative, daring and groundbreaking ideas. But, as what prevails in

cinematographic quality are other factors. It comes out a little bad. In the first place, those who think that the film

is terribly original because of, only, dealing closely with the subject of a transsexual, are very wrong. It

is not even the true background of the film. What I do appreciate is the boldness and self-assurance

with which a (possibly) controversial and controversial subject is played. But that is a double-edged sword. What

at first is a kind of road-movie to use (but absolutely with all the factors seen and

manidos) with a dramatic tone and dramatic background, degenerates into a succession of It is aof family entanglement

logical pathetic comedy, and it concludes, logically, as a drama spiced up with small chemical elements to

entertain the viewer. An evolution as orderly as obvious and predictable. The problem is that it is such adrama

simple and typical, hundreds of times seen in movies, that it needs a funny mask that makes it somewhat

endearing. And that mask, precisely, is what prevents the story is counted with the necessary claw

for us to put ourselves in the skin of Stanley / Sabrina with all the seriousness that requires it. As I said ,A, that

carelessness with which we are told about a subject so complicated for many is a point in favor, and, really, it can

be that way if you simply look for fun in the cinema. But seeing its lack of originality, it is difficult to ascend to

the film beyond a passing entertainment. We have all the ingredients of theroad-movies

tragic���mic. The frustration of a father / mother to discover the existence of a child, until today,

unknown. The coincidences that give rise, obviously, to that both coincide and they are known. The journey that they

undertake, that more than a trip is a clear McGuffin for a future redemption and a rediscovery of both.

trip more spiritual than physical, a journey in which, no matter how much Stanley / Sabrina looks for the element that will

definitely make her the woman she has always wanted to be, what ��� The only thing you will really look for is

acceptance and an encounter with your child. The redemption story that in essence is, does not do more than flood the

viewer in a continuous sensation of "" d���j��� vu "". The unspeakable secrets that are discovered along

the journey, the traumas of childhood that are revived by the intolerance experienced in front of a sexual (or

psychological) option, I will not analyze it) at ���pica, both in the family environment and in the social environment. The

fear of rejection and the replacement of a child who was not given all the love required by his condition as a

transsexual (here is the subject that he treats us, but any other reason or condition is valid and applicable). A

whole set of evidences that make the quality and originality of the final product too expensive. Because no, do notourselves

deceive. . The fact that we are told the story of a transsexual does not change anything. If it were a drug addict, achild

lost, a coward who leaves home because everything is complicated, or an abusive, surely the film would not

reach such levels of public interest. It would go unnoticed, since it is really what it would deserve.

History is the same as always. The only thing that changes is the sexual choice of its protagonist. But no. We must accept

that it is the story of a transsexual and that's why there will be a stir. And unfair criticism. They are things that happen. If

for that simple reason we have to label it as a movie, forgetting about its true quality and paying attention

to the commotion that it provokes. I will not get into that car. Also, Felicity Huffman is fine, but not at all

as great as some cackle to nominate or announce it with great fanfare. Overactive Pelt maybe. Therefore

, in short, it is an interesting work only as a portrait of a transsexual and the frustrations,

fears and prejudices of its environment. Although the story and its formal self-assurance are numbered in a tone so

humorous that, on occasion, it is a burden that prevents us from properly positioning ourselves in the complicated skin of the

character. The correct description is enough for us to understand the message it is trying to

send us. In addition, we must admit that the innocence, simplicity and lack of pretensions of greatness with

which the story is told is a fact in their favor. It gives off the classical aura of tranquility of the

purely "independent" films that are present, from time to time, on the billboard and that

turn into something incomitable. But we do not let's cheat I can upload some whole, but never turn it into a

great movie. It's so typical, repetitive and obvious that it does not bring anything new. The only thing that changes is the choice of the

protagonist, a change not valid to raise the quality of a film that has little to offer. Entertain, have

fun and little else. We are not in front of "Brokeback Mountain" level cinema (allow me to compare the

topics and to avoid a policy that would be unfounded, incoherent and ���pida).

" 0

" Follow the free fall of the poor ogre. For my taste it is the worst of the three parts by far. Afilm

loose, recommended only for bored children and adults.

Follow the free fall of the poor ogre. There was an irreverent, crude and sarcastic Shrek of which onlyremain

shadows. There was a silly, heavy and gracious donkey from which there is hardly any trace, and something similar could be

said about Fiona (who never had too much joke, everything is said) and even about the cat with boots, which he consolidates

as an inseparable friend of our monstrous friend. With Shrek Third, the magic of thisis definitely lost

tale, and it should be finished. Writers stretch and stretch, probably at the request of those

who smell and handle the money, but no longer know where to go. Resources are exhausted and the characters are

increasingly soft, less surprising, more. boring Also, this time there are no new characters. at least

none that stands out, that brings something new. The story, on the other hand, is relatively entertaining, but very

focused on a child audience. No more pranks and some other output of tone. Everything is

politically correct, no animal suffered while shooting this movie and blah blah blah. In short, that

the adult public can entertain the plot, but that has never been the great asset of Shrek. The genuine, the

authentic of this story of ogres, was the absurd gag, the nonsense, the bizarre situation. All that, in my

opinion, began to be lost in the second installment, and finally dies in the third. In short, for my taste it is the

worst of the three parts by far. A loose film, recommended only for bored children and adults (it was my

case). Anyway, if you do not have anything to do, if your partner or your children get involved, see it. Do not bore, and that

's something. Pity that the cinema has been set to 7 ?. If I had seen it on DVD maybe I would not have disliked it.

" 0

" Always remember the November 5th. Finally, after so long looking forward to seeing it (thanks to some very favorable reviews and a verytrailer

promising), I just arrived from the second session of V de Vendetta, cinematographic adaptation of thenovel

graphiccreated by Alan Moore (script) and David Lloyd (drawings), there by the eighties. My

expectations were very high, but always accompanied by a glimpse of bad vibrations, since the film's

gui���on runs by the Wachowski brothers, creators of Matrix. and its ineffable sequels. and with that

I think I've already told you everything. But, oh! Life gives you surprises; Each and every one of the expectations that I

had in this film have been fulfilled without any doubt, all contrary to the bad vibrations thatgave me

the word Wachowskibefore 19:00 hours of the day. Today, and that will not underestimateand

again.Vibrantapothetical, would describe the Vendetta V as the sensation of embobez that you have when witnessing an exhibition Den of

dominoes forming drawings, shapes and dimensions thanks to its peculiar effect, which has some

prominence in an excellent sequence of the final act of the tape. He knows how to maintain the rhythm minute by minute without

getting bored at all, even though there are three scenes of action counted with the fingers of the hand in the one

hundred and thirty-six minutes that the film consists of, thanks to a direction And impeccable and elegantin

gui���nidentical parts. Like some sublime performances by the whole cast, but especially by

Natalie Portman in a state of grace. A brilliant interpretation of his, that I would not miss anything that

took several nominations in various film certifications. And Hugo Weaving, the star of the show and

who plays V, an uncertain character hidden behind a mask of Guy Fawkes, whosewe can not see

facein the whole film, but that splurges a certain sympathy and an overwhelming charisma. I do not know if the V of

cinematographic Vendetta (and "directed" by James McTeigue) is a good adaptation of the graphic novel . But

one thing that I have been clar���sima: it is a film cojonuda. For all this I have mentioned, and for much

more, it deserves to spare the first 10 of the year. I will always remember November 5th.

" 1

" His defects are forgotten thanks to the interpretations, the wonderful music and the brilliant

direction of Kenneth Branagh.

Those who know me know that I try to focus on my comments to the purely cinematographic. However,

there are occasions, like this one, in which previous clarifications are essential. "" The Magic Flute "" (The Magic

Flute) is not a film for all p�� Public. I mean by that if you hate opera or classical

music this is not your movie. We are before an adaptation of a Mozart opera and, therefore, most of

the time the actors are singing opera. Surprising yourself, or feeling disappointed about it, would be

ridiculous. Now, if you like opera or, without being a lover of opera or music, you have an open mind

to enjoy new artistic experiences, then, and only then, let's talk about cinema. Because CINE, thus with

capitals, is what each and every one of the Kenneth Branagh's films to date (even the

least good ones). "" The Magic Flute "" starts with a (false) prodigious sequence shot, of those who make time, in

the that we move from the soldiers in the trenches to the planes fighting in the sky. With such a

brilliant start, Branagh creates a visual equivalent to the opera opening, masterfully introducing us

into the context in which the story will move. Before such an impressive start It is very difficult to maintain the

level throughout the entire film but, without reaching the genius of the sequence, the film achieves it and

Branagh demonstrates that he has not lost an inch of his claw. narrative. His work as a director is one of

the strengths of the film. Since the beginning of the project, everyone has had their (logical) doubts

about the work of the actors. There was a risk that by employing professional singers (something inevitable in

a project of this kind) they would lose their interpretative capacity. I have to say that not only is it not so, but

people like Benjamin Jay Davis (Papageno), Joseph Kaiser (Tamino), Ren��� Pape (Sarastro), Tom Randle

(Monostatos) or Lyubov Petrova (The Queen of the Night) are really well and some, like the aforementioned Jay Davis,

show a great visual. Maybe the weakest part in that section is Amy Carson, which is a little

dull. But the movie is not perfect. In fact, it has an important inherited defect, I think, from thescript

original: a certain lack of coherence. If in the original libretto these small inconsistencies can be excused

because it is a text full of references and masnic keys, in the film and already devoid of that

reading, it is not so excusable. In this way there are jumps in history that are strange, like seeingappear

certain charactersor disappear without explanation. There is also a scene that Branagh has solved with very

rapid inserts to try to explain parts of the story that would not be clear otherwise. The

result in that case is not entirely satisfactory and I could understand that someone called it videoclipera.

This happens, in any case, in a scene or two. What happens is that those defects, some importantly I insist,

remain for me almost forgotten thanks to some performances and, above all, to the wonderful Mozart score

(very accessible in addition to the profane public like me) and the brilliant leadership of a Kenneth Branagh that proves

that he remains one of the most visually interesting directors on the international scene. ��n final

of moonfleet.es: 8 out of 10.

" 1

" Richard Shepard directs and also writes the script remaining anchored in an unlikely succession of scenes

that sometimes touch the ridiculous

Richard Gere has become stiff. It's not as fresh as it was in the nineties and it shows in its tapes at last (it

has cost him but he has finally grasped the concept that being gray and sexy is not attractive when you're almost an

old man). In La Sombra del Cazador plays an intriguing war reporter who, in the midst ofretransmission,

Bosnia'sloses his key and begins to rant. Ten years after the conflict, the reporters return to the area

and they are reunited with their life-long camera (which is now a comfortable camera of the star presenter in

New York and he plays in conflict conflicts). Then he releases the bomb, he says he knows where to find

Zorro, a guy who controlled the land during the war with which he also has some outstanding accounts.

As the journalists are not stone they end up, along with the rookie on duty, kicking the mountain in search of the

bad guys. Richard Shepard directs and also writes the script remaining anchored in an unlikely succession of

scenes that sometimes border on the ridiculous. He does not opt ​​for social denunciation or thriller, so he decides to

use his three protagonists as a parapet, using his interpretations to save the tape. He misses

a little more coherence between the complaint and the actions that take place on the screen. In addition,

from a certain point, everything becomes a kind of film, whereseems to be more important

Gere's characterthan the objective of the group. a commercial product

either.

" 0

" So great is not. Haggis rolls well (he is 50 years old and works with Eastwood), but he is not a genius: he is the

creator of the series "" Walker Texas Ranger "".

For a while this part has been producing stories in Hollywood that seem to want to laugh at

people. Robert Altman directed in 1993 "" Lives crossed "" (Short cuts) and the fever of the coral movie began to

invade us. Altman's movie lasted three hours, as the putative daughter who arrived six years after the hand

of Paul Thomas Anderson, "" Magnolia "". They were two great movies. In 2003, Alejandro González Irírritu cheated us

all with "" 21 grams "", a kind of "" hagoloquequieroconmipelo "" cine version. Personally I think that "" 21

grams "" is made with discards of "" Amores perros "", it seems like a bad sequel, of those that you do not know well if they are

second parts, remakes, autohomenajes or that I know. "" 21 grams " "I had the script and the plot of a TV movie

, the editing was horrible and the picture came to load. I hate her almost as much as "" Extra���as

coincidences "", last year's movie that offended me but that very much. On this occasion, Paul Haggis, screenwriter of

" "Million Dollar Baby" ", debuts with grace at the beginning, stumbling before time and falling into a succession of

clichés that comes to despair at the end. The plot involves a series of characters (a couple of polis, a

locksmith and his daughter, a family of Apus, a rich marriage, it does not matter, because everyone has a thousand and one moves that

sooner or later face each other) in the already routine movie in medias res.I'm starting to To be fed up with the fact

that the choral tapes have to have an accident as a nexus (Ibritute has 2 out of 2 and I think the new one isgoing

alsothrough there) and having to put up with situations stupid (that slip of the Bullock in the staircase) to

come out of premises difficult to give during the resolution. ne interesting moments, such as the start,

with an interesting sequence shot, and the criminal act of the couple of black-and-white friends. What happens is that it

is anticlimatic and it does not surprise you at any time. We will never know what happens to many characters and just

like "" 21 grams "" rubs ridiculous in extreme situations (��� really it is so difficult not to ridicule the

supposed death that chains it Everything? It does not excite, and the worst thing of all is that in the end, when you joke with the

"" I'll drop frogs from the sky "" is about to happen. , say how cool it is, Haggis rolls well

(he's 50 and works with Eastwood), but he's not a genius: he's the creator of the "" Walker Texas

Ranger "" series. ends with a Stereophonics theme that does not hit or tails. Best regards.

" 0

" Children of men is the perfect excuse to love cinema, it works like a puzzle, nobody stands out more

than necessary, the star it is the film as a whole.

"" Some of the anticipated hazards that have been excluded from the list of accidents in the arguments that seem

too unlikely to cause an global terminal stre are: solar flares, supernovas,

explosions or fusions of black holes, gamma-ray bursts, implosions of the galaxy center,

supervolcanoes, loss of biodiversity, accumulation of pollution Atmospheric, gradual loss of

human fertility, and various religious views on the final day. "" (Nick Bostrom, director of the Institute for the

Future of Humanity of the University Alfonso) Cuar���n is a very peculiar type, capable of

approaching all kinds of movies, such as the entertaining "" Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban "", to give him a

new revision. �na the work of Charles Dickens with "" Grandes Esperanzas "" or make his most personal work to

date, the road-movie "" And your mam��� tambi���n "". I guess nobody bet on "" Children of Men "", beyond

several advances that aroused our curiosity. In my case, seeing it relatively late with respect to its

release, I was already predisposed to find me with something quite good, but everything that presupposes falls

short. It's (and I'm very sorry for Marty and his people) the best of the year (for want of seeing "" Babel "" and "" Flags

of our parents "" and some other premiere m� ��s, that as this continues so I will not have numbers to rate my

valuation). The story is sensational and terrifying: 18 years ago that society is doomed to extinction,

for unknown reasons (or lack that makes them know) Humanity has lost the ability to procreate. With

such a story we would already have enough for an interesting film, but Cuar���n includes otherevils

globalas a direct consequence of that problem and also derived from ours, that of now, the one of the 2007

recently released: the immigration, the poverty, the terrorism, the military control, the war and the hopelessness

before an uncertain future. And Cuar���n approaches everything from a pessimistic and spectacular prism, full of verismo.

It involves us in the story, we participate in the film, we feel. The narrative is beautiful. It is also capable

of embedding the camera in the most striking scenes of the film, giving it legs to run between chaos and

death, and making usto bring forward this jewel of science

Clive Owen, so that it is he who guides usfiction plant the charismatic (and many other things) on the road to

Tomorrow, giving him life as a great common hero. And also gives a small role to Michael Caine,

leaving us the most engaging and filmic sequences of the film. The case of Julianne Moore is different, her moment

is so well done that it does not matter at all not being able to enjoy her the rest of the film. Each secondary

(Chiwetel Ejiofor, Claire-Hope Ashitey,.) Works like a puzzle, no one stands out more than necessary, the

star is the film as a whole. Children of men is the perfect excuse to love the cinema.

" 1

" My lack of interest in this film being clear, I have to say that I do not think it will go wrong at the box office

since its dynamic visual games are usually easily digested by the population. Teen.

There are arguments that require a lot of violence (El Padrino, 1972) and violence without any kind of argument

(La naranja mec���nica, 1971). In this section we could include Joe Carnahan's last film, ""Aces

Hot"", supposed action comedy where we can find a cast with faces as well known as Ben

Affleck , Andy Garc���a, Ray Liotta or the singer Alicia Keys. The narrative is developed through several groups

of hired assassins who, knowing potential winners of a million In dollars, they try to end the life

of a rather disgusting magician, whom the police protects because they will testify against the mafia. The fun will

start when everyone ends up together at the hotel where the alleged victim is hiding. There, each one will take out the

worst of himself and, along with this, enough arcenal to finish a civil guard barracks. In a

story like this we can not forget to introduce extremely violent and surreal characters

because this is very comical and smells like what some call independent cinema (concept, by the way, that I never

understood: independent of what ��� or from whom). In the end, we give a twist to the argument and we believe that we have made

an acceptable guide, come on, to what has commonly been called having faith. Without doubt, this type of feature films

has an advantage quite exponential: if you do not know how to solve a dramatic situation, take care of some of

its protagonists, if you do not know how to solve two situations, c�� Go to me. And said and done because as

my mother would say "" Here the prompter is not saved "". In short, kilos of meat for hamburgers accompanied by their

corresponding liters of ketchup and seasoned with a supposed black humor; set that looks more like

an MTV video clip than with an action film. My lack of interest in thisis

filmclear, I have to say that I do not think it will go wrong at the box office, since their dynamic visual games are

easily digested by the adolescent population (as is the case with certain types of food).

" 0

" Very good to convince you that you should never enter a psychiatric hospital. Why have the eyes of the poster man been so red? Spooky. The film is about a man who

has died twice. The first time in the Gulf War and the second in a strange case with a policeman

while hitchhiking. Total, as he does not die at all, he is a little crazy, so he is admitted to a

psychiatric hospital. The doctor who treats him must be a cousin of the Menguele, since his therapy consists of drugging him,

tying him in a straitjacket and putting him in a cellar filing cabinet. Then he takes him out and he has to be cured.

Raaaarrroooo, raaaarooooo. What do you want me to tell you? As you have left the brain at home, do not even think about

entering, that this is thinking. To me I bored myself sovereignly, since the story does not hook until almost the

end. The gui���n is not bad at all, but the truth is that it does not kill. The actors do it a lot, and they do it very

well, but you spend the whole movie thinking about what is going on ?. And that is the problem, that you do not understand why

this movie has been recorded. You do not know if it is a criticism of war, of criminals, of psychiatrists, or of

what. And if it was laughable, you'd still understand, but it's a kind of very strange love drama. At the

end it improves, and makes a curious approach to travel to the future, which saves the rest of the

footage. If you make a film about future travel with this idea, something good can come out.

Of course, this is not the best way to tell a story. And if they pretended that we were anguished, they have

succeeded, I spent the whole movie looking at the clock to see what was left.

" 0

" Unbearable boredom of the couple less dynamic and less comical cosmic national outlook. You can not

make a movie with Ar���valo in the 21st century.

I swallow the unbearable bore of the couple more less chemical and less cosmic couple of the national panorama.

Quite a bunch of disproportions this sequel without imagination, without gui� .N and without locations (!!!), approximately

90% of the footage is indoors. Miguel ���ngel Lamata, who had debuted with the most

entertaining ( but just as bad) One of zombies. In short, that the director and his team have seen Zoolander and the

two movies of Wayne���s world and a bit of comedy USA type Dodgeball to shoot a film infumable, It lasts

85 minutes (thank God) and it has no structure whatsoever. Assembly? Remove, remove. You can not make

a movie with Ar���valo in the 21st century.

" 0

" The nastiness of Korean cinema runs the risk of liking us for the simple reason that it is not the nonsense

of American cinema. I prefer not to run to hang trophies every time I see two slanted-eyed men

eating an instant soup with chopsticks because of the fact that we use a spoon here.

The nastiness of Korean cinema runs the risk of liking us for the simple reason that it is not the nonsense

of American cinema. I prefer not to run to hang trophies every time I see two slanted-eyed men

eating an instant soup with chopsticks for the fact that we use a spoon here. The protagonist , who will

call the protagonist because nobody is able to remember a Korean name, is a kind of reallyloser

pathetic. Te���ido de rubio, with a minor job in a candy store, asleep all day, takes care of a

daughter who acts as a mother before such a loser. He is a type of hero who can work in the East because he is

traced by the stereotypes of any B series karate movie. It bothers me because of the coarse imitation

he makes. of the western rebel and because perhaps in our cinema we connect with the loser but never with the

clown. To do antics, here the hero always has the friend. It's more strange that food and traffic

signals result in family relationships. The protagonist loses his daughter at the hands of the beast and the two

brothers run to gorrazos. One does not know if the authentic viewer perceives the scene as dramatic or dramatic,

but feels an urgent need to move on to another topic. The monster does not devour the child, he keeps it in his

pantry. The father knows that he is alive, but he is not the most anxious to rescue her, the three brothers unite their

skills like three pokemon. Again fraternal elections that would not make a western creator.

Koreans remember their dictatorial past like the Spaniards, they add barricades. One of the brothers

prepares Molotov cocktails while the taxi driver reminds him that they already have democracy. The evil of the beast contains

political accusations of thick line. The spawn is the fault of the army that manipulates chemical products on an

American base. The surgeon who wants to show that the monster carries a virus against all evidence is

American str���vico. The father starts looking for his daughter when he hears his voice in the mobile, which starts a

point of emotion. But a police officer refuses to take it seriously and stops him for being crazy, which

is halfway between the Kafkaesque and the sainete. I never know when a Korean is co���ay and when he is

serious. The beast is an acceptable infographic image. The computer they used was not the last generation, or

it was missing a few megabytes of RAM, but that's the least of it. In the beginning it persecutes people as aattraction

fair. We start to take it seriously when you eat your victims. The girl, locked in a nook of the

lair has the option of sitting down to wait or risk finding a way out. When the girl is

playing, the guy starts the show. It is the little that remains of the director's seal of "" Memories of

murder "". That and a couple of intimate scenes that do not stick to the plot. He may be very excited about colarnoslas

, but should not do it. Either another argument is sought for them, or repressed a little.

" 0

" Only the youngest of the house will like it, the older ones will be able to start a couple of smiles

in an hour and a half offootage

Disney betby "" refloating "" his classics, if last year we had the insidious Lindsay Lohan at the head

of the "" Herbie "" remake, this time we have to Tim Allen (who has managed to get to Disney thanks to the saga of

Santa Claus), in front of this review of "" A very doggy candidate "", the film is 100% Disney,

pol Ethically correct, familiar, and moralizing and happy ending, in times where Mickey Mouse's house has

to subject itself to its successes in real image cinema; after his more than sounded failure in his animation division,

with the exception of Pixar, but that's another story. History does not give for more, the situations are completely

known; a sample is his trailer, and the performances of 90% of the casting seem to be thinking about the

check, rather than to please the audience. In short, he will only like it. � to the smallest of the house, to the elderly

as much will get to start a couple of smiles in an hour and a half of footage.

" 0

" One thing is to ensure that the evolution of the characters is well perceived by the viewer through

the conversations, gestures and looks of the protagonists. Another very different is to recreate causing a

certain tedium

The film begins in Jerusalem, continues to Jordan to end up entering Palestine. It is

starring the wonderful Natalie Portman, who continues to grow and evolve prodigiously, and

directed by Amos Gitai, one of those directors with a voice of their own, who works outside thecommercial circuits

usualand likes to write their own scripts. a book road, a manual, that travels

through very unusual landscapes on a cinema screen and, unfortunately, too common onscreens

television, news and television news. A road movie in which women are absolute protagonists,

but not the wild style of Thelma and Louise, but their friendship and their relationship is more possibilist, more leisurely,

m�� It's creative. And also contradictory, because of the generational issue. We have, then, some of the most

attractive elements that should have a great film. . But nevertheless. Is there something that does not work. The narrative rhythm of

Gitai, for my taste, is too slow, slow and rewarding. One thing is to ensure that the evolution of the

characters is well perceived by the viewer through the conversations, gestures and looks of the

protagonists. Another very different is to recreate in thoughts and silences, causing a certain boredom

and excessive distance. The film has very intense moments, like the talk between the Portman and the

American. It has powerful images, like that of the burning village. It has very intimate sequences, like that of the

three women in the car, vibrating with the music. But he lacks continuity in the emotion. Sometimes it becomes

too discursive, too obvious. In any case, it is necessary that, in addition to Supermen of design and

Scaries Movies summertime, this other type of cinema that seeks emotion is made , the look and the word. An

intimist and scrutinizing cinema, a cinema committed to the characters, which pays more attention to content than to the

continent. A risky and minority cinema, but of those that evolve and grow the seventh art.

Unfortunately, however, this "" Free Zone "" promises more than what it finally ends up giving.

" 0

" A film delight for the children's public Zathura, against the criticism of a lot of superb pseudo-intelectualoideo circulating around there, I

thought it was a film A great and very successful film, both for children and adults who are still

able to enjoy an adventure full of imagination, well told, with large doses of goodeffects

special, humor, surprises and tenderness and, above all, enjoyable, without decaying at any time. Some

lovers of art and rehearsal or manga animation for children will call corny the underlying message about

good relations between brothers (or between any of our peers), but to me it seems a value to

me. Added in the midst of so much gratuitous violence that surrounds the youngest ones lately and thatthem so little. The design is

givesfantastic and entertaining. or the game board. The flying house reminds me of the nostalgic film

"" The Wizard of Oz "" that was once a song of imagination and dreams. It highlights the good acting of

the kids, and I dare to assure that many kids will be identified with a multitude of scenes! There is a

funny balance between laughter and scares. In short, the authentic critics in this case are the children, and you

only have to listen to their enthusiastic comments when the movie Do not missleave the cinema

the faces and words of the kids around you when you. Surely they will be surprised.

" 1

" As Edith Piaf sings, "Paris sera toujours Paris, the most beautiful ville du monde ?. Well, this and much more is

what this film expresses. Undoubtedly one of the most awaited, desired and hopeful films of this

beginning of 2007.

As Edith Piaf sings, "" Paris will be toujours Paris, the most beautiful ville du monde "". Well, this and much more is what

this film expresses. Undoubtedly one of the most awaited, desired and hopeful films of the beginning

of 2007. Who does not know Paris will be able to admire its essence here, what makes Paris different.who

Thoseknow him have here a unique opportunity to get away from tourist guides and enter theentrances

city's, in those corners that fill books and stories, get lost in its streets, dine in somebistr���t

hidden, get lost in some small art gallery, in some street vendor and live the city as it is, not

as they want to sell it to us . And who loves the cinema will be able to feel that it is still possible to sit in an armchair,

cry, re���ry and ultimately feel, with a great film made of 18 small stories One day walking around

Paris I listened as a Spanish tourist asked her companion why would she call her the city of light?

with how gray it is. Se���ora, they call it that, not because of the light it receives from the sun, but because it is the city itself

that illuminates all those who are in it. Paris radiates light through all its corners, and this film is a clear

example of it. The directors: Joel Coen, Ethan Coen, Isabel Coixet, Alfonso Cuaron, Christopher Doyle. Wes

Craven, Gus Van Sant, Tom Tykwer, Alexander Payne and Walter Sayles. And now a few actors: Natalie

Portman, Steve Buscemi, Elijah Wood, Nick Nolte, Willem Dafoe, Bob Hoskins, Ben Gazarra, Gena Rowlands and Maggie

Gyllenhaal. Actors: Bruno Podalyd���s, Le���la Bekhti, Cyril Descours, Marianne Faithfull, Elias McConnell, Gaspard

Ulliel, Julie Bataille, Steve Buscemi, Axel Kiener, Frankie Pain, Catalina Sandino Moreno, Barbet Schroeder, Li

Xin, Sergio Castellitto, Emilie Ohana, Miranda Richardson, Leonor Watling, Juliette Binoche, Martin Combes ,

Willem Dafoe, Hippolyte Girardot, Yolande Moreau, Paul Putner, Sara Martins, Nick Nolte, Ludivine Sagnier,

Lionel Dray, Maggie Gyllenhaal, Joana Preiss, Seydou Boro, A���ssa Ma���ga, Fanny Ardant, Bob Hoskins , Wes Craven,

Olga Kurylenko, Elijah Wood, Emily Mortimer, Alexander Payne, Rufus Sewell, Melchior Beslon, Natalie Portman,

G���rard Depardieu, Ben Gazzara, Gena Rowlands, Margo Martindale, Florence Muller

" 1

" What remains final is a film with murders enca denies, neither more nor less. It could have been

Lecter, it could have been Freddy Kruger. Absolute wear of the formula.

Hanibal has been part of our lives for too many years. It is now 16 years that we have

known Dr. Lecter through sequels, prequels, and now, origins. And so long can only have one

consequence: the absolute wear of the formula. The only ones who are impassive in this situation

seem to be Dino De Laurentis, his producer, and Thomas Harris, father of the creature, who still have corners

of the character to explore, but who You want me to tell you, you can not always tell anstory. "Hannibal

interesting: The origin of evil? It was presented as a dark story where we would see Lecter

inoculated with that attitude of ferocious psychoanalyst and soulless cannibal, I wondered if the why of such away of

mechanically heartlesslife would have To his explanation of surprising events, and even theorized about the

internal change that must occur for such a wild disposition to kill (see the fate of Ray Liotta in

? Hannibal?) . However, and after seeing? The origin? I have found the typical story of crude revenge with

somewhat diffuse preliminaries. A film of assassinations, without tension or apparent plot. The? devised by

Harris has been small before the aura of the character, much more complex than this Hannibal decaffeinated, and for

me, I would have preferred to continue without discovering it. The film tells how a Lecter infant, which must witness a

chilling event, becomes a teenage Lecter who lives tormented by what happened, and prepares his

revenge in front of those responsible. ��� That you can not be more uncertain, because I do it deliberately before

the simple gui���n that is presented in this prequel. Two unique pivots support the film: the first half

hour, where we are told the why, and the last half hour where the story is told. Why I

want to kill, and the way I do it to make it look sick. None of this honors the Lecter we saw in "The

Silence ?, and seems to be a mockery of the Hopkins of? Hannibal ?. The way to link these two main reasons

to become such a feared being is embodied in this prequel in a way as forced as sometimes absurd.

What about the policeman, Lecter's aunt, the butcher? After watching the credits I know that it was first a

novel and then its adaptation, and even more clearly that Harris has been the artífice of both. I saybecause

thisthis usually results in a greater fidelity to the original story, and that leaves me perplexed at the valency

with which the writer has endowed his child with a decent origin. It is as if he had been asked for a script by

co \*\*\*, and with that obligation, to draw Lecter's childhood in the first way that has come to mind.

Before we see a glimpse of cannibalism in Lecter, there is no sign that the character is that

? Hunger? the one that leads him to commit his particular murders. Nor is it very clear to me when Lecter decides to

be can���bal. And less clear, I still have to do it because of what I lived as a child, since the first victim of the character

has nothing to do with his past. In short, an amalgam of inconsistencies that populate half of a film that

should have been better planned, or in view of the result, never made. Many people will say �� that the

setting is incredible, and the interpretations correct, but that was not what I was looking for in this film. The

actor in charge of giving life to the psychopath has been warned to show all the familiar faces he knows, but

they also do it in the cheap telefilms, and they are not Lecter. The scenes of Gaspard Ulliel and Gong Li are

incoherent. M���sa���n when Lecter learns the use of the samurai sword (a desprop���sito), and the figure of the

police is designed to threaten the murderous tranquility of the protagonist, but nor for those, it seems at the end

that his presence is due to reiterate that the boy is a "monster", a fairly easy resource. What remains in the

end is a film with chain-linked murders, nor Not even less. It could have been Lecter, it could have been

Freddy Kruger. If you ever hear the term? Characters in two dimensions ?, this movie is your biggest example:

what you see is what you get. If the history of cinema makes it the last installment of Hannibaladventures

Lecter's, it will be an unworthy ending to his predecessors, a deliberately commercial product of dubious quality.

Your fans should give a touch to Harris, who has finally lost his way ?.

" 0

" Coconut trees still do not give chestnuts. The continuous pacts and betrayals, and the creation of acharacter

homosexual, constitute undeniable successes of the gui���n. And we met again with the dog !, cause of my only joy and

maximum concern.

Almost like an axiom, the third parts of a saga often overcome the first, and always

the second. We found a reference in El Retorno del Rey. At the End of the World, thebeheaded

hen of the golden eggs is, the manifest decompensation existing between a weak guide and thevirtuosity

technicalthat accompanies it, is overwhelmingly evident . In the background, the consolidation of some indefinite

characters that already have their own name in the history of the seventh art. From the depths, emergent, / The

Hidalgo de los Mares / purges its outstanding debt / with World in His Hands, / tying the rudder quickly, / already glimpsed

in the distance / to the Dread Burl���n / His Majesty of the South Seas, / by all known as The Captain

" "Bloom." / / Ashamed of others I would feel Espronceda de m���. The same as Rabo Walsh (he, whoso well

measures the times) before the cluster of misfits sponsored by the "" genius "" artisan who repeat after the

cameras. Ah, if Michael Curtiz raised his head! If Robert Siodmak had had half the

technical possibilities in his time. If Jacques Tourneur had directed the Knightley. If Byron Haskin is

found with this cake. What waste of special effects and what absolute lack of imagination.

Did the screenwriters of Borden Chase not talk? But let's go in parts. Coconut trees still do not give chestnuts.

The continuous pacts and betrayals, and the creation of a homosexual character, constitute undeniable successes of the

gui���n. And we met up with the dog again, cause of my only joy and maximum concern to fascinate, The

Curse of the Black Pearl, pleasantly, I surprised. The boarding adventures were rescued from theabysses

phyllic; their misfortunes, they returned to conquer, and the turn given towards the fantastic genre, without convincing, did not

get to displease. In this way, we attended the opening of the dead Man of the Dead Chest (���o era al

rev���s?), Who, basically, was dedicated to defraud. An unforgivable conception of the script placed the action in

three different scenarios, for the brilliance of its main protagonists and torture of the spectator. When

leaving the cinema, with the boiling cerebellum, few recognized Captain Barbossa ... nor the mother who

pari���.���sta who subscribes, refused to let loose and, with the purpose of avoiding an announced collapse, was

prepared to review the first two parts, so as not to get lost at sea. He got lost and was shipwrecked. Let's say

that, at the End of the World, the scripts are not convoluted, but unintelligible. With a premeditated confusion,

profusion and diffusion of ideas, Elliott and Rossio only give the option of enjoying a merely visual product. The

shocking start is diluted in the breeze of Singapore nothing more sail, plunges into the immensity of its own

plot incongruity, it timidly emerges in the expected Assembly of Brothers and, marking course towards good

port, finds an insurmountable cliff when navigating. The telescope, now, allows us to glimpse a

dramatic spectacle without limits, wrapped in three endless hours of footage, in which we dive to

find only a small scene- treasure, two beautiful images and three phrases that I can not resist to mention. The first

one, sent to the director: "Do you think he has everything planned or improvising on the fly? "" The

second, reserved for the outcome: "" The world remains the same, but with less incentives "". And the third, which

honors Depp: "" No cause is lost while a fool is left ready to fight for it. " Poor

Johnny, main object of the tribute that is made to Fantas���a. Worse is the one offered to The Little Mermaid, with that

huge goddess Calypso imitating the bubble, I say, to the witch ���rsula del mar.The scene is none other than the emersion

of the Holand���s Errante. and his brand new admiral. The images, a floating coin and that little boat, in a mantle of

stars that, in absolute silence, crosses the sea. Cin���fila's memory drags us torelaxing

Kubrick'sspaceship without a waltz, and to a hasty appraisal: At the End of the World, does thepropagate

sound also? Regarding the cast, I copy of my previous criticisms. Excellent Geoffrey Rush. Orlando, a beauty.

It would not be fair that Jack Sparrow eclipsed the actor, to the detriment of the magnificent interpretations obtained

under the orders of Tim Burton. And Keira Knightley, technically perfect, but with an alarming lack

of sodium chloride in the vein. Adding that the china hat suits her very well, and I highlight the successful performances

of Stellan Skarsgard (the Goya of Milos Forman) and Keith Richards (the guitarist of the Rolling Stones). And no,

I did not stay �� in the cinema to see the false farewell of "" after "" the final credit titles. This, that

each week pirates time, refuses to write about a quarter. Of course, for 9 reais to 8 ..

Who do you know?

" 1

" Fincher has rewritten the classic patterns of the thriller. This is a sentimental thriller, sickly,intimate

almost.

Thorough and suggestive even pornographic, overwhelming in its neat dissection of ainvestigation

criminal, Zodiac is not a commercial film in any way, although it contains traces of box office cinema

generous because of its quoted director, David Fincher (Alien3, Seven, The fight club, The room of the

panic and the very minor The game) and its more than competent cast . Zodiac is a study on obsession that

descends from the merely descriptive (the crimes, the relevant indications of a case that alarmed the

population of California during the ��� last sixty and first seventies) to the sickly, representing

a series of characters corseted in a very ambiguous territory that is neither police nor periodical. Fincher does not

intend to miniaturize the plot; moreover, what it does is snuff its narrative talent in all the

loopholes so that the viewer is suffocated by an excessive dramatic proposal, perhaps too

rigorous, that does not abandon its car�� Cinematographic character at any time and that investigates with demeaning delectation in

the aspects normally most hidden in this type of physics gadgets: the investigations, the researches ,

which are, at some point in the footage, burdensome and obviable, but without whose support the exquisite ensemble

is left untidy, disheveled, as if any minimal trait had been subtracted from it. of credibility and we were

attending any vulgar telefilm of sobremesa on murderers in series and deranged policemen who try

to give chase. As we have seen a lot of movies of this fur, you must be very demanding with Zodiac. ��� The result?

An almost masterful, overwhelming, in any case, perfect in its perfect sense of the ytica and the

porquepica because, well looked, the final aftertaste is ���se: that of having swallowed a monumental outburst sentimental

about justice, the right to find the truth and the obstacles that time and the reluctance of society have

in giving it when the media, authentic depositories of the mountains As of data, they have already

decided to give their back sovereignly. Zodiac dazzles by its excessiveness, which is also - in the opinion of some

- its greater demírito.No it is possible to diminish its excesses: its two hours are needed largu���simas so that none No

thread remains unbraided and, at the same time, have the last reflection that all the threads, when abovinated, have not

led to complete any skein. Never trampling narrative, Zodiac entertains at all times and has

the virtue of not granting licenses perhaps forgivable: a more explicit truculence, a spirit to the Seven

to which Fincher is no stranger because that masterpiece of the latest entertainment cinema (commercial, dir? n)

is yours. In this case what the director does is to rewrite the pattern on which to approach the genre of serial killers

and reformulate his speech based on more literary criteria, more close to seventies models like

All the president's men (I'm not the only one who has seen this similarity, in fact before seeing it

was this the only information that had the film) or even JFK. His formal neatness, his absence of

doctrinal enthusiasms and his marginal character within the thriller make Zodiac a more than

recommended film, which is not the masterpiece that could have been and inducements to be so in those who

consider it in their inner court) but yes, and overwhelmingly, a larger film within the

filmography of Fincher at the height of Seven. Curious that their greatest achievements come fromnarrative foundations

similar. Maybe in the next incursion in the genre he gave the man to list the hundred and eightysights

degreeand dive into the melodrama or the musical, and all without abandoning murderers in series, of course.

" 1

" At the same time captures the meaning of a graphic novel and a futuristic ���pica. I can not wait to see her again

. It's incredible that Linklater will release another film this year, Fast Food Nation, my expectations are

huge

Based on the personal experiences of Philip K. Dick (Blade runner) with the drugs, this movie is a

wonderful hypnotic trance. Animated with a rotoscope process, the film constructs its own visual language

that is at a magical point between photography and animation; the real and the imaginary. Between life and

the dream as it was the theme of "" A waking life "", the previous project with this style of director Richard

Linklater. He has again achieved an extraordinary experience in both narrative and visual, just

as cinema should be. In these times it is difficult to push the limits of imagination. We have seen so much that

we have a sarcastic and detached look of the future and of life. That's why it works very well that to talk

about science fiction this work prefers to be located in the near future. Everything they pose fits perfectly

into the neurotic lifestyle of the era of terror in which we live and we already know that technology advances

so fast. Few high-tech elements in the film do not exist anymore. Except, of course, the

identity decoding costume used by the police to be unrecognizable. This element is the focal point

of the visual style and at the same time captures the central theme of the film. Bob Actor (Keanu Reeves), anagent

undercover, must monitor his own life through a system of video espionage; since he has been involved in

the world of drugs to which he is supposedly making war. Are we so separated from ourselves

that we can not recognize ourselves? And if someone or something can see everything about me, including all theinformation

personal, do you come to know who I am? I come to know it myself? Or who looks through the mirror does it in the

dark, just as I see my own life? The title of the film comes from that phrase of Corinthians "" Now we see

by mirror, in darkness; but then we will see face to face: now I know in part; but then you will know how

I am known "", updated to the age of the bar codes. To develop a particular language would not have value

if it were not forged to say something. Here he presents us with an important document of the problems of

identity today. In addition to not getting lost in the nebula, this film is full of humor and real anddi���logos

sincere. Especially the group of Jonkis with paranoia to walk around the house. Linklater has already tested it since it has a

sharp tone in "" Before sunrise / suset "" (Before sunrise / sunset) and "" Dazed and confused "" for

sincere conversations that resonate with certainty. Complex characters with dishes pending to be washed,is to

thatsay real and of this world. The actors enrich these characters, particularly Robert Downey Jr. The

fact that the humor works is due to the naturalness of the rhythms of the cast. At the same time the

sense of a graphic novel and a ��� pica futurista, without leaving out the black humor around paranoia.

I can not wait to see her again. It is incredible that Linklater will release another film this year. "" Fast Food

Nation "", my expectations are enormous.

" 1

" Alatriste is one of the most unfortunate shows that one has seen in a movie theater. Ajoke

heavy, very long and very expensive. At least now they can not say that if they had money and means they could

make good movies.

This is something more than any premiere, you can check days before, with the news programs connecting

live at the cinema door to see what is going on there, the "president" "from the government and other authorities

going to see the film. And above all you can see when you go to the movies and over there is the premiere, it's not

just any movie, there you meet all kinds of spectators, the fan���ticos of the books, making a

porra about his favorite character, who instants before we have seen them in the literature section of the

same mall chatting about them. Can you find even a "" famous "" local journalist,

normal people who go alone, as a couple, with friends, as a family with grandparents, grandchildren? There is no one missing. Nobody

wanted to miss the most serious attempt of the Spanish cinema. He had prepared the criticism of "" The young woman of the Water "" but

seeing what I saw last night I have been able to resist to review what is the most expensive film in the history of Spanish

cinema. Alatriste is a disproportion from beginning to end, without any kind of storyline, where we

witness scenes one after another, which worse shot, and for which they appear, a long cast of

recognized Spanish interpreters ���ols, and there's been a lot of the film's grace, to see which actors

do it worse. And in the meantime, loose mamarracho and although the election has been difficult, the worst has been Eduardo

Noriega who follows, and he is not the only one, with his serious diction problem, I do not know how he manages to do it but he says it

all the same, but the funny thing is when we see his statements in the press conference of the

presentation of this disturbing film, in which he said that upon learning that his character had few words, he

decided to try to express it through his presence, his forms, and These factors

defined it. A bearing and an expressiveness that Eduardo has that neither Marlon Brando. Eduardo has had a tough

competition with Unax Ugalde, the poor man, I do not know who will have told him he is an actor. If even I put forward you

acted better. We also have, I could not miss, the free nude, which appears in any Spanish film that

boasts, this time by Elena Anaya which is something to be thankful for. A separate chapter deserves the performance of

Viggo Mortensen, whose choice to play Captain Alatriste seems very unfortunate, only understandable

by marketing as a claim abroad, the poor try it but the character does not transmit a shit, he

does not believe it or him, he is very content taming his marked Argentine accent, and at times, every time he

comes on screen, he seems to be drunk when he speaks. It was really unfortunate, more than a laugh managed to

rip off the spectators present in the room, that when it was understood of course. I do not know what work it

would have cost to double because his performance is really diminished by his accent, which makes it

quite unnatural. The direction is not that it is bad, it is non-existent, something is needed. s of

personality behind a camera for a production of this caliber, not what he has done Agustn Daz Yanes,

who seems to have shot a trailer of 2 hours duration. A soundtrack of grief, that soundtrack that

seems that you've heard before in a thousand movies, and that is very poorly integrated, many scenes where missing and

others where left over. The battles are of pity, ���There are no specialists in Spain ?, but what battles are those, with

four cats and very badly shot. And the photograph, without being bad, gets tired with so much painting by Vel���zquez and

Bodeg���n. To all this, and for half the footage, you watch the clock for the thirtieth time and you think it can not

be, you think that your watch has stopped, you take it off and keep it to avoid suffering any more It is therefore Alatriste one

of the most unfortunate shows that one has seen in a movie theater. And it makes me ask myself the reason

for so much flattery between the author of the work, Arturo P���rez Reverte, and the person in charge of "" directing "" this,

monsterAgust���n D���az Yanes, and that can only respond to a community of interests. Alatriste is a heavy joke, very

long and very expensive. At least now they can not say that if they had money and means they could make good

movies. Show it.

" 0

" Putting to birth a movie that does not count anythingIt's a pain this movie. I already go with fear. First for the long queues, second to see whoyou

touchesnext, and third for the increasingly gilipollescos scripts that are worked. The cinema is

plummeting, like TV, like the publishing world, where any gualtrapa who, just by being on TV,

"writes" "a" "book" ". The thing about Spiderman is to catch the director and give him four ostias. But to tell you that you

put so much philosophy of cure in the mouth of so many characters in the movie ?, They want to let us live a little ?. I go

to the cinema to see Spiderman as he beats the bad guys, not to lure me into his private life and hisproblems

psychological. I sweated the girlfriend of Spiderman, that lerda with the face of a shepherdess from the mountains of Usurbil that

seems to never fuck, and that is a pretentious that tells you at the end that it will save your life, and that you

ride a chicken because he could not go see his shit theater. But what kind of character is this?

What a subnor? And the old one? A firecracker who does not stop giving councils in Reverend Smith plan, go to give

advice to your fucking mother, old chocha! Turn on the TV and leave me alone, heavy. And Spiderman, often tontolava, a

superhero who does not have a hard fucking. That learn from Batman, that is lined in the Batcave making straws

without doing anything spying on the neighbors with micro-cameras It is that I already touch the eggs, that is dedicated to catch

the bad guys and instead is not able to do that the house be seized by his aunt May. Go and get your ass,

mediocre. Do as octopus, steal something there and leave us in peace, weeping, you do not stop giving the whole

movie with the face of a monkey you have, motherfucker. It turns out to be revealing that the spider's web does not come out, that in

my town is called gatillazo, and that is that it is normal, it is a geek of a motherfucker, a nerd. It's just someone when he

puts on the Spiderman mask. It's like a lot of people in real life, which is nobody but puts on a "" mask "" Thething that stands

onlyout in the movie is the action, which is fucking, and when Spider comes and goes through the buildings

flying. And the blows of humor, there are several, especially starring the Editor of the newspaper, a character

that perfectly represents the typical bastard who caught nothing for nothing. Brilliant The good observer will

see that the movie alternates action-relation. The action cojonuda, come paqui palla, however when you put the

absurd and anodyne relationship between the shepherd and the monkey, the movie falls to unsuspected limits. They both give shame to each

other, how can they be such assholes? Is it that they do not know the meaning of the word blowjob or pajon

castellano? No, in those movies do not get sex or for a moment, are all a mo���as and fuck all the time, but of

course, the guys want to reach all audiences, and they understand that children They do not have sexuality,

when in the 80's, when many of us went to the movies or watched TV, we saw more jevys, or

that, today, that anyone put the TV at 6 o'clock in the afternoon and you will see a lot of incredible ponzo���a,

anonymous beings talking about how they fuck with this or the other. I'm not going to talk about this movie anymore, sorry, about this

disproposito. It hurts me to have paid for such a shill, next time I'll download the internet movie and pay for

supu. That they give Spiderman, that idol of my youth in the comics, is going to see Spiderman 3 his cousin

Atapuerca ..

" 0

" If you have climbed stairs at a gallop with the hammering on the head of the tanan, tananan of the soundtrack

original, you will enjoy like pigs in a puddle. And if not, you will have a sports drama of those that makes the

female sector hate the male sector. Of course, Stallone has managed to thrill me again.

Look, when I read that Stallone was going to make the sixth installment of his most famous and Oscar-winning title, he made me

tremble. After having enjoyed the first, v��� with total stupefaction as he mistreated one of his

creations, to make messes like that in which he fights with the Russian. Too much patetisto for this actor. But

hey, as one is more innocent than a botijo, he granted that opportunity to the one who waits with nostalgia for the right

direction. And hey, it straightens up a lot. The film is about a former heavyweight champion

retired many years ago, who currently runs an Italian restaurant. Like any good champion, he lives anchored

in the past, remembering each moment and each person who listens to him, as was his life when he was the

greatest. Although all this does not hide if not a life quite lost, with a woman dead of cancer and a child

who does not see, and he living what was, not what it is. And in these, from an absurd idea comes a flash of illusion,

a way to show yourself that is still alive. Well, well, I have to admit that I'm writing

with the penis stiff as sailboat mast of brigantine, so it may be that the keyboard of a cock breaks from one

moment to another (is that so much earlier poetry could make you change the channel). I loved the film,

and I mean it very seriously. To begin with, the rhythm is slow and tiring, like the life of the protagonist, the life that goes

out of someone who was everything and is consumed in the memory. The continuous memories of the past make us, the

nostalgic, remember with the hair of the tip the original. And they give a sense to the film that without them would not

be understood well. It also has flaws and things that no one believes, but what do you think it matters? In short,

if you have climbed stairs at a gallop with the hammering on the head of the tanan, tananan of thesoundtrack

original, you will enjoy Marranos in a puddle. And if not, you will have a sports drama of those that makes the

female sector hate the male sector. Of course, Stallone has managed to thrill me again.

" 1

" Zoo does not judge, does not propose ideas, does not give options to the spectator, the director assumes the normality of what he

narrates. It is long, boring and somewhat heavy because it does not create sympathy or hate for anything that appears on the

screen. I'm still staying with Equus.

Zoo is a rare movie. It is not just the pseudo-documentary format or the disturbing topic it deals with, it is rather

the complete package. This little diary of a zoophillic (or group of more correct

terminologically speaking) explain with disturbing voices in off where, how and why the love for

animals is born after the terrible death of one of them . Kenneth Pinyan died shortly after being taken to theroom of

emergencya hospital in Enumclaw, Washington, where they were traveling as it is one of the few states where it is not

considered a crime. According to the death certificates, he succumbed to internal injuries resulting from a

colon perforation. A police investigation was initiated that led to a farm. There were

video cassettes and DVDs in which several men had sex with horses. The documentary, based

on the real testimony of one of the participants, has new actors to reconstruct the vision of

these practices, with a lot of material from the events that took place in 2005 such as radio or television interviews. Theysubstance

helped to giveto the story and to accompany the resource images that tend to tend to politics and

politics more than to the chabacano zoof���lico acto concreto.El main problem of the narrative is that it is quite

complicated to connect with the viewer despite trying to show the concerns of each of the

protagonists of the story. It is complicated to justify or understand bestiality or what encourages a person

to change state in order to maintain relationships with a horse. While in the films about teenagers or

in the hands of Kevin Smith the thing may seem like fun, taking it seriously costs a bit more.

Comparing it with Equus by Peter Shaffer, a play written in the 70s that revolutionized the public at the time

(and even gave a couple of thumps in the assembly of this a���o) Zoo seems like a schoolboy exercise

more carnal than anything else.sex appears little on the screen but no one has any qualms about talking about

Explicithim. In Shaffer's work, taken to the cinema by Sydney Lumet, the protagonist prefers to hurt the animals

aware that the relationship (which never becomes carnal) is amoral. The whole work tries to understand the young man

and his inner struggle, arriving at the end to understand his anguish. In Zoo at no time arises the

possibility that the protagonists recognize that their behavior is questionable, defends the difference and

their freedom and motivation to move forward because their director considers that the existence of these pr� ��cticas

is real and reasonable.Zoo does not judge, does not raise ideas, does not give options to the viewer, the director assumes the

normality of what narrates and precisely in that lies the politics surrounding the film and its main one ���n of

Achilles. It is long (despite lasting one hour and ten minutes), boring and somewhat heavy because it does not create sympathy or

hate for anything that appears on the screen. I'm still staying with Equus.

" 0

" A good film, very estimable, that it is necessary to see calm and peaceful, without haste. Otherwise it

might seem excessively long and somewhat tedious at times.

Very interesting film of intrigue, based on sadly real facts, adaptation of the book that one of

its protagonists wrote, the cartoonist of the San Francisco newspaper who became obsessed with the case. Because that is one of

the true themes of the film: the obsession. An obsession that a human being took to unravel one of

the greatest mysteries of the modern criminal investigation, that of the mysterious serial killer who terrorized

San Francisco at the end of the sixties and first half of the seventies. Objection that, as shown in the tape, took

him �� to lose family stability and his work as a cartoonist. But he could not stop until he knew the truth.

Until, as he himself says and it is verified at the end of the film: to be in front of the murderer, to look him straight

in the eyes. The film is frankly good, although it is not, in any way, the masterpiece that is being said out

there. They fail him and they have some things left for it. The best thing is without doubt his beginning and his end. The first

half hour, where three murders are seen (terrible the one of the lake), and not one just as it did recently an acquaintance

and, I suppose, respected national critic (once more a critic was talking in a newspaper without having seen the

film, and they go.) And the last half hour is also great, with the artist as absolute protagonist, in

his terrifying visit to the former film projectionist, to the prisoner in prison, and to the ex-policeman who

took the case for years ( Here humor is employed, with intelligence). However, there are many in the middle, I would

say too many dialogues, a fact that denotes an exhaustive, rigorous and very meticulous guide. .N Anwork

impeccable researchthat, however, extends the film long. Well, maybe not much, because it is possible

that it has the right duration with what is exposed, but that it could well make the story go to a good

number of spectators whom the action likes more than the explanation. Good performances, especially

by Robert Downey Jr., which comes out less than I would have liked to, that I am an unconditional fan of ,

l, and of John Carroll Lynch, as the most possible suspect. Exquisite ambientaci���n, acrisolada fotograf��� and

a wise assembly, especially in the first and last room of the film. In short, a good film, very

estimable, that it is necessary to see calm and calm, without hurry. Otherwise it might seem excessively long

and somewhat tedious at times.

" 1

" I have no choice but to rent, buy or download the first part of Los 4 Fant���sticos. Lucky

that this second is minimally entertaining and has some good times (the rest are truly

embarrassing).

Horrified I was when the movie started, with those awfully bad gags and thatproduction design

impossible. I must admit that as the film progresses I have entertained myself, but I also recognize that, in

reality, it is a real mess. And for that reason, I will summarize it in 4 points, which are few. And that I have not seen the

first, which they say is worse.1. The characters, no matter how much Mr. Story wants to try to show us, do not

have a hint of personality, and sometimes release every sentence that is to burn them, strangle them, leave them

stone or wish they become invisible. Neither the beautiful Jessica Alba, who here looks more like a Barbie than the

cute Nancy Callahan of Sin City, gets me to choose one of the four fantastic ones. And for that reason, I choose

Silver Surfer as the best character (despite offering us some truly pathetic scenes -not because of him

, it must also be said-), either because he is new or because he does not It makes as many fools as the others. And

also running to that Vctor (Nip Tuck). 2. The script is one of the worst written jams. It has no

meaning, nor coefficient, nor grace. Dialogs are simply pathetic, with some of them even

feeling embarrassed. And where does that Chinese wedding come from? They will be tacky! Actually this story is one of the

simplest I've seen in my life, and see that the director is called as he is called. 3. The film itself is more

flat than a sheet of carpaccio. At times try to belong to that type of film that is interested in the

visual and leave part of the content and moral, and then walks with bullshit like some I can not

mention and claim to be "" deep "" or dramatic. Disappointing.4. And finally, I would not want to leave her so,

so badly, because there is something that has caught my attention: the visual effects. The truth is that nowadays all

these science fiction superproductions have an incredible technical section, and I suppose that thanks to it

many of them are saved from be authentic clunkers (a clear example would be the film in question). So I have

no choice but to NOT rent, buy or download the first part of Los 4 Fant���sticos. Lucky that

this second is minimally entertaining and has some good times (this is truly

embarrassing), like the one in London or the one in the forest. And I would not want to leave another four points, this time all

positive: the first, Doug Jones as Silver Surfer (actually this surfboard is a tacky, and

I ask forgive the fans of the character) ; the second, special effects; the third, the music of John Ottman;

and the fourth, which is relatively short.

" 0

" Craig transmits many nuances to the character, as many as the new approach requires, and to my liking

-I feel girls- it does infinitely better than Brosnan, whose biggest dream was to put a stick face embittered

throughout the footage.

This James Bond is different. It had to be different, by force, for many reasons: the fundamental, that the

character needed a "" aggiornamiento "", a update that allowed to preserve its essence and get a

new p� Public that went beyond us, the unconventional nostalgia we grew up with Sean Connery or

Roger Moore. From the point of view of the producers, this reason implies a strong economic component,

undoubtedly vital for the survival of the franchise that has been able to extend for more than forty years. ,Os,

but that ran the risk of becoming stagnant. And they opted for the riskiest bet, in reality: to preserve the

character more "" Conneryano "", but humanizing it, that is, Bond is still indestructible, but that condition Itnot

isobtained for free, but through a hard process of character forging. And how to do that? Well,

bringing the character back to his origins, that is, the Ian Fleming novels that gave him life and that

contained a Bond that was much less lush than that of the movies. .Culas. The trick is to make "" Casino Royale "", the

first of these novels, the first adventure of the British agent in his condition of double zero, with license

to kill. Thus, the 007 incarnated by Daniel Craig is younger, more impulsive, more confident, more arrogant and,

paradoxically, less sure of Yes. All these faults will go polishing based on disappointments and sticks,

especially of many clubs, since in "" Casino Royale "" we will see how James is shaken a lot on several

occasions. Yes, dear readers, James Bond bleeds, screams, writhes in pain, physical and moral. He is not

afraid, because to get to double zero he has had to eliminate him a long time before, but he looks much more

biso���oy and vulnerable. This approach, together with Daniel Craig's election as actor who should have incarnated the

superagent, sowed politics to this film long before, even to start shooting. However, I

like both the approach and the interpreter, although I admit that I was one of those who doubted the choice. As

for the physical, it is clear that this Bond is exactly the opposite of Pierce Brosnan, but it happened at the

time when Moore replaced Connery in 1972. In this case I think that the change is even better, since Craig

lends much more to the hard-guy image. As for the character and his interpretation, I think it's a veryway

novelof portraying him by making the actor evolve with him, giving the impression that in the next

film You will grow and mature while Bond does (or vice versa). Craig transmits many nuances,

as many as the new approach requires, and to my liking -I feel girls- he does infinitely better than

Brosnan, whose biggest dream in the four films he did as 007 was putting face of stick bitter during all

the footage, without showing even a hint of the humor that this always carries with it. Otherwise, the film is

quite entertaining. Without being the best of the series, it greatly exceeds its recent predecessors

(except, perhaps, "" The World is not Enough "") and, of course, reconciles with those who almost vomited with

that joke of evil Taste called "" Die Another Day "". "" Casino Royale "" rejoins to a large extent all the elements that

make the Bond franchise what it has always been, with spectacular scenes and scenarios, fast-paced action

when there is one (and we give thanks that Martin Campbell, the director, learned the lesson "" Goldeneye "" and no longer

extends the persecutions to infinity), a hardness perhaps unusual for what we were used to and , very

important, the return to the resounding beauty in front of the anorexia that seemed imposed in the last

decade. Both Eva Green and Catherina Murino illuminate the screen as they fall exhausted before the charms of

our hero. A couple of failures that I find and that are quite obvious: one, the footage, again excessive

because of the burden of wanting to explain too many things that could be explained alone; the other is that the villains,

although they come equipped with the whole repertoire of tics and physical defects typical of the Bondian iconography,

appear somewhat diluted in their conception and never seem to be up to the task. of 007, they do not give that sensation of

omnipotence that was undoubtedly presented in almost all the previous films. It may also have been wanted

"" to humanize "" the villain as is done with Bond, but if so, the effectiveness in this case is much lower.

Chirr���an also some misconceptions of continuity that, although they do not influence in the history, to the fans of all the

life they can be annoying to them; for example, the fact that "" M "" continues to be the "" new "" boss thatinterprets

Judi Denchfrom "" Goldeneye "" (and that in addition in that film she appears, indeed, as the successor of the Admiral

Miles Messervy) and yet here he appears as his original boss. That and the disappearance of the characters of

Q and Miss Moneypenny, although, if I have to be honest, I did not miss them. As I try, quite

risky, to revitalize the franchise, I will put Una remarkable to the effort. It is true thatneed to be polished

many thingsand, of course, we must get used to seeing a more mundane James Bond, although he remains

invincible and irresistible in equal parts. The survival of the brand and the character will depend a lot on how

the public reacts to this new (or maybe not so new?) View of Mr Bond. That yes, the scriptwriters should

keep in mind that this 007 will have to be much harder and steely cold in the next films, and that the

whims that are excused here by history will not be allowed so happily afterwards, whenis

Bondsupposed to have succeeded in eliminating them. I do not say any silly obtuse fan with this, since in

the same "" Casino Royale "" that is already pointing in a veiled way towards the end of the tape. And, if the

producers are consistent with it, I have a feeling that we will still have James Bond / Daniel

Craig for a while.

" 1

" You can expect to hang out with her, but of course I, if I had known before, would not have gone to

see her at the movies or joke.

Good evening, dear readers. Here comes your dear colleague and neighbor again. that is, me. Today we come

to talk about cinema. The truth is that I arrived a little late but, with all my apologies, I have not been able to write

before because of "" labor issues "". We are going to talk about an alliance that, unfortunately and to my great regret,

seems to me that it is not going to become as famous as some of us hoped. We talked about a

fundamentally science fiction story , at least to my understanding, since (as someone told me there): "But it was not

terror ?. because the truth is that he tries, but he gives more than a little fear, except for a couple ofsustillos

low-level(of course, since I saw in a large area the film of "" Bursting "" classified as

terror, I believe anything). The truth is that I went to the cinema with the intention of seeing another movie, but when

I saw that the aforementioned was not there and, nevertheless, they had just put on the billboard "" The evil alliance "", I said:

well, I was also looking forward to seeing it, because on TV you could see a couple of scenes that looked very good

. Well: the truth is that the effects are not bad, although it is not that they are wonderful, but the

script is disastrous. I do not know how you can lose an idea that, although repeated, could give as much of itself

to some geeks as us. This is a series of families, the "" children of Ipswich "", who generation after

generation are passing "" powers "" from parents to children. These families are united not only by friendship,

but also by such a secret, since in modern times they were persecuted and killed by witchcraft.

Some alleged powers of this draft and a typical distribution of adolescents (supposedly teenagers, because

I doubt that someone has less years than me) handsome, although they are already very seen, may have given more than yes, of

course with little more than an hour and a half in duration all good intentions would be nothing (alga alg Does a

producer and / or director think that a good film that is not childish can be developed in such a short

time?) By the way, since I have a joint page with my colleagues, I take advantage of to complain: Who would

think that putting the cinema at six euros is a good idea? You really think that the economy is to

risk again to go to see a movie that you doubt? From now on, and with the

prices that the cinemas are putting (and it is clear that I know that in Madrid or Catalonia it will still be). It's

expensive, which seems to me even more chilling) I get the feeling that more than one of us are going to rethink very

much if we're going to go back to the cinema (And will you be able to tell me now that the number of clients has not dropped ?,

because that I do not believe it), except to see authentic movie fans (That is, one in a thousand.) Putting

here my complaint, I'll summarize the matter: the synopsis I already told you and, although it seemed little, the

truth is that I can not tell you m� Sins without risk of spoiling the film (logically, in a movie of an hour and a

half, there is little more to tell). In short, you could expect to hang out with her, but of course I, if I

had known before, would not have gone to see her at the movies or joke.

" 0

" The staging looks like a vulgar telefilm, the special effects are, the photography is

jokesnon-existent, the script is not understood, demonstrating the downward dive of the once wonderful director if you

remember other mediocre titles rolled lately as the Player or Insomnia.

No! ���Noooooooooooooooooooooo! ���Mil times continue to deny that this is from the ARGENTO teacher! Do you remember the

other two parts? SUSPIRIA and INFERNO were the highest flight of the brilliant Italian director who previously left

his Dark Red or the trilogy zoophilia. They were not films about zoophilia, I mean those titles with names of

animals, the bird of glass pens for example. All these works reflected the mark of anartist

extremely macabre, where the murders were shot As if it were a beautiful painting, the music

seemed devastating in GOBLIN's work, aesthetics oozing elegance on all four sides. That artist is

dead and in his place a third part is null on all fronts, his daughter ASIA ARGENTO fatal with

whom I collaborated previously in Trauma or The Phantom of the opera, is not saved veteran UDO KIER who already

intervened in the first part SUSPIRIA and that is current with its participation in the HALLOWEEN of ROB

ZOMBIE.The staging looks like a vulgar TELEFILME, special effects are jokes,photography

non-existentthe Guin nor understood demonstrating the wonderful fall sharply once the manager ifare

other titlesreminded lately mediocre shot as the player or Insomnio.Tan just murderloose sb

usremember the one of his first works.

" 0

" Highly recommended film, with a very elaborate plot that makes us want to know the

outcome from the first frame

A thorough study of the poster can annoy us the entire film. So I recommend that if you want to see

the film, do not look at the poster, which is worth it a lot so that you spoil anything of it.

It is more, you should not read any criticism, it is going to be that they reveal to you something of this essential film. By the

way, is the creators of Matrix (although much more moderate and I dare say that better than the last two

installments). And do not forget to tell you that it comes from a comic. The film is developed in a

futuristic England, which has become a police state. The United States is mired in an

internal civil war and England has become a superpower. Within the chaos prevailing by the new

regime (motivated by a terrorist attack that engulfed the current leader) arises a figure who calls himself "" V ""

who tries to overthrow by all means the power. In these, a young girl will be raped by a kind of

police force when the mysterious "" V "" makes a haircut to the flying knife that leaves them nickel.

Who will be "" V ""? or better yet, what is all this about? Well, we have a film of those that do not bother

you because you lose details and, although in the end they all the pieces in their place, much better to follow it from the

origin. The story they tell us is really good, with futuristic scenarios (though not much) that give the

hit perfectly. In addition, as "" V "" has a mask, then we can not criticize anything to the performance of the actor who

interprets it. And it is to highlight the staging that has, with some very interesting details of photography

that make this a great movie. In the bad, you have a half hour of roll left over. It is not that bad that

time, but it gives a cut to the action that can take you out of the movie. Resumiendo, highly recommended film, with

a very worked plot that It makes us want to know the outcome from the first frame. By the

way, the ending is great, of those that you would like to see in all the movies.

" 1

" With this movie you should relax, sit in front of the screen and let yourself be transported. If you put any

concrete expectation about it, you may not see it fulfilled.

Terry Gilliam commented in the press conference that his wife had said a few words about Tideland that he

liked it a lot: "with this movie you should relax. , sit in front of the screen and let yourself be transported.

If you put any concrete expectation about it, you may not see it fulfilled. " This kind of definition

is perhaps ambiguous, but so is the sensation with which one can leave the room. Personally, I debated

between "" simply good "" or "" fucking good "", but I understand that more than one was between "" simply

good "" or "" a fucking shit "". In fact, this game has been going on forever for Terry. One of its objectives is to

provoke, to make think. To all his works he prints a very personal touch, a special magic that fewhave

directorstoday. And if it ever turns out to be flat, or excessively commercial, it's because he's taking a

run to make the kind of movies he likes. This is one of them. Like it or not, it will make you squirm

with disgust or not, laugh or not, cry or not, but he has gotten what he wanted: that peoplehas been

react.Itdescribed as a genre film, but I could not say why. I suppose it has an air of fantastic cinema,

but it could well be a black comedy, or a drama, or adventure cinema, or a mix of them all. Tideland tells

the story of Jeliza-Rose, a 9-year-old girl who lives in a completely unstructured family.

Accustomed to living in unfavorable conditions (his father has to prepare ashot every night

heroin, his mother can call him "" bitch "" and "" fondness "" in the same sentence, etc.), Jeliza-Rose has developed a

great imagination and easily evades reality with the help of her four best friends (heads

cut-off doll). The sudden death of his mother takes him to travel with his father to a lost house in Texas

(inheritance of the grandmother) and there begins a new stage of his life, where anything is possible (squirrels

talking, submarines in middle of a meadow.). From the hand of his neighbors Dickens (a boy withretardation

mental) and his sister Dell (an eccentric old maid) will find new possibilities for his incredible world.��� And

c��� What is the world of Jeliza-Rose? It's hard to describe, but it has something of Alice in the Wonderland

and something of Fear and disgust in Las Vegas. It never becomes an entertaining story full of adventures like

Alicia's, but it does not become as skimpy and crazy as Fear and disgust in Las Vegas. Everything has a

surreal air, but in the end nothing is as magical as it seems. If you also hurry me, you have an air to Life is

beautiful. The reality is that Jeliza-Rose lives the end of her family, the final decline, and that fate puts her

in the hands of a family equal or worse. And yet, she finds adventures and new reasons for

happiness where no adult could see them. What Terry does is put us on his skin. And the best thing is not to

escape, not want to see it from outside. Then we will think if it was very hard, if it was entertaining or if it was

empty. Leaving aside the story, the excellent photography, the aesthetics,deserve a special mention.

completelyadapted to the story, and the masterful interpretation of the girl, Jodelle Ferland (also

highlighting Jeff Bridges in the role of father and Brendan Fletcher as Dickens).

" 1

" Three good reasons to see this film "" The faithful gardener "" is based on the book of the same name, written by John le Carr���, a famous English writer

who He has already taken to the big screen other spy novels, such as "" The Tailor of Panama "" (2001),

starring Pierce Brosnan. There are three good reasons to see this film: one. Its director: Fernando

Meirelles, who was nominated for the Oscar for his magnificent "" City of God "" (2003) (film that like

this, was based �� in a book) .2. The protagonists: the excellent British actors Ralph Fiennes (The English Patient

, 1996) and Rachel Weisz (The Mummy, 1999) .3. The issue: the serious complaint against the world of theindustry

pharmaceutical, which carries out its tests using the most vulnerable humans on the planet and therefore the mostdisposable

"" ": the poor of the African continent, the perfect humanized women of India. In this case, children,

which makes the complaint harder. Some time ago, when I was working in the communication area of ​​theRed Cross

International, I was surprised. �� a press release issued in Geneva that was titled something like "" No to

international donations of medicines for the third world "". "The Red Cross went crazy", he thought, but

reading the content of the note I realized why he asked: most of the donations are n Composite

of past medicines that would cause more harm than relief. Seeing "" The faithful gardener "" I could see that the

problem goes beyond past medicines, but that it involves medicines on trial, for the great pandemics

that come to us. Maybe seeing the numbers, fr y and calculatingly, the deaths currently caused by these

tests, prevent millions more deaths in the future. But who are these industries / mafias to decide

on thousands of lives? At one point in the film, the protagonist asks why the pharmaceutic companies Ethics

do their tests directly in humans and they answer that because it is easier to correct than to prevent, in addition

to that way, they were ahead of other laboratories of the competition. A quite strong complaint.

" 1

" Essential semi-blic film, which shows us the largest prisoner escape that took place during the

Second World War. Dynamic, intriguing, tense, emotional, personal, with thousands of small stories that have

made it one of the best films of all time.

If I have not seen this movie 20 times I have not seen it before, and this was the first time I've

seen the initial scene. I do not know why, but that entrance into the concentration camp had never passed through my

retina. In addition, this time I have learned that it is based on a real fact, with which the hairs andescarpies

usualhave become hairs like beams of skyscrapers. What a wonderful film. The film is

about a modern concentration camp during the Second World War. In it all military prisonersfall

who have been captured and recaptured many times, that is, expeditions in escapes. According to the boss-in-chief's philosophy

, they have put all the rotten apples in a basket. So the prisoners decide, led by aleader

natural, to make the biggest escape that was ever made, to get the Nazi troops to waste time looking for them,

instead of fighting on the front. It is one of the few of the Second World War in which there are no

cruelties, no horrors of war or concentration camps. We are shown a very kind face

of the War, with some very innocent Nazis, who border on absolute candor. On the other hand, the allies are

astute and intelligent for the most part, with a great sense of honor and duty. Maybe too much vision is

given, but of course a tremendous film. A good deal, with a real story that puts the

hair on end and calls the ,pica, manages to maintain a tension for almost three hours, which is not easy to

do. In short, essential semi-blic film, which shows us the largest prisoner escape that took place

during the Second World War. Dynamic, intriguing, tense, emotional, personal, with thousands of small

stories that have made it one of the best films of all time.

" 1

" A comedy, a parody, which nevertheless is capable of maintaining tension, action, even drama. A

little gem

I extracted a mixture of genres. A comedy, a parody, which nevertheless is able to maintain tension,

action, even drama. The duty of the comedies has always been the story in itself. � Soon the gags or

jokes end up taking the spotlight, relegating what is counted to the background. Only rarely

, when the intensity is reduced one point, and with something to say of course, theis achieved

balancejust to interest the viewer beyond making it laugh. This film achieves it, withmoments

very funny, but with a rhythm of action, based on the development of a police intrigue, which also keeps us

interested, and that undoubtedly makes you leave the cinema in a good mood. I can only recommend it.

" 1

" The tape remains a mere experiment, which, like the soda, is worth doing at home and then

keeping it in a drawer, as high as possible of the view of the others.

I know I referred to this film in my opinion about "" Once upon a time there was a story backwards. "" But it was not

until a conversation. Conn with my cu���ado, faithful reader of this page (I take this opportunity to send you a hello! Hello

Joselito !!), when I have been pushed to see the tape, that although ��� I qualified with a mere experiment, which I

had to see, it was the curiosity and his opinion that led me to prove it for myself. It is an original way,

never seen, this one to encourage with peanuts and other nuts, which does not fall on deaf ears, of course, but

despite the excellent soundtrack, debtor to Tim Burton's cinema (and with certain touches of sonority with the

great Danny Elfman ), stay in that, in a mere anecdote, of short duration (hour and a quarter nothing else), that with a

language of its own and with an argument debtor of the horror cinema and suspense, get only inte Resar a little for the

original of his silvering. And is that, the peanuts just say nothing, and one in some moments thinks it

is losing a few minutes. precious in doing anything else, and not in seeing how two guys move again and again

some "" panchitos "" on the screen, apart from the dubbing, which seems like those made by 2 coleguitas inplan

totalFinally, I agree with the opinion of my cuÃ ± ada, and that is that, as he said, the tape remains a

mere experiment, which, like the soda, is worth doing in house and then store it in a drawer, as

high as possible from the view of others.

" 0

" 90 minutes to forget a little the sad world that surrounds us, full of hardships, injustices and

disappointments, seeing what the Yankees of Slovakia laugh at. And the rest of the world.

Eli Roth directed in 2002 "Cabin fever", one of the surprises of the last intelligent horror cinema. On that

occasion a high number of young people suffers the unspeakable thing to die in a horrible way in a cabin in the middle of

nowhere. I saw the success of my mouth had, and turned into a cult movie, now comes with some more money

and sponsored by the infallible Quentin Tarantino with "" Hostel "", which I just saw, as it was one of the

most anticipated titles of the season, and in which a number ( not so high) of young people suffer the unspeakable until

dying? horribly in the middle of nowhere. And the movie does not disappoint. ��� Or is it? The fact is that it is not as violent

as it is painted ("" Passion "" still holds the first place in terms of sadism, gore and torture in the

cinema ���de terror of the 21st century) but it is fun as it was the previous work.for navigators: is

Noticethe movie with good m yst���as and tits and asses with thong (and without ���l) what's on the billboard The argument is the

least (I'm not going to gut it, but basically it's another "" those "", you'll see) and the first act could go

through the imaginary "" American Pie : Study trip "", that does not exist, but that if it existed would be something

similar. There is a cameo by Takashi Miike, the most brutal of the moment, and it will give the j Young people who, with

summer around the corner, think about the interrail, or how balls are written. The effects of make-up

are the work of the great Greg Nicotero, who better than to put on some movie in which he has worked , almost 100, you

look at IMDB and flipais.La music of Franco-Giacomo Carbone is not bad (and sometimes, especially in thecredits

final), reminds the "" Psychosis "" The director does not innovate or try to invent plans "" never done "",

so fashionable in today's cinema, but we thank you not to beat around the bush (Although I insist, it's not so

wild I should, to see if there is a director���s cut chachi) and show us some subnormal characters with a

penis brain that we really do not give a damn what happens to them. With a third act a little absurd, since

during the two others we expect to see the torture rooms and then, when it arrives, it goes running (or will that be

a success that you shit?), it is enjoyed 100% and one is thrown a couple of laughs, which is appreciated, as well as

the end, where the viewer, a subject complicit and infected by the dominant dementia, becomes another

"" of those "", as you will see. summary, 90 minutes to forget a little the sad world that surrounds us, full

of hardships, injustices and disappointments, seeing what the Yankees of Slovakia laugh at. And the rest of the world.

Do not miss the Slovak enfants.

" 1

" This is a brutal poem, an excessive and precious song about destiny and life from

very few materials and filmed with extreme tenderness.

There are codes of honor that require a calligraphy. Ra rude, a typical background that justifies the deployment of

violence. Not a violence to the way Tarantino films it: oversized, masterly for itsenjoyment

visual, but totally blunt in dramatic profiles. I prefer Sam Peckinpah or Samuel Fuller, who are (

maybe) the two immediate referents when it comes to exercising that unnecessary, though cin���fila (maneuver

cinephile as idle whim)to westernize the cinema asian Hana-bi (Flowers of fire) is the

portrait of a man driven by circumstances that surpass him - who does not? -: terminal illness of his

wife, the companion who has been paralyzed in a raid and the gang of mafiosi that chases him with

bad intentions and bad intentions. And it is death (precisely) that dictates all the gui���n. Death escorted by

tenderness or by beauty or by melancholy. The concise, almost fragile stroke explodes when necessary in a

powerful visual torrent, in hypnotic action scenes that are flanked by unforeseen and beautiful

recesses in which the characters, whom we know doomed to a fatal fate, stop to contemplate the

sea ​​not a snowy landscape with the delicacy with which a character would do it in a Bergman or Kurosawa film.

This staggering thriller (it does not look like it at its beginning) is a fénebre poem, a kind of song to life

from the consent of his escape. Perhaps you dismiss the profane spectator in the filmography of Takeshi Kitano or the one who

only considers the American-style photograms, those that distill violence, blood and adrenaline in a

gush, that all this is and in enough doses to satisfy that skewed audience. But Kitano

can not contain his poetic breath and raises his camera to the sky or lets it rest on the sea: it tames us in the

storm, it drives us as it wants to the terrain that more pleases to, in the end, make us derail in the

abrupt drama of an irreplaceable destiny, orchestrated fabulously from the shadows of that sky or from the

nervous crests of the infinite sea. This breath can also be appreciated in the various

drawings that appear throughout the film and are the work of the director himself (and actor Beat Takeshi

) was awarded with the LeÃn de Oro at the Venice Festival in 1997 and international recognition for

the work of a man who possesses a very peculiar sense of violence and how to narrate it, marrying

minimalism and spectacle. ��culo, making their yakuzas, those gangsters of the rising sun, bewitched by some

ancestral spell, deadpan and lethal, hieratic and wandering, constitute a caste of loyal archetypes

of their dramatic universe. tico, who also goes to these wicks, to the spell, to the plot and the paucity of gestures

to make explicit an enormity of resources and an almost limitless range of messages.

" 1

" In a way, and although it may seem like a simplistic impression, espáa is the typical story of the revenge of the

nerd towards the most handsome and popular of the class.

The glamorous image of the esp foma encouraged by the cinema seems already in disuse, excessively

exploited. The latest productions with workers of espionage agencies as protagonists come to

corroborate this trend with examples such as Syriana, The Good Shepherd and even, despite not giving up the

exaggerations of the saga, the last Bond embodied by David Craig, much more earthly and vulnerable than

his predecessors. This is also the case of El Esp���a (Breach), the second work of director Billy Ray, who will

debut with The Price of Truth (Shattered Glass), a remarkable film financed by Tom Cruise. And it is curious

that, for both works, Ray has been based on two popular scenarios: in the case of The price of

truth, in the case of a journalist with an excess of inventiveness for his stories, and in he spies, as his

eloquent title in Castilian, in the story of a secret agent considered the greatest traitor / mole

discovered in the entrails of the FBI. Judging by the subject of both works, Ray must be very interested in

cheating characters with double life. The verismo approach of this sober story is perceptible from his

credit titles. initials, with the television images of John Ashcroft, attorney general of the first

Bush administration, announcing the arrest of Robert Hanssen, FBI agent who sold secrets and esp�� as

Americans to the USSR for more than 20 years. His case, perhaps the one with the greatest public significance known

to date, was considered one of the greatest disasters to have occurred withinintelligence. But

Americanthe tape does not address the way in which this man could leak secrets to agovernment

rivalfor two decades, such as Hanssen's possible reasons and reasons. So espáa tries, above

all, to delve into the strange and contradictory personality of an agent specialized in systems of

management of the information whose gray task, far removed from the predestined glory for field agents,

was never subjected to severe scrutiny. Excellent work by Chris Cooper, a regular of the third Line

of credits, providing complexity and depth to the contradictory character of Hanssen To guide us through this

journey to the mind of Hanssen, another character far from him, the young agent Eric O'Neill, played

Effectively by Ryan Phillippe, it will be who we enter the complex world of this character created with great

richness of nuances by the excellent Chris Cooper, actor usually relegated to the third line of the

final credits . O'Neill will be assigned the task of 'hunting' Hanssen in one of his betrayals to avoid his

retirement from the FBI without even having stepped on a court for his countless list of crimes. So,

for much of the film, both will be measured in the typical pulse between the outstanding student and the old

fox who knows them all. Also the always splendid Laura Linney appears in the cast as O'Neill's

boss. In short, the simple proposal of El Esp���a is to explain how an agent of clear

patriotism and apparent honesty could 'sell' to his country a rival power. Why strange cable crossover in

his mind could make decisions so damaging to the safety of his country. Many of the arguments used in

the film point to the continued contempt shown by Hanssen's superiors towards his work, considered an

office mouse, but which, as he himself demonstrated with his betrayal. n, it was much more crucial and required much more

dedication and effort to safeguard sensitive information on matters of national security. In a

way, and although it may seem like a simplistic impression, espáa is the typical story of the revenge of the nerd towards the

most handsome and popular of the class .

" 1

" At the beginning a heavy movie is made, with scenes filled with nothing, bland and somewhat disconcerting. It is not

known if it will be a bore, an example of pedanter���ao, maybe it will drift towards something positive. And, thank God,

this happens last.

"During a stormy night, bandits kill a whole family, except the youngest son, ten years old;

He will look at the image of the bandits, and then after, he will look for them to take revenge, with the help of a

man betrayed by those who also want revenge " "This spaghetti western is not that it differs much

from the rest of the rest, but the direction, in charge of Giulio Petroni, is something more fortunate than the average in this

type of products. So and everything, at first a heavy pelt is made, with scenes filled with nothing, bland and

somewhat disconcerting. It is not known if it will be a bore, an example of pedanter���ao, maybe it will drift towards something

positive. And, thank God, this happens last, with the final third that is the best of the film, getting

really interested in the violent confrontation between ruthless beings, deprived at that moment of any

hint of humanity. An excessively irregular film, which has good scenes and denotes a knowledge to be behind

the scenes. Unfortunately, the rhythm is not adequate and the gui���n gives quite a few bumps.

" 0

" I have nothing against special effects, on the contrary, they are very useful in certain films

to get a more real effect, but we must not forget that special effects must be at the service of

the story that is told.

I read somewhere that someone thought that the cinema of the 21st century will become this, and I am afraid that

this could be true because this is not cinema, they are just a lot. Den special effects mixed with violence

and video game aesthetics. I have nothing against special effects, on the contrary, they are very useful in

certain films to get a more real effect, but we must not forget that special effects

must be in service of the story that is told, and the less you notice, the better they are, however, in

300 and in some other current films, there is no story, we just go to the movies to see what well done are the

effects, and that is very sad, the cinema should be something that excites, that makes you throb and stay stuck to the

chair, that makes you feel emotions, and it has left me completely indifferent, I did not care about all the

characters and what happened to them, and something fundamental in a film really is that the viewer is involved

in some way in the story, now that someone tells me if he has been involved in the story of this

film? 300 is an empty and meaningless show, with the Typical speeches about honor, glory, and blah,

blah, that nobody convinces anymore. A nice wrapper but with nothing more absolute inside.times I've

Manyread the typical argument that "it's pure entertainment and nothing more", and I ask myself: do people only

entertain bad films? I do not understand, am ... I am much more entertained to see a good movie thatme

Makethink and tell me something, before a simple and empty seasonal blockbuster, it will be that I am a bit strange.

" 0

" A film that reveals a new twist in modern crime scenes. At first glance and according to other critics, the film seemed to drink of Heat, that masterful film by Michael

Mann that (how time passes) has already 11 years. Some similarities are true, but only in itsconception.

stylistic and commercialThis film has two heavyweights of the French cinema (Daniel Auteuil and G� ��rard

Depardieu), a series of decent shootings but not even far from Mann's film and a

cold, blue ambience. And there the similes end. The script is very original and I presume that they have ancharge

autobiographicaland a very strong personal contribution from the director. Very similar to the cases of Habana Blues and Un

franco 14 pesetas. Not in vain Olivier Marchal was a policeman while studying acting and doingtasks

screenwriting, and surely his experiences are reflected in several moments of the film, totally original (the

theft of the plate, the repudiation in an official act, etc.?) The story is about two police officers from different

brigades who get along. Although the macguffin of the film is catching the thieves ofcars

armored, the plot revolves around the envy and bad plays that certain policemen do for past reasons

that are seen but are not explained , which is to be grateful. None of the characters is a saint, but

there is a real goat in history. The pending issues referred to in the film

are very clear as the footage progresses. And with it increases the incredulity by a cruelty without limits

and an unprecedented corruption and moral misery. The strong point is a very hard guide, tremendously

credible. On the other hand it seems that the effort in writing a hard story has left aside the

aspect of the direction of actors, since two monsters like the ones in this film are pretty dull. A certain

part of the footage asks that the seriousness and even the apathy of an absorbing and hard work be the protagonist,

but as the characters fall into a spiral of violence, the interpretations require much

more pulse of which the director has used. On the other hand, maybe you have a few minutes left, that removed from thehalf

finalhour could accelerate and make the film much more interesting. A more than decent film that it can be seen

with passion, as it has been my case, and that reveals a new twist in the modern polic���aca plots.

" 1

" The argument is the thriller story of personal self-improvement that Americans like so much. In fact,

the movie is very American ... from the point of view uncouth and bipolarly improvised.

Passed of turns, (Tallega nights: The ballad of Ricky Bobby, 2006, Adam Mckay) is, in spite of not having

any copy in vos, the inossima demonstration that here the The boss is Mr. Will Ferrell. Forget about

Stillers, Wilsons or Carreys. This man is the only one who joins today, he manages to make me sweat in a room

while tears fall on me as I contemplate his endless antics, more and more "" spent in laps "". The argument

is the trillionth story of personal self-improvement that Americans like so much. In fact, the movie is

American���sima. from Ferrell's brazen and improvised point of view, seconded by a glorious

John C. Reilly, who has a great time, and by a cast of regulars in Judd Apatow's productions, Molly

Superstar Shannon inculcated. Huge the n���mesis of the prota, the chameleon Sacha Baron Cohen (Ali G and soon

Borat). Maybe it takes a little bit to start, but once entered into matter does not stop not a second, despite not

reaching the glorious limits of El Reportero, becoming the best comedy of this year.

I understand that you refuse (the fans) to see her dubbed, but neither is Nacho Libre (Why do they change the title of

a movie that has a title in Spanish?) They have been released in original version, so you have to make an

effort, which will last a little longer on the poster. A 7���75.

" 1

" A huge mess, full of tonter���asOther American remake that opens between us, that oh surprise! It's not an oriental

horror movie. This time they have taken a film by the excellent director John Carpenter, "La Niebla", made in 1980, and that

despite a couple of good ideas, I consider it one of their worst films. I think it was a veryfilm

wasted, so when I found out that a new movie was up and running, I thought

maybe it would explode. better the excellent material that was at hand, the work of Carpenter himself, and his

eternal partner, recently deceased, Debra Hill. However, when the news broke that the director was going

to be Rupert Wainwright, I lost all hope, and I trembled, because I still wake up sweaty, at

night, remembering that frightening bodral called? Stigmata ?. Can not do it worse ?, he repeated me over and over

again. Well, yes. I know it can, and after seeing the film, I can only say that it makes the Carpenter film

a masterpiece. In a coastal village, very cute, you ��� On a still more beautiful island, a lot of cute

characters, they wander about their cute lives, when suddenly, a dense and cute fog, starts to load

some, because it turns out that the island conceals a past terror. And no, it is not because there is a monkey. Trying to

renew the previous version, they have wanted to do it in all possible aspects. Even rejuvenating

some of its main characters. For this they have used two of the most famous actors in the current

television scene. On the one hand, Tom Welling, interpreter of? Smallville? (series that I have not seen a

single episode, how is this?), and on the other, Maggie Grace, one of the protagonists of the? wait, wait, that's

your favorite word, overrated? Lost ?, although that's it, very entertaining. The two are?

is that they are not, because their characters are nothing, they do not exist; archetypes of typic archetypes. The third one

in discord is my beloved Selma Blair, an actress with a special morbid, but who is not here either, does not exist,

is not nothing, since there is nothing? you are welcome? God m���oooo !! The fogaaaaa? I have chosen a bad day to stop

smelling glue. Why do not you know what movie that phrase is? What happens? Do you not understand what you are

reading? Is that the movie does not make sense. Well the criticism either. And I prefer to talk about other things? What is

the fifth season of? 24? Do not say anything, that I have not started to see it yet, and I'm a fan of

Jack Bauer, good of the first three, because the churro of the fourth, it was not worth dipping in chocolate? I'm

thinking about the meme about strange habits that have happened to me, but I leave that for my blog, where I allow myself

to cheat a bit, and move them to the world of cinema? to focus It's already, I'm

focused, pass it on, pass it on? In the director's chair, and painting the monkey, Rupert Wainwright, to which some

personal enemy recommended him to dedicate himself to the world of cinema. The realization of this film is not only

extremely flat, but it is full of clumsiness, and it raises the topics to the highest power, provoking in

some At the moment, specifically two, the laughter. In the rest, one suffers, and not precisely from terror. Wainwright

believes that by shooting close-ups, and then alternating them with a gimmicky montage, moresound effects

absurd, it's going to cause some kind of suspense or tension, or intranquality, or God knows what? What the

movie is full of ridiculous moments, and it suffers from the damn handicap of wanting to explain everything, so some

things are simply shameful, unbelievable. If there was something good about Carpenter's film, it was that the

most interesting aspects of the story were suggested, and were left to the imagination of the spectator. Here there is

nothing of that, so, trying not to leave any loose ends, a series of illogical situations follow one another, and

the result is worse. And if not, how badly explained and shown that is, how is it possible that in the past (and itnot

isany spoiler) those four people could do what they did? is that it is not possible. On purpose, a huge

mess, full of nonsense. I'm surprised it's produced by Carpenter; I hope it was not to put

money, and has collected a substantial check. By the way, there are two more remakes of Carpenter movies,

running; and are those of the magnificent? Halloween? and? The Thing? (This in turn was already a remake of a masterpiece

entitled "The Other World Enigma" by Christian I. Nyby). SOS, do not give them to Wainwright. SOS, do not

give them to Wainwright. Uff.

" 0

" Pass by cash, leave your euros, if you have nothing else to do. If they have it, make it. Although it costs

more. Money is not the most important thing in life.

ITodo is getting too confused. One believes to be in a world and then it turns out that it is another. Open a

door waiting to find a garden and what you see is a slaughterhouse. Close your eyes and search the imagination with

a beach with conches and children playing with the waves and what you see is a forest where

elves and witches roam, perhaps alg��� Catholic fundamentalist or a hooligan with slight artistic inclinations. He goes to the

movies to have a good time and he goes out hurt, enpantanated in thoughts almost always dark about the

convenience of never going back to using more selective selective criteria. Weigh even the

possibility of not going back to step on a movie theater and leave your eyes on the TV at home. Ah��� it is always possible to hit the

stop and change the disk. Or do not put any. Reading is an entertainment of the first order. There are good books

in the market. I have been a voracious reader and I still read with fury when time allows me. Ah

Charles Dickens. Ah Paul Auster. Oh Borges. Ah Gamoneda. If the bookish thing does not strain, there is music. Take one

CD from the shelf, drop it in the favorite bucket and close your eyes. Bill Evans' piano can

fulfill all the expectations of happiness to which a human being aspires. Or some Billy Joel melodies. Or the

symphonic rock of the Genesis of the first time. If the kind reader still has doubts about how to occupy his

time, he can go out into the street. Not everything is cinema, books and records, although that can fill veryappetites

demanding. There are still friends with whom to take a moment and debate about the divine and human with a good

bourbon on a winter terrace. Or simply walk around, let yourself be carried away by the wind while the afternoon

depopulates its rigors and the night peeks between the rooftops back home. Anyway. Life can be

wonderful, as a television announcer of phimbombancia fon���tica and poor hoses says, like an outcast at the

reception of the Rockefeller Center. And all this comes from the cinema , I rememberthat last night I saw The

. It turns outscream 2. And left reflective, as the kind reader warns, fatiguing pros and cons, resolving in my heart

(I have one, yes, sir) on whether to forget this event or incorporate it into the thick list ofmoments

incidentalthat mark the course of the days. I do not know what to do yet. I do not know how my almostwill proceed

always reasoning. Maybe, posts to be honest, is not the thing for so much. One has seen infumables clitoris

of lesser moral calculus and this (what they want to tell you) has until some time incombustible.

Or maybe a couple or three. Out of that bonanza, the film is a large chestnut that is undermining

our patience until the eyes begin to sting and the brain (which is wise, fuck) calls out to us

(m� Shouting) that we leave the room and walk through the avenues, outdoors, watching the cars,

families coming and going through the parks. My friend J. warns me of these excesses: Emilio, ���date. Do not

go sick It is very easy (he concludes) to start with El grito 2 and then swallow the whole filmography of

Andr���s Pajaros and Fernando Esteso, even if there were tits to tutipl���n And once got into these From thesun,

risingthen it is very difficult to return to Stanley Kubrick or Alfred Hitchcock, who you liked so much. ��� So bad

is it? Well, I'm not sure if the adjective "" bad "" is entirely appropriate. It is strange. It's a remake of a

sequel. It is an apa .o. It is, let's agree, a package of popcorn a kilometer high that is eaten in

one sitting and then your stomach is empty, as if nothing would have gone in. To deepen my guilt, I admit

that I saw the first one, and that I did not disgust myself excessively. This second one has reached me more deeply. The curse of the house

has left the screen and has pierced me. Inoculated I am. The virus has invaded my critical capacity. This

review will end up being ben���vola.IIThe Japanese cinema is giving us more and more joy. After the

incommensurable Dark Water or Pulse (from sober Japanese inspiration) has fallen on our screens The scream 2.

If you still have not gone to the movies, leave what is doing. Go Run. Row seven. Eight too. There is emotion

and fear in abundance. Ask the producers to look for another house soon (it's worth it if they change the

furniture) and launch for Christmas The scream 3. And if three screams do not satisfy your craving for ghostly infants

in cursed houses, go to the video store m�� It's close and rent the Japanese originals. Or buy them. There will be a pack.

The tapes tend to be more raw but not less shocking. How beautiful the cinema is. How happy

I am today.

" 0

" Le���n de Aranoa's first show that shows a bearded man and his family. Tremendously original, at

times funny, at times emotional, at times hard and sad, is a must for anyone who likes a

sip of good movies.

Director: Fernando Le���n de Aranoa Duration: 97 minutes. Year: January 23, 1997. Viewers: 151,333 of

human beings. If you have not seen this movie, I recommend you stop reading. right now, this review. It's not that she's

thinking of revealing anything, it's better to see her virginal, how maiden of Atañon's harness, who fondled

Pamela Anderson in pneumonic dreams of millions of anonymous onanists. Warned you stayed. The first time

I saw this movie, I was very impressed. To begin with, for the first 10 minutes that you get so

surprised you do not even know what to think. And then because this is a drama, camouflaged in a curious way of comedy,

but a drama that leaves you pretty crazed. That's right, in between you laugh. The film is about the celebration

of a father's birthday. And so far I can read without crashing anything. The first opera by Fernando Le���n de Aranoa

(it's not that Fernando's cousin is performing, as the other day pointed out to me. a) it turns out to be a very curious film,

and above all very original. That I do not forget, many years ago, one of those bépedas vipers of the programs

of the heart attacked this director because he had gone with the same shirt as in the previous gala

of the Academy Awards. Ah��� you see the cultural level of a country, in what we change clothes (if I do not tell

now, then I forget). Total, that the actors do their role very well, the follies of the storyyou

putback in the movie if you leave at some point, and the end has apotheosis moments. To see her on

a quiet Sunday afternoon. Resuming, Le���n de Aranoa's first show that shows us a

bearded man and his family. Tremendously original, at times funny, at times emotional, at times hard and sad, is a

must for anyone who likes a sip of good movies. It is not the best, but it stands out a lot among

the others.

" 1

" Those defectillos, not as big as it may seem for my comment, do not prevent the viewer

from spending two entertaining hours, pure cinematographic spectacle in which he will be without a doubt one of the

most remembered movies of this year.

This is one of the films most expected by fans around the world and I could not

miss the opportunity to see it three weeks in advance, thanks to the invitation sent by Warner Bros

Espa���ay and by muchocine.net The expectation was palpable in the room and it was not for less: "" 300 "" is based on a

prestigious c���mic of the no less prestigious Frank Miller and is directed by Zack Snyder, whose first film,

"" Dawn of the dead "", was a great presentation letter. The story is, for many ,

well known but still will not reveal too much. We are in the year 480 BC and the immense Persian army led

by Jerjes (Rodrigo Santoro) is preparing to attack Sparta. With certain political problems that prevent him from

reuniting his entire army, Le���nidas king of the Spartans (Gerard Butler) gathers 300 of his best men and

prepares to face the Persians in a narrow passage known as the Term���pilas. The rest is

history, but if you do not know it, do not worry because it is not necessary. If something is raising expectations and it is going to

be talked about in the film, it is your visual treatment. I've already heard everything about it: if they are

cartoons, that if everything is by computer, if they are decorated painted? My recommendation is that you do not think about

all that and you just let yourself be carried away by the festival of spectacular and full of images that flood

the movie. �cula. There is no moment in all the projection in which there is not a shocking image and it does not matter if they

are generated by computer or not; the result is perfect visually. In contrast to what is being talked about, it

is about other aspects that I have found outstanding. The sound, for example, is impressive. The

storms, the advance of the army of Xerxes or the voices like thunder on the battlefield, echo in the

ears as few times, getting to mix at some point with the impressive band sound of Tyler Bates,

that I do not know how to work without the support of the images but, of course, oye in the film is of the more

memorable of the last times. Another aspect that perhaps calls less attention, as it usually happens in this

type of films, is the interpretative one. You have to applaud the work of casting because the actors fit

their characters like a glove. Gerard Butler, an actor who always seemed to lack some strength,

puts all the meat on the spit and composes a Le ���nidas hard and just at the same time, with ancode of honor

irreproachable(for a Spartan, of course). His voice, his presence, his charisma on screen make us understand that

we are before a king that anyone would follow to hell itself. For example, the bottom photo in

which Butler's gaze, only comprehensible to those who have seen the film or read the film, says more

a thousand words. Beside her, a beautiful Lena Headey, giving her all the strength of character imaginable in the

Queen of Sparta. His character, of whom he would make a man face an army only to protect it,

plays the parallel story in Sparta that was intuited but not counted in the original c���mic. This story

is very well introduced and has so much interest that is missing that it does not start sooner than it does,

because it also serves as a repose between battles and help, therefore, to modulate the rhythm of the film. The rest

of the cast is perfect with its papers but I would like to highlight the imposing presence of Rodrigo

Santoro as Xerxes (see photo above). Presence that, in addition to the interpretation of the actor, is achieved

in two ways. The first is how well created are the special effects that make us appear as a

King of more than two meters in height, huge against Le���nidas (already of itself). � tall and sturdy). The second one is the

tremendous physical transformation of the actor, a real one, who is hard to recognize with

makeup and digital retouching. But it did not seem like a perfect film to me. I'll mention the flaws

that I see that you owe more sensations than objective elements. And my feeling is that, at certain

times, the film is too excessive and causes a certain saturation of stimuli in the spectator.the

Onother hand, in my opinion In all that the tape has of adrenal���nica it lacks of pure emotion. Wethe

attendbattles with the senses completely obscured by the visual feast, but that prevents us from getting excited or that

we really worry about the future of these battles or their protagonists. Speaking of the battles,

I think nothing would have happened if one of them had been cut slightly in the assembly room. But

those flaws, not as big as it may seem for my comment, do not prevent the viewertwo

from spendinghours entertaining, from pure cinematic spectacle in which it will be without a place to doubts one of the

most remembered films of this year and that shows that Zack Snyder is called to become one of the

most important directors of the beginning of the century .

" 1

" The producers of "" The Sixth Sense "" are responsible for demonstrating the irreversible comma of screenplays

, the death of originality and the resurgence of plagiarism.

The producers of "" El Sexto Sentido "" and the director of "" Blade Trinity "" (dangerous collaboration) perform this

thriller, a remake of a Swedish film. An irregular and, at times, entertaining student history with

transcendental pretensions that, in its multiple turns, is in charge of demonstrating the irreversible comma of the

cinematographic scripts, the death of the originality and the resurrection. Deln plagiarism. As "" the essential remains

invisible to the human eye "", we must admit the possibility of finding ourselves before a cult film, one of those

films that will serve as a reference in the future. But, for now, everything points to another "" what "" television

like this starring Harrison Ford, who left us only a memorable and recurring fright in the bathroom In What

The Truth Hides from the year 2000. From the stories to not sleep in the Fourth Millennium (that great

program), the writers have made many raids in different genres, from terror to drama

going through the comedy, until you get to this "supernatural thriller that gradually becomes a

romantic story of redemption", according to the director's words. Too much flourish to define a

ghost, in the best sense of the word, according to the m���as. The story is rocked between the adolescent terror of

Blue Fear (1,985) and the effect of Ghost (1,990) to lead to an unexpected turn, original surprise,

attractive find. If we had not met in a romantic comedy, Ojal��� Fuera Ver, from the year 2.005.to

Stepsfollow both, we discover that sta, The Invisible, is the remake of a Swedish filmWahl, Den osynlige,

based on a novelthe author Mats the year 2,002, also In Swedish. On the other hand, the excellent

comedy of Mark Waters, which included in his cast with Mark Ruffalo and with the adorable Reese Witherspoon, comes from

the literary adaptation of the play Et si c? ���tait vrai . of the French writer Marc Levy. ���Extra chance!

Only here the coincidence does not end. One of the directors of Den Osynlige, Joel Bergvall, prepares his debut

in Hollywood with Addicted, remake of a Korean film. Thematic id���ntica! Arrived at this point, the

viewer begins to marvel at the originality that rules the world, which must be another collateral damage of the

effect of globalization. ,N, and "" what "" is written in Singapore had already been thought of Burrows, but it turns out that it

was published in Philadelphia. It would not be strange that in the year 2.060 somebody commented a movie of premiere

alluding to "" What is not seen, like that classics of the year. ��o 2.007 "". Another of those curiosities that govern the history

of the cinema. At the moment, only a plagiarized history is perceived, with a narrative structure oflinearity

exasperating, with the ups and downs of the worst telefilms, with dispensable phrases that derive towards

subframes that they remain in the air, and with a modern soundtrack, which would only lack a seductive voice-

over that will remember some "" Things to do in Denver when you're dead "" to become the pilot episode

of one of those new-batch television series. A film that bases its main attraction on the

supernatural phenomena that run without resorting to special effects (we return to Ojal��� Fuera Cierto),

with transcendental pretensions that many other directors, writers and producers they reflected with greater

intensity and less camel. What does that sound like? "" Only life is appreciated when you experience

non-existence "?,? Maybe that? What Beautiful is Living by Frank Capra ? In the end, we are all surprisingly

different and terribly similar, we just have to break the facade that makes the image of others come

to us distorted, because beauty is almost always in the heart. Does not this remind you of Beauty

and The Beast by Jean Cocteau? Once again, nothing new under the sun. Only a lamentable guide from Davis,

entertained in his development when his ridiculous frequent failures are overlooked. We are, however, with

the great work of the Oscar-winning Marcia Gay Harden, with the expressionless boy of War of the Worlds (that

kind of actor who, inexplicably, whistles to the producers) and, above all, with a project of Angelina

Jolie, with less lips and more talent. Attention the gymnast Margarita Levieva that, if it does not finally turn out

for the dramas, it could always be used in the third installment of Lara Croft.

" 0

" A wasted opportunity to create an interesting product based on an idea that could be

taken much more advantage.

The chosen one is one of those films of modern terror, which has now been called psychological terror (as

if there were another). Starring a deliberately effete (although not wanting to get it) Monica

Bellucci, tells the story of a lonely and lonely woman who adopts a little boy from aorphanage

Siberian. When he is eight years old, a mark appears on his torso, which is associated with a legend of a

tribe from his native territory, and from that moment, assassinations, disappearances andevents begin to happen

extra. ���os.With a quite successful setting, favored by the halo of mystery that already covers

Mother Russia, the chosen one is a production that will be I could get much more juice from the obtained and have

made a film much more round and finished than the one it represents. Starting from an interesting andidea

intriguing, the truth is that the tone goes down to becoming boring at times, leaving a sense of

dissatisfaction and lost opportunity. The alternation between the Parisian and the Russian stages does not end to

convey the feeling of uncertainty that should, nor does it incite the viewer thatis being raised in amanner

the why of thingscontinuous, nor l is the motivation that moves the characters that are parading through the

screen without finishing contributing anything really worthy of continued attention. When in a film of

intrigue, one does not feel the need to think and guess about the answers to the unforeseen questions,misplaced. That is

we havewhy even the presence of the immortal Catherine Deneuve does not get provide the

film with the consistency necessary to convert a good proposal into a tangible reality and easy to

enjoy by a spectator who will undoubtedly be disappointed with his disappointed expectations, since little more

than the Nude integral, fleeting and unexpected of the Bellucci will remain for the annals of the seventh art.

" 0

" Felicity Huffman's masterful performance Since I saw the trailer for? Transamerica? I can not see the same anymore? Desperate women ?.makeup

Felicity Huffman'sin the film helps make it look like someone who was previously a man, but her own

features are somewhat masculine and, especially when she makes some gestures, it's hard to see Lynette as a

woman . Probably, your husband in real life, William H. Macy, protagonist of "Homicide ?, do not think so

. To top off the mix, Huffman's character in? Transamerica? her name is Bree, like another one of the

? desperate women ?, to which Marcia Cross gives life. Despite the title of the film and the fact that itshas focused

advertisingon this aspect, the central argument of? Transamerica? It is not transsexuality, but the encounter

between a person and the son who did not know what he had. Difficult encounter for the secrets that both have been kept

and for the revelations of truths that are disappointing. But these secrets and lies could be others

and the film would have exactly the same scheme. It happens the same as in "Brokeback Mountain ?, where theargument

centralis not homosexuality, although it is treated at least more than transsexuality here but the story of

an impossible love for social issues. The word? Transamerica? not only indicates the change of sex, but

also the journey from one side to the other of a country that is changing according to Bree and Toby advance in their journey. �a. Due

to this road movie treatment, and the sentimental plot of reunion for mother-child, the film isreminiscent

veryof a telefilm. The happy ending, a bit sweetened and too reconciled, also brings him closer to this

format, in which he does not end up falling thanks to the quality of his performance and interpretations. The

double transformed Felicity Huffman, in addition to achieving a masterful performance, gets some gesture, some

profile, with which we seem to be before a transsexual. Paradoxically, when she wears less makeup andnot

cantake hormones, it is when she notices more that she is a woman. For this reason, perhaps it could be posed if it would

not have been more accurate that the role was embodied by a true transsexual, since it is less usual forto

therebe characters for them and this film could have been a great opportunity for an actress who

has made a change of sex. As in the movie "The Hours ?, it could have given an opportunity

to an unattractive actress, because they usually have less chance of being movie stars, instead of-

makeup and makeup Nicole Kidman However, it seems that the "" most difficult "" is one of the preferences

of American industry and, especially, of the Oscars (see? Forrest Gump ?, Rain Man ?, Innocence

interrupted ?, etc.). Therefore, it is quite likely that we will see Huffman climb the steps and pick up a

new trophy that will unite his Emmy for "Desperate Housewives".

" 1

" I said without blushing that we are facing one of the best animated films of the year, there are a couple of plans in

the tape that are well worth the price of the entrance to the room for see them.

Say without blushing that we are facing one of the best animated films of the year, there are a couple of plans in the

film that are worth the price of the entrance to the room to see them, the tape, very much like Burton narrates

situations calculated almost to the millimeter and is that nothing happens on the tape "" because "" but everything has a

reason to be and finally (the tape just lasts hour and fourth) the result does not disappoint. Also, although towards

the middle of the film the film falls a little rhythm, the final result is excellent, the music of Danny

Elfman (collaborator Burton's usual) does not break the narrative at any time, and although it is not a film

especially recommended for the children of the house, the older ones will enjoy it. n of it from beginning to

end. Very dear to the aesthetics of both sides (the world of the living and the world of the dead.) the

environment victo The film's length is measured and studied, and the beginning of the film, perhaps with a

couple of notes of "" bad baba "" towards Disney make it so extremely hypnotic that when leaving the cinema onenot

canstop thinking about the film again and again.

" 1

" Movie of the mound that will delight lovers of the genreThanks to the hand of Quentin Tarantino, Eli Roth presents us with a new version of the People of horror movies,

in which a group of young people ends up in a small village where nothing is what it seems and will not be.

F��� Easy to escape. Normally the scenario used to set these films is usually the

deep America, but in this case and to give it a more exotic touch they have decided to move it to Europe, specifically to

Slovakia The origin of the film comes because Roth was told that there is the possibility of killing

someone for 10,000 dollars. This is possible (or so they say) in Thailand, then Roth was petrified and

thought it would be a perfect argument for his next film. After these comments and you can imagine the

argument: a group of boys (two Americans and an island���s) travel through Europe in search of sex and being in

Amsterdam they recommend going to a small �o Slovak village in which beautiful women go crazy over

foreigners, especially Americans. Predictably, our protagonists go in their

search, and also in a predictable way, they will find much more than sexual pleasure. I have to say and thank

the film. ��cula is not as strong as they sell it. It has its dose of casquer���a, but it is not the most abundant or the

most unpleasant, since what is really scary is that facts can be produced in reality like those that

we They count, and that to a certain extent it would be easy for them to happen. Eli Roth does not tell us anything new, nor innovates

within a fairly exhausted genre, but does a review of the Basics like The Texas Chainsaw Massacre including

some Asian movie ingredients. In this regard we have to comment on the cameo made by the director

Takashi Miike (one of the greatest exponents of the genre) playing a client of thehunt

luxury. On the acting level there is nothing to emphasize, except the beauty and discovery of the Czech actress Barbara

Nedeljakova, since the portrait of the characters does not go beyond the typical.It must be said that Roth combines in

certain moments the terror with the comedy, giving a couple of touches of black humor that are appreciated. A good

contribution, which Chicho Ib������ez-Serrador knew how to exploit perfectly, is the figure of children as the entity and

personification of evil, and they are the protagonists of a couple of great moments of the film. There are two

very different parts: the first dedicated to showing the journey and behavior of the protagonists and the

second one in which happiness turns into horror. Jay Hernandez is the only one who has a more

dynamic and profound role, as he narrates a fact that he had when he was little and that later it will try to redeem, thus

showing an act of value that many others would have declined. But despite this it is still a mere

character more, quite flat. Tarantino and his team have known how to sell the motorcycle, since many people have the idea

that it is another movie of the great director, and when they see the title that accredits the address to the creator of

Cavin Fever, they are disappointed. Another point in his favor has been the way to publicize it as the best work

that has ever been shot, which will drag many teenagers and not so young, see what What they

hope will be the biggest bloody feast in the history of cinema. In short, a film of the montón that will

delight the lovers of the genre and that will surprise the new generations. Finally, they do not

advertise Slovakia very well, and as a curiosity, there are many Americans who are

asking if this country in Eastern Europe really exists. If in the end as in Spain in any

place.

" 0

" Although unsuccessful, it is an interesting and recommendable film for the cin���filo, for the good intentions of the

author and for the attempt to create something that goes beyond the usual schemes.

Jindabyne is the place where the different strata that make up the story coexist, and in which

the general plane that represents the serene future of the nature of that region, the ���rida fields, the

waters of the lake or the mountains that surround the river. According to the director Ray Lawrence's visual approach, the

natural landscape is the true protagonist of the story, seen through long shots and thecadence

contemplativethrough which the eye of the c��� Mara immerses us in her geography, almost seems to respond to anideal

animisticof return to nature, the same nature that sustains the varied human profiles. Thus,

Jindabyne is not so much a film about the emotional or ideological conflict between human beings as an

allegorical representation of nature in conflict with the artificial world. , and human culture, inclusive.

The plane that opens the narrative - the nature of the landscape segmented and limited by a wire - expresses this

conflict that will also have a correlative closure in the simple act of killing a trapped insect

inside the truck, whose owner homicidal be the trigger knot relato.De thus

intended Lawrence weaving a network of interconnected phenomena; connection between human beings, in astratum

secondary, and connection between humans, human culture and nature, in the main stratum, the most significant

for narrative purposes since it is what could be Enga encompass the entire latent structure. The discourse advances while

tackling varied themes, from opposite angles according to which character is used to emphasize a

certain aspect of the narrative: folk tale, choral melodrama, reflection on thefeelings

humanand the disjunctive that arise when extraordinary events interfere in the everyday, the

social conventions and the problems derived from the act of violating them, moral dilemmas because ofbeliefs

conflicting, ecological, racial reasons , and a long etc. An idea of ​​masterpiece but that does not

have the necessary packaging, especially because the director, often, confuses the subtle with the dispersed and

undefined, and although it is likely that in Lawrence's mind everything has a coherent sense with aidea

very clear base, as it is developed on the screen, the required clarity is not perceived. The subtlety is not

to use the silences to trot and moche or omit some aspects of the argument that are key

to vertebrate the motivations and development of the characters as it should. The subtle implies ingenuity and

versatility, and not those routine dialogues and a repetitive scheme of omissions and silences that end up

impairing the author's good intentions: this entails the dispersion of the story and the final indefinition, with the

consequent ballast for narrative effects. The corpse of a girl floating in the waters of the river refers to the

interaction human-nature, often unpleasant and violent, incompatible also, as seen in the

tense representation of the electrical towers that destroy the landscape, and the fear aroused in one of the

protagonists of the excursion. , of animistic beliefs. The murderer, precisely, is a worker of the

electrical company. In the end, all the characters meet in a beautiful natural environment, in an

aboriginal ceremony that culminates with a song of love in memory of the murdered one (it is as priceless as

capricious the fact that the murderer is present in the ceremony), which becomes a reason for

general reconciliation. Leaving aside all this, Jindabyne, although unsuccessful, is an interesting and

recommendable film for the cin���filo, for good reason intentions of the author and for the attempt to create something that goes beyond

the usual schemes. That yes, everything remains in an attempt.

" 0

" If you can avoid a good year, avoid it. It is a romantic film absolutely flat and full of

stereotypes. A good year, but a bad movie.

If you can avoid A Good Year (2006), avoid it. It is an absolutely flat romantic film full of

stereotypes, incredibly directed by the renowned Ridley Scott and starring the good actor Russell

Crowe. In short, a scam. Crowe is Max Skinner, a cold and calculating stockbroker from London who

suddenly sees his life interrupted by the sudden death of his uncle Henry, who He has inherited a vineyard in

France. This property represents for Max, all the memories of a happy child. He decides to go for a day to

fix the papers and leave the house ready for purchase, but for life's sake, he ends up staying for more than

a day. Going with the simple beings around and falling in love with the most beautiful French woman in the village and

the simple life in the countryside. Color���n colorado. So, simple people. Scott and Crowe had already worked

together before, with much better results: The Gladiator (2000). Those times.

" 0

" Recommended for all those who have been in Paris at least once in their lives.Ambedded in Paris, both in that part of the city that all tourists know, and in that part that

only the Parisian citizens know, this film, composed of small pieces of stories, starring a

thousand well-known faces (Steve Buscemi, Leonor Watling, Natalie Portman, Javier Camara, Sophie Marceau, Willem

Dafoe, Nick Nolte, Bob Hoskins, Eliah Wood.) And directed by a thousand and one names of the cinema, they compose in their own way,

each a story that blurs and draws at the same time the city of love. Some brief, very brief, others ms

long, a cmicas, other trgicas, one of terror, others of passion, but always with the thread of thecity

eternalbackground, leaves a good taste mouth and the sensation that in just a few minutes. you can say and tell

great things. Recommended for all those who have been in Paris at least once in their life.

" 1

" The film is, above all, a sharp reflection about a basic attribute for those who hold

power: popularity.

A large number of TV-movies titles of desktop, of dubious quality and repetitive invoice, often

go to the "" based on real events "". For a certain type of audience, this is an incentive to sit

in the chair during the almost three hours that can be extended the viewing of the film, next to their

respective advertising breaks. For others, among which I include myself, it is usually an attenuating against the tape

that uses such a claim. The magnificent film by Stephen Frears does not require the tagline of yore for the obvious

that it would result in it. The Queen centers its story on the days of May of 1997 that mediated between the first

electoral victorial of Tony Blair and the death of Lady Di in a traffic accident in Par���s. The interesting thing about

his story is the dissection he makes of how the people directly affected by the events lived those days of

questioning the monarchy and acclaim Come to Downing Street. So the film

is, above all, a sharp reflection about a basic attribute for those who hold power:

popularity. A capricious quality that does not always smile those interested with the constancy that they would like

and that leaves them suddenly, and without prior explanation, with the same ease as a day. It came to them. A third

key character in the film, Lady Di, is not played by any actor: his presence is recreated through

the immense amount of im File sources available from her (somewhat similar to what Clooney did in Good

Night and good luck with Senator McCarthy). Its long shadow will be exaggerated by theproperties

Mit���manof its early death to the disgrace of the royal family. Queen Elizabeth II will live with displeasure the

unanimous acclamation that her people pay to someone whom she no longer considered as part of her family.

Carlos, prince of Wales and ex-husband of Diana, is portrayed as a man of fragile character, afraid and

unable to stand up to his mother. In view of the acclamation with which the Britons dismiss their ex-

wife, Carlos' advantage will thrive so that his family will render every possible honor to a woman

whom he cheats. ���� and who had divorced six months before his death. To make his mother right, he will

go to Blair, who will try to convince the monarch of the convenience of dismissing Diana with the honors

of "" the princess of the town "" (adjective) Accused by Blair in his speech at the request of one of

his advisors that earned him the applause of the press). Needless to say, in a film of these characteristics, The

importance of interpretations is key and goes beyond mere physical resemblance. The work of Helen

Mirren as Isabel II is so exemplary that it could well be used in a master class for students of

interpretation. Because, to the difficulty of putting face to a living personage of so much relevance, theis added to him

obstacleof which this one is a woman educated to dose millimtrically the exhibition of its feelings. So

that its interpretation achieves, through subtle details, denote the minimal states of the monarch and,

at the same time, the af���n of porsta to self-control and prevent these feelings that he has self-

banned to show in public. In addition, the rest of the cast clothes with great solvency to the London actress:

from a modÃlico Michael Sheen in the role of Tony Blair, to an effective James Cromwell as Prince Felipe or

a mordant Sylvia Syms in her role as queen mother. But it would be unfair if she did not value also the excellent guide

Peter Morgan, witty and subtle in the darts she throws to some and other characters. Because it would have been easy to

play in favor of the work and have drawn a profile osco and gru������n of an Isabel II envious of Diana's fame, and

not try to make a Weighted evaluation, as in the film is made, from the points of view of some and other

characters involved in the hehcos. Morgan gets it and the director of Dangerous Liaisons moves like a

fish in the water in this bedroom portrait of nobles and rulers.

" 1

" I begin not to correctly digest the implicit morale load that this type of production carries.

To know how foolish we are and the origin of all the ills of this planet I do not have to go to the cinema.

The children of men are all, but what would happen if the last of us had already been born? Under

this approach Alfonso Cuar���n presents us, in his last and peculiar film, a new story about the

haunted society in which the human being has shit again (again) and back, downhill and without

brakes, to the state of nature. Typical and typical story, written and filmed hundreds of times, based on the

novel by PD James, and reminiscent of certain classics of literature in advance, as well as the

well-known 1984 or a happy world, which is already boring. The deformed vision of a society like ours a

few years older - those that would have made it evolve towards the most radical and fascist positions that today

we can imagine - no longer impresses anyone, especially when the development of the movie in question issimilar

tooto any news of three in the afternoon. At one point in the film, a radio program plays

a song from 2003 and the announcer reads something like "that time when the world was not aware that

everything was going to go fuck? I would say it for ���l. To enjoy a good reinterpretation of this type of

sub-genre of science fiction, I recommend V de Vendetta, novel gr�� �fica of the great Alan Moore, much less

Manichean and with really interesting proposals. From here, and taking into account that the plot does not

seem original or too interesting, you can say that the film is dotted with light and

dark. The cast is one of the facets to emphasize (in spite of the scam that turns out to see Julianne Moore in the

credit titles) constituted, among others, by a surprising Michael Caine and a superb Clive Owen; perhaps

the most charismatic actor in today's Hollywood that is enough to sustain the project, even in its mostmoments

leaden. They all say tacos and smoke cigarettes, which is very much appreciated. Another point in favor is the

photograph, of the most suggestive and successful to transport you to a near future in which things are almost

like now, but more ugly. Probably did not have to squeeze too much to find the locations,

and this is one of the greatest successes of the film; In the middle of the final confrontation in whichare submerged

the protagonistsit is not difficult to recognize the same faces that we see daily in Mogadishu, Haiti, Palestine or

Baghdad. The recreation of an eternal, entrenched, street-based armed conflict is remarkable. But on the other hand the

script is lost in a succession of predictable and boring events, with very few instants of

true emotion. The rhythm of the film suffers many ups and downs, even taking into account that the director

(very inaccurately in my opinion) dizzies us with the camera on his shoulder throughout the film; this technique

has its explanation in a few minutes of the roll, but it becomes even irritating in others. Sometimes it gives

the impression that if it were not for the good interpretation of Clive Owen, making the current type that

life has abused, the film would become virtually unbearable. However, in others (as in theminutes

final, in spite of the snip that the end itself implies) the film is interesting and can be seen. Finally,

I must say that I begin not to correctly digest the load of implicit morality that this type of

productions take. To know how foolish we are and the origin of all the ills of this planet, I do not have to go to the

movies, it is enough for me to stay at home and look in the mirror.

" 0

" This time, little has to do with love, except the story of the Gay couple. Sequel that without being more of

the same, it is the same but without more ...

"" Manuale d'amore "" was a nice and original Italian romantic comedy , where with love as the guiding thread

of the plot, the actors (all unknown) took us to their land; said film was a success

both in Italy and outside the land of calcium, so it was more than normal a sequel, the problem of

it, is that it loses the freshness of the previous and this time, to have known actors (in addition to some of the

previous ones that also repeat in this) loses the credibility of the previous one and freshness, and tries to curlcurl.

theThis time, little it has to do with love, except the story of the Gay couple, the rest is moredriven

sexually(manuale d'sexo could have been called the tape perfectly), and the comedy of entanglement, that to

capture what in the first film were the different parts of love, and the lack of love. On the other hand we must

highlight both the beautiful and sensual Monica Bellucci, a sexual myth for many and our Spain. Ola Elsa

Pataki, another sexual myth both explained on the screen even though they did not say a word, the rest of the actors

stayed with the explained Carlo Verdone who already repeated in the first installment and also "repeater" "Sergio

Rubini, who in the first installment was the best in the movie In short, a sequel that without being more of the

same, is the same but without more.

" 0

" The critics blew the movie, but the audience responded enthusiastically. From then on, the

American western did not become the same again. Neither was the career of Clint, an actor who still had not

obtained any recognition in his country.

After finishing the shooting of The Death had a price Clint Eastwood remained a time in Rome to participate

in The Witches, an Italian film divided into chapters that would be in turn directed by different

directors. Eastwood worked on the orders of Vittorio De Sica playing a normal and somewhat boring husband

who neglects his wife after many years of marriage. After finishing the work he returned to the United States,

where he would find that he was now the main character of the television series Rawhide. His companion

had been fired. Now Eastwood was the protagonist. Meanwhile, his two films with director

Sergio Leone remained untouched. In his country Eastwood was just a familiar face that appeared on

television once a week. Meanwhile, in Italy, several North American producers had stalked Leone

to direct a new western. Offering him a large budget, more substantial than he could everquick to

imagine, the director and his Italian producers wereaccept the offer. Interested in demystifying

the difference between good and evil and the subjects united to the western, the director wanted to shoot a story

about three scammers, three gunmen who are not what they seem, and who In the circumstances, they can be

generous or cruel. The director wanted a mix between the picaresque tradition and the drama of a

bloody civil war. Here it would be the starting point to elaborate the new script. The story would be

titled "" The two magnificent rags "", title that was changed before filming began. The film

opposed the futility and cruelty of the wars ("I never saw that so many lives were wasted so futilely",

says one or more of the characters) with the picaresque and low morals of the protagonists of the film. The

gunmen, capable of killing, cheating and stealing, are, even so, more human and worthy than wars and those

that provoke them. In the Hollywood tradition, the Secession War, when it had adapted to the big

screen, had always had to do with moral values ​​and construction. of a new nation. Hero���smo and

sacrifice. However, Leone was willing to make a non-heroic portrait, where the background war that

takes place in the film is reduced to the dead and the dust. Orson Welles told Sergio that making a

film about the civil war was "crazy". Except for what the wind took away, no film that dealt with

the subject had triumphed at the North American box office. As for the cast, the role of "" the good "" was

reserved for Clint Eastwood. However, this time, Eastwood was not so eager to accept. Without the

previous films having been released in North America and having become the protagonist of the

series Rawhide, the actor feared that he would become associated with the B-series Italian films could

damage the future of his career. On the other hand, he also expressed doubts about his role, as it seemed that

the real protagonist was Tuco, "" the ugly "". Leone himself had to travel to the United States and convince

Eastwood to accept the role. But both ended up discussing what Leone's wife described as "a

clash of male egos." Finally Eastwood agreed to sign, but he made sure to pocket a large sum

for his participation in the film. For the role of "the bad guy", Leone had hesitated to work again with Lee Van

Cleef. He tried to sign Charles Bronson once more, and this time he had accepted, butincompatibilities made it

contractualimpossible for him to be available. So, Leone confided the role of Sentence to the good of

Lee. Finally, to interpret Tuco Benedict Pacifica Juan Mar���a Ramirez, he had originally thought of

Gian Maria Volont���, but Leone wished an actor with more vis ‡ cism. The chosen one was Eli Wallach, a prestigious

actor from the Actor's Studio who had already been a bandit in Los siete magn���ficos. Anyway,

Leone chose him for his role in "" The Railroads "", episode framed in The Conquest of the West, and where

Wallach left Leone impressed by his ability for the mémica. Wallach, who at that time felt

pigeonholed as the eternal Latin bandit, at the same time found it difficult to adapt his theatrical style to the

Hollywood technicality. Eli wanted to go back to the movies, but again a director arrived, this time Italian, with

an Italian role. Leone begged that before accepting saw any of his films. That was all that

Eli Wallach had to do to accept working on The Good, the Ugly, and the Bad. Wallach and Leone got on straight away

, and during his stay in Rome the script suffered changes. important Director and actor had a

great time playing and contrasting ideas for the character of Tuco. The bandit would be an atheist but at the same time

superstitious that does not stop to cross himself, and that instead of wearing a belt he wears suspenders and belt and carries the

pistol hanging from a rope. To the feared Eastwood, Tuco became the central character of the

film. The best phrases and scenes had to do with the bandit p���caro. The enormous talent of Wallach managed to

move from the center of attention to the eternal "" man without a name "" of Eastwood. So the tensions between him

and Leone continued during filming, although Clint not only showed no antipathy towards Wallach, but

helped him advise him. ndole and giving him ideas for his character. Anyway, the long filming of The Good, the Ugly and

the Bad meant the swan song for the collaboration between Eastwood and Leone. The progressive decline of the

protagonist of the Californian ("" If I continue this way in the next film will be accompanied by all thecavalry

American"") and the friction between the actor and the director marked the end of a great symbiosis that gave the cinema

three great western, each better. Eastwood and Leone did not meet again until, shortly before the

Italian's death, they were left to eat at a restaurant in Rome. Despite that sour ending Eastwood always

had good words with Leone, and never denied what he had learned during the European shootings: the

media economy, a different way of working, It's free than in old Hollywood, and a way of portrayingopen-minded

raw,violence. It was also with Leone that he developed the archetype of his hardcharacters

and silent, and also he shot those western ones where he knew how interesting the

dual characters could be. . As he had practically done since the beginning of his career, Eastwood did not stop

studying Leone's work and ways of working. The gusanillo of the directorate would continue to recognize the

actor for a few more years. The good, the ugly and the bad was premiered in Italy at the end of 1966 and constituted a new

success, although it collected less than Death had a price. Meanwhile, legal problems were solved with

Akira Kurosawa, the producer Alberto Grimaldi, who had finally made the rights to the three

films of Leone, sold them to United Artists. In this way the three films were commercialized in the

United States as a trilogy, and for advertising purposes was when the phrase that would givewas reached

immortality to the character of Eastwood: "" the Man without a name "". The criticism made a fuss over the movies, but the

audience responded enthusiastically. From then on, the American western did not become the same again.

Nor was the career of Clint Eastwood, an actor at that time 36 years old who still had not

obtained any recognition in his country for his work in the great screen.

" 1

" Tremendous, sensitive and ecosensitized tost���n. Happy feet is a film without a hook and with very little

personality.

Mother of God and of the beautiful love that can be giving with this little penguin. And that I do not have kids that

if not, it was my turn to buy some silly penguin dollthought it was a tremendous tost���n this

dancing. Imovie. The first hour I almost fell asleep. A lot of dancing, a lot of chatter and an argument more seen than the goals

of Espa���a Malta. And on top of not having originality the argument is repetitive, it oozes moralistic and

smells like rotten fish. None of the scenes are saved. The songs are almost all in English and can make

sense in the language of Shakespeare, but for the medium-level Spanish speakers who have no idea of

English, the musical in this sense does not enhance in any way. At the moment the rhythm of the film, nor the sensitivity of

the characters. If the script is bad, the design of the sets and the characters do not tell you. The sky in many

moments is that it is taken from a documentary of National Geographic, fuck, are not even able to

currar a sky? Except for the part that humans mix with the penguins, the rest is totally forgettable. Of

the penguins we better not talk, because they can not have chosen a more bland and monochromatic animal to make

a film of babies.Happy feet is a film without a hook and with very little personality. Despite theblow

final, which makes you shudder at times, it is very unfortunate that they dedicate three thirds of the footage to the

persecutions and the pinguinil songs to give us a little pill of an ecologist message. Do not go to see her.

" 0

" Disappointment. The tape plummets, leaving aside the heroic theme of Superman and takes to the part

of love

story I had all the ballots to be one of the "" taquillazos "" of the a�� �o 2006, all the options for it to be

a film that I would love, that made me dream, that I was eager to revisit again and again, but. After

the joy that was in the room (he even got to applaud the mythical theme of John Williams' Superman), the

tape plummets, leaving aside the theme Hermanic of Superman and takes to the part of "" love story ""

(boy returns to see the girl, who is with another.) And nothing, unfortunately is what it seems, the film is called

boring, slow (too much), and very simple, one expects a final shot that never arrives and the bad taste of the mouth

gradually fades into the personality of the spectator. As a positive note, the interpretation Brandon

Routh, who at times comes to "" imitate "" Christopher Reeve, and the always brilliant Kevin Spacey, who

mixes the best Lex Luthor with small "" whips "" of the Joker of " "Batman" ", ah! The Score of John Ottman also

sensational, mixed in some moments with the theme of John Williams. Anyway, you had to listen to the air of

disappointment that floated in the room at the end of the projection.

" 0

" The metacine is something very funny. An example of a modern masterpiece. Noir comedy of the good and couple

for History.

Kiss kiss bang bang, written and directed by Shane Black, is the fastest, funniest and most original thriller of

the last few years. In fact, I think it's the best thriller that I've seen from "" Fargo "" A chorizo ​​put to actor,

(Downey Jr.) in a boot that is a blast, gets into a sleuth detective in which he was accompanied by adetective

gay( Kilmer) and a childhood friend (Michelle Monaghan) with whom he is reunited in the city of dreams. The

director is responsible for the scripts of the saga "" Lethal Weapon "" or from "" The Last Boy Scout "" (also from a

movie from our childhood, "" An amazing gang "" and from "" The Last Great Hero "") , and I have to take my

hat off before the result of his first opera, of masterful results. The picture is excellent, the score

is pure noir, the rhythm is wild and the actors are, simply, sublimes. Kilmer is not a gra An actor, but

here he enjoys each one of his (ingenious) lines of dialogue and it shows.Mention aside for an EXTRAORDINARY

(as always) Robert Downey Jr. proving that he is an ACTORAZO in the best role of his career. (yes, better than

in "" Chaplin "") I'm sure that if the direction was run by Jonze, Gondry or some other modernillo would be

called a masterpiece, because he plays with fiction and reality throughout the entire film to end up in a

(spectacular) auto-parody cl quemax that leaves on canvas the one of the (remarkable) masterpiece of Spike Jonze,

" "Adaptation" "Absolutely mandatory for all laggards.

" 1

" The game of the cat and mouse moves to a parking lot that is undoubtedly an attractive place to develop the

action but the inefficiency of the director does not take the least advantage of it.

A mediocre French actor who had the great fortune of working with the remarkable ALEXANDRE AJA in HAUTE TENSION

because they apparently connected forging a friendship that convinced the French director to produce and help him in

guiding his first film. Apparently little did he learn the actor serving a typical PSICO THRILLER a thousand times seen

with insipid interpretations beginning with the unbearable WEST BENTLEY that seems lately pigeonholed in

villains of three fourth then repeat the role of GOST RAIDER. The victim is the beautiful RACHEL NICHOLS seen in

the series ALIAS and debuting as protagonist. The cat and mouse game is moved to a parking lot that is undoubtedly

an attractive place to develop action but the ineffectiveness of the director does not take the least advantage of him. Technically,

if he gives the size in his photographic sections or the attractive sound, although a mediocre

script united with worse actors does not It gives a lot. It can serve as entertainment if you are not very demanding.

" 0

" It is complicated that with a raw material as good as L'Ultimo Bacio you can lose the

essence, the grace and the balance of a brilliant story about the fear of maturity.

It is complicated that with a raw material as good as L'Ultimo Bacio you can lose so much the

essence, the grace and the balance of a brilliant story about the fear of maturity. Tony Goldwyn simply

uses the usual system used by the United States to make the perfect remake of foreign films:

Copy and paste. But in The Last Kiss something very funny happens in this process, so that in exactly the

same length of footage they count only 40% of the story with much less grace. Coldly analyzing

that footage that is subtracted from the story of friendship and principles of each couple goes directly togag controversies

irrelevantstarting the essence of the drama they were really trying to tell. (Important note, although

Filmax puts on his record that it is a comedy is a lie) Michael, his protagonist who is caught

learning that he is going to have a baby, the flight can come from the hand of a young woman who knows the wedding of a

friend. While he gets involved in the problems of his new relationship and of hiding it from his girlfriend, his friends

are involved in the same tasks trying to deal with their own fears to grow with greater or lesser

dignity. Zach Braff is quite unsatisfactory and even its relationship with a university student (eliminating all the

tension of what they mean for their relationship even shortening the age difference of the original) that

has just met seems taken out of a Sitcom. Actually the quality of young American actors who

look like they come from American Pie is quite disappointing. The script has been quite trimmed and they have even

dared to change the magnificent final of the original film that in a certain way was the magic of the original film.

It has been Paul Haggis, screenwriter of "" Million Dollar Baby "" who has perpetrated this blasphemy of the snip. In

short, neither fu nor fa.

" 0

" There is nothing interesting, until the time comes for the Monty Python, and that is that the org escenaa scene must

be the last work of the English, because it can not stop laughing.

We find a film that they say is directed by Tom Tykwer and it really can be like that until

about an hour and a half past and something happens that he will comment on later. The truth is that we did not go to the movies at

4:25 or so because of the movie I was a little fried during the movie, and that is the ��� The only explanation they

give for man to go crazy is that he smells more than normal. The principle is good, and he made foresee

something more, with that of focusing on the objects that are smelling, or about the birth, is quite good. Then the

boy begins to look for life and starts roasting, the first girl is charged by mistake, trying not to

scream, but good as you can be such a beast, anyway. Later he joins the perfumer or perfumer as it is, he

flirts and prepares 100 perfumes come and go. Put a cat where oils are made for perfumes,

madrem���a. There is nothing interesting, until it's time for Monty Python, and that is the org escenaa scene

should be the �� Last job of the English, because he can not stop laughing, with the initial,

stupid logicthe most ridiculous way to conquer the town, the girl's father dead, and even the priest, hehe, and at the time

of waking up, that descojone, but the whole room huh !, I ask that if someone saw it in the cinema tell me if

people laughed or not , because in my room it was tremendous. A man in front said "" But well, this is incredible,

this is unforgivable "", but it was so absurd that. Of the worst, those who have read the book they say, they

do not explain many things that are vital to understand the poor protagonist, as always, the fact is that

the adaptation to the big screen is the worst.

" 0

" Contestant is a torn and vitri���lica critique to the economic system and to the banks and the plotyou

hooks, with a history that is macabre and ir���nicamente fun at the same time . Fun, intelligentand made

cinemahere.

Last Thursday I went to the preview of the film Concursante, kindly invited by the executive producer

and yet friend Xavier Villaverde, author among other things of the great "" 13 chimes "" or

"" Finisterre "". ��is my deep animosity towards a large part of Spanish cinema or Spanish music

(well, you did not know but now I know) motivated largely by a whole class of clunkers (subsidized a

great majority) with which we flood the billboards and radios now, it also prays. When a story is

good, when the script is good and also the actors are great, it happens that we have a good movie,

like this one. Contestant is a torn and vitri���lica cr���tica to the economic system and to the banks and the plotyou

hooks, with a history that is macabre and ir���nicamente fun at the same time. And above all the

postproduction (digital, which endows the film with a dreamy atmosphere) is very successful

, and (What I'm going to say is not pejorative, but I say it as a compliment) sometimes makes you

feel that what you're seeing is an Audi ad. Of those that you like to see, that do not consider you

imbecile? Mr. Sbaraglia embroider it, his role as a poor wretch, unable to handle what comes his way

is good, and he magnifies it. Myriam Gallego his wife, is great, and Chete Lera, little can be said.

I have always thought that he is one of the best actors in the world. Luis Zahera is also that secondary, simp���tico

and cabroncete that turns each one of his irruptions into very funny moments. Some exteriors are

filmed here in A Coru���a, and its sea, its exteriors and its sun, manage to be a perfect counterpoint to the gray

and rainy images of the city, or the bank. The music is another great success, the half times, or the

harder guitars, even the electronic one fits perfectly with the story. Perhaps it can be attributed to him

that a film ends up in excess the end but, to my modest understanding, it is something that does not overshadow a work very

well done. Fun, intelligent cinema and made here.

" 1

"With a recital of clichés in this guise we dress the Korean the remaining hour and a half where

boredom will become the protagonist of a stretched, languid, disconnected and ca. tico.

Encouraged by a brazen and provocative trailer where a beast arising from a slow acmara ro lashes out

against the surprised citizens, entr to see this film in Sitges, where Adem Its director presented it by

announcing that the sound effects would not allow us to sleep even though it started at eleven

o'clock on a Sunday night. The best part of the film is its Initial part and check how it goes straight to the point, a

very bad doctor, the only American that appears in the film, of course, orders to throw some chemicals down

the drain his laboratory Six years later there is already a monster sunbathing in the adjoining river. It's

original for nothing, but it does not matter, people discover it by diving and the beast goes out to play with people "

you take it". The monster is at ease in broad daylight and we can see and enjoy his physiognomy and

his abilities superbly thanks to some effects, these, in Hollywood. The images of the

beast, generated by computer, during the first twenty minutes are absolutely captivating. Sure, and

I, meanwhile, wondered there sitting in the cinema. If in twenty minutes this Korean has taught me everything

that a movie of these characteristics gives me in all its full length, what will it teach me? from

now on? Well, from there, we discover that the protagonist is an unfortunate pat���n and we are stuck

when the beast kidnaps his daughter and then they march, the whole family (even with the grandpa), to look for it.

So, as if they were excursion to the pine forest. The mixture of genres is a dangerous thing and if the humor is oriental then it is

even more complicated. Imagine that a monster kidnaps Aida's son, the one in the series, and from

there we see how she, accompanied by her entire family of louts, will rescue him. Well, it would be a comedy with a

monster. A movie of horror. Now imagine that the family of losers and jokes are Korean and

that the best of the traca is when the grandfather says he can identify the state of mind of his son when he farts

inside the caravan. Well, if you are going to see this movie, it will not be imaginations anymore. Many people

laugh in the room about things in the film that are just funny to our western mind and that

actually have to do with the way we act, react or with the strangetraditions and rituals

oriental. It reminded me of that movie session a few years ago, with the room full of teenagers splitting

the box to read with the remastered version of "" El Exorcist"". A film that madecry with fear

entire generations, now it had become a comedy for teenagers who could not help but

laugh, for example, at ridicule pints and seventies hairstyles of the actors. Returning to "" The

Host "", we soon learned that the sister of the kidnapped girl is an Olympic bowler and that sadly she only

gets the bronze. And we know then who will shoot the monster the final arrow to try to win the

gold. With a recital of clichés in this guise, the Koreanremaining hour and a half where

is dressed for theboredom will become the protagonist of a stretched, languid, disconnected and chaotic film. I could give the

odd nod in spite of the sound effects. The movie lasts two hours and to tell the truth, maybe with

that fabulous trailer there would be no more.

" 0

" Hoffman will achieve with this film the respect it deserves. An important portion of the blogosphere is strongly seduced by what is called "" New

Journalism "". So when a film about Truman Capote, starring the "so far, I

think," underestimated Philip Seymour Hoffman, the least that can be done is a short post. I think Hoffman will

achieve. �� with this film the respect it deserves. "" Capote "" is not an exhaustive and historical biography about the

intelligent, sarcastic and mannered journalist, but an intense approach to a fundamental moment of his

life: The elaboration n "" In Cold Blood "", last book of Capote (and later film with Robert Blake as

protagonist) and first piece framed in the genre "" non-fictional novel "" that opened � the doors to "" New

Journalism "" and / or "" Gonzo Journalism. "" This film is entirely by Philip Seymour Hoffman. Achieves what Nicholson in

"" About Schmidt "", a total detachment of his image "" real "" actor and a total incarnation in the character.

Not only makes the sharp voice and the characteristic gestures, key and basic aspects of the character, but

through their looks, gestures, reactions and intonations, he manages to condense in less than two hours what the

gui���n could not do voluntarily. It was not necessary to see a shot of Capote's childhood, when he himself tells us

in one of the most intimate moments of the film. If the film wanted to show Capote, he has achieved it, without

needing to show all aspects of his life concretely. Bennett Millar (director), Dan Futterman

(gui���n) based on the book by Gerald Clark have managed, through Hoffman, to sketch his personality, life and

work. Hoffman is supported as well In other good and sober performances (Catherine Keener as the writer

Harper Lee, Clifton Collins Jr as the convict Perry Smith and Chris Cooper as the detective Alvin Dewey, among

others) "" Capote "" makes us elaborate the same question it could not be answered in reality:

��� It was the events surrounding the elaboration of "" In Cold Blood "" that led the writer to his

self-destruction through alcoholism ? Considering that the writer in question is Truman Capote, that

question makes this film an interesting audiovisual option. Choice is of the type that reverberate and

conclude in the search for other books, articles, reviews and films, to extend the original film more

there of your footage.

" 1

" How does this man look, wearing a suit, shirt, tie, skyjama and cape? Does Superman not piss?

Superman in comics, in movies, young and not so much has always been present in our lives. The first actor

who became famous playing the character on television was George Reeves, who is one of thebrothers

Tarletonwho wants to dance with Scarlata O���Hara in Gone with the Wind, at first of the film, in the

atrium of the plantation. This actor committed suicide and the film (Christopher Reeve) already know what happened to him. I usually

ask several things about the character in whatever medium it appears: the skyjama is wearing it

under the suit. It's a bitch. but it's worth ��������� AND THE LAYER? !!!! Where does it take it? And when it goes flying ������������D���NDE

METE THE SUIT ???? !!! But there are more inconsistencies. If Krypton is atomized, where does so much kryptonite come from? And

finally, when he goes to the water, like Clark Kent, Does this man dress, with a suit, shirt, tie,

skyjama and cape hat ????? Does not Superman piss me ????

" 0

" Seducing a stranger has erotic as the labyrinth of the faun of cosmic. Perhaps the only thing thathim

savesis Giovani Ribisi, in a role that is also absurd, but at least it has a certain grace.

After fascinated with The Good Shepherd, I was expecting from Seducing a Stranger, the new film by the once

promising James Foley, a decent and minimally entertaining film. Well, not even that. Here you have the 8 and areasons

halfnot to see Seducing a stranger: 1. For his absurd gui���n. Really, one of the worst of the last

years, lacking in grace, sense and intrigue. It has absolutely nothing attractive, its plot twists

surpass idiocy, revealing the last, in theory, the most important. Pat���tico.2. For the character of Bruce

Willis. It is one of those roles that are totally left over. His intervention is purely designed to augment the

box office salary, nothing more. It does not make sense and in addition, it is very badly drawn. It hardly has itspersonality

own, you know nothing of it. Anyway, if Willis does not get to accept the paper, thehave to be changed

"gui���n" would. "3. Because of the inexpressiveness of Halle Berry. According to him, he has only made a good performance in his life,

that of Monster's Ball, and from there, his career has only worsened. See, for God's sake! You have to lovevery

the cinemalittle to accept roles like those of Catwoman, Gothika, Operation Swordfish and Seducing a

stranger.4. Because of the lack of personality that the film has. Even a mediocre film director could have

shot a film with a little personality, or even a little. Here there is no original or personal detail, let

alone a worthwhile shot. All are of this Hollywood style that is lately fashionable, this

where only focuses on the character and nothing more, that's it, with very good image quality. 5. For its painful

atmosphere. As it seems, everything is shot on plat���sy from time to time you see some image of the street or

a p���rking (very common in this type of thrillers) .6. Because it looks so much like a telefilm on Sunday afternoon

(from Antena 3, above all). Until its, initially, promising outcome goes to the pot using the technique

of the final surprise, in this case, very badly carried out, since it lacks logical sense and in addition , you

do not believe it or in jest. Really disappointing.7. To make see that it is an erotic thriller to the basic instinct and

really is a thriller to dry, because erotic has nothing. What is the affair with the character

played by Gary Dourdan (the black of CSI: Las Vegas)? Really, it does not come to mind, because it is totally

dispensable. It contributes nothing, absolutely nothing, to history. It's not for nothing, but Seducing a stranger

has erotic as the labyrinth of the faun of chemistry.8. For that kind of final moral that does not come to

mind. If you do a bad thriller, you do a bad thriller. Now that they do not come to me with logic andthings

psychological! A mess is a mess, and it is more when it pretends not to be. You have to be very stupid to play

smart while you're directing a tape like this one. If you have annoyed her, you have annoyed her.1 / 2. For the painful

advertising campaign he has had. His posters (both Spanish and official) are really frightening, with

hardly a touch of originality (rewards in the typical promotional phrase: "How far will it be?" as able to arrive?) and

its trailer more of the same, although the final part is a little more interesting (a bit!). Perhaps the only thing that

saves him is Giovani Ribisi, in a role that is also absurd, but at least it has a certain grace.

" 0

" Aftermath of the remake of the Japanese film The Curse and a clear example of how to make a bad sequel

without imagination and repeating the same scheme over and over again.

After the events that took place in the first part, this new film is showing us three argummental

lines, one of which has to do with our protagonist, Sarah Michelle Gellar. that her sister will

come to look for her to take her home, but she will find herself in the same problem as her when investigating what

happened to her and entering the cursed house. On the other hand we have a couple of girls young students who

decide to play a joke on another third making it enter the house and make a macabre game, which will not

end up being more real of what they expect. And finally, the third plot line where we have an

American family whose members begin to behave strangely and aggressively. The film is not more than

a succession of scenes of frights and deaths, again and again we see some of the protagonist being harassed

by the child's ghost, the mother or both at the same time until he ends up dying. There is some fright achieved,

everything has to be said, but it is that each scene is practically the same as the previous one in the middle of the movie, they are already

tired. Although then try to sneak some plot through the sister of the previous protagonist and his

investigation to find out what has happened but they end up ventilating everything in five minutes and really it's

no use knowing what we account. And then ends with an end that is seen the league for a while but they

stop to explain with flashbacks lest our poor intelligence does not capture it. It's already time for the

director of the originals and his remakes going saying goodbye to a saga that does not have much more to say and

that the only thing that will get is boring.

" 0

" There are few things that excite me but an explosion of explosions to the rhythm of Tchaikovsky is something thatme

touchesthe fiber.

If there is one thing that I am proud of, it is my prejudices. I do not know if they are the engine of the world but I know at least

of my life. Films that I do not see because the fame of "" calit��� "" of the director throws me back, others that I see only

because the director of photography is the same as the one of HEAT, records that I do not listen to because I do not like the

typography of the cover, etc. The only reason I had to make an entry on V of Vendetta in July

2005 it was because Natalie Portman came out with her head shaved. Neither Alan Moore's comic book, which I have not read

but will do, nor the Wachosky Brothers' guide nor ostias. I wanted to see her through Natalie's head and

as the rest of things seemed totally secondary I did not bother to read what the movie was about. �cula, where it

was set or what critics it had received; me at least. It seems that V de Vendetta has not aroused much

expectation because they put us in the smallest room of the cinemas to see it. Obviously it was full because its

dimensions were like the ones in the living room of my house. I will not summarize because surely everyone has

read the CMIC (I am ignorant on this subject, so I would appreciate any advice. Hgamos of

comments something useful!) and because it would be absurd. But in case someone is interested in my opinion, I said that at

various times I had tachycardias, spasms, goose bumps on my skin several times and with the end I

cried. There are few things that excite me but an explosion of explosions to the rhythm of Tchaikovsky is something thatme

touchesthe fiber. Anyway, because I do not like tattoos but I would not make one in the forehead of V for

Vendetta. I've said before that I'm ignorant when it comes to comics (in that and in many other things,

go), but I do not understand how a film that was shot in May-June 2005 can be based on a graphic work

that starts with the attacks in the London subway that had place in July of that same year. may

Ihave bad dates, maybe the writers make changes usasen last hour and a fact

base, or maybe Alan Moore's fiction became reality July 7 to ��opt.look at the photo

Take aI guess it will not be necessary to say that it is worth paying 6 euros, even if you hate the film (which is very

unlikely if you have a minimum sensitivity and brain mass ), only to see that head without hair.

" 0

" Scatological humor, lack of wit, vulgar and rude, that little or nothing contributes to comedy. In a

few months we will probably see it on television, and in a short time it will be a distant memory.

Keenen Ivory Wayans rose to fame for the unexpected (and in my inexplicable opinion) but overwhelming success of

Scary Movie, which he interpreted and directed in the year. or 2000. Since then he has stood behind and in front of the camera

to bring us some similar esperpentos, full of uncouth, unimaginative, vulgar and ordinary humor. On

this occasion it seems that at least the idea is something more original, since Peque���o but mat���n narrates the adventures of

an expert jewel thief that comes out of the prison after several years, and that he does so with the intention of

withdrawing from crime, although not before giving a last and great blow , which consists of appropriating

a valuable diamond located in a jeweler's shop. The thing is complicated and our protagonist sees in the obligation to

hide the stone in the bag of a woman who was in the establishment with her husband. To recover

it, he can not think of anything else to take advantage of his peculiar physicist (he measures less than a meter) and pass himself off as anbaby

abandonedat the door of the couple's residence. Vanessa and Darryl welcome him with enthusiasm and

dedicate themselves with great devotion to their work as parents. The multiple adventures and tricks of the delinquent min���sculo to

recover their precious bot���n will cause crazy situations. As I said before, this film

is in the line of the usual American humor, an eschatological humor, lacking in wit, vulgar and

rude, that little or nothing contributes to comedy. In a few months we will probably see it on television, and in a

short time, this bizarre and ridiculous tape will only be a distant memory. Fortunately.

" 0

" Political thriller that, like the dark events that it tells, is very cumbersome and requires all the

attention of the spectator and a certain background on recent American history.

The magic of cinema takes us back to a time when the polygraphs were used to save the world and not to

determine if the descendant of a folklore resorted to the services of ��oritas of moral distracted

while his progenitor was relieved the nostrils between the backstage.De Niro, at the same time to remind us the

first uses of this artifact, performed in The Good Shepherd a journey for 30 years of intrigues, secrets and

lies in a political thriller that, like the obscure events it tells, is very cumbersome and requires

all the attention of the spectator and a certain background on recent American history, that the film

has many ellipses narratives and a lot of characters. The first thing De Niro does is demystify the

romantic idea that Ian Fleming, or Le Carr��� have given the esp�� �as. As in La vida de los otros, the

sp -a - be it red or blue, red and white - is a solitary being, with the state as the only friend and lover. The film

tells the fictional biography ��a of one of the founders of the CIA who is forced into secrecy since

childhood and who is recruited at the University to belong to the OSS - precursor of the CIA - during

World War II. It ends up becoming a prominent member of the Agency during the Cold War and well

learned the motto:? But that it seems an accident? combat the KGB, the advance of communism and becomes

an efficient, calculating and emotionally chess player cad���ver.Saving the world takes its toll and Wilson is not

able to reconcile family and work life: his wife does not want him Your child is afraid of you and your friends

simply do not exist. So The Good Shepherd is a story of resignation, which, given that Matt Damon does not

change his expression in the 160 minutes of footage, we do not know if the sacrifice was worth it or not, if he is

happy so �� or if he is a miserable person. Apart from leaving the room with this debate, there is another unanswered question:

Where is Max Factor? Rarely have I seen characters so badly aged in the movies and if you want a

story that goes through 30 years to be credible you must make up the protagonists well or there are

moments like the father and the adolescent son seem colleagues of the insti and the mother -Angelina Jolie-, a

cheer leader with 50. The protagonists are not saints of my devotion, to Damon between that seems relative of Dorian

Gray and that does not move One eyebrow, because I can hardly believe it. Angelina meanwhile, does not have much presence and is more

decorative and example of the? Celebrity? He has eaten the actress. The rest of the side is

wonderful: John Turturro who should have had more court, William Hurt, De Niro himself, Alec Baldwin, Joe

Pesci, Tammy Blanchard and curiously Martina Gedeck that goes from spied -La vida de los otros- to esp���a. In

short, highly recommended, the film maintains the interest during the long film, has an excellent bill and

the secondary ones are luxury , given the recent American cinema, a delight.PD: As a curiosity I point out that the

secret society "" Skulls and Bones "" to which the character of Matt Damon belongs really exists and among its

members are the Bush, father and son, and Democratic senator John Kerry, Democratic senator.

" 1

" Neither the plot, nor the actors, nor the scares, nor the soundtrack, gets to hook at any time (in

the audience you heard more laughter than screams), and if you Annoying at some point is not horror, but

by the sound rises, even my grandmother with her sonotone at least would have been scared.

The best thing about a morning press pass is not always the film, it was like in my time as a footballer, I was

more interested in the case after that. Ques that with the hope of making a good match, here Mr. Trujillo sent me to

see this movie (at my own request) instinct me to meet several of the characters that populate the fauna (and

flora) in the forum of muchocine.net (if you like the cinema, you know), and that's how I got there, after fighting first with

the people of Deaplaneta ���Qu��� m It will give you how many people will see the film if there are 4 monkeys that populate

the room? there I stood, with my mobile waiting to meet these characters, it was they who at the entrance

of the room knew me. After the illusion and joy, we go with the movie ;Cula; I have to say that the

genre of terror does not fascinate me and that while all my friends went to the movies with the girlfriend, it was her who

"got" "cuddled" to him during the projection , always the opposite always happened to me, that it was me who ended up

scared caught by his arm.Partiendo of that slope I can be afraid so disparate things from the frog

Gustavo to the man of the sack, but this movie, that seems sponsored by the DEA, the project man and the

foundation of help against drug addiction, neither scary, nor laugh or anything, it is true that we have to envy at

least that other pel�� Seculas remain in the limbo (trillions), and yet this, although with its stupid and

laughable approach has become reality ���Cats with better argument will live the dream of the righteous? Neither the

plot, nor the actors, nor the scares, nor the soundtrack, nor the story gets to engage in any moment

(in the stalls there were more laughter than shrieks of terror), and if you get upset at some point it is not

because of terror that runs through your body, but because of the (unjustified) sound , even my grandmother with her

sonotone at least would have been scared, it's not a joke. In the press affiche that we were delivered right on

arrival to the room (and that a critic has thrown with rage at the ground the half of the footage.) reflect the opinion of

its director, who boasts of mixing the most narrative cinema, the mystery and the oriental cinema where? For me

who shot a film and distributed another. In short, would anyone pay 6? to see such a mess?

(I do not, of course).

" 0

" The problem of this failed tape is that it has not been fooled by a childish tint and despite the

cast, which is to shoot rockets, it does not just take off at any time.

I'm going to be very bad with this film because unfortunately for the scriptwriters being Nancy is very common for

our country when we make that attempt to learn another language. So given that I had the misfortune and at the same

time taking care of children (9 to be exact since I found my bones in a nursery instead of in a house) and

deal with their parents, grandparents, teachers and derivatives. Yes, I admit that putting myself in front of that so divine Scarlett

playing a role according to her age provokes in me a certain childhood excitement that after ten minutes has

almost completely disappeared. The film narrates Annie's adventures in the big city. She lives in Jersey

with her mom who has taken care of her until finishing high school and now they have to start their first steps inlife

working. A little distressed by this crisis that nobody in the real world is allowed to have decides to take the summer

to find herself and by a small accident in the park ends up being an inner child in a house of

Fifth Avenue. And here is where I get pejiguera because with so mediocre raw material at least I hope they

entertain me and have a bit of fun and they do not get it. The writers are going by courses that little or nothing

have to do with the comedy lost in a film that rides between children's movies and teen movies.

A product that even dares to copy (let's stand) to Mary Poppins, ���dolo of all budding Nanny or

exnanny that boasts with two stunning references: the umbrella and Supercalibragilisticoespialidoso. I would like

the Johansson to have the grace with the children that Julie Andrews still has today. The problem with this

failed tape is that she has not been fooled by a childish tint and despite the cast, which is to throw

rockets, not just take off at any time. It does not get a single genuine laugh from the public over 10 years

which to succeed in the Christmas card is very good but in the curriculums of Scarlett, Laura Linney,

Paul Giamatti and even for the ���dolo of teenagers Chris Evans (who does not even bother to teach torso tofor

entertain mea while). A pity to have so much and give so little.

" 0

" He has entered in his own right in the history of cinema for his wise exposition of daily horror in the

life of a person for the simple fact of being diminished his size in relation to the objects that daily

they surround us. A classic of Science Fiction.

"" As a result of being exposed to radioactive clouds, a man begins to see his size diminished

progressively. With this, his relationship with the world will change remarkably, starting with his girlfriend and laterhousehold

with simpleobjects and the cat from his home. "" One of the métis titles of science fiction film of

all times, discovered on television thanks to Chicho Ib������ez Serrador, a lover of this type of film

. He has entered in his own right in the history of cinema for his wise exposition of daily horror in the

life of a person for the simple fact of his size being reduced in relation to the objects thatday they

Everysurround us, like the telephone, a house of dolls, and with animals, such as a cat that goes from being a

pet to wanting to eat you. Excellent special effects by Richard Matheson, author of the novel.

" 1

" Influential tru sobreo about a guy who becomes obsessed with women and wants to kill them on board his car. A lot of

talk, little action and di quelogos that I'm sure a lot of people would be dazzled by, but they helped me decide what I was doing

the day after dinner.

Director: Quentin Tarantino.Duration: Hour and a half of talk, 19 minutes moved and 1 minute of show.

Year: August 29, 2007 Viewers: 185,083 human beings according to the Ministry of Culture , so

you go to know. Did you know why women do not want to get married? Because for 100 grams of chorizo ​​do not

take the whole pig. Embedded in this joke of low estofa is a millenarian philosophy that

comes to say "" If the duck quacks on the fig tree, the mouse will gnaw the entrails of the earth with the sharp

fangs of an armadillo deceased in an act of extreme courage ". Or in other words, what a movie

that I swallowed with a little bit that seemed to improve but lasts less than a powder with the Pataki (I

'll go I'm in a hurry to tell you, of course, that you do not doubt my man, muahahahaha). The film is about a

guy who calls himself Mike or Joe, or something like that. ��, that has a black car that makes brrrummmm,

bruuummm and with a duckling in the nose. Then the girls come out chatting about what's coming out of their coos, and they call themselvesblacks

shitty, white bitches and the like, but they're little friends. And it has asses like bull rings. And then those black

shits and skinny white whores disappear and others come out, who call themselves black whores andshit

whitebut who love each other. And suddenly, when it seems that the film begins, it goes and ends. I have allowed myself

to make the synopsis of the film to pay homage to the beginnings of every child in school, that when asked

for a summary account the entire film and chunks unconnected. If this movie is a tribute to something, it is that anything

goes. Let's see, what a bigger co���azo. I do not care that it is homage, that the Tarantino is God for some or

what you want, to see two groups of women say baskets that would blush plumbers seasoned with slit of the

ass in the air, I do not think interesting. And that nothing happens in the whole movie more than seeing these women say

nonsense seems to me like a roll. It's just fine, towards the middle of the movie, a scene. I think they put it on

to wake up the staff. Resuming, infusable tru���o about a guy who becomes obsessed with women and wants to

kill them on board his car. A lot of talk, little action and di quelogos that I'm sure a lot of people would be dazzled by, but

they helped me decide what I was doing the day after dinner. Paja mental.Besitos.PD: We should have

recorded the face that stuck to my half calabac���nyam��� when suddenly put "" END "". Amazing.

" 0

" Here it does not end up being very clear what the balls each one wants, without entering into the subject of sexuality, as

mother's past as a De Palma "" De Saldo "".

Kenneth Branagh signs one of the most rare experiments of the season with his version (with the permission of

Harold Pinter) of Anthony Shaffer's classic that he had already taken to the cinema impeccably Joseph L.

Mankiewicz thirty-five years ago with the bad luck of coinciding with The Godfather the ceremony of the

Academy. Now it presents itself in a more twisted, more visceral way, visually impeccable for forty minutes

(the composition seems great to me at times) and with a less "" equal "" gui���nmso until it gets out of hand, and in

that way, in the other forty and five. Right, it lasts three quarters of an hour less than the previous one and I

thank the director because the thing could have ended in stampede. Michael Caine gives badto his ex-

excrementnemesis of almost four years ago. decades and Jude Law becomes in the end a kind of English Jim Carrey withechoes

jocker���sticosthat will come to pearls to the writer of the next Scary Movie. If in the original we were presented with

two characters with two completely opposite objectives and a game of cat and mouse delirious and evil, here it is not

very clear what the hell he wants every one, without entering into the subject of sexuality, aspast

mother'sas a De Palma "" De Saldo. "" A much riskier exercise than Rob Zombie's Halloween but just as

unnecessary.

" 0

" Imperfecta, addictive, At the end of the break is cinema within the cinema, black cinema,resonance

classicmovies but here embedded in the hectic 60 in Paris ... . A jewel!

Those were the times of the Cahiers du Cinema. Nouvelle wander. Truffaut. Chabrol. Sartre, Camus, existentialism,

the war in Algeria: Par���s was not a party. The first foundations of an unstoppable consumer society.

Humphrey Bogart flying over the attic of the Latin Quarter. A blonde with short hair and close black tights

selling in the El���seos Fields the Herald Tribune. A cheerful bon-vivant, play-boy gany and reckless, talkative

and sentimental, who trespasses without malice and to which, invariably, we grant all our

sympathy. At the end of the break, death on the asphalt, betrayal. Before: a beautiful black and white:

Jam���s Par���s has been filmed in this way. Before: a story of love na���f rise of tone for the time.

Inside: a Greek tragedy or a Shakespearean drama. Jean Paul Belmondo is a Hamlet of the underworld, anfan

avowedof the black genre who imitates in his vital journey the archetypes that the films offer him. Jean Seberg

is beauty, an absolutely timeless beauty, an image that exceeds the rigor of the years. Bebop:jazz

syncopated, the new jazz lighting in America splashing the agile movements of the camera, which also seems to

move as if spurred by the m��� music Furtive love, clandestine love, love fou. The flight to Rome, which will not

be possible. The non-extendable betrayal. Breathless. Michel Poiccard cares little to die: just want to

sleep with his American girl.

" 1

" I do not know how such a mess (after its success in Cannes) has come to premiere in Spain, but if you can,

run away from it.

Not long ago (and that the film has been released for centuries in the rest of the world) I decided to see this

(let's call it "" Biopic "" to call it somehow), which has made Gus Van Sant about the supposed last

hours of the life of Kurt Cobain, the mythical vocalist of "" Nirvana. "" To say that the film is a horrible one is to

fall short, it is supposed to be the last d� In his life, Van Sant paints Cobain as a curious

character who dedicates himself to going from one place to another without speaking a word (the movie script is conspicuously

absent , and they spend almost 10 minutes until we heard the actors emit some sound), the picture is excellent and

the hypnotic music (to say the least Well, and be kind of benign), the characterization of Michael Pitt is

amazing, that is, if I have a blond hair and I have a beard! I am also Cobain ! Well,

something more would be needed, but well. I do not know how such a mess (after its success in Cannes) it has come to premiere in Spain,

but if I could You run away from her.

" 0

" Vacuo and relamido apa���o that fails to entertain, but get an interest in seeing how it ends, which

is something. The abyss was in the chair.

Ventura Pons has always seemed to me to be a literary director and not because he lets a film ruin because of an excess

of spoken prose, but because he imagines that there was a novel under the film and, in most cases, a novel. a of the cases (

I think now of Quim Monz���, a prodigious writer), a good novel. This is unfortunately not the case. Pons

pulls a work by Ferran Torrent that tells of the initiation of a young man into the crÃpulas atmospheres of

nocturnality. Then there are whores, rogue people and bad living. Or maybe that's life and the rest are

fringes, appendages, fills. The young virginal opens that perverse catechism and squeezes it with the will to learn

in a short time what life gives in years. This is, the experience. The abysmal life disappoints by a more

than inconvenient mise-en-scène, that is not credible, that is warned sloppy by more than the argument

dazzles in loose scenes (perhaps the beginning). I have not seen ���scar Jaenada playing Camar���n, but

here he is troubled, confused, confused, depressed, like the song of Hilario Camacho. He does not look comfortable

and the character is wishing that the movie ends. El Chino (as it is called) is back a lot, but

the actor who puts it on screen does not make it explicit: it remains in an impertinent gesture and in a face

with intentions, although expressionless. live at the limit do not fill a film no matter how much you think you are

going to have telling the story we suspect you are going to tell us, but everything comes close to

precariousness when what you ask for is passion (sickly if you want when the topics that are narrated are

great and require great words or a great will too not to ruin everything for not taking care of details

). The scene (pathetic) of the declaration of love with the French girl comes to mind now. If they put

a trio and give those scenes, does one go to the movies? Ventura Pons did El porqu��� de las cosas (1993) and Anita noi

loses the train (2000). Look for the kind reader in some video store some of them or both and you will see that there is

trade and manners. The first fascinates. Here there is no enchantment, not even remotely.

" 0

" I feel like a weirdo among such excellence, but I risk saying, with sincerity and respect to the rest

of the critics, that this film has disappointed me enough, at the risk of having to abandon the country, and live in

hiding.

I have been overwhelmed by all the criticisms that circulate in blogs, portals and cin���filos forums referred to this

film. They call it "" masterpiece "", "" risky "", "" Guillermo del Toro's best film "", or "" is going to be

the Oscar winner for the best talking film of 2007 Not English "". And, as for the interpretations

of their actors, they elevate them to the category of "" great "" or "" sublime "", with an unforgettable Sergi L���pez. I feel like

a weirdo among such excellence, but I risk saying, with sincerity and respect to the rest of the critics,

that this film has disappointed me a lot. I stress the base that I promoted it. No tape (say trailers) is

totally deceptive. It shows exclusively the fantastic part of the story, forgetting (maybe

intentionally) what really is collected in this film: a passage of History, with may�� �sculas,

from Spain, specifically the post-civil war, "" softened "" with a fairy tale, princesses andcreatures

strange. Even the same poster in the film confuses, with those lyrics in the purest style "" Harry Potter "". In

short, to really learn what the film is about, and not to take To deceits, it was essential to

have read at least before the first paragraphs of the official synopsis. After reading the rest of that

synopsis, we will get an overall idea of ​​what the film tells, although we will continue to believe that it

is a fantastic story located in an ingenious and different way. in a turbulent moment of Spanish history

. Nothing further from reality. Whoever is going to see this movie will find the worst and

weary movie about the Spanish Civil War (explicit miseries included) , in which during scarcely

half an hour of the two that lasts will transport us to an unreal and fantasized world just as cruel and interested as

the real world that is reflected in it. By the way, parents, abstain from taking your children to see her because as a

child she has nothing. Promotional gifts aside, I consider that this tape has fallen short for the

expectations created. It is true that photography and music are very good, and the script is acceptable, but

Guillermo Del Toro is able to create better and larger worlds than the which is seen in? El

Laberinto del Fauno ?. Having to deal with only two complex histories, reality and fantasies in 120 minutes,

although related, it is only possible to be brief, fast and direct, so that it can not be extended excessively in

florituras.Quiz���s would have been more effective, and even gimmicky, that the fantastic world we see would have taken

more footage and would have gone through sweeter paths than the one shown, to create a strong

opposition to the real world, represented in a very cruel, violent and bloody way. But of course, then

this product would not have been signed by Del Toro. As for the main cast of the film, for my taste

, the interpretations of Ivana Baquero, the protagonist child, stand out (although in some scenes it may seem a

little repellent), that of Maribel Verd��� (in the incredible line of his last works, this time with appropriate

thinness) and that of Alex Angulo, although the latter He has had other jobs with better results. The one of Ariadna

Gil seems to me quite normalita, throwing to mediocre, and the one of Doug Jones, like the Faun, does not contribute anything new.

As far as Sergi L���pez is concerned, here you go is to throw to my neck: I find it significant but not

remarkable. His interpretation is based on the visual, and in that sense, Lopez has built a bad,unscrupulous bad

bloodthirsty andguy; but that is why we can not think that it is the best bad thing in the history of Spanish cinema.

The badness is reflected in other aspects, and when Captain Vidal does not commit the atrocities that

explicitly we are taught, the character is interpreted correctly, as one among all. For all

that has been counted, I qualify this film as "" regular "", at the risk of having to leave the country, and live in

hiding.

" 0

" By far the worst film of the short (but intense) filmography of Quentin Tarantino as

director ... but, !,oh !, ���ojal��� the worst Films of the best directors were so enjoyable!

Quentin Tarantino has suffered his first trip as director. Do not be alarmed, it is not what it seems. Death

Proof is one of the best movies of the year, and an unparalleled enjoyment, but it is the first film in

which Tito Q drops a movie. n of the usual level, and commits excesses that the average viewer can hardly

bear (as I have been able to check in the movie theater): he has plenty of footage. That's the first thing I

thought at the end of the projection. There are too many dialogue scenes quite thick. Nothing else to start, there is already

one, and it is not one of those dialogues, also thick, but digestible and logical, like those that open Reservoir Dogs

or Pulp Fiction, but of those who sin of an alarming superfluity and a pretentiousness that you see the

feather duster from where Christ lost his hat (as if he wanted some of the little phrases that therelease

protagonist girls, went to the history of celluloid), that they last too long, and end up causingtedium

considerable; although it may be something unimportant for the most fanatical of the American director,

since they will probably endure - with a patience - happy dialogues until come the really good

, the enjoyable, the org���smico.Porque Death Proof can sin of what I just said, but we are

talking about one of the funniest movies, entertaining (obviating Dialogues of the devil) and hooligans of the

year, not taking yourself too seriously (which is something that you should not do either). In addition, that

is very "" tarantina "" (something that was not, for example, Kill Bill, to be a poturr��� - harshly hilarious, it

must be said - of a thousand g� Different genres, which oozed commerciality from all sides), and it shows

in all its frames, in how QT moves the camera, in how the movie lives and breathes. �cula by itself. It has, in

addition to the best-shot action sequences of the year, a thousand and one details and references, as in any

Tarantino film worth its salt, which should not Dejaris to let go, in addition to some songs very well chosen for the

scenes of turn (priceless the erotic dance scene between the character of Vanessa Ferlito and the

specialist Mike). Kurt Russell, very playful .N I liked the interpretation, although it is not to throw

many rockets (which would give me to see how the character of specialist Mike would be - a pel���n unused,

by the way - played by the actor who had to do it from the beginning: Mickey Rourke). The girls, at

their point. In the background, the plot is simpler than the mechanism of a botijo, and that's why it may have

a few minutes of footage, but I thought the film was quite funny, and I've had a great time,

that despite its shortcomings, is what really matters. By far, the worst movie of the short (but

intense) filmography of Quentin Tarantino as director. but, !,oh !, I wish the worst movies of the best

directors were so enjoyable! Attention to the details of celluloid wasted expressly so that the

Grindhouse experience (here mutilated) is more realistic. and that sudden and unexpected The End, simply

masterful, how mischievous it becomes.

" 1

" People loved Match Point, but we know that these people are the ones who do not like Allen. Woody is this film,

by principles, by intelligence, by cynicism, by essence and by quality too.

Woody Allen's films could be divided into thousands of subgroups. The cosmic of its beginnings, the serious "" to

the Bergman "", the innocuous, the great, the latest standard to autopilot, etc. But let's talk about his

best film of this last stage: Disassembling Harry. Or rather, Disassembling Allen.Film different and

obviously exaggerated, a kind of Woody Allen reloaded. Already since its inception, the purpose of Allen tois noted

provoke. A furious and choppy montage - used throughout the film, injected into his film - makes the difference. And

not to mention his humor politically incorrect. Very wrong. Despite being the protagonist - Harry Block - a

monster without apparent virtues other than literary ones, it becomes lovable and irresistible. Will it be byhimself

Allen? Is this character a more sarcastic face of himself? The biographical elements put here are a

mirror? His relationship with psychoanalysis , sex and religion - and so they seem. Although thinking about it a

bit, her story with the Korean girl would not be out of place in this script. Unlike the last installments

of Allen, he never loses his overwhelming rhythm. We said before a nervous assembly and at the same time brilliant. A

film that treats women poorly, the whole religion, the psychoanalysis so loved, the American middle class and

even himself. A rarity for its degree of acidity. The gags and the di sonlogos are unbeatable. Few in his

cinema as imaginative as the actor who is out of focus (Robin Williams ha!). Or the one of death knocking on the

door. And we could point out more. The jokes about Judaism are hilarious: "I already know we lost 6 million

but the records are to be exceeded." "What's wrong with science? Between the air conditioning and the

Pope, I am left with the air conditioning "". Or one of his former women reproaching him for teaching his son in

common phrases such as "" I shit on God. "" The parade of level actors is endless, demonstrating once again the

prestige and importance of Allen's cinema. The sum of characters and the endless stories of this film,

show a prodigious handling of timming, where they never get mixed or tired. And that shows the

characters of the film plus the imaginaries plus the characters of his book more. uff Great. The people are Match

Point, but we know that these people are the ones who do not like Allen. Woody is this film, by principles, by

intelligence, by cynicism, by essence and by quality too. I would be encouraged to say that leaving aside its

indisputable classics? Hall, Manhattan, Crimes and sins, this Dismantling Harry is undoubtedly his

best film. Or the one that best represents it.

" 1

" This is a great masterpiece of our time. Before I start writing anything, the first thing I will do is to say that the film contains an "" unexpected turn ""

from the 100th minute onwards. projection, but, since I'm not such a bad person (despite what some may

think) I will not reveal it here, so whoever wants to know more, you know. Saying this (and I am looking forward to my detractors,

since I am going to talk about more things than usual) Clint Eastwood has proven to be a solid director of

actors, as he demonstrated with "" Mystic River "" and with "" M $ B "" he does it masterfully, in addition to the fact that the aesthetics of

the film is little less than ACOJONANTE with images that come to leave " "poso" "in the viewer, in

the 1��� 100 minutes of film we witness the birth and subsequent redemption of a young boxing promise and

a" "Coach" "who does his best ( not wanting beforehand ) because his pupil gets what he wants. Some

planes, parts of the gui��� and gestures of the actors do and they get you to put "" the hairs as escarpias "".

But, there is not that left, that goes. Not much less !! In the last twenty minutes (with that twist that will not reveal)

Eastwood takes the film far beyond what one expects, demonstrating that he is capable of telling two stories

in one , and leave behind the credit titles with the mind crushed by the moments lived in the chair.

In addition Mr.Eastwood (who is already seen mayorcito) composes the score, directs, acts. Come on Juan, I

cook it, I eat it! And if we add to that the excellent performance of Hillary Swank and Morgan Freeman,

we are facing a great masterpiece of our time! I hope the Oscars are favorable and win all the

nominations to which it is nominated. Why do you wait to see her?

" 1

" These two hours and a bit of cinema know, let's see, what we're going to do, little by little. I do not doubt that some festival with

self-inducements will assign him a star that he does not deserve.

Neil Jordan is a competent director who lets himself be persuaded by the Hollywood cinema (Interview with the

vampire), but looks from the corner of his eye (with a heart) to a cinema of roots, which some call author , although it would have a

lot of fabric to marvel. In this installment, he delves into the Ireland in which he was born and, without shying away from the

political transcript, investigates the direct and unambiguous melodrama. As Jordan is not Douglas Sirk, the film ishearted

half-because it abuses the clichés and is heeled excessively to the common place, to the dramatic space that the

viewer has visited. too often. What we see is an Irish catologist, who ruminates thesiesta

provincialof tranquility. What threatens this fragile stillness is the character of Cillian Murphy, born a

man, but vocationally female, who prefers to be called Gatita and who dedicates her troubled life to finding

the mother she did not know. Time will be in this sentimental journey of lost identities so that theIreland

political(IRA, neighbors found, street riots) also arrogates its particular universe of

topics. �� very accelerated and shines, above the narrative set, a precise soundtrack and a

sober acting composition in which, although overactive, Cillian Murphy, we remember in Batman begins or in

that spawn of kidnappings in airplanes of the already outdated Wes Craven, gives packing to a difficult character. Breakfast in

Plut���n is a melodrama with comedy touches that we can not call tragicomedy entirely because the humor

it presents is dark, sordid , sometimes. He has in music (I insist) an invaluable ally. From punk rock to

Ha���ndel, from local folklore to the disco music. Even Bryan Ferry has his little piece, perverse, for the sake of it. It

seems, the way Tarantino models his scripts, that Jordan wants the twists of the story to

drink from the movie soundtrack. cula In fact, Patricia "" Kitten "" Braden, the character of Murphy, lives for

those songs and guides her growth as a person throughout the length of the footage. TheGame came to my mind

Tears, better film than this one, also signed by Jordan. Both treat transvestism. Both portray

terrorist violence. Here everything has remained in a minor tone, mannered to the sweetness, but tender, at

times. Liam Neeson as a self-sacrificing and courageous priest and Stephen Rea (a landlord of Jordan) as the magician

barely traditional embroider, in my opinion, their characters., the kind reader has on the billboard

Anywaya motley rationale of practical behaviorism and also, here is the absolute magic of cinema, an entertaining time

of European cinema, ballasted by the footsteps of the American neighbor, such a thief, so beloved, soI do not doubt that

ours.some festival with self-inflicted rhythms will assign him a star It deserves, but we would not

criticize too much. There is so much trash and it is sold with such complacency that these two hours and a bit of cinema

know, let's see, what we are going to do, little by little. Tonight I'll see With skirts and crazy. It has nothing to do with

everything written, but I miss Jack Lemmon and Tony Curtis.

" 0

" Still with the purpose of spending an entertaining time, and nothing more, I would have a hard time recommending it. But I'm going to

do it. That's right, pay attention to the consequences. More than one can leave the movies pissed off.

I notice from the beginning: I'm not a fan of the c���mic, or Spidey geek or anything like that. I had a

lot of sympathy with this saga, I liked the television series when I was little and little more. If you have not

seen the movie yet, do not keep reading. And if you expect a "serious" criticism, either. Spiderman 3 has premiered

with box office records all over the world. The trailers and the previous films were great inducements for

the spectators to come en masse during the first weekend. In addition, it is the most expensive film in

history, so the expectations were maximum. But the final result is, without a doubt, DISAPPOINTING.

So, in capitals. The film does not make any sense, the presentation of characters is not only regrettable,

but it does not end up fitting into the story (if it exists). The reactions of the characters are

totally unreal, the dialogues are almost romantic comedy (that end with the dawn in the background, for God,

only missing a kiss.), And if outside, the visual section does not offer anything new, and although it is not bad at all,

the truth is that there are enough scenes in which it is too noticeable that the actors are in front of the famous

green screen. What's so good then? Little bit. Very very little. Ignoring the special effects, I only

managed to make him enjoy a film scene from the movie. Nothing more: not Venom (with the amount of

hope that had been deposited in the bad bad by excellence), or Sandman (but what is that crap

who was the one who killed the guy and wants Parker's forgiveness?), or anything. Harry has a pretty stupid role (in

the line of the second part of the trilogy), Mary Jane behaves like a bitter selfish self, and

Peter Parker comes in Outbursts that do not hold anywhere. But who believes what happens? Let's see. I

could start with a thousand things. But I'm going to do it with the end. A man of sand of thousands of tons of

weight is destroying what is in his way. But there is a girl, with her camera, at side of

his "" mommy "", photographing the moment .- "" Look Mommy! "A black bug and a mountain of sand are crushing

our beloved Spidey! And everything in front of me! In addition, on TV they tell it live, as if it were the mostthing in

normalthe world. And what about Mary Jane? What are those faces when you find yourself trapped inside a

car, 80 stories high, in a giant cobweb? ���If it seems that when they focus on it, they are watching

TV in their home's chair! It seems incredible that this is the same equipment as in the predecessor films. Why does

the script have such a brutal quality drop? How do they pretend that we swallow phrases like: "" My best friend "",

"" I forgive you "", or scenes like the kiss between Spiderman and Gwen Stacy, the little dance in the kitchen, club.?

And the story of Sandman? He wants the money for his daughter but.���ah��� he goes! "The girl does not appear except at the beginning!

What are you doing the rest of the time? ��� Feed the pigeons The problem with Spiderman 3 is that younot

dobelieve anything about what they are telling you. And yes, I know, it's a movie about a comic and blabla hero.

But you already know that you can find certain kinds of things, but never a series of nonsense, a film without

any line of argument. In short, there is no where to take it, and that I love the two previous.Also

with the purpose of spending a while entertaining, and nothing more, cost me I would recommend it. But I'm going to do it. That's

right, pay attention to the consequences. More than one can leave the cinema angry, without entering into inconsistencies

with the comic, which I do not care anymore. PS: I know badly write this in a saga for which I had a predilection .N

Maybe it was not so bad. Or is it?

" 0

" The child who sees ghosts has already become better in Poltergeist, the stereotype of rebellious girl that no one believes is

tiring, the crows have already become in The Birds and the ghosts p�� �lidos under the sheets and climbing

the walls in The Ring and The Curse.

Many were the expectations created by seeing the Hollywood premiere of the Pang brothers and seeing if they could

make a horror film in conditions under their cloak. The brothers Pang, Oxide and Danny, became

world famous thanks to the movie The Eye, which is already preparing its corresponding remake with

Jessica Alba as a protagonist. A family, parents, rebellious teenage daughter and young son ,O, they move to a

farm almost in ruins with the intention of rebuilding their lives and starting from scratch after being practically

bankrupt for causes that were already explained in the film. There, they intend to make a sunflowers plantation, which

I'm still wondering why because it could have been just as parsley that the film would be the same, because you

already explained to me to take a plantation. ��n of pipes or oil what will report to them of economic benefit, but anyway,

that is not the issue. Total that the house is full of ghosts which only seems to see the cri���, that

apart this traumatized and does not say a word, for causes that are also explained throughout the film. Then without coming

to mind it turns out that the sister also begins to see ghosts, but of course, nobody believes her for being agirl

problemand such. Then there are more apparitions of ghosts and through a mogoll���n of crazy crows that attack

all who wiggle. And everything ends with an explanation of the most foolish and predictable, no, I will not tell what it

is, an end the sea of ​​easy and simple and it's over. You have deduced the film has been a total disappointment,

a horror film that brings nothing new to the genre and that is equal to or worse than any otherhouse

hauntedin between. The characters are the most flat and predictable, as the child who sees ghosts and is

best done in Poltergeist, the stereotype of rebellious girl who no one believes and tired, the Ravens already done

in The Birds and the pale ghosts under the sheets and climbing the walls in The Ring and The

Curse. Another failed film of terror and we've already had a few. It's going on a year, to see whenappears

that filmthat surprises us all again and is not more of the same. I hope that now theadventures

separateof the brothers can offer something better.

" 0

" It gives a bit of a feeling that its director, Andreas Prochaska, has not wanted to risk a single

frame as long as the film can leave Austria to all the countries that have read it. ��do themanual

Hollywood slasher.

The young people of today, in the slashers, die as they did in the eighties. With a couple of cuts,

some shrieks, a suspicious shadow and a gore touch, the formula still stands. Now we get

another one that follows the rules, but from Austria. Few films produced in this country come to light, and it

is necessary to see more films filmed in their beautiful places. This is one of the strengths of Morir���s

in three days, giving us the opportunity to make tourists looking at the scene in which

quite ugly events take place. Among the huge mountains, and next to a fairly cold lake, young

graduates receive a message on the phone that tells them they will die. in three days. First they do not take it very

seriously, but everything will change when one of them is killed. Starting with this approach, which could

resemble the Lost Call of Takashi Miike, the film presents five young people with the same personality

as an ATM. To which you press a few buttons, they are activated accordingly. The surprises

that Morir���s awaits us in three days are very few, not to say that there are none. As one of the

protagonists says "" Why three days and not four? " Exactly, what else? It is a unidirectional argument, which starts

very well, but which passes the rest of the film teaching the same thing again after another. It gives a bit of a feeling

that its director, Andreas Prochaska, did not want to risk a single frame as long as the film can

leave Austria to all the countries that have read it. the Hollywood slasher manual.

" 0

" Let no one believe that there is cinematic genius behind the appalling apparatus of images and noise.

We are, once again, before a deceptive film, use, movies that seem very good movies but that are not

more than correct mediocrities.

"" How much pain, how much incomprehension and how much passivity is there in this global village. " Thus, speaking above,

the nature, the theme and the intentions of Alejandro Gonz���lez I���arritu and screenwriters can be summed up in their desire

to create a dramatic film very crude, with a visual invoice that refers to the documentary style and that at this

point has been exploited repeatedly and in various genres. To start, if you want to make a

movie. "About" "Oh my god, what a bad thing the world is going" ", it is not very constructive to restrict the style to arealism

hand-heldthat is directly inspired by the immediate reality of the documentary film. If what is atis to

issuegive a sense of realism in order to accentuate the dramatic potential of the narrated facts, it is well

as a gimmicky and effective contraption for, as ,Nimo, achieve a decent show. But do not lose sight of your

pretensions as a cinematographic artist facing the very core of our current collective tragedy: that

we are already part of an interrelated whole, but more isolated and destructive than ever precisely because the

absence of a global conscience that manages (managing is not the exact word, but so we

understand each other) and sustain that network of responsibilities among all and for everything. What we are trying to say is

that, undoubtedly, " "Babel" "is a very well-intentioned film, which places us facing areality

raw and devastating collective, but that is not enough in relation to art work. proposed

We speak of the scant conceptual, structural and visual imagination on which the film story is based.

In the visual, as we have already said, pure documentary style so that the viewer has a "sense of reality",

which unnecessarily results in the reality inherent in the story. Nor is it enough, but nobody believes

that there is cinematographic genius behind the appalling apparatus of images and noises. We are, once again,

before a deceptive film, use, movies that seem very good movies but that are not more than correct

mediocrities. In the case of "" Babel "", it is an interesting mediocrity, let's recognize it. Go ahead of everything

that "" we "" have liked the film, but in "" Images and Words "" we have the ordeal of being objective, so

, at rag.The simplism and the plain of "" Babel "" become obvious at once, with a look that integrates everything

seen in almost three hours: a japo who has a deaf and dumb daughter (the poor thing is very bad, she is very lonely , the

society is very superfluous, etc etc etc.) that has sold a weapon to a Moroccan hunter who in turn sells it to

another village that leaves it to his children which, by accident (?), they shoot antourist

Americanwho has two children at home who are going to have a hard time because they take them on holiday and in the middle of the

traffic of illegals are involved in dangerous tribulations. And that's the movie. Then, in terms of

structure, it's not too forceful either. Good organization of the sequences, but many of them do not

finish arriving at anything that is truly substantial. Go, see how the story of the

Mexican lost in the desert and the guy who runs away leaving two children homeless ends. What did not you

need anything else? It can, but it is still typical and insubstantial. The resolution of the situations in a great

movie (with a good basic script) never ends halfway or ends in such a predictable way. Another thing is

how the story of the Japanese girl and the daddy ends, the final hug opens a subtle channel of suggestions, and it

is one of the few moments when one has the feeling I'm watching CINEMA. And the resolution of the history of

the couple of Americans in Morocco. Prrrrrrrfffffffffff. I know, that it's worth it, that Brad Pit's final sobbing

makes a lot of sense, but that does not take 145 minutes, since I can already see the ninenews on

o'clockTVE. Well, from that connection thread Between histories, an evident, Mannerist,idea

typicalunfolds. Loaded with feeling and pain for what things are, but their ability to dissect the complex and

powerful reality that faces, is nil. And he pretends, there's the problem. If you want to express how bad

the world is, a single story that represents universal problems is enough. Mr. Gonz���lez

I���arritu, in constructing a story of histories, a vision of the global problem, deviates towards a

pretension n greater Such a pretension requires something more than a succession of passages in which the spectator can not

do anything but jump from one to the other with the only trick that "" there is a nexus of union between all of

them. "" If something else had to come from the conceptual and visual creativity of the filmmaker, it is not our job to

find it, but � that, intuitively, any serious analyst will discover that this movie is hollow from

the moment we approach its "" base text "" and its underlying themes. The "superficial text", without a doubt, has an

overwhelming execution, the rhythm never wanes and, at times, achieves a subtle look at the intricate

relationships between minds, cultures and spaces throughout the world. This unfortunate human balloon. But only for

moments. From then on, the only thing we have is an extensive video clip about people from different latitudes and

cultures to which a series of things happen. At the end of the projection, the viewer is left with the

idea: "What are we fucking and what are we bad"? But, I repeat, for that the news is already there. What it was

about was to put that same idea under a cinematographic treatment that derives in a personal vision (the

genuine in art), which is given, but to a greater degree. nimo, a mere choral structure in which the facts

have a progression at least as simple (the events narrated respond to a sequence that could be summarized

in a paragraph or in a ten-minute television documentary). That is, I���arritu does not tell me anything that I do not

know beforehand, and does not even show a capacity to approach the problem from a singular optics. And

that - offering a unique optics - is creativity. And the cinema must be an act of creation, not a

pretension to say this or that thing about obvious issues and that we know every day. By synthesizing, Babel is a

meaningful, correct and well-intentioned production. n for the free sentimental expression of its authors, but

cinema, what is called cinema, there is justito, very very very little.

" 0

" It does not get lost in nonsense, and from the first minute it puts us in flour, reflecting the arrival of Todd in the

mundane London landscape, under the Tower Bridge. Of the best of this 2008, by far.

For all those who read me usually well you know and you know my passion towards Tim Burton, that is why

I have not been able (or known) to endure the time that remains until its premiere in Spain ���a (February 15) to see

this MUSICAL, in the cinema, one of the most famous musicals of Broadway, sung almost in its entirety (little

spoken dialogue is, in fact) and that, Once again, he stars Johnny Depp, along with Helena Boham Carter,

Alan Rickman, Timothy Spall and Sacha Baron Cohen, in his first dramatic role, and that is that Baron Cohen weonly

haveseen him do comedy . It should be noted that Burton has been dreaming for years with the making of this film and

it shows, it shows in what has taken care of everything so that the tape is round, from the planes that separate the

film completely from a fully theatrical exercise, to the actors, even the effects and makeup,

all perfect, maybe, the only negative note I see, and then in that he does over and over again incapie that he is

a MUSICAL is that in some moments he gets to tire so much time singing, on the part of the actors, and, he

lacks a little more dialogue, and it is that both "" Chicago "" and "" The fant���sma of the ���pera "" or even "" The

producers "" had a spoken and part sung part. The actors, all, without exception they are impressive, from

Depp, who sings frankly well, to Alan Rickman, who is slow to start, but also does it (saving the

distances) quite bi in, I leave aside Timothy Spall, who frankly has a lot to learn to

sing "" a little "" well, since his character every time he opens his mouth you can see that his is not

singing. Saving this and knowing ���ndolo in advance, it is forgiven everything to the film, since it is not lost in

nonsense, and from the first minute and it puts us in flour, reflecting the arrival of Todd to the mundane landscape

London, under Tower Bridge, or the final moments in Todd's house. From the best of this 2008 by

far, let's hope Oscar's good is with Burton.

" 1

" A masterful film that will undoubtedly remain in my memory for many years, for its

originality.

Did anyone know that Gabriel Garc���a M���rquez had a child? Well, not me. This is Rodrigo Garc���a, director and

writer of the very well received by the critics Things that he would say with only to watch it and Nine lives. The first one I did not

get to see, although they spoke very well of it, and today, luckily, I have seen the second one, which in my opinion,

is one of the best movies. I've seen this year. Not only did I find him masterful because of his guiding, but

also because of his peculiar style. For the director's own pleasure, each chapter is shot in the same

plane-sequence, so it not only becomes more credible, but- much more interesting and intriguing. Maybe not

all the stories are equally good, but what is clear is that with none of them you lose interest.

The second aspect after the script that I would name would be the spectacular cast where most are actresses.

And it is that each one of them (and they) gets so much into their role that sometimes you really think it's avideo

home(with very good quality, by the way). This cast is composed of Kathy Baker, Amy Brenneman, Elpidia

Carrillo, Glenn Close, Stephen Dillane, Dakota Fanning, William Fichtner, Lisa Gay Hamilton, Holly Hunter, Jason

Isaacs, Joe Mantegna, Molly Parker, Sissy Spacek, Robin Wright Penn. Impressed, right? Each story is

full of sensitivity, realism, drama and melancholy. Not all, but many of them are intertwined

with little characters. Well, you could say that what Rodrigo Garc���a wants is for you to realize that behind

every little life of a character, however secondary, there is a a lot of problems, not just

family, also personal, and in general, very complicated. It is not a sentimental and

tear-jerking movie (spy on my Word Trade Center criticism). No, this is a film of feelings, yes,

but real. I like both its rhythm and its intrigue. As I said before, each chapter is shot in a single

plane-sequence, so, as I have also mentioned, the interest and intrigue are more intense. Each of

them is perfectly coordinated and structured. One can never know what will happen within a minute (each

chapter lasts approximately 12 minutes). In some of them, even, the mystery provokes real

confusion (look carefully at the last one, interpreted by some splendid Glenn Close and Dakotta

Fanning). Perhaps, in my opinion, the worst are the first and that of Kathy Baker and Joe Mantegna, on the one hand

for their lack of interest and on the other, for not have an ending as interesting as all the others. Although I'm not

saying they're bad, they're just right. The others, however, masterful. Within this section I would

highlight the work of photography, which must have been incredibly difficult and laborious. For example, in the

chapter of the daughter overwhelmed by her parents (some superb Sissy Spacek and Ian McShane), the photograph is moved

and the atmosphere very oppressive (attentive that hall that is so repeated). Another of them, also excellently

photographed, is that of Holly Hunter. You do not really know how the director will manage to

follow them without cutting the sequence and without the micros or anything else being seen. And the protagonists have to climb

in a small elevator, where they can hardly fit more than five people. In short, a masterful

film that will undoubtedly remain in my memory for many years, for its originality.that

Let's hopeRodrigo Garc���a will roll with me. Frequency and touch other topics that are not women, not because they are not

interesting, but because it has already deepened them so much that I doubt you can tell us more than what you have told us, that

is, everything . How difficult it must be to tell the whole life in nine chapters, right?

" 1

" Anyway, it is not that any past movie is better, but at least let them where they are, without

transvesting them under the light veil of the postmodern. We will always have the original.

It does not require much cunning or cin���filo love to recognize in The Good German its character of homage to those

films that there by the forties and the fifties (especially of the Warner), in a rigorous black and white,

with characters and music easily recognizable, portrayed under the backdrop of the Second World War

the difficult loves of their tormented protagonists, without detracting between so much tragedy alook

melancholy and romanticabout the impossible loves. Surely Soderbergh enjoyed those movies

when he was a young man in the dark of a movie theater in his native Atlanta. It is not strange that he

himself is the director of photography of many of his films. Already since the beginning of Good German, when we see

c� How the format of the huge screen is revealed as the unusual and square 1.33: 1 (after the credit titles

widens a little, to a 1.66: 1, which approaches a little m ���sa our usual panoramic), and the color of the

frames takes the documentary texture of a black and white illuminated the old way, we know that it is more than

sure that Soderbergh intends to return us to then , as if with it he wanted us to travel with him that cin���fila

memory that one day (and today) excited him: the romanticism of Casablanca, the sewage systems of The

third man, the German capital destroyed by the bombings of Berlin West, the Dietrich dishonoring

the knights (if not the ladies). All the frames of Good German are chosen, framed and

photographed for that purpose, as if an enthusiastic lover of Vel���zquez's work had mixed (not without

intelligence or passion) The surrender of Breda, La forge of Vulcano and El aguador de Sevilla, rendering with it

a pretended homage to the master. As we can imagine, the resulting work in addition to almost impossible would seem

a priori more a collage without its own entity than a painting. This is the problem of Good German. Hisformalism

passionatemakes the proposal cold, erasing the whole soul and depth that have their referents. In

fact, we could almost say that it is not substantially a film, but rather a yincana of cin���philic

gui���os that take us back to the beauty that is �� they provide the films of Tourneur, Wilder, Curtiz or

Reed. In all the scenes of Good German there is a distancing that is more analytical than in the

creative. His characters look stiff, despite the strength of the character of Maguire or thepresence

always disturbing and emotionalof Blanchett. Clooney does not adapt to the size (both physical and psychological) of his

character. The photograph tries to emulate the expressionism of its original referents, but sometimes it

superimposes the light, or flattens it without endowing the scene with emotion. The will to imitate,

is too noticeableforgetting that a film is being made, only that.It also happens with the narration, linked in the same way

the scripts precedents That husband hidden in the sewers - remember! to the Laszlo of Casablanca, although the

Ilsa de Soderbergh is less prudish and more stormy (to the Dietrich) than that of Curtiz. But the height of theaffronts

emulatorthe final scene. If at least Soderbergh had taken the Russian general Sikorsky as the

incomprehensive police prefect Louis Renault in Casablanca, perhaps the affected tone of the film would have gained a

sense of humor and iron���a. But no, everything in The Good German possesses the tyrannical rigidity of the geek. In

short, Good German fulfills the unique mission of dusting our cinematic memory. ��fica, encouraging us to once

again enjoy those post-war delights that still survive much of today's cinema, created in

mostly by European filmmakers fled from one of the two wars. In addition, another suggestion that feeds

(although without many proteins) is the image of Berlin as a source of inspiration for many other films,

far away in time. (One, two, three, Germany, year zero) and not so much (Cabaret, Sky over Berlin, Good bye,

Lenin !, The lives of others, Berlin blues, Berlin is in Germany) For what has been said, Good German is more a

document that pays homage to the cinema than a film about the genre of imitates. There is no use in Soderbergh using

giraffe microphones, instead of wireless, incandescent lights and fixed focal length lenses. This

fact only underscores the impression of having attended a museum representation about cinema at

that time. But I'm afraid that is not enough to make us believe that she herself is a film. The

fetishistic formalism of Soderbergh connects with other proposals of the current cinema, endeavored to repeat or

recreate in master formulas already rolled and uselessly reproducible. In my memory is the spawn that

tries to revive Gus Van Sant with his Psychosis. Or the amateurism of American cinema for the remake

of European and Oriental films of success. Even the excellent Scorsese Infiltrates is rebuilt from

his antecedent Hongkon���s Infernal Affairs. However, the Soderbergh thing more than a gui���oo remake is a

Frankenstein f ,ustico, patched up with the essences of physics that isolated distill beauty, but that smelly they smell

strange. In short, it is not that any past movie is better, but at least we leave them where they are, without

transvesting them under the light veil of the postmodern.

" 0

" Artificial Intelligence, by Steven Spielberg, is probably the most undervalued film of the

last few years, although right now, from certain film sectors, He is warning us and proclaiming his

condition as a future masterpiece, a classic for posterity, a jewel wasted and despised in

our time.

The science-fiction genre is a suggestive instrument to explore the desires and concerns of thesoul

human, especially in the framework of the space age, opening an infinity of possibilities in the

creative field , a projection of fantasies or fears or an excuse to develop the potential of the new

infographic techniques, of all there has been and there will be. "" Artificial Intelligence "", by Steven Spielberg, is probably

the most undervalued film of the last few years, although right now, from certain cinéfilos sectors, we are

being warned and its status is proclaimed future masterpiece, a classic for posterity, a jewel

wasted and despised in our time. Hand in hand with science fiction philosophical and political,

never before the abandonment and the realization of unattainable dreams had such a treatment direct,

heartrending and felt like in this story about an entity that dreams of becoming what it is not, an idea of ​​a

marked religious character and one of the basic pillars of a network very dense conceptual Our goal,

however, is not to give lessons in philosophy. Let's focus on the immediate content.���fairy tale

Twilight?. ���Met���fora about God and the human being ?. Both thing at a time. The story is divided into three

segments that offer a contrast at different levels: after the prologue that leads us on thediscourse

philosophicalto develop, the first segment (the warmth of the family, the home, environments of peace and security),

second segment (the dangers of the world, the darkness of a forest, loneliness, violence),segment

third(trip to the "" end of the world "", return to the origin, end of the b��� search). The different parts serve as a

structure to channel a vital process that encompasses different facets and levels of human existence,

represented in the life of the robot child: his creation, from the initial rejection to the progressive acceptance Porn on the part

of your family, the awakening of the consciousness that loves (the imprint), the inherent dangers of being sensitive and

aware (the idea that love makes us vulnerable, jealousy, fear of being left alone, fear of

death), the discovery of the differential fact and the search for a higher condition (becoming "a

child of truth"), loneliness and b�� Searching for a meaning to life. As we can see, Spielberg moves interrain

tricky, themes and transcendental motives for a filmmaker who prefers the spectacle and the emotion in front of a

dense and complex content, in what intellectual values ​​are concerned. Now, as we will explain later,

in this case he has the ability to conjugate all that in such a way that he manages to take it to the field he is

interested in without getting too screwed up. It has been said and written many times, and it is necessary to repeat it once more. ��s:

the first segment of the narrative, approximately the first forty minutes (from the beginning to the

plane that shows us the image of David reflected in the rear view mirror of the car) is an authentic wonder and

virguer���a narrativa, which is very useful as an exemplary exhibition in all film schools: it is an

example of efficiency and skill, of a cinematographic language so devoid of unnecessary artifice as

illustrative of the argumental and emotional content that encloses and unfolds throughout the first fragment. The

story of a family that has lost its "real" child and adopts an "artificial" child, the progression that

goes from the initial rejection in M���nica (the mother), the appreciation and the subsequent acceptance (process that culminates in such

an everyday act as a dinner, a spaghetti hanging at the corner of the lip, which provokes thelaughter

spontaneousof David, a sign of humanity that ends up moving the family), the jealousy that accentuates

David's vulnerability, the incomprehension and the most absolute helplessness represented in that image of the rear-view mirror

that gradually it moves away, it gets dark, it becomes profoundly dramatic. Special mention deserves one of the

most beautiful moments of the film (and one of the best moments of the entire filmography of Spielberg), the imprint

that is lit in the conscience of David through invocaci���ny recitation of unconnected words: the hand of

Monica in the neck of David, the child's hieratic and expressionless stance in front of the expression No fear on the

face of the mother, the moment in which the face of David is transfigured from the hollow emptiness of

feelings to the sensitivity of the conscious being that he loves and that, in addition Yes, that will be your tragedy, YOU KNOW that you love. The

wonderful frame of Spielberg shows us the hug between mother and son in a central position, bathed by

the light of a window. Brief visual imagination of Mr. Spielberg, but also, direct, honest, effective

and simple, communicating what deserves to be expressed under a prism of intimate sensitivity. To Spielberg,

too often, he is accused of being a lacrimor or "" ���o���o "", a big mistake, at least in the film thatus today

concerns, there is no something other than sincere sensitivity. And whoever does not believe it, review the scene in question,

among others. (Of course, most of the public and critics need to be explained the difference between

emotional manipulation and sensitivity). With hardly any dialogues, without explanations, reiterations orunderlines

unnecessary, through plans and frames that gather the necessary visual information to understand what is

happening, to understand why Mónica thinks what she thinks, why her thoughts David begins

to change, because the brother feels jealousy, because David feels different and needs a fantasy in the form

of a fairy tale to justify his desires. The enormous visual expressiveness of Spielberg It is also evident

in the scene in which David is immersed in the bottom of a swimming pool, after involuntary aggression against the brother

because of a fear caused by the excess of vulnerability triggered in the invocation. n of the imprint,

previous to the pain of the knife: the subjective camera places us in the perspective of David, alone and helpless

with respect to humans, the waters that cloud that perception serve as symbolic expression from hisstate

alienated, the disintegration-disconnection between his intimate world and the world of others. Then comes thatshot

generalof the pool with David alone and lost in its center, with open arms, waiting for an affection he does not

have, the perfect visual expression of helplessness. What has been said: there are so many cinematographic qualities. These are the

first forty minutes that would be eternal. The second part of the story, perhaps the most problematic,us

tellsabout David's adventure in finding the blue fairy . In contrast to the home and family, after being

abandoned, David faces a darker and more hostile world: the wolves that chase the protagonists through

the forest, the garbage dump. mecas "", the moon emerging threateningly in a horizon of bushes, the

meat fair. A curious mixture of science fiction elements and the typical of thefairy tale

traditional, although there is nothing Be fascinating beyond the subjective gaze of each viewer. In this

section, the visual imagination of Spielberg is reduced to the possibilities of an environment that generates a

strange mixture between the cybernetic and the enso���ador: the Teddy bear running across the hills in search of

David, a cradle song that sounds from above, the raucous rock at the meat fair. All this gives rise

to many impressions and suggestions , but the staging is not up to the material used. That is,

Spielberg, without losing the narrative forcefulness, does not make the most of the possibilities of certain passages. The

passage of the meat fair, certainly grotesque, but if what Spielberg intended was to provoke empathy. And

drama in the mind of the spectator, failure is complete. The executed droids are reduced to a bunch of

animated contraptions without a personality that is significant, therefore, annot generated

emotional connection in that sense is. This is one of the usual criticisms: the tone used by Spielberg in the passage

of the meat fair is not adequate, the characterization of the mutilated and tortured robots (?) Is

too banal, when not childish, for a scene that should have a much more dashing tone. But, eye, the

objective of the film, and the scene, above a pretended drama, is to reflect that David is a

robot different from the others, he is the robot with soul, the rest are scrap metal. Precisely because of that, the girl

identifies David in the cell. As we can see, although surely the scene of the meat fair will never

be satisfactory enough, Spielberg does not deviate a bit from the essential purpose. Gigol��� Joe

deserves a separate paragraph. It is not a character that has too much weight in the narrative, it simply performs the

function of accompanying David in his search. But the truth is that his dances, his couplets, the pirouettes and

the cool bonhom���a of his gestures hide an unforgettable character, or, at least, leave a very good taste in his

mouth, even though is a character that is integrated into the story by picking it with pins: you have to see how and

where it disappears from the narrative. What is said: taken with pins. Finishing with the second segment, we have the

impression that it is too long, too many things are dispensable: the arrival in Rouge City, a

futuristic variant of Blade Runner but does not bring anything new to the narrative or the design ,O, the visit to Dr.

Known, from the science fiction philosophical we went to an own iconography of Disney. The problem is not Dr.

Known, the problem is the design and the ambience of the scene (the tone), very infantilized and, consequently,

lacking that fascinating power that the ori must have. �cles, even more the or queculo that will indicate the way to the

origin and the end. The third and last segment takes place in Manhatan, a city flooded by the seas because of the

thaw, and here Spielberg regains the pulse to give it the final touch. The reunion with Professor Hobby

(the creator), who embodies the essential discourse: dreams and religious faith as a distinctive attribute of the

human species. The agony of David is the agony of the human being, who wants to be more than he is and believe in things

that do not exist, the great human error. David discovers his origin, as Adán confronting the creator, becomes

aware of being the first of a new species of droids. In this order of things lies one of the

most important meanings of the film: somehow, "" Artificial Intelligence "" narrates a process of

broadening the child's conscience. �o-robot, from the inert, artificial and vacuous life of a mechanical musician to

the discovery of conscious love, leading to the revelation of his true creator, his prop��� site and its

origin. It is not so much a religious film as a m���stica.Im���genes desoladoras of the city of New York

devastated by the waters accompany the solitude of David. His encounter with the blue fairy, in thedepths

submergedof the city, is not devoid of great lyricism; its appearance between the darkness of the waters, and

the image of David's face becoming one with that of the blue fairy reflected in the glass of the vehicle, is another

great moment of inspiration. visual, unifies the being that yearns with that yearned for, the beginning and the end of the

dream. Many cin���filos have thought that the film had to finish in that point, with David in front the fairy of

stone and cardboard, waiting for an answer that will never arrive. They forget, in such a case, that Spielberg is a filmmaker

of dreams, and he is a constant in his filmography: what reality can not give us, we can achieve it in the

dream, in the hope, in another life, in another world. Not in vain, Stanley Kubrick entrusted the project to

Spielberg because he knew that the story of Brian Aldiss fit better with the sensitivity of thedirector.

North AmericanOn the other hand, we tend to think that David has a too one-dimensional facet , which does not

correspond to the intended speech; that is to say, at a given moment, David's stepfather says that "if he is

capable of loving he may also feel hate". But it turns out that David is a loving entity in essence, his acts are

almost exclusively oriented towards love and tenderness. Is there, then, an incoherence between the discourse and the

story? Is David too flat a character? At first it seems that I do, but let's not forget the scene in

which David confronts one of his replies; when he is conscious of not being the only one, he attacks with violence

against his homologue. "I will never be yours." Jealousy is born of love, and leads to hatred. But it is not more than a

punctual moment, the character does not finish a complex profile. Although Spielberg complies with a minimum

of David's personality, it is too simple a profile for complex content

and thorny terrain. This is one of the film's shortcomings. It's not that David is a badly constructed character in

a functional sense, but the film would have been much better if he had added more edges, more

ambiguity. age, more dynamism to its development. In certain aspects and passages of the film, the complexity of the

discourse and the plot reasons are met with a direction that is too flat (a complex content

needs something more than an attractive frame and some moments of pure efectismo, to understand us). After the

rescue carried out by a new group of droids, two thousand years later, David approaches thefairy for the last time

blue stone and carton, and ���sta , in another desolating scene, it cracks and reveals its falsity. David discovers

that the blue fairy was as artificial as himself. Met���fora of the human being in front of the false gods and the end

of a hope: that the gods can give us our dreams.Spielberg does not support the harsh reality and

needs a happy ending. The last plot pirouette draws on science fiction intoned, and has been

widely discussed. Considering that we are dealing with a metaphorical fairy tale, it does not make sense to say that

such a pirouette breaks the rules of the genre or of the global tone; the fact of reproducing the life of aperson by

deadrecovering the information of their conscience in the space-time fabric is not more improbable than the

fact of manufacturing robots endowed with consciousness. It is not, therefore, anything forced, and also serves to channel the

story toward the end desired by the author, and in that field little or nothing can be said by the critic. Let's not

forget it; in the framework of the fantastic genre, it is no more courageous or has a higher intellectual value

than an idealized ending, we would be, in any case, talking about two speeches different, of equal

intellectual value, as long as the filmmaker respects the tone and laws with which he is building his

narrative. It could even be said that a happy ending is a creative act of value: Spielberg wants

the hope deposited in dreams to triumph, and so he shows it to us without hesitation. It is the character of the work that will

define the rules and criteria for evaluation, and Spielberg does not intend to show a crude resolution, but

hopeful. The reunion of David with his mother, and the tears of this one in front of the words of love that he had

always wanted to hear, justify the whole odyssey. It is the moment of happiness that is articulated with the

great moral dilemma posed in the prologue: ��� How much responsibility requires the creation of an entity capable of love,

which needs a correspondence ? And yet, the end is not as happy as it seems: with the last dream

of Mény, hope dies. Mónica was only a memory recovered during a single day from the thousands of

times and memories lost in the cosmos. To David, as a unique specimen, with the human race gone, only

the solitude and the dream remain. That is the deep despair that beats in the end: that there is no other choice than to

dream to live the desires, and ultimately, David is alone in an empty cosmos. Or any entity that

may correspond to its nature. Halfway between hope and desolation, Spielberg concludes his

story with an end of polychrome meaning, building a lyrical work , of sincere sensitivity, and the

sensation of helplessness that can be experienced with the viewing of this film hasmatch with

noany other piece of the fantastic genre. rustic Her beauty is far beyond the current and immediate perception that we

now grant her. It is the analysts and fans of the future who will place it in the position it

deserves. "" Artificial Intelligence "" is the current equivalent to "" Blade Runner "". In other words, a fantastic-philosophical

genre film that has been given very little attention in its day, but will become in a classic and a

work of essential cult. Time to time.

" 1

" The plot does not look bad and it could have worked well and even be a new Hidden Youth, if itnot

wasbecause the film is everywhere.

Go another title translation in English too, because once the film is seen I do not know where they

got such an alliance, but well, let's go to the topic that is to comment the movie The Covenant is the last film

by director Renny Harlin, a director who has made films as successful as the second part of The

Crystal Jungle, Deep Blue Sea or The Adventures of Ford Farlaine and that � Lately he seems to have lost the

north with films as mediocre as Driven, Mind Hunters or The Exorcist: The Beginning, and this last one

does more than confirm that this man is not the that was before because it continues in its line of mediocre pulling to

bad. The plot of the film has pretty much better looking than what we can see later, a group of

four young friends who belong to families with a witchcraft lineage and who have inherited magical powers.

Everything is going well until strange things start to happen and they will discover that there is another boy just like them from a

lost lineage who intends to steal their powers from them. Basically this is the argument, which could have

worked well and even be a new Hidden Youth, if it were not for the film is water everywhere.

The four friends They are very nice chicks and grooms in a boarding school for people with pasta and

they are dedicated to using their powers for anything less for something useful, to be chulear, to look for a fight, to jump

from cliffs, to impress the girls and to waver among them. The eldest is the leader and sensible

of the group, and the one who monopolizes all the protagonism, the other three appear on rare occasions and

their characters are barely developed. �� the cute and new girl who, of course, falls in love with the prota, all this

with a car of topicazos more, apart from some di���logos that directly cause embarrassment to others. But thething

bestis the character that does bad, that directly everything related to him is worthwhile. And it does not do

anything that makes sense, if we think a little about the steps it takes to get where you want to see that they lack

all logic and reason and that perfectly the scriptwriter could have I looked for a more coherent and less

typical way to present the antagonist and to develop it. To all this desprop���sito we added a final fight that I

thought was the most ridiculous and tiredness that I've seen in a long time in the cinema with special effects

used in the most clumsy and repetitive way you can imagine.

" 0

" The superb black and white photography is the perfect support to visualize a world whose lights and

shadows seem to reflect Blanche's state of mind, a character that encompasses sadness and hope,

represented in the darkness of the corners of the home that he uses to hide his truth or the sporadic

moments of lucidity.

The film by Elia Kazan, a faithful transcription of the work of Tennesse Williams, has a feminine soul that

becomes the real thematic axis in a story that goes beyond �� of its appearance of melodrama about life as a

couple, which is only a collateral theme to the furious and multifaceted feminine expression that it contains in

its great moments, focused from the first im�� Engenes in which we see Blanche DuBois (Vivian Leigh)

appear among the sinister fumes that surround her on the and���n of the New Orleans station, until the

conclusion of the material f� Enlightenment, accompanied by a psychiatrist who offers the security of understanding

and the cordial gesture before a soul that seeks sensitivity to the rudeness and chaos prevailing in the suburb .

Her past is as misty and turbid as the fumes from which she emerges to enter the story, equivalent to her

march towards madness through deception. Hypersensitive, jovial and manipulative, Blanche constitutes the element

that dynamizes the tonalities, she is a character whose gestures and words range from the most sensible sanity

to the childish endeavor that leads her to weave a network of deception and self-deception the one that in the end, she, and

only she, will be the victim. Throughout the story, lies the pulse that refers to the struggle between

femininity and masculinity. If Blanche represents the idea of ​​femininity carried to its vulnerable andextreme

unbalanced, the character known as Stanley Kowalski (unique and immeasurable Marlon Brando) provides a

counterpoint of rude and insensitive masculinity. The duel of tension- The contention between the two constitutes the true

dramatic axis of a first descriptive film of a situation in progress, until, in the last section, the

state of tension n-containment transmutes into another action, a verbal and physical confrontation with clear

sexual connotations that until then remained implicit in the subtext. This confrontation culminates

with the violent expressiveness of a broken mirror, a figuration of a broken feminine soul and destined to

self-destruction in the hands of the testosteronic executioner. The superb blank photograph and black is the perfect

support to visualize a world whose lights and shadows seem to reflect the mood of Blanche, a character

that encompasses sadness and hope, represented in the darkness of the corners of the home that she uses to

hide her truth or the sporadic moments of lucidity (often exalted) that find their visual referent

in a small yellow light at night or the illumination of their face in the foreground, an impressionism that

synthesizes and produces rhythms of the image in accordance with the contrasts between truth and lie, past and

present, reality and pretense, masculine and feminine.

" 1

" The movie may have struck, but it should not be taken as a novelty. The rednecks

cram the screens since the cinema is cinema, and this is not the most acute.

Americans love the hopscotch. American cinema is full of hicks. ET, for example, is a

space hustler. Elliot and his sister have a great time teaching him the American roll. They also teach it to

Terminator, Crocodile Dundee, Johnny 5, thousands of robots, Martians, aliens, elves, clones,

fallen from a nest. There is nothing that an American viewer likes more than to see an ignorantlearning the

studentcustoms of America. The Spanish version of the hick is that of the rogue. The Spanish cinema, especially that of the

60s, prefers the p���caro. It's the same story, but told from another point of view. The bill pays and

tells it to other hicks. Leblanc, Landa, pretended to be fools to pluck the rich foreigner. Traveling to

other countries I have discovered that they have the same mythology that we did in the 60s. In Cuba, many movies

now laugh at naive tourists, at us, that we are now like the Yankees. Borat is a mixture of the

two points of view. Borat toured America inviting us to tell us about his ignorance, his inferiority

in the developed world: he does not distinguish a v.ter cup from a wash, he masturbates by the street and he makes his

needs in the gardens. The rich can laugh here. But on the other hand it is a false naive. We know that he

is taking the hair of each of the Americans he interviews, we know that he is not the fool who pretends to be: a

American senator offers him a piece of cheese and then explains that it is made with his wife's milk, at a

society dinner he asks if he can bring a friend and invites an ordinary prostitute. Those who live in

poor countries can laugh here. The film may have struck, but it should not be taken as a

novelty. The rednecks cram the screens since the cinema is cinema, and this is not the most acute. He has saved

production funds using only people on the street and has not squandered neurons filling meters

of film with scenes of thick humor, or looking for the esc���ndalo in the vulgar Like our

domestic palet, Santiago Segura. The mixture of reality and fiction (the interviewees do not know that the camera thatthem

focuses onis a stupid gambol), it looks like to the interviewers of "" Whoever falls "". If this

film wanted to be something more than garbage, it would have to have entered into the game that so well manages this television

program to engage with the interviewees , instead of roughly mistreating them. Borat

has only complicity with the public, which, it seems, is on track to get a ping���e box office.

" 0

" I have a very good script, of those with plot twists, multiple points of view, a lot of action, good

dialogues and, very importantly, few pretensions. Reinventing black cinema.

The Slevin Case is one of those post-Tarantino modern black movie movies not made by Tarantino. Well, for

a server, Tarantino represents something much bigger than Ra for the Egyptians. Which does not mean I

despise anyone who imitates him, on the contrary, I'm a great admirer of imitators and good

imitators. That's right. I despise bad imitators, but it happens that this movie is not any imitation of

Tarantino. just follow his wake, that path that opened the right to make movies of this type without the need to

copy bad Quentin, is the case of that infumable movie that was "" Things to do in Denver When You're

Dead "". After Quentin (almost at the same time) Rodriguez came, and then came Guy Ritchey. This movie by Paul

McGuigan follows more the parameters of English than Tarantino's. I'm late for this criticism, but I

saw her again recently and wanted to say something about her. "" The Slevin Case "" has a very good script, of those withtwists

plot, Multiple points of view, lots of action, good dialogues and, very importantly, few pretensions.

From the beginning it keeps you entertained. A good narrative pulse for a story that requires him,

a story that, even though it is very confusing, remains perfectly clear to you. It has some of those wonders that are

"" Ocean's Eleven "" and "" Ocean's 12 ""; that casual and frenetic tone, but more violent. The interpreters are in a

state of grace. I have always thought that all actors, ever in their lives, want to play a

mafia boss, because it should be the most fun role to play of all. Sir Ben Kingsley had already done it with

great results in that great movie that is "" Sexy Beast "", directed by a man, Jonathan Glazer, who

afterwards disappointed us with that little It was a pretentious conversation that was "" Reincarnation "" (with that boy with anface

unbearable) Morgan Freeman had never done it, we do not count "" Hard Rain " ", and it unfolds perfectly

within his role. Bruce Willis is still an actor who will be considered after death, more for these

roles than for those for whom he says a lot. people who will remember him. I prefer John McClaine than the dead man of

"" The Sixth Sense "". I think modern cinema owes a lot to this actor. to his roles of "" Crystal Jungle "",

"" The Last Boy Scout "", "" Twelve Monkeys "" or "" Pulp Fiction "" (let's avoid the cheesy "" Trope "" Arnaggedon "") Genial.La movie

has a very good rhythm, is long but not boring, has a good story but not memorable, good characters

but not typical. It is what is said to be a very good film, one of those that should be done more often so

that the spectators have a good time. The director, Paul McGuigan, is a Scotsman who made a movie that some

people will remember? "" The Acid House "", a movie neither good nor bad. Something weird of the post era "" Trainspotting "". And

also an entertaining movie that was partly shot in Spain called "" The Reckoning "" and that I recommend without

any urgency at all. A highly recommended film by a screenwriter that, obviously, comes from the TV. medium in

which great screenwriters are discovering lately. ask Dr. House.

" 1

" Excellent Hitchock film, one of the best of his English stage. "" In London, a series of sabotages of unknown origin are taking place, causing, for the moment, only

bewilderment. However, the police are behind an apparent honest man, who runs a movie

theater. He is married to a good woman and they live with the little brother. A frutero, who has the position

near the cinema, is actually an agent of Scotland Yard who follows in the footsteps of her husband, convinced that he is

behind the plot of sabotage. , and the bosses of the plot require him to carry a powerful bomb to the

center of the city, which could cause many deaths and real fear of the population. "" Excellent film by

Hitchock, one of the best of his English period. Certain critics say it is the best of that stage. I do not

dare to say so much, but I know it is a very interesting work, which has already printed Hitchcock's mastery in

telling a story of intrigue and suspense. By letting the viewer know things that the characters do not , delights and

makes you suffer, moving the springs available with ease and good rhythm. Moments like the brother of the

protagonist carrying in his arms the powerful bomb all over the city, while we see the hands of the

various wall clocks through which passes, really get anguish. On the other hand, she obtains

great interpretations on the part of Silvia Sidney and Oscar Homolka, like the husband of ella.A film that

has not aged and still keeps the aroma of good cinema.

" 1

" She was accused of being too long when the short life of the conqueror would give, at least, for a

miniseries.

All the features of Oliver Stone's always vital cinema are delineated in the monumental - in every sense -

Alexander the Great (only Alexander in the original). That's right, it's an "anesthetized" Stone. The nervous and

egocentric camera that characterizes his style and extolled "minor" films, but valuable as Assassins by nature

and Road of No Return, are conspicuously absent. Alexander is an option. ��nl���gica for a filmmaker adept at

great biopics: JFK, Nixon, The Doors, Larry Flynt, Commander. If we add to these other quotes the

value of Pelot���ny and born on July 4, the rejection that generates his cinema between criticism becomes incomprehensible.

���Grandiloquent? Pedant? Is not cinema the same? It begins in 323 BC, telling the life of the

conqueror of 90% of the then known world. Historians say that Alexander was so great, that the

conquests of a Julio C���sar or a Napoleon are reduced to "" a short walk through the park "". The reading that

Stone makes is historically correct, but in appearance, he does it without passion. They are unusual sensitivity

for the time of Alexander and his excessive ambition, but not his gift of command and animal ferocity. The

battles are vapid, without shine and even unclear, they seem a mere pretext that they do not manage to save a very good

assembly. The American critics destroyed it for unjustifiable reasons-leaving politics

aside for Oliver's still fresh documentary about Fidel Castro. She was accused of being too long when the short life of the

conqueror would give, at least, for a miniseries. The voice-over of the Hopkins character is necessary because of the

number of events narrated, otherwise all would be lost. I will not refer to theproblem

homosexualthat caused so much trouble in the north, because it would be twenty years later. There them. Of course it

has flaws. Olimpia (���Jolie mam��� de Farrel?) Never grows older, Vangelis's music is unbearable because of the

corny and because of the "serious" scenes, Val Kilmer seems like a whim of the director (�� How much does it weigh?), The film

loses strength at the end and we come to its great, big mistake: Alejandro is too big a character for the

three gestures of Colin Farrel. The human profile of the hero, the scene of his wound next to his horse and in front of an

elephant, the untimely inclusion of his father's death, his photography and visual richness, rescue

Alexander from mediocrity and place him in an imaginary space defined by Spartacus in its roof, but

above the contemporary and undervalued Troy, Gladiator and 300.

" 1

" Mia Sarah is a sweet and sweet story, that at no time falls on the easy or in thecaramelization

cheap. To that mixture we must add the originality of the proposal and its development, the intelligent humor, and a

touch of magic that turn the film into a modern fable, in a romantic ���ntica

In cinema, as in all the arts, it could be said that everything is already invented, or at least almost everything is governed

by invariable rules that leave little to each one's imagination. There are some cinematic genres

that seem at first sight a nightmare for originality, in which to do something different and new seems to

be punished. The romantic comedy is one of those genres whose greatest exponents today seem to be

photocopies of photocopies. Perhaps that is why romantic comedy as we know it is not one of the

most exploited genres in recent Spanish cinematography, due to the limitations that it offers. There are always some

exceptions, and Mia Sarah, from debutant Gustavo Ron, is one of them. Marina (Ver���nica S���nchez) is agirl

youngwho has been taking care of her brother Samuel (Manuel Lozano) and her grandfather Paul (Fernando Fern���n G���mez) since the

death of her parents three years ago. Since then, Samuel suffers agoraphobia, and has not gone out into the street.

Whenever Marina gets a new psychologist to visit her brother, he manages to scare him away. Everything changes

when Gabriel (Daniel Guzm���n) appears, Samuel's new psychologist. Starting from the premise of acomedy

romantic, Gustavo Ron elaborates a beautiful and cheerful film, which exudes good intentions. It is a

tender and sweet story, which at no time falls into the easy or cheap acaramelamiento. To that mixture we must

add the originality of the proposal and its development, the intelligent humor, and a touch of magic that

turn the film into a modern fable, in a romantic ���ntica To maintain the illusion, the film is

based on its actors, especially on a masterful Fern���n G���mez, as always, and a sweet and adorable

Ver���nica S��� nchez Mia Sarah is not at any time heavy, but it is seen with a smile on the lips

from the beginning to the end, and it is one of those films that leaves happy, of which They comfort

one's spirit. Unfortunately, by the time it is released, and because of its poor distribution, few will be

the spectators who enjoy the first little jewel of the Spanish cinema of next season

" 1

" This documentary serves to raise many interesting aspects and all all related to morality.

But the question to debate that arises to me to have seen this documentary is: to be free is to see porno or to be able to

see porno?

Great documentary, brilliantly realized (in the line of the already commented on Robert Evans), on one of

the milestones of the history of cinema: Deep Throat (Deep Throat). This documentary shows this porn movie

as point of inflection for a revolution or a sexual rebellion and as a denunciation of the constant dangerthreatens

thatfreedom of expression (although I believe it will be It's right to speak of freedom to dry). The

porn, as recounted in this film, is the platform for many filmmakers to get fast money and

get some kind of experience . And many are in the current cinematography as Barry Sonnenfeld or Wes

Craven, who appears in this documentary "" confessing "" to have made more than one X-film. this documentary

serves to raise many interesting aspects and all all related to morality: not onlyadvocates

openlythe freedom to do porn (raising this film several times and naively as

m��� Obviously demonizing these ""preferences

cinematic"" is ridiculous and only favors the rest of humanity be curious and give him a vote

of confidence, especially when it is something new. However, he tells, with something more modesty, half-measures and less

enthusiasm, all the negative that a revolution entails: mafiosi they benefit from the situation,

opportunists who do not hesitate to support that movement to later or become radical and reactionary (in this case

the feminists, the worst sexists there are) and the enthronement of normal people as popular heroes of the

cause and of the sheet and then forget about them so r� Quickly as they chose them. This documentary even

looks with some nostalgia on the first days of porn against the industry that exists right now. He also

comes to question the change in morality or morality can interfere in the freedoms of others. And it is a

criticism (for a change) to the American morality that, according to which it is dropped, currently has the same anti-laws

obscenityof the Nixon era. However, it is curious that the greater part of criticism against the USA

comes from themselves (they are also the best known), an act of freedom in itself that some people

practice simply when it suits them, like here Es. It is priceless to see in this documentary the discussions

of Arthur Sommer with his wife, Terry, a marriage that took a film at the time and that project the film.

Both received, like many other cinemas that made a lot of money with that movie, threats from the mafia for not

giving them a tithe of their profits. And for the lovers of the technical and to see that any means It is

valid to do a job depending on its nature, this documentary was shot in Mpeg IMX format. But the

question to debate that comes to me after having seen this documentary is: ���To be free is to watch porn or can I watch porn?

" 1

" The film that supposed the consecration of Ava Gardner and Burt Lancaster, in addition to one of the summits of

the black cinema. Little more can be asked.

It is not the first time that I write some lines about a film that fits in the so-calledcinema

black, which so brilliantly understood the fantastic Fritz Lang, the undisputed master of gender Outlaws is

directed by another monster of the screen, Robert Siodmak, who makes in this film a display ofresources

narrative, of games with the cameras, of the handling of plane changes and of the combination of Deln the drama and

action.The presence of two colossi, although by then not so recognized, as Burt Lancaster and the beautiful

Ava Gardner, contribute to provide more packaging a story that already of it is interesting and that it manages to

convey the sensations that the interpreters experience at every moment, and that combine anger,

satisfaction, frustration, love, fear. The dense atmospheres, the contrasts in the characterizations and

the undeniable nostalgia that awaken some of its scenes, make of Forajidos a film in which other

elements such as music, by M. Rozsa , they are essential in the complete assembly of one of the greatest works of

the black cinema in gene ral, and of Siodmak, in particular. The story of the gangster or macarra, with a fatal woman is one

of the recurring arguments of the genre, and without a doubt one of the greatest games offered. And more if the script is

based on a story by Hemingway. Therefore, it can be said that Outlaws is a great movie; Not a

masterpiece, because it does not come to that. But I'm a good movie.

" 1

" New film by Alejandro Gonz���lez I������rritu, this time less mixed than "" 21 grams "" and more of the

style of his first film "" Amores Perros "", with a series of plots, which, some by the hair,

pretend, through hard images, to attract and confabulate the viewer.

New film by Alejandro Gonz���lez I������rritu, this time less mixed than "" 21 grams "" and more of the style

of his first film "" Amores Perros " ", with a series of plots, which, some by the hair, pretend,

through hard images, to attract and confabulate the viewer. Sinceramente the film I found beautiful in its

bill, well built, but VERY boring, with few moments that reach the retina of the spectator,

on the other hand, both Pitt and Blanchett, like the rest of the actors, including Gael Garc���a Bernal and Elle Fanning

(little sister). a de Dakota), they are normal, measured and following their usual line of interpretation. Of all

the stories, (united, by a link to each other's best), I am so with the one in Japan and the one in Morocco,

both perhaps the most complicated and harsh, one for the separation of cultures and for their hardness in ome

times, but they have never comeme not to shudder at the butaca.Respecto the soundtrack Gustavo

Santaolalla, with whom he has won an Oscar, I listenthe eternal melody with guitar, maybe

stay with the collaboration �n Ruichi Sakamoto, in some moments enlarging a Score, which is small.

Resumiendo, a film that has been given so much hype that it is impossible to be impartial with her.

" 0

" Maybe it is not, in the end, any allegation against the war and its hatred, but rather an exercise in

cinematographic textures, as a kind of collage of formats that, on the way, give a hit on thetable

teletype.

Brian de Palma has browsed on the Internet and has found material to mount a burning film of

commitment, which denounces the wars in general and the war in Iraq in particular with the reconstruction of the

rape and murder of a girl and her family at the hands of a group of American soldiers in Mamoudiyah,

a town near Baghdad. Far from the discursive asepsis of Robert Redford in his recent Lions for lambs,

De Palma does not denounce that the wars are a neocom political with broadband in the blackberry and high

ideals of bible pocket. His is (has been) to make movies with a minimum of life, movies lovingly

installed in the entertainment, in the respectful tribute to the teachers who encouraged him to take a camera

(Peckinpah , Hitchcock) and give us visual euphoria. Here he moves away from what we could expect from hisbrand

houseand approaches with adolescent enthusiasm the wounds of the conflict, wounds to cauterize and even wounds

that have not yet lacerated the skin of the always innocent ex-votos of battles. The problem is that it

acquires few compromises with the image and is loaded with political theses, pure activism. To translate this

dramaturgy does not resort to actors but archetypes. What Redacted account is not the plundering of war: his

vocation is to cram images incumbent on the viewer to reason the madness of the conflict and understand

that, beyond the commercial steamroller of Hollywood, the cinema can sometimes provoke andialog

intelligentand remove the ideas, which sometimes get stale and do not enter the cloth of the taking of positions and of the

media manipulation to which they submit the criterion of those who do not allow the information to flow without the

interference of their interests. : Redacted is a cold plea, devoid of emotions. The fact that

reality can be configured at the whim of ideologies and crisis or marketing cabinets is not asubject

newin cinema. The images require an ethic. The former aesthetic daring of De Palma is here reduced to

a documentary without a soul, excessively burdened by the modernity of the formats that provide thecontent

unique(mobiles , youtube, infrared, photo montages, websites, security cameras.) All that is

formidably mounted on the tape, but the cinema is also a fictional issue, which requires ofof

the prizesthe fiction and Redacted is a falsified testimony raised on a real fact, but lev���simamente built

on the emotions that that real fact produces in those who dramatized it. Almost nothing that the director did not

reflect, with greater fortune, in Corazones de hierro, a film that is twinned to this and surprisingly current because of

the replies that the wars adopt to strike the blush and the shame of the people. Before Vietnam;

Now, Iraq. Brian de Palma, an exceptional creator of dreams, is a filmmaker who is more keen on fireworks

that encouraged the birth of the seventh art than the introspective traveling of who, On the

shoulder, it aims to capture the poetic essence of a ruise���or's flight or the transpositions of the human soul. Without being

rude, the look of De Palma does not qualify. This simulacrum ofcinema dialogues with two bands: that of the

sensitizedbox office, which is lost, and that of criticism, which will contemplate this effort as an exabrupto more pol�� �tico or

social that strictly cinematogr���fico, more inclined to the agitation of the voter (���sa is the story, almostnot

isanother) that to take care form and content and invoice a product of more height.

" 0

" A good idea, some excellent initial minutes and a very poor and mediocre development. I admit, with my hand in my heart, that when I had occasion to see the first few minutes, It seemed not only

disturbing, but also quite well done, besides, add that before I had read the storyS.King

inthat it is "" slightly "" based (there are so many changes, that one is not sure if it really is that way, or a

free adaptation, so free that only the names coincide and little else. After the first few minutes, which,

coinciding with the great majority of critics I have read, are the best of the film, it falls into the topics, even you

try lengthening excess of that story I was talking about scoringmany references as possible, since

"" the shining "" to "" Dante and hell "" all together, mixed but not removed and where nico what is lva

of the burning is John Cusack, who knows how to act at all times making us see how scared that is on

screen. The rest, including Samuel L. Jackson (secondary mere, of exceedance, but secondary .) are

normal, throwing mediocre, to tell the truth; also highlight the compendium of special effects, could not

be otherwise in this type of tapes, the horror soundtrack of the lebanese Gabriel Yared, and the idea, that

It's good, but it does not work for a 90-minute tape. Why would not King think to put this story in the miniseries

"" Nightmares and hallucinations ""? As a curiosity, add that in DVD USA of the film, there is an alternative ending

that has nothing to do with the one shown on the screen (and that is not better,

let's say). Resuming: A good idea , excellent initial minutes and a very poor and mediocre development.

" 0

" Ricardo Franco mimicked these three anguished characters, always bordering on pathos, theharshness

incontestableof a life lost in loneliness and in the denial of all joy, v��� victims of the tyranny of the

heart.

A wounded man writes better about the nature of his wound. Something like this should think Ricardo Franco when

Pedro Costa proposed to record The good star. Almost blind, sick, vulnerable, Ricardo Franco film��� The good

star, the misfortune of the meek, the one-eyed and the pretty face with the intimate satisfaction of being

narrating a complete work, of adhesions literary and of an incontrovertible hardness. Like life itself. Itnot

ispossible that life is not hard when you aspire to find happiness and only find disenchantment,

desolation, hardship and moral misery. All this must think Rafael, the butcher, (Resines), a good person,

a man without attributes to the Musil that shakes his routine neighborhood life with the arrival of Marina, a

pregnant prostitute (Verd���) which welcomes, pampers and considers the fundamental step to build a family.

Of what other form, it is asked. Daniel (Moll���) is the delinquent boyfriend, the hung man, the necessary evil so that the

goodness of the story will embrace the traditional mechanisms of melodrama, which here are nobly

amplified, written with anguish , interpreted with heart and served in an impeccable phonic device,

oblivious to the passage of time, soaked in feelings like few films. This very crude radiography of pain is

also the formidable testament (Black tears was not entirely finished) of a man devoted to cinema

and the diffusion of culture as something great . I do not explain it in any other way. Ricardo Franco mimicked these

three anguishing characters, always bordering on pathos, the incontestable harshness of a life lost in

loneliness and in the denial of all joy, victims of the tyranny of the heart and patients guinea pigs of his sad

letan���a And I still do not know anyone who has seen the film without a lump in the throat. And ad���a of today, not

being this cronista of his eyes very enthusiastic in the native cinema, I have not seen movie more moving. You

can make a film with these wicks, but not a melody.

" 1

"What the film wants is to entertain, the bad thing is that most of the funny points show them

again and again in the trailers.

It's very curious that in the USA they are for sports and! ��cula on the THEME! Well, it turns out

that in TIME magazine they dedicated a cover to "" Dodgball "" which is nothing more and nothing less than that game so

stupid that we have all played some Once when we were little in the schoolyard and of course, the

producers were saved from cinematic successes, in this year 2004, which is a little short of cinema, they decided to

make a film about the subject.Ben Stiller that seems to make films like churros and I wonder ���this

man outside the plat���s will have a life of his own He has starred along with his fatigue colleague Vince Vaughn

(which I miss this t desdeo from the remake of "" psychosis "") resulting t la It's a great film to see with friends

with beer cans and some pizzas and the cinema debtor of the Farrelly brothers (eschatological humor and

120% cochinote). What the film aims to do is to entertain, bad is that most of the funny points

show them again and again in the trailers (so if you have seen these you have already seen the best of the film).

" 0

" Raw dramatization of the fall to hell, where it involves the viewer, causing it to wreak havoc

on the strongest stomachs, where it squeezes them as we fall with the characters.

Film by Darren Aronofsky based on the novel by Hubert Selby Jr. Aronofsky was the creator of the opera prima

Pi, a cult film for many that relates the neurotic life of a mathematician, and for which he

won the Best Direction award at the Sundance Festival. We discovered a director with a concern for forging a

universe of his own, he is considered one of the last masters of cinematographic tension, able to overwhelm

the spectator and make him grasp the seat, as ��� As I experience everything that thefeel

charactersin their journey to self-destruction, and personal mutilation, is an author capable of bringing the

post-modern avant-garde to the cinema, creating the aforementioned, its universe itself. The work is carried on

wheels by the flawless performances of actors many times in a state of grace. Ellen Burstyn (Sara

Goldfarb), represents the most complete journey and with which the viewer most suffers, for embodying the innocence

consumed by the one who will say and for being someone coming out in their means of liberation. Personaln personal, television. She is

accompanied by Jared Leto (Harry Goldfarb), Son of Sara, who is alreadyto drugs and who represents the

addictedspiritual guide in the fall to hell, where he accompanied him. Cona Jennifer Connelly (Marion Silver)partner

Harry's, who represents an independent dressmaker who touches the abyss by selling her body to get

drugs, losing part of her human condition by becoming like her companions. �eros in slaves of logical

substance, next to them is his friend Marlon Wayans (Tyrone C. Love) of also impeccable

interpretation. Together they represent the story of Sara Goldfarb an older woman , lonely and widowed and that of

Harry, his addict and opportunistic son. Sara is suddenly nominated to compete in a television

program. Illusioned by the possibility of becoming "someone" for appearing on TV, she decides todiet

strict. That is the only alternative if she wants to attend the program with her old and charming red dress, since

her weight exceeds the measurements of the dress. Meanwhile, Harry and the delicious Marion begin a relationship

based on love, drugs and a life project away from the semi-abandoned and poor beaches of

Coney Island. To accelerate the "" increase "" processes of capital, Harry and his friend Tyronne C. Love

become small dealers of hard drugs. The problem is that the product apart from selling it, they consume it.

Suddenly, the fate that had promised them another opportunity is lost and takes another path away from their

lives. The overwhelming rhythm of the film increases us into the world of drugs, which is felt before

and after having consumed using optical effects as the acceleration or deceleration of the image to your

liking to create the environment and the sensations of consumption. Aronofsky proposes an avant-garde realization in

which he uses a multitude of overwhelming parallel assemblies and fast and up-tempo assemblies of preparation and

consumption of the drug that accompanied with a magnificent sonorous montage. in certain moments almost musical that

involves the viewer to the maximum. It uses previously unutilized resources and above all not used so

brilliantly, as the fact of dividing in two the image to show us characters often separated

by a few cents. meters and that it gives great emotional load, or the placement of the esteady cam, in the own

body of the personage to represent the confusion of these. The overwhelming rhythm of R���quiem for a dream is

surely a strong indication of what it feels like before the puncture and what goes on. It is not a film that

promotes the use of drugs, nor were Trainspotting, P���nico in Las Vegas or Drugstore Cowboy.

Aronofsky, simply, wants to transmit that sensation that impacts on the human body before a dose of

drug. The vertiginous succession of images can exhaust the unsuspecting spectator. The speed in the assembly,

could turn into a nightmare or a migra���a. If the spectator manages to overcome certain

schizophrenic successions, he will be able to enjoy a particular film, frenetic, surprising and above all,

uninhibited. Although those with delicate stomachs will have to abstain since in many occasions it can

hurt sensitivities.

" 1

" You will enjoy as children with this new Superman that seemed like a slapstick for the cinema and to which Singer and the

screenwriters Michael Dougherty and Dan Harris have given life to him again.

I was lucky enough to be able to attend the press pass of one of the films most awaited by all those movie

lovers who still maintain an adventurous spirit: "Superman Returns "" by Bryan Singer. In it theyus

tellhow, after a mysterious absence of several years, the Man of Steel (Brandon Routh) returns to a

Planet Earth that has become accustomed to survive without �� �l. Upon arriving he discovers that the woman he loves, Lois Lane

(Kate Bosworth), is living with another (James Marsden) and has had a son (Tristan Lake Leabu). To make matters worse

Lex Luthor (Kevin Spacey), his great enemy, has left the prison and has a plan. Thefactor

nostalgiaplays an important role and I am not ashamed to say that a moonfleet smuggler As hard as

I was, he was about to drop a tear, during the initial credits, when listening to the mythical song

composed by John Williams. Theme, by the way, brilliantly honored and used with restraint and intelligence by

a John Ottman who is up to the task. Bryan Singer had before him a really difficult challenge and

Demonstrating that he is a courageous director he made several risky decisions. The first one is to continue the

story more or less where it was after "" Superman II "", thus maintaining a certain narrative andcontinuity

stylewith the previous films. In fact, this return keeps a good part of the spirit of"Superman"

Richard Donner's, to the point that it could even be considered a covert remake. Aspect that may

make happy those who saw it in cinemas 28 years ago but could leave indifferent to the public younger

and more distant from the original. Another risky decision by Singer is to give the film a slow rhythm. The

film focuses more on the problems of Superman to find his place in the world again, than in the

action pure and simple. Act that, being demanding and despite being brilliantly filmed, we must admit

that it lacks that pure emotion that it had "" Batman Begins "". Here the emotion will not find it so much in the

action, that something also, as in intimate moments. I can not deny that seeing Superman fly again

carrying Lois Lane in my arms reached my heart. To curl the risk loop, Singer decides to dispense with the

final cl���max that is presupposed to a ribbon of these characteristics. This decision, together with the aforementionedrhythm

paused, may displease a large part of the potential public, possibly eager to see pyrotechnics at any

price, but it is totally coherent with what is wanted to be told. We are not dealing with a character with the innocence

of the 70's. Singer's Superman is a mature character, who suffers, who is overwhelmed by a world that would

need too many like him to leave ahead. Maybe this Superman seems to be younger (although Brandon

Routh is a year older than Reeve when he played it for the first time) but life has passed him verybills

expensiveand that enriches the character Good part of the critical and amateur looks will be directed at the

actors. Are Routh, Bosworth and Spacey at the level of Reeve, Kidder and Hackman? In general, I think I know.

Especially striking has been the leading actor because if he is totally credible as Kent (his

performance is really clinical Reeve), certainly convinces completely as the Man of

Steel. Obviously, one could complain that Luthor's plan is a bit strange and not very concrete (although it is

a clever way to connect this film with the previous ones), that has very few and clumsy

assistants or that it is impossible that some journalists so clever are not able to see that Clark Kent and Superman

are the same person. But to accept all these premises is a necessary condition to enter to see the film.

If you do not accept this, it is better to stay out of the cinema. But all those willing to accept the rules

of the game will enjoy themselves as children with this new Superman that seemed like a slapstick for the cinema and to which Singer and

screenwriters Michael Dougherty and Dan Harris have given life again, adapting it to the 21st century. Superman is back

to stay and that is, without doubt, good news.

" 1

" Cronemberg portrays at the same time the most despicable and praiseworthyhuman being under the

instincts of theinstinct of survival as only he is capable of doing.

After having terrified many with films like They came from within., Rabia, Videodrome, Scanners or La

mosca, the Canadian filmmaker David Cronemberg started to change the record already with The Lunch Naked (or

even before) , although it was not until A History of Violence when the dramatic concerns of the director

were acclaimed worldwide. With Eastern Promises, David Cronemberg returns to work together with Viggo Mortensen,

who is accompanied on this occasion. Porn by Naomi Watts, Vincent Cassell, Armin Mueller-Stahl, Sin���ad Cusack

and Donald Sumpter. The film tells the story of the mysterious Nikolai, born in Russia, who works as a

ch���fer of one of the most important families of organized crime in Eastern Europe. Headed by Semyon,

the charming owner of an expensive Russian restaurant that hides a brutal and cold nature behind his smile,

the family's fate is shaken by Kirill, his crazy son, who pays more attention to Nikolai than to his

own father. But Nikolai's cautious life changes abruptly when he meets Anna, a midwife who works

in a hospital in London. Anna is very affected by the situation in which was a teenager who

dies giving birth, and decides to look for the girl's family based on the diary that left written in Russian. While

digging through the diary, Anna involuntarily unleashes the wrath of the mobsters. It may be that for many, including

myself before I let this criticism rest for a few hours before I started

writing it, Eastern promises turn out to be somewhat inferior to A history of violence, much more direct and with less

concessions. But, after remembering the history and its dialogues, after remembering certain sequences, certain

details, a server has chosen to change his opinion. Of a striking hyperrealism, Promises of the East is,

as is usual in the work of the Canadian, a kind of portrait of a man from a sector of

society unknown to most, at the same time as a reflection of the inherent brutality in thebeing

human. With a Viggo Mortensen reserved in words in direct contrast to a Vincent Cassel more than convincing

and, above all, with a truly superb Armin Mueller-Stahl, Promises of the east naked without any concession

the animality of the unleashed man by power and arrogance.portrays at the same time the

Cronembergmost despicable and praiseworthy instincts of the human being under the instinct of survival, showing them under a false

reflection of appearance, on the one hand, Through a shady Viggo They are capable of performing despicable acts

with a frightening stoicism at the same time that they do not hesitate to put their own integrity into play in anact

altruisticand, on the other, with an Armin Mueller- Stahl, whose affability is hidden by a ruthless being capable of

killing both for hiding his sins and for imposing his respect, a respect he sees diminished by the acts of

his own son. On the other hand, it can be said that the role of Naomi Watts results perhaps the least attractive of the

Eastern Promises, representing the London citizen (West Coast) who discovers the sordidness

of a suburban London and unknown, almost marginal, in which a modern review Caciquismo and

slavery survive under the guise of clans and mafias. In any case, Eastern Promises may suffer from a

certain slowness in their footage, in which events occur with a chilling daily life, without

excessive shocks or unexpected plot twists . And, as usual in the filmography of the

Canadian, his violence is filmed with an aberrant crudity, almost hurtful in some cases, with a

hyperrealism, a naturalism, tremendously shocking. Very good film. I give it an 8 out of 10.

" 1

" Account, that's it, with an effective construction of characters that makes the spectator connect with

the psychological states of each of them , although this does not become the right vehicle for the film to

overcome the lukewarmness and blandness of its development.

The acid look from inside a train that - from time to time - pokes its head into the outside world to

try to see something more than chaos, exoticism as a subterfuge, magic just a trickster of the

losers. The train is the path, metaphor of life, and thus initiates and concludes the physical representation, with the

train that advances towards the uncertain destination (it clearly affects the esp? ��ritu of the traditional road movie). Three

brothers of blood (not of spirit), Peter, Francis and Jack, cross India starting and ending

nowhere. That look of Wes Anderson, when emphasizing the pathetic of wanting to seek harmony and meaning

from chaos and a certain postmodern devaluation, starts being absurdly expressive because it explores the

emptiness no matter what may be beyond the battered personality of the protagonists. Erroneously,

as the story progresses, Anderson introduces too much information about the conflict between father, mother

and children (including the unnecessary retrospective sequence). By making explicit, the story, hitherto very well

sustained in its tonality of absurd but quiet and accessible comedy (that is to say, it

moves in the realm of the everyday), drifts towards a Mannerist portrait of immoral individuals in search for

redemption. We consider that it would have been more forceful to maintain to a greater degree the suspension of the sense of

the narrated, thus gaining in an affinity - and more consistent - singularity with the concept to develop: cinema of

acts and gestures sustained on an idea of ​​indefinite tragedy, the pulpit of pain that hides behind

comedy. Anderson, of departure, wants to be subtle, but ends up yielding to the attempt to simplify. This is

a type of cinema that resorts to the extravagance of the absurd to not really tell anything, and from that nothing

expressing a nihilistic pessimism. If we look at its structure and the schematism of its forms we have a

descriptive parable that is linked in various sequences and typical referring to the supposedmysticism

purifyingof the Far East, proposing a dissection of the state anomic and socio-familial of the three brothers

through the incompatibility-tension between these and the exotic environment of India. The film, in short,

is an agglomeration of sequences - in a satirical key - that reiterate the state of desestructuraci���ny and emptiness of

the characters with respect to their peers and of these in relation n to the environment. ��� And where does the story end

? The future of the trip ends up leaving a residue of reconciliation between the brothers and each other and with the life thatthem

surrounds, and is best expressed in the sequence of the three brothers running, freeing themselves of the luggage that

until then had accompanied them, to finally be able to get on the train. And then, contemplating the luggage

that remains behind (ambitions, affections and hurts of the past), the three faces draw a shy smile and immediately

continue the march to nowhere. And it is that - Wes Anderson seems to say to us - in spite of everything,

life can be deliciously absurd. The incoherence between the subtle stroke of the calligraphy (staging

, montage, photography, landscapes and silences) and the simplicity that finally results at the level ofcontent

global(schematic description). The ethics of a destructuring and subsequent family redemption makesgaze

Anderson'send up saying very little in relation to the dramatic and evocative potential that hides its comedy and its

forms. Account, that yes, with an effective construction of personages that causes that the spectator can connect

with the psychological states of each one of them, although this does not get to be the vehicle. adequate ass for the

film to overcome the warmth and blandness of its development. In cinema, being subtle does not mean reducing the possibilities

of content to a scheme that represents the most obvious, and then saying - and this is redundant - the most

obvious.

" 0

" Well, I know you've all seen this movie, so there are plenty of the usual recommendations ... I have to admit that for me "" The return of the Jedi "" It's one of those movies that I have a singular

fondness for, rather than for the Star Wars Frikism itself (that too) because it was the first movie. the saga I

saw accompanied by my father at the tender age of 6 years, a whole little one. Seeing those ships and that deep space

accompanied by the excellent music of John Williams left in me a great footprint as cin���filo and as a fan of Star

wars.Today I felt like I was reunited with all my favorite characters from the saga and with Episode VI for me the

best along with the "Empire Strikes Back". "The quality of the image and sound makes you feel like you are watching a

new movie, maybe the voices in VOS are better than in Spanish, where the dubbing does have somesound

"old", and it's a pleasure to watch Harrison Ford, Carrie Fisher, Mark Hamill and company. Comoa as if it

were yesterday. They have added certain images that to my taste spoil the film enough, but hey, we must go

with the times and look for the taste of Luca $ that the movies are his and he does what the real wins., I

Wellknow you've all seen this movie, so there's plenty of As usual recommendations.

" 1

" Too superficial, simplistic and didactic Steven Spielberg's new film is one of those rare cases that becomes a dilemma for whoever

writes. It is difficult to review the tape without giving personal points of view on the subject in which you try to

deepen the script. So we will try to expose both. Spielberg develops the film with the

consequences of the event, following the chain of violence that, far from solving a problem, simply

perpetuates it and exacerbates it. At the beginning of "" Munich "", Spielberg recreates the terrorist attack that, during TheOlympic Games

1972in Munich ended with the death of 11 hostages, five Palestinian terrorists and one German policeman.

Then Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel, initiates a secret operation called "" Wrath of God "",

where five former agents of the Mossad (the Israeli secret service) will carry out a campaign of revenge,

killing the 11 leaders of the Palestinian terrorist group "" Black September. "" Those men were part of

a Palestinian nationalist command that called itself "" Black September "", baptized as a tribute to the three

thousand dead and ten thousand injured that left as a result the operation of expulsion of pa lestinos mounted by the

Jordanian army in that month of 1970. The film does not show those events, but it is obvious that they are part of

the chain of violence and revenge that took a new turn from Munich and that arrive with their

dramatic effects until our days. The taking of the Israeli hostages at the 1972 Olympics was,

perhaps, the first terrorist act broadcast live on the world television and was the germ that

gave rise to a new type of Israeli response, different from the conventional military one and that involved the adoption of

methods of counterterrorism that, in many cases, are assimilated to those of the enemies.This way, we continue

Avner (Eric Bana) and his group of agents around the world for months, while carrying out its work,

obtaining information from a mysterious man francsy questioning at every step the usefulness of this

mission On.Obviously the executions are sending a clear message to Palestinian terrorists, who also

respond with violence; and, worse still, the assassination of the leaders of the terrorist organization does not achieve the

dismantling of it. The murdered leaders are simply replaced by men who are still violent and

militant. Who benefits from the chain of violence? "" Munich "" has received severe criticism its alleged

historical inaccuracy, but we must take into account that its gui���n is "inspired" "in a book that is also

" "inspired" "by the supposed facts actually. Of course the main points of the storyhappened

really, but the plot and the characters are probably fictitious; and I see no reason to criticize that attitude,

since the purpose of the film goes beyond being a mere didactic tool; instead, he dares to

offer a much more important message, denouncing in a crude and clear way the vicious circle of violencecertainly

generated by terrorism and the supposed war against terrorism. It isone of the most mature works of

Spielberg, because he manages to complement the narrative with his cinematographic style, which emulates the visual plastic

of the espionage thrillers of the seventies, submerging us full in that decade, but without falling into puerile

exaggerations. In the same line we have the precise way in which the violence of the attacks is recreated; far from

falling into a visual spectacle, the violence occurs naturally and even prosaically, thus giving much

greater impact and realism to those scenes. The work of the cast is outstanding, and there is to applaud to Spielberg

the decision not to use "" stars "" in the film, but authentic actors capable of transforming themselves into their

characters. And although they always maintain their position an��� In addition to the cameras, special mention should be made

of the dynamic day of Janusz Kaminski as director of photography and Michael Kahn as editor. No doubt much

of the "" magic of Spielberg "" comes from those two constant collaborators. I wish we could say the same of John

Williams, whose music is now so soft and an�� It's just as it was spectacular and noisy in decades past. His

work on "Munich" is not bad and works reasonably well, but we would have liked to see what some more

composer innovative (say, Elliot Goldenthal or Graeme Revell) would have achieved with the tense scenes and

ambiguous emotions of "" Munich. "" Beyond the courage (narrative, dramatic and especially politics) of his

proposal, "" Munich "" has everything to irritate the different segments of the public.

" 0

" Possibly open the way for new Hollywood blockbusters that sell many

popcorn. But like a movie, it's boring, slow and monotonous.

Alatriste is for many reasons a failed film and mainly because you can not make the mostfilm

expensivein the history of Spanish cinema from such a bad script. " "Alatriste" "is based on the successful series of

novels by Arturo P���rez Reverte that recreate the life of a swordsman salary from the Golden Age. The mostthing will

logicalbe It has been adapting a book, or making a new story, but with the keys and the spirit of the saga.

Instead,preferadapt all books into one movie, offering a rehash of scenes from the

context of the work which are, placed one behind another without a common thread that hilvane

This produces that there are many characters that parade through the two hours of film, without

any leave a special deposit or have an excessive importance in the plot. For both things "" Alatriste " "fails

miserably when trying to create a coherent story (with its introduction, knot and outcome) and with a

minimum of intrigue tension. We simply see Captain Alatriste in three types of scenes that are repeated

several times in the film: battles, conversations with people, and duels in dark alleys, and almost with the

feeling that they were arranged at tunt���n, until the end of the film. But it is that even the sequences

of action, due to the lack of interest in the plot, lack the punch enough to attractthe limits

attention and are belowStandards of adventure cinema. Special allusion deserves the battle of the pikes,

Probably the most stupid stage of the seventh art. It is a pity that such a poor script, covers the quality

of the cast, replete with the names of first row of our industry as well as the meritorious work of makeup,

costumes, decorations etc. Photography and editing are good; but a little rigid in action scenes,

especially compared to some static framing of the more leisurely sequences, which look like they were taken from a

baroque art book. We need an ambitious project in our cinema. Possibly "" Alatriste "" open

the way for new Hollywood blockbusters that sell many popcorn. But like a movie, it

's boring, slow and monotonous. And that in the adventure genre is unforgivable.

" 0

" Pretty entertaining film, which has the added advantage of being able to delve a little into the childhood of such a

famous psychopath, and that efficiently solves the memory of the original movie .

Halloween has to its credit with the label of being one of the most profitable films in the history of

cinema. The budget that Carpenter had handled in his day is laughable compared to thefundraising

worldwidehe achieved worldwide, apart from the fame achieved and that would lay the foundations for a genre

that would become fashionable and that every so often continues to resurface, that of the slashers. With this handicaphad

the producerto fight to get ahead a remake more than worthy of the first film of the

saga, and is that after several directors and writers abandoned the project in the end they managed to

get it out ahead thanks especially to the interest of the director of this new version, the singer turned to

film director Rob Zombie. Already in his previous two films he had shown very good manners, being his

debut, with The House of the 1000 Corpses, and then his subsequent sequel, The Renegades of the Devil, two films. ��culas

already considered cult.On this occasion, the Remake tries to go a little further, and while in the

original version of Carpenter the murder would give Myers' mythology was told very

early on, focusing on the killing on Halloween 15 years later, in this new version. It takes a full hour

to try to show us the breeding ground in which one of the greatest psychopathic murderers of thewas created. During

cinematographic historythe second hour of duration, it concentrates but in the classic, reaching copying

murders and situations, but I think most sincere tribute to a blatant copy, because after s the

start so different that has this good show to new generations that was what really made the success

of this pelcula.Los players estn quite well, perfectly meets Tyler Mane the time to incarnate a

giant Myers, who gets scared just watching him standing on screen, and manages to create a supernatural aura

around the character, although part of this success is thanks to the outstanding leadership of Rob Zombie, which

I already liked a lot in his previous two films and that in this film continues to show that it is one

of the rising values ​​for any future project aimed at this cinematographic style. ���fico, although it is onfaith

goodthat the other collaborators of Clockwork will be happy to refute any acknowledgmentAnother

to the director.interesting role is that of Myers de ni���o, played by Daeg Faerch , and that

makes a very convincing recreation of the childhood of the character, something key to the evolution of the character

throughout the entire footage. In short, a very entertaining film, which has the a��� adido to be able to

deepen a little in the childhood of so famous psic���pata, and that efficiently solves the memory of the

original film, something that according to the last seen in the cinema is very Keep in mind, since youdo not

usuallyfind worthy remakes.

" 1

" Journal of a scandal dares to explore very difficult and controversial issues, but does so with great

care, subtlety and sensitivity, without judging their characters.

It has been more than a month since the Oscars were awarded, and when it seemed that the hangover

of the winners (and also of the losers) had ended, they suddenly come back to the fore. And it is thatarrives at the Spanish

one of the films that opted for several statues of the important ones (adapted script,billboards

actress, actress of cast and music), the brit Unique Diary of a Esc���ndalo. No one can doubt the good form that British

cinema is currently experiencing, both in quality and in international repercussion. Richard Eyreus

offersthe adaptation of Zoe Heller's political novel, which narrates the relationship that arises between two teachers,

Barbara (Judi Dench) and Sheba (Cate Blanchett). Sheba is married to a man older than her, Richard (Bill

Nighy), while Barbara remains single. Their relationship will take a turn when Barbara discoversadventure

Sheba'swith one of her students, Steven (Andrew Simpson). One of the virtues of Diario de un Esc���ndalo is

that it dares to explore very difficult and controversial subjects, almost taboos. But unlike whatsell

the trailers, Richard Eyre does it with great care, subtlety and sensitivity, without judging his characters. At

no time does the film fall into sensationalism or easy paths. The strong script of Patrick Marber

contains well-constructed characters, showing them in all their humanity, full of feelings,

joys and miseries. The rhythm that Eyre prints to the film is excellent, and the duration is just and necessary, not

a minute more. Despite the virtues of history, above all stand out Judi Dench and Cate Blanchett,

who perform simply colossal performances. Both embark on a truetour de force

interpretive(the best in many years), embroidering some complicated characters, making them believable andDiary

close to the spectator.of a Esc���ndalo is an essential film, a modern classic that

invites a restless spectator to reflect on the great variety of themes and questions thatposes

history. And it is an opportunity like few to see two of the best actresses of the current cinematographic scene

in an interpretive duel of those who make time.

" 1

" There are two other continuations made by the same team and the third is the best because the retarded

learned that he should leave the camera still so that at least we know what happens.

Sometimes I say to myself, Why do not I join four bullies and roll something? What do I have no idea to direct?

"And what?" He could shit on a guy and then force him to eat his own shit, we also get involved if the

situation requires it in a residence. We would rape some old women, we would throw them on top of them, that they would also

eat the vomits. Of course, no gui���n, so that it is noticed that it is amateur that apparently that gives very bad roll

or assemble or cast or nothing at all. The camera will move as if it were held by amonkey.

lameAfter some craziness of the network will discover it, then I will be encumbrar to author of cult, a guy who without

budget and with other psychopaths has made a work of art. That's what happens with FRED VOGEL and his colleagues,

I'm not disgusted by mutilations, shit, vmitges or violations from the film, the kid has already seen mondos of all

kinds, GORES sagas like GUINEA PIG, I swallow them and I do not need bicarbonate. Maybepretty sick or

I'mjust do not impress anything anymore, but I still do not feel so bad to do that and believe me

director. Do you know what really disgusts me? What really impacted me and made me throw up? Well, a piece

of meat with a brain stuffed with shit will tell the director himself, some people talk about these terrorists and

consider them to be filmmakers. That's not cinema, there's no gui���n or anything to hold on to, it's not actors, it has no

music and it does not have the slightest bit of human intelligence, that is rolled by a few animals

wanting to give the grade, precisely this kind of people are what GORE is notorious for, because the rubbish that they

have for head does not give them to think that in that genre, sometimes you also need to have something to

tell. There are two other continuations made by the same team and the third is the best because the retarded

learned that he should leave the camera still so that at least we know what happens. They are consideredauthors

cult, some things still escape my mind.

" 0

" Something like Pulp Slapstiscifi where the visual gag predominates, the vodevilera music and the absurd.

You may not believe it, but Alien Space Avenger is one of the worst movies in history with better

"" history "" Directed in 1989 by Richard W. Haines, three years later of the terribly bad Mutants in the

university and it is the final piece of the excellent horror film that I started with Splatter university in 1984, and

the history is cool. We met in New York in 1939 and we know two couples then: they

worried about being late to the movies and they worried about not being still drunk talking about

c���mics. Well, just before that some yellow letters about the Galaxy inform us of the flight of four

alien prisoners quite montoneros.De return to Earth we see the vehicle or car of the kids (quite

old, we're not going to cheat) on a secluded road at times of day , at night time parked to

piss. Then a UFO flies over the area until it hits in the middle of the forest that surrounds the protagonists and of course,

the curious one of the group wants to look at it. You, as a spectator, already think that you are seeing it "" again "": the linnet

keeps the par���sito and eliminate the rest of the group one by one. You're wrong. There are four aliens, one for

each chic @ and as the most foolish one opens the ship with a stone they are all possessed. Then, properly humanized, they

decide to approach the town for some plutonium and nuclear fuel. The atmosphere of this part of the movie is

something like Slapstiscifi where the visual gag predominates, the vodevilera and the absurd music. After making a

stop in a bar in which they steal weapons and kill all the customers flee a UFO bounty hunter

shooting the ufo with shotguns, hiding in the forest ship.50 years later s workers (who will die

as a group when they discover the ship and open it with a shovel) rediscover the ship. And is that our aliens only kill

masses, they go from killing one to one unless they violate him, then the human melts. In the current NY lives

Matt, a cartoonist of comics in low hours. until he sees in a nightclub the four villagers those of the

thirties, who enter without paying. Matt is not interpreted by him, but he could be. Matt becomes obsessed with

them (he chases them down the pub-disc while he draws them) because they look like "out of this world" and he It happens to

create a new comic book in which alien terrorists of the thirties invade the earth. The terrorist thing

is because in a nuclear power station those old men kill 33 employees and steal a thermos with plutonium that

was on a toolbox. The journalist who narrates the events with a helmet gives them the qualification.

Logic. In the office Matt tells the idea to his boss, who asks him for a sketch. In the next scene one of the

aliens sees the camera in a kiosk and gets scared. Gathered in a water they decide to load it because of course, their address

comes in the back cover. An alien bounty hunter gets inside Matt's girlfriend and together they decide to

exterminate the threat, which is difficult because "they" "regenerate debut. And Matt is based on his experiences to

draw the comic . In this aspect, the movie becomes super copyable for good: a cartoonist who has

a series of successes about an alien bounty hunter who exterminates terrorist invaders from

thirties.which is really !!!l !!! UAU !!! But the movie becomes embers despite not reaching the eighty minutes.

The best thing is that about 70 people or so will die. All "" waiting "" your shot.

" 0

" The failures and successes of the Zombie remake are due, respectively, to their desire to honor one of

their idols and the use of a foreign story to dig up a���nm��� It's in your personal aesthetics.

At this time there will be no one (at least of the visitors of this page) who has not already approached

Halloween (2007) by Rob Zombie, one of the films m��� s expected in 2007 and finally ended up being

released in Spain early this year. The treatment that this director has given to one of thefilms

most celebratedof John Carpenter has turned out to be quite worthy, although well below what he had achieved

with his two films previous The failures and successes of the Zombie remake are due, respectively, to their

desire to honor one of their idols and the use of a foreign story to dig further into their

personal aesthetics. Because the best of this new Halloween, without a doubt, is the first half, in which Rob Zombie

uses the story of the origins of Michael Myers and his psychopathic madness to write another chapter in that

great white trash chronicle that he had already sketched with his previous tapes. Certainly he resorts to a lot of

topics (abusive stepfather, incapable mother and an oppressive environment full of violence and humiliation), but these

at no time have they seemed exaggerated or exploitative; on the contrary, they are perfectly coherent with

the thematic universe of the director, highlighting the image of that boy andr���gino whose pleasure for the suffering of

others is the only way escape to a reality in which he is always the weak and foolish of thosehim

around. From there, the film evolves to the narrative pulse that exists between Michael and the psychiatrist Sam Loomis

(a character who is here much better employed and developed than in the original movie). ), a man who,

like the public, seeks to understand the reasons for Michael's behavior and what hides behind his

will to kill. With the passing of the years this will prove to be a sterile search, and after escaping the asylum

where they have locked him up (in a sequence very unpleasant even for them). standards of Rob Zombie), Michael

returns to his old suburb of Haddonfeld to sow death among its inhabitants. It is in this second half

where the Zombie film loses much of its strength; as it has been said in countless occasions, this

second half of Halloween does not do anything but summarize the original film except for slight differences (among them a

greater number of casualties), with which it would fit wondering what has happened to the delicate introspective gaze that the

director had shown us. In the end, as Sam Loomis discovers, it turns out that the madness of Michael Myersno

hasexplanation beyond violence as the only possible expression of emotionality. But here the

director has sinned a great excess, because I do not think it takes two hours of film to reach that

conclusion. However, despite these failures, you have to take off your hat at the way Rob Zombie has

dissected the slasher genre by completely undressing it and offering its most basic aspects the point at

which the same murderer voluntarily takes off his mask to show his veneration for the final girl

he faces. Also, the relationship with the typical sex of these masked psychopaths has its

explanation here: the girls in this film use their sexuality as an element of humiliation and ridicule,

starting with the unbearable older sister of Michael and ending with the no less exasperating friends of

Laurie Strode. The most interesting thing is that, with all this, Rob Zombie is not paying homage to the "myth" of

Michael Myers, but on the contrary: he is destroying it, in the same way that a child destroys a clock

that he opens to see how it works. That's why the long explicit explanation of the killing machine and the fact

that, unlike Carpenter's film, this version does not leaves open the possibility of a sequel (a

key detail that differentiates it from virtually all the rest of the genre). In the end, the love letter that Rob

Zombie and his friends (it is impressive the number of horror luminaries and series B that walk through this

film) have written to the original work of JC is weighted by a footage excessive and also excessive

reverence to the teacher (not only in regard to the second half but also to the use of themusical theme

original, which here seems not to fit too good), but it's definitely one of those good remakes, one that is

worth seeing to appreciate the work of someone who has not only seen Halloween, but also understands it.

As always, there will be discrepancies regarding the final result, but the difference is that here theis appreciated

tone of a real artist.

" 1

" What the Wayans brothers add to Hitchcock is a Freudian element that the British and some other would

put the hair on end.

A more heartless and hard-core jewel thief hides the diamond of his latest theft in a couple's purse

without them knowing it. To get her back she has to get into the happy family. The thief measures less than a

meter and disguises himself as a baby. The couple adopts it all weekend. A key scene of "" Sabotage "" of

Hitchcock happens in the palace of a society lady who, in reality, is a Nazi spy. In the sceneare

two levelsmixed. On the one hand the hero wants to save his girlfriend from the Nazi spies. On the other hand the hero

is in a society dance with all his protocol that can not be altered. The Nazi, to catch the bride,

asks for a dance. The hero can not refuse because he would break with the good etiquette. When he

gets the girl he joins another innocent couple and leaves the palace. The Nazi can not use force, because he would

break the same label, and so on. Something similar happens in "The Stolen Letter" from Poe. The minister

steals from the queen the letter before the king, but she can not say anything, because the king must not know about theletter

incriminating. ? i? ek calls this game "" the impotent look "". In the midst of this type of action there is always a

third element. In "" Sabotage "" is the good society of the palace, in "" The stolen letter "" is the king. There are people

who should not know what is happening. ��� The other one, he says? I? Ek, he should not know everything. I like to quote Hitchcock

to talk about such a bad movie because deep down I like to give him the odd coscorr��� n from time to

time. The cinema of low intellectual budget can show the same tricks that the one of Hitchcock. The mat���n

disguised as a baby is willing to use force and weapons, but when the "mam���" appears, he returns to the

babbling: she should not know everything ��� Every time he has the diamond in his hands he has to go back to the farce

that he is a baby and he loses it. Why? Because she's ahead. There's a famous "Chained" scene in

which Cary Grant and Ingrid Bergman are about to be discovered by the evil Sebastian. To hide that they have

gone to the winery to investigate the Nazi uranium, the two pretend that they are lovers and embrace each other. They deceived Sebastian by

making him believe they love each other. But the funny thing is that the two really love each other. ? i? ek says that it is typical

of Hitchcock's cinema to move "" from outside in "". The characters pretend that they are something until they discover

that they are that something. By pretending that we are something we occupy a place in the intersubjective network, and in the end that place

becomes our true position. "" Small but mat "", makes the same movement of an intuitive mode The

boyfriend of the couple wants to have a child but she wants to wait. When the boyfriend sees the baby at the door of hisdeludes into playing

house, hefather for two days. The thief takes the place of a son, to get the

diamond. Each one represents a role, but what the film tries to demonstrate is that in the end they need

each other. They have created a symbolic father-son network in which they feel too comfortable. So

the two of them go out together to celebrate it. What the Wayans brothers add to Hitchcock is a Freudian element

that the Briton and somebody else will put to him. to the creeps The baby has to sleep with the couple the first

night so he looks at them eagerly when they begin their sexual preliminaries. In the morning she remembers two

adventures, the groom only one: the baby has had fun. But in which of its two facets? Is he thethief

prisonwho took advantage of the mistake and slipped into the bride's bed? Or has he done it

symbolically? Was it the baby who had fun with mam���? The spectator has the possibility of making

a second scandalous reading, a lustful oedipus completely satisfied.

" 0

" The truth is that he did a lot of time that he did not enjoy so much in a good cinema session. Afilm

tremendously exquisite, maybe a long, but good one ...

To talk about "" Zodiac "" the first thing to do is to talk about the childhood of its director, my always

adored David Fincher, and that is, ���, being a more tender infant, and living in S.Francisco, had to go

through the terror or horror of being the threat of this ruthless serial killer, it did not become a trauma for the

small David, but something that marc and that sooner or later have proposed, in his first film "" Sev7en ""

we talked about serial murderers, and here in "" Zodiac "" (which has nothing to do with his first film) returns to

the charge with the same theme, although from a completely different prism, this time little, to say nothing, is

recreated in the murders of the Zodiac and if in the investigation of his "" works. "" The truth is that he did a lot of

time that he did not enjoy so much in a good cinema session, well burned, interpreted in a masterly manner by

Jake Gyllenhaal. that gives life to the author of the book on which the film is based, Mark Ruffalo, Anthony Edwards (with

an impossible wig), Robert Downey Jr. and more than enough Brian Cox (this I have compared to Ed

Harris, is that only his presence on a tape greatly improves his viewing). Perhaps, as a negative note would

talk about its excessive duration, and is that at the beginning of the footage is passed in planes long, artistic and that

have little to do with the result of it, and that drag its duration to 160 min. and that is that one leaves

the cinema with the rear more bare than a baboon.

" 1

" A spiritual tape that, to make itself understood, uses several unforgettable images. A Mexican girl in charge of two American children has to decide between doing her job or attending her

wedding. only son A couple of American husbands who walk through Morocco suffer what appears to be

a terrorist attack. A Moroccan pastor tries to raise his children. And a young Japanese deaf-mute

struggles to communicate with her father and her surroundings, while desperately trying to lose her

virginity. All this, although it does not seem like it, is part of a single tape, it is about Babel, the third film in

collaboration between the scriptwriter Guillermo Arriaga and the director Alejandro González Iríritu and that they threaten to

be the last, arguing creative differences. Artistic separation that leaves a great challenge to Irritu

for his next projects alone, without counting the depth, strength and emotion of the

Arriaga's scripts.And even more challenging, after this third film, in short the most stylized, neater,

most moving and although it sounds weird Both tell these stories as a pretext

to talk about globalization and the growing lack of understanding between Americans and Mexicans,

between Americans and potential terrorists, but also n between husband and wife, between father and son, between

brother and brother. These several narrative lines that are sliding one between the other, at different rhythm and

time, while the story that the story of the mature actor today Brad Pitt and the beautiful Cate Blanchett

happen in a couple of hours, that of Adriana Barraza, in one of the more realistic performances that I have seen in a long

time and whose class is easier to find it in theater and not in cinema, it happens in 24 hours or more, but this is not

an impediment so that the stories can narrate each other. With a slow and slow pace,

we jump from the Moroccan deserts to the border deserts between Mexico and the United States, then take

a big leap towards the colorful and noisy streets of Japan. Flooding the tape with long sequences without

di���logos, but intense and touching all, highlighting two in particular, by means of which somesome

characters discoverunknown place for them, like a pair of children. who visitfor the first time

Tijuanaand are surprised by the intense images they see behind the windows of their cars, or as the group

of tourists that arrive in a desolate town in Morocco, whose conditions are very far from his comfortable life.

And although it is a tape accessible to all kinds of audiences, it finds the story too

slow and less chaotic and climatic than Amores Dogs, we are more before a contemplative and artistic film,

although in a certain way, there are some unnecessarily long parts in the Japanese part, that although itto

is pretendedbe the most sublime, it is really , the weakest story, focused on its artifices to form neglecting in

part its background, contrasting in great measure with the rest of the tape. The music of Santaolalla, the photography of

Rodrigo Prieto and the art design of Brigitte Broch, The usual collaborators of Irritu, make an

appearance, with the difficult task of giving cohesion to this shredded film, portraying with a certain veracity the

lifestyle of various regions of the world, including their rituals? Does anyone want to know what awedding is like

Mexican town? They do not have to look for more, watch this tape and discover it. And in case the different languages

spoken on the tape were not enough, suddenly the silence falls among their characters, of thosesilences

intensethat bother, that They hurt and move, moments that the director takes very well showing that he

owns an impeccable technique. And declaring that, sometimes, to really understand each other,are not necessary

words.

" 1

" Even the balls of the Yankees Every time I like mass movies less. The movies that everyone sees seem more and more heavy

and more insufferable. I do not know why but always the prota is silly of the ass and is lucky, and at the end of the

movie, when he has managed to overcome the evil, he becomes clever, and the bullshit that he made at the beginning of the

movie vanish like magically. He becomes mature and intelligent. This Spielberg movie is more of the

same, run away and flee and not give him a single shot. In addition, the bastard has gotten a couple of actors who are

like to feed them separately. The girl, an old woman stuck in the body of a girl, because you

just have to see her speak (in clear original version) to realize that we are facing one of the great

freaks of cinema. They will believe that the baby is funny when she talks like her fucking mother, but I am

terrified. Seeing a calf that speaks like a mature person is something horrible. The children are children and

see them outside their role scares. Then is the teenager who has the Cruise. Another subnormal that is to

give him slaps until you see the bone at hand. Faithful reflection of what is calledmanipulation

military, the boy wants to kill the bugs without any weapon, hale, crazy and without thinking, come, a saco.Queis

that I say, but to me that seems fanaticism and madness . That someone wants to go to fight without means is to go

to a certain death, that's why it freaks me out so much that at the end of the movie appears the mongo este and his

grandparents and the whole family. All god is saved, and on top of that the old woman appears in a Sunday outfit and all

makeup. But what is she feeling? It only remains that Cruise returns with his ex-wife and that the world is

much better. Quiet, I tell you the end of the movie but nothing happens, all the movies end the same

way, and saying that does not detract from the mystery of this one. I do not know what Spielberg is going to be, but at this rate he will

become a director who is good at making special effects, because what is telling stories? You did not

realize that the Americans do not know how to keep the composure? That everything they say screaming. In

difficult times the most sensible thing is to calm down and not argue for bullshit, and in the whole fucking movie they keep

screaming and sticking together. It's funny how at the beginning of the movie, when the floor starts to

crack, people stay there to see what happens. Fuck, I do not know, but I would already be running

like a bitch for a long time, and hiding. If I see that a bug is throwing rays and crushing

to god, I hide. In order, that to continue talking about this shit, if what they wanted they have already achieved,

which is that we paid the entrance, so I think it goes to go to the cinema your cousin, from now on I will download everything

from the internet, which by what you see, the quality of the movies is acceptable, and I can pass it on. Today, not

having a command with the forward in hand is to die.

" 0

" Trace Slobotkin after a long career devoted to television scripts debuts in the direction and the truth

seeing that horror would ask him to park his career as a filmmaker.

TRACE SLOBOTKIN after a long career dedicated to television scripts debuts in the direction and the truth

seeing that horror would ask him to park his career as a filmmaker. It is not that the script is completely harmful, the

idea of ​​a young apprentice serial killer was to at least make a funny horror comedy. Thething

badis that the promising material remains in an interesting starting point that deflates

drastically in flat characters and in a development lacking in interest where boredom does not take off in a

televised staging, among the interpreters highlight a pair of familiar faces, the sand man of the

third part of SPIDERMAN THOMAS HADEN CHURCH and the ex-child prodigy COREY FELDMAN who stood out in the 1980s with

hidden youth or the GOONIES. they give luster uniting to the pathetic interpretations of the entire

artistic team, all this is overcome by an antichological end where the nonsense encompasses the story that does not

even serve to laugh a little since apparently the mediocre director really believed that he did something

useful to take it seriously.

" 0

" The film adapts S���skind's novel very well in several ways. It is a very well achieved film, without beingbe

- nor trying to- revolutionary or even disruptive, and excellent in aesthetic care.

If Tom Twykwer's perfume does not become, to my liking, a great film (due to the lack of

eccentricities, outbursts, something that really catches the eye in the narrative Enda in some

other clich��� in the gui���n -which did not appear in the novel-, for certain ambient errors that from time to time

bothered), would be annoying and picky if I did not assume that it is a film 1-very well achieved, without being

-or trying to be-revolutionary and not even disruptive, 2-excellent in the care is ��tico, especially in

what aa) camera, b) election and characterization of actors and c) election / creation of locations -although

in this plane has, as I said, some other error.1- The film adapts S���skind's novel very well in several

ways. In the first place, voice over contributes, advances and deepens the story without becoming unbearably

recurrent and abusive. The narrator, on the other hand, does a great job. Secondly, the times are very well

measured, and the film, which covers a period of time and a series of very broad vicissitudes, never

bores, never hurries, never lack or spare information. Third, there is a great respect but not

blind and dogmatic by the novel, which is faithfully followed, with the necessary changes for its optimal adaptation

to the screen (And fidelity interests me only in the ethical plane and not in the reproduction of everything that happens, of

course, the important thing, I think, is not to betray what the work says, or, to do it, to make it explicit. The

novel, in this sense, does not appeal to a negative moral evaluation of the murderer, and this seems to me to be respected

in the adaptation.) 2-a) M��� there is the beauty of certain planes and, above all, of certain camera movements,

there is a very interesting use of it (parallel to the use of certain resources literary in the

novel, which is eloquent about the success of the adaptation): the camera as subjective but, in this case, not

reproducing what the character sees ino transforming, as in a sinestÃsico delirium, what it smells in

imÃgenes.b) Another success in an adaptation not stupidly tied to the original : S���skind's protagonist is ugly,

horrible, deformed, disgusting. The one of the film, without being a beauty, is a normal type - even with some

attractiveness, except for a slight lameness when walking. It is true that this is a step back in theinquiry

text'sabout beauty, but nevertheless, the film seems to say that Grenouille is ugly anyway

because it is poor. And that is also interesting. On the other hand, the beauty of the girls is also very well

achieved: without being perfect, they have a particular, hypnotic beauty. C) The perfumer's house in the middle of the

bridge and the Popular market plans are fa-bu-lo-sos (Of the errors, today we're good, better not to

talk). And I add another point, maybe not to the film but I do as proof of the excellent aesthetic care of the

film: the posters. Very different from each other, all beautiful, they are also a great - and praiseworthy, because theynothing

haveto do with ideological hegemony or economic dominance - marketing tactics.

" 1

" Monchito, The Killer. Full-fledged disappointment this Dead Silence directed by James Wan, the guy who rolled the

first Saw and here again treats the viewer as if he were subnormal.

Full-fledged disappointment this Dead Silence directed by James Wan, the guy who rolled the first Saw and here

again treats the viewer as if he were subnormal. The only reason why he stayed until the end was to

confirm that in the 15th minute of the movie "" you see the duster "" and you know absolutely everything, so that go fucking

friend Wan. A ridiculous scene with a gentleman, that I will not spoil in case some reader of Libertinaje with less

than thirteen years wants to see it, says it all. At times ridí ��cula, at times more ridiculous.And the whore mana���a of the Wan to shoot

with his fetish actor Donnie Wahlberg, a real ga������n .The first ten minutes are not cool, which is the most

acceptable. Wan will have to put aside his face as a con man if he wants me to go see that (a priori)

eighties with Kevin Bacon playing Charles Bronson called Death Sentence.

" 0

" Tease with serious film trim. Either I was not for the job or I did not hear anything for more than

I wanted. Dreyer, the cin���filo embedded in the Franco dictatorship and the spectators did not deserve this.

The cinema-club, that ���gora propitious for the cin���filo enjoyment, that hermetic space of geeks of the seventh art

as vocation of life, has in this beginning of millennium little tree. The vertigo of the times opens new

fluid exchange scenarios in the form of frames, understand me well. Cinephilia is a disease,

we know that, but now it is not even bad seen. There are so many strange people loose around the world that the passion

of an individual to devour cinema and speak passionately of their devoured matter does not produce resentment, astonishment or

repulsion in those who, oblivious to these goings-on, attend his convulsed addiction. The Dreyer cycle talks about

movie-freak frikis in the sixties. Carl Theodore Dreyer is constituted flag of presentation of his protagonists

and we already have a film on films, a cannibalism na���f of interposed texts, of palimpsestos of the

cinematographic reality. Humbleness of transcendent phrases produces hilarity, but not because the

purpose of the director (���lvaro del Amo) is grace, the cavalier joke. Is that there are di quelogos thatnot

canbe heard without blushing. For bad. The other solution goes through the reflexive way, my friend J. told me, who

lately is very cin���filo. It may happen that the director wanted to give us not so many characters

but archetypes, signs of a reality (the sixties, Franco, the dark theaters of fluid verb)

necessarily constrictive. I even thought of my admired Tim Burton and his fantastic ironic exercise

called Ed Wood. This tape is our Ed Wood homeland. This political-social frieze does not get boring because the

actors (especially the priest) are outstanding. The records that the dialogues point out do not allow

their dramatic delivery to go in other directions. They do what they should: and well. What does not just enable us

to attend with interest this manual manners is the excessive artificiality of the whole. The

bombing of the title coincides with the imposing flood of melodramatic, jocular, andmelodramatic dialogues

inopportunethat almost never enter. The cinephilia of the Spanish sixty deserved greater respect at the

time of tribute a tribute, no doubt deserved in mind (I guess) of the moral straits of the

time.

" 0

" A police story that Scorsese transforms into a memorable show of the genre. If you are ever going to give an Oscar to Martin Scorsese as Best Director, and finally recognize his

excellent career, you should be able to Do it at once, for his unbeatable work in Los Infiltrados, the film that

some people consider already, a masterpiece and a classic of a police cinema? And perhaps those statements are not

so risky. On this occasion, Scorsese, puts all his expertise on the order of a story that takes place in the

streets of Boston, which could be any city, with which he manages to create a direct dialogue with the

public, which is rarely seen in his movies. Based on the Taiwanese film Internal Affairs, the story narrates the

rise of two policemen ��as, one (Di Caprio) infiltrated the lines of the bloody Irish mafia, commanded

neither more nor less than by Costello (Jack Nicholson), and another (Damon), whose rising career it is only with the

intent to pass on information to your own boss; Costello. Throughout the story is narrated how each of

the two characters are involved in the most complex situations, leading them to live trying tohide

constantlytheir true identity and playing the skin every minute. The work team could not be

better, Jack Nicholson, as the omnipotent boss of the Mafia, filling his character with a cynicism

bordering on fun, turning it into a an antithesis of the Padrino of Marlon Brando. Leonardo Di Caprio

performs the best performance of his career, well above his celebrated work in The Aviator, becoming

the absolute protagonist by going public with the stock market. just a few scenes. Matt Damon, his

counterpart, completes the trio and are backed by a very good cast that includes Mark Wahlberg, Martin

Shen, Alec Baldwin and the beauty of the film, Vera Farmiga. The city of Boston, its streets, its different

locations, become a character more, a perfect atmosphere for the actions to take place in the right

environment. And it is there where one of the most memorable scenes takes place, in a Chinese neighborhood, where the

characters of Damon and Di Caprio, very similar to each other, pursue each other, trying to

discover each other. �s, Scorsese returns to the usual violence he used to in his first

films, that kind of violence in which in less than a minute several characters have died with their heads

bursting with bullets and that verbal violence with which allows the word fuck to be repeat 236 times. And it's also

one of his tapes with an unchained rhythm and an overwhelming energy, which seems to be dedicated to all

those who believe that he is a boring director. The only detail, that many could refute, is the end of

the film, which surely divides the audience in two, those who loved him and those who hated him and that could undoubtedly

be the subject of a long discussion. Enn.In short, what seems to be a simple police story that some will

broadcast on channel five on a Saturday night, is in reality a complicated, intense and intelligent

thriller, a film that will undoubtedly be remembered for a long time, that in the hands of any director

could be any rehash, but in the hands of an experienced and wise artist, returns in an

essential and memorable work.

" 1

" In the city is the story of how little we sometimes know each other even though we live together: about how we

cheated ourselves about our life and how we cheated the others to make our existence a

little easier or just out of pride.

Barcelona. A great city that hides a multitude of small stories. In this urban setting, a group of

friends open the doors of their homes and their lives to let us be witnesses of what happens to them in their

day. Characters who are much more silent than they say. Characters that show much less than what they

hide. It is the story of a group of 30-year-old friends who meet every day, share all their experiences

but hide an important part of their lives: their most private feelings. Only the spectator will be

witness of everything: of his lies, secrets, hidden desires and infidelities. Eduard Fern���ndez (member of the

cast of Alatriste) -and who won a Goya award as best actor of cast for his role in this film -

embodies the character of Mario, a tormented guy who suspects that his wife, Sara, (Vicenta N? Dongo) cheats him

and will fight for the entire film to try to confirm their doubts. Irene (M���nica L���pez) shows a

rejection attitude and avoids seeing her faculty friend with whom she reencounters after years without seeing . Her

marriage does not work although her husband Manu (Chisco Amado) does not cease to strive to satisfy her in all her

desires. Tomás (Alex Brendem���nl) also hides something: their relationship with a minor, who to top it off is the

niece of his friend Mario. And finally, Sof���a (Mar���a Pujalte) prey to a relationship with a Frenchman whose

rudeness constantly tries to justify the others for not The story

full of deception reminds Tapas, although in the latter the drama disguises itself as a comedy in an attempt to

take the matter away from it. In the city it is the story of how little we sometimes know each other even though we live

together: how we deceive ourselves about our lives and how we cheat others. Paras so that our

existence is a little easier or just out of pride. It is easy to empathize with these characters because,

after all, as one of the protagonists says: "We all have secrets, ���no?"

" 1

" The worst movie that I saw in a long timeNight of those without wanting anything, something of bad mood and the never well weighted "" I hate every human being that inhabits

this planet "". What better to see a comedy to take the cloud of the head and clear a while ?. Good

proposal, sorry I keep asking. I tend to see bad movies knowing they are.

Usually I findfunny, but therealways an exceptionthe rule. To corroborate the magnitude of my

limitation (I can never leave a film in half) I saw the two hours and ten minutes of this

absolutely painful "" comedy "". I leave evidence that came to the spoof of Hair and "" Aquarius "". I want my

130 minutes back. Virgen at age 40 is the worst movie I've seen in a long time (a lot) .PD: Catherine

Keener I still love you.

" 0

" The tape tries to have its dramatic touches, which are much more pathetic than usual, andis that

Juani, dear, life is not rosy.

Personally, the film seemed to me a sovereign co ,azo, since neither the music (trying to sell a

soundtrack where groups appear that do not interest me at all), nor interpretations; maybe a little

Veronica Echegui, since the "" Canto del loco "" Dani Mart���n, better to dedicate himself to singing, because what is

acting leaves much to be desired. How beautiful is the language SMS, the one that fucks the language of Cervantes to turn it

into an unintelligible gibberish, where this young girl, attached to her parents (far from today's

adolescents, who ignore them, completely spoiled in his most ignorant ignorance). The tape tries to have itstouches

dramatic, which are much more pathetic than usual, and Juani is, dear, life is not rosy.

Anyway, I imagine that this film will end up selling alongside "" 7 V���rgenes "" in an inseparable pack of the best

cinema kinki jam���s rolled.

" 0

" Solitary Hearts is a film that fails sonoramente in its attempt to emulate the classic

black film, offering a story that despite being based on real facts nobody is able to believe.

If there is a genre that could be qualified as a symbol, as the best exponent of classical Hollywood, it would

undoubtedly be the black cinema. Some of the greatest films ever made belong to this genre, such as

Casablanca, Perdicion, The Malt���s Falcon, Cayo Largo or Sed de Mal. Not to mention the filmmakers who directed

these productions (Welles, Huston, Wilder, Hawks, Preminger?) And the great actors who worked on them.

It's hard to find a great classic Hollywood star who did not make at least one of these

movies. Go over these lines as sincere and meaningful homage to an entire ��� little of the cinema and agenre

special, now practically defenestrated. It is not only because he hardly comes back to it, but because many of the

recent examples are embarrassing, such as the ominous Black Dahlia. But let's focus on what concerns us,

which is Todd Robinson's Solitary Hearts. The film is based on the real crimes committed by Ray

Fern���ndez (Jared Leto) and Martha Beck (Salma Hayek) at the end of the forties, and in the capture of these

�� Last, in which played a crucial role Elmer Robinson (John Travolta). Coincidences that life has, it

was the director's grandfather. The film has a serious error since its inception, and is the approach that

has in the form of flashback, showing before the end that the outcome. As if that did not hurt enough to

the story, Robinson narrates it in a very deficient way, without sense of rhythm, slow at times and run over

in others. Admittedly, the guide does not lack anything to be full of common places and topicazos

typical of the mediocre shows of film noir. The characters are mere empty casings, and as it could not be

otherwise, both the protagonist and the villain live tormented, each suffering his own cross. Of the

best interpretative work, better not to speak. Solitary Hearts is a film that fails sonoramente in

its attempt to emulate the classic ones of the black cinema, offering a history that in spite of being based In

real events nobody is capable of believing.

" 0

" As I said, "" The Source of Life "" has a very good script, which tells us an idea, with three stories.

But the most important of these 3 stories is what they tell us, and how they tell us.

Almost by chance I found out that such a movie called "" The Fountain "", by a certain Darro Aruofski

(that's what I used to call it before), dealt with a subject that I always has called the attention. Eternal life

. It was like that, looking for, found the BSO (an authentic marvel) and the date of the premiere in Spain: 4/27/07.

Sincerely I saw the film the day of the premiere, then, you will ask: Why has it taken so long to publish

the criticism? The truth is that for reasons beyond the control of I have not been able to do it until now, a real shame. But

that does not matter now (or ever), so that. Let's talk about the film. To start I would like to express

my displeasure at the fact that in a room of 400 people, in a session of 6:30, I was only We have 10

people. Some people might think that the film is bad (as the critics say), but I tell you it IS NOT, FOR

NOTHING, BAD. You can call it strange, strange. ��a, paranoid. but no one in their right mind can say that the movie

is bad. Even so, the critics of Venice put on their boots with the film. Nothing could be further from the truth.

"" The Fountain of Life "" can boast of an unpolluted guide, of actors who fulfill their task

with a special and apote���sicos special effects of public proportions that have been made with a ridiculous budget

for a film of these characteristics. It is true that this film is for a select public, for a

public willing to think , to compare, and to enjoy with a film that requires the viewer to get into

it to be a movie with capitals. And, unfortunately, that's something that people are not willing toto

do,get involved in a film like that. Ufff and think at the same time. it's a pity that we

are used to sit in the chair and see. As I said, "" The Source of Life "" has a very good script,

that tells us an idea, with three stories (that although they are interpreted by the same actors), theyalmost no

haveconnection with each other (except Tommy's visions next to the tree on the way to Xibalba). But the most

important of these 3 stories is what they tell us, and how they tell us. I'm not going to comment anything more on the

script to not disclose important data. One of the strong tricks of the film, is the work of its director,

Darren Aronofsky. "" Inspired "" is the word that defines Darren's work behind the scenes. The man is seen

winning and enthusiasm making a film that has sunk in the deepest miseries as far as box office is

concerned. As I said the actors are great. Since the cast is headed by a fantastic Hugh Jackman and

an immeasurable Rachel Weisz, splendorous after winning that deserved Oscar for "" El Jardinero Fiel. "" As

for the Soundtrack. Well, I already said it at the time. cool. And even more brilliant in the film, where it acts

as a common thread and merges with the images of Aronofsky in an enviable way. In addition, it is an

essential accompaniment for special effects. And it is that both elements give the film aair

Biblical-Paranoidthat makes you stay in the seat of the dumbfounded cinema. For you to have an idea, since

the first phrase appears on the screen (a quote from the genesis), the film exerted on me what I call "" the

shovel effect. "" I will explain what is this "" Pala effect "": Imagine that someone is going, take a shovel and you

release a host in the face that leaves you fools lost. Well, that, you stay as a fool. As I said, the

film leaves you as a fool, it's something very curious. it is as if you could not clear your eyes from the screen, as

if what the film tells you (a trip to a dying star, the death of a loved one, the search

of the temple of �� Tree of life.) Was happening to you. As if all that, had a meaning (the

funny thing is that it has it, but you have to stop to think).

" 1

" To break your chest to laugh and have to go down to the emergency room to be sewn. The humor they do in oriental countries rarely like us in the West. The closest thing tous was

thankthat program "" Yellow humor "" that really was fun thanks to the comments of the

presenters. By the way, now they could not be aired on television, given that they were a bit high-pitched and

potentially xenophobic. But they were other times. Who does not remember the chicho mama, the warmth and

other rets of fish nipples will jump? What times those. The movie is about a band of bad guys

called the axes. Naturally, they are called so because their main weapon is an ax. For reasons that are not relevant

, they reach a poor area of ​​a large city, where a large neighborhood lives in curious harmony.

In this neighborhood an explosive mix of characters coexists, all dubbed with Spanish accents, making

the audition a real mess. Andalusians, Basques, Galicians, etc., are represented by jumping Chinese

experts in martial arts. And the whole film is about the band's fight against the neighborhood. To tell the

truth, the film is a joke. It is impossible that you do not laugh, eitherthe scripts make you funny or

becausebecause they seem so pathetic that you laugh. The characters are the ca���a. There is a concierge withcurls

perpetualwho flees to the minimum, since she does not want to use her hipoeruptohuracanado (like pepep���tamo), ahumming

huge. Her husband, a tomboy and loin, expert in the most hidden martial arts and

high-grade calzonazos. The gay hairdressers, also tremendous fighters. And a long etc. To highlight the bad bad

, which is a gentleman who got into the asylum because he could not find a rival to fight against. His

secret tactics are ridiculous. Resuming, that the film is very worthwhile. My half Batata and I

broke the box literally. At first we looked at each other strangely, but as soon as you assume the translation, the

rest of the tape is shot. That's it, assume that the film is a total nonsense, that the Chinese do not fly and

that if they step on your head you do not get up. That you are very stupid and you believe everything. To break your chest to laugh

and have to go down to the emergency room to be sewn.Besitos.PD: The advice of the Chinese guitar is the

monda.PD2: Because there is a character that shows us the ass all day? PD3: There are guides to many

movies, like Matrix (with Mr. Smith with ax) , to Asterix (for the absurdity of the blows) and more that

I do not remember now.

" 1

" Mr. Browning gives us to understand that many times the real monsters are not those freaks, but the "

normal" ones.

To catch up with classics this weekend, I launched for Freaks, by Tod Browning.that encourages you to

Somethingsee it is its duration, as soon as it arrives on time. The story is simple but it is told with great skill and

simplicity (maybe the two things go together). The edition on DVD contains a special introduction by the

director in which he informs the viewer of the nature of the term freak and of his world as a

collective that supports each other and feels offended as a whole when one is despised.

Precisely about that is the story: in a circus full of attractions, especially called those who are

called freaks or those who have unusual physical deformities. The story centers on Hans and

Frieda, a couple of dwarves who commit to get married, but crosses the beauty of Cleopatra,

a beautiful trapeze artist who maddens Hans and turns him into a puppet. Everything leads to a cruel story

of manipulation, contempt and revenge. The best thing about the film, and perhaps the most overwhelming, is the parade of

mutilated and deformed people. But the most impressive thing is that they are capable of being integrated in a masterly way in an

argument of fiction like this one. It is inevitable to compare the so-called "freaks" of that time with the

current Today the characters presented in the film would be handicapped or diminished psychic or

physical and it would be in very bad taste to make them a commercial claim. Today we are more sophisticated and the

"" freaks "" of today are the ones who are more stupid, either because they are like Forrest Gump or want to be it; there are

(or existed) public forums such as El Sem���foro or Martian Cr quenicas that were supposed to make known, in a

pretended environment of equality, all Those rare people with mental problems or desire to succeed based on

any barbarity. But nothing is further from reality, since they were not confessed circuses for derision and public

mockery. Even "" freak "" is used as a distinctive element and with pride for those who want to

distinguish themselves from the rest of the mortals in customs, habits, hobbies or supposed knowledge andPerhaps

experiences., and if it were not a conclusi� It's too easy, Mr. Browning makes us understand that

many times the real monsters are not those freaks, but the "normal" ones.

" 1

" There would be only a greater depth in the psyche of the protagonists if you want but not much more.

Pleasant surprise.

Open water is a very particular film and this is for several reasons: Its director Chris Kentis makes his

absolute debut helped only by his wife, 120 total hours shot on video and without special effects, facts

(and sharks) totally real in a film of primary terror, with an ideal duration (only 79 minutes) and

finally, awarded in the prestigious Sundance festival. All this would say nothing if Open Sea did not end up

being -as it is- a very good low-budget premium opera, with an air of pseudo documentary, extremely

effective and of good taste. An apparently happy couple, after 40 minutes of diving is forgotten and shipwrecked in

the ocean, kilometers from the mainland, in shark-infested water, is the whole story line. The

increase in tension and the psychology of the couple themselves go in crescendo, together with a precise montage, until they

reach a beautiful, surprising and final poetic. There would be only a greater depth in the psyche of the

protagonists if you want but not much more. Pleasant surprise.

" 1

" Hierro 3 is a film that conveys many emotions with a minimalist style, full of small

details.

Exquisite film full of silences on a lonely boy who enters empty houses and lives them

for a day, this protagonist does not say a single word throughout the movie. but it is not necessary

because it transmits much more with its acts and its looks. He walks by the houses, he cooks, he watches the television, he also

washes the clothes that are in the house and tends them, he fixes the damaged devices that he finds and after a

while he disappears from the house just as he came , without making noise. And look for another empty house. In one of the houses where

he enters there is a silent woman, who watches him for hours without him realizing it, is a woman

mistreated by her husband who wants to escape from his life and finds in the protagonist that way of escape, the two

do not cross a single word, but they understand each other and go together, they share a time living from house to house

and feel free, it is a relationship Full of poetic and subtle moments, they are two lonely souls who take care

of each other, silently passing through the houses as if they were ghosts. The title of the film is the

name that receives the golf club less used by golfers and is the type of stick that theuses

protagonistand that will be very important in the history. Iron 3 is a film that transmits many emotions

with a style minimalist, full of small details.

" 1

" It is presented as an allegation against drugs originally written by Phillip K. Dick. Bored and

quite unnecessary.

A priori this film draws attention for its, say, novel animation system (although one Ralph

Bakshi would have a lot to say about this), based first to film the film normally with real actors

and then pass a few photoshop filters to each frame so that it looks like a kind

of cartoon. Personally I understand that this technique, in the film, only serves to disguise a

special effect apparently important in the plot, which is the use of a suit that blurs theappearance

externalof the characters who want to go unnoticed. This effect would sing a lot if the movie was

photographed normally and with this animation the movie is also with an air of

ohh-what-cool-what Diferentes-different-we are.The movie is presented as an allegation against drugs originally written

by Phillip K. Dick, who at the end lists the names of his friends killed or seriously injured by the

abuse of drugs. An incredibly long list, by the way. Seen that way the movie is understood a little more,

but that does not save it from being boring and quite unnecessary.

" 0

" A horror movie with all the prints of the album of stickers of the horror films ... Even so:

visible, passably entertaining, very well done, fantastic photographed ...

I The poet's criticism An abandoned house, doors creaking, dolls with a perversely trapped eye,

rotten woods, mist in the woods , ghosts of the past, the implacable destiny that returns to collect its

debt, dark corridors that amplify the breath of evil, have you ever been to Disneyland? II

The criticism of the cin���filo not excessively PleasedCompetent in its purely technical facet, simple in its

plot proposal and, above all, very richly photographed, The abandoned ones could have been the

horror film of the year or the ���cula of terror of this century. At least, made in Spain, although the credits overwhelm us

with Czech names, B���lgars, Russians and possibly even Ukrainians. The one who runs iscompatriot

our, but we are not here to raise the flag and sing with the hand folded on the chest the benefits

of national products. For that we have programs on television that still cling to

the nostalgic sensibility and emit pesti���os of Cifesa and vacuous melodramas of folklore in love with gigol�� � from the Riviera,

but maybe I'm getting away from it. It was for the country: The abandoned seems something else, a foreigninvention

or foreign. ��� Good or bad? Susto da: gooseflesh crosses the dark corridors and there are even

shrieks in the room. Who gives more? Then there is the strictly cinematographic component: ah��� Cerd��� fulfills,

but we are not aware that we are witnessing something new. Clichés, clichés again rethought, clichés

sifted by the funnel of talent, but clichés at the end. III The criticism of the genre aficionadoWhat does not

need a booklet of di���logos to the Ivory: Cerd��� needs few elements to create insane atmosphere and give

the respectable a High quality tape that will not disappoint the real genre lover. Fed up as

we are with American pastiches where the flavored gore or the gore decidedly crushed by the

tweeter membrane of a loudspeaker at a Linkin Park concert. The abandoned is an exceptional

demonstration of narrative bravery: the two protagonists, who shine at an extreme height, cover almost all the

meters of bovine. The ghosts, the inevitable, do not abuse framing and there are (fortunately) children,

although the spirit of two of them (do not eviscerate anything) swarm through the rickety furniture of the house, which

is a protagonist more. It is not a masterpiece like The shining of my beloved Kubrick (allow me the Anglophile detail

: today I have been remembering my summers of Guinness type and dramaturgy), but it makes me think that

this author we will be happy in the future with more daring works, with real milestones in the bibliography of the horror

genre.IV The criticism of the recalcitrant cin���filoCaso that the photographer of this infumabletracheotomy

neuronalhad caught a double lung three days before starting to record, we would have a dispensable

concatenation of scares that do not lead anywhere. As the man came to work, we have a

charming mess, one of those movies that we take from the video store and we call some friends to reduce stress and to

discard to taste a few liters of malt and lipos with panchitos and non-stop chips. We have left the

usual scenographic frame: now we are not in Kentucky or in Wichita Falls, the deep America so delighted

with herself and with her cache of capitalist ghosts. The foreign director has looked for an idyllic

Ukrainian forest oh���ngara ob���lgara. I do not know, and I do not care for the least. My brain feeds on

other vitamins: these are left for teenagers with acne in the lack of scruples and a brain still to

be regulated. Only three young women with a good breast size (silicone, do not believe) would have been missing to make the

yawns of the spectators-macho and (modern times) some convinced and proud of their inclination..n

SexualI'm taking Nosferatu de Murnau right now and I'm healing my wounds. Do not scream. I can not stand the neighbors and

these outbursts of cantankerous critic. V The Critic CriticMu���ecas old that mean memories, atruck driver

crazywho has not read Panero, a house that the good fetishists of the Hammer, something more than a

hundred minutes of kangaroos jumping on the belly of a broker of feelings. VI The critic of the never has written

a critique This is an American that arrives in Moscow , it seems to me that it is Moscow to collect an inheritance that turns out to

be a country house or forest house in which then terrible things happen and in the end you meet a

family member you did not know. The two, before it ends, are going through hardships and more troubles until finally they

stop struggling because they are loaded. At the end of the projection, I left the cinema with my softest noble parts

completely shrunk and with the feeling that when I wanted to spoil the afternoon some

undesirable I would have no qualms about recommending this film, which has impact scenes. ��� It says so,

no? VII The critic of the fierce merengueFour goals has got him Real Madrid to Spanish tonight and that

the Spanish has gotten three. Three goals from the Pandiani Rifle, but my Madrid does not shy away and knows how to get up from the

ground no matter how low it may seem. It's just that tomorrow the locals are going to knock and then there we are, dear

fan, on the way to another League. And that is already given when we were in November. Before football I saw

The abandoned. David Beckham and Roberto Carlos do not come out, but if one of them did a piece of paper

because I prefer the Brazilian defender, who gives more impression in a dark corridor. Ah, if youfrom a horror movie, it

take away the music's as if Bernab���u is taking away the grass.

" 0

" Manipulator, didactic, solemn at times and obviously necessary. Oppressive in many moments, with

sustained rhythm and excellent performances led by Bruno Ganz.

Oliver Hirschbiegel (The Experiment), was finally responsible for one of the hardest and most realistic works

that were made in the movies about the Second World War, in addition to a German mea culpa that arrives with many

years of delay. In light of the successful list of Schindler and the best The Pianist, although both would be light

in comparison. This does not mean that the sinking meets all expectations -and less

the policies- but the world's and the rules of the cinema. The last days of the great dictator are approached with

crudeness and didacticism - it is not a theme or an easy film to make - based on the book by the historian Joachim

Fest (Der Untergang) and mainly in the memoirs of Hitler's secretary, Traudl Junge. Let's start by

making clear some of the criticisms that were made to the film, one of the most criticized and praised of that

year. This film never becomes condescending or mythifying of the figure of the Fuhrer. It is true that he

shows affection for his secretary or kisses with his dog, but he does not focus on it at all. It's more, at

ten minutes one already hates it. His paranoia, his lack of tact, his delusions of greatness and

murderous behavior prevail. Nor is it claustrophobic despite everything happening in Berlin's underground bunker,

where Hitler spent his last days but only apparently. The streets of the city and the

vicissitudes of the people are shown, with a child and a German medical soldier - Professor Schenck - as examples of civics,

and also for to achieve some empathy with the spectator. It is true that nothing is shown of thecamps

concentration, but it is another story that is told here. It is the Germans themselves who are exterminated

by the Red Army, without ceasing to be the "bad guys" of history. The sinking is also manipulative,

didactic, solemn at times and obviously necessary. Oppressive in many moments, with sustained rhythm and

excellent performances led by Bruno Ganz, a realist and therefore delirious Hitler. His hunched back,

his advanced Parkinson's, his lost gaze are part of a whole that astonishes. It undresses us (without overacting)

the decadence of the greatest world's nightmare in its just point of cruelty, that even defeated, wants to

drag along with as many people as possible. "" I do not have them. Othima. We do not force them. They voted for us and theyus

gavea mandate. And now they're paying for it, "he says in a moment of fury. Speechless. Themistake

director'sis to gloat over some executions with strong images - like that of Goebbels' children - and not to

show his own with his wife, with a saving ellipsis. Error that made to lose part of the

possibility of questioning their own black history but that does not affect the outcome of the film.

" 1

" Direct to the DVD. There are no more. And there will sweep. Disney has these fusses of destiny, its filin to

continue the legend.

Walt Disney needs to green his prestige, lost (in part) by the Pixar tricks (John Lasseter at

the head) and the Dreamworks factor (with Steven Spielberg at the controls). It's not going to be the tape that

regurgitates the fame escaped, but it gives an entertaining time (that's what it's about) and it will please those who attend the cinema

to enjoy with an hour and a half of honest evasion. Discovering the Robinsons is a-manual

selfhelpcamouflaged as an animated feature film. As if Paulo Coelho (that juggler of thesolucionarios

sentimental, that imposing guru who sells coconut biscuits his records for the needy) would have

put his finger on the gui��� and contributed his very particular vision of the sentimentality humana.Gusta (and a lot)

by parts: it is very successful and is seen with greedy delectation at first, when the knot ofis raised

the plot, that is, the ni��� Or who wants a family and ends up in the future discovering the Robinsons,

an eccentric, convulsed, overestimated family of stereo steroids or, if you like, simply

written, crazy about tying. The film is seen without displeasure, it does not tire, it produces (everything is said) a certain sensation of

deja vu, as if we had already seen it in other films of adults , but here the Disney puts hisvision

correctof the family, which is what has always given him the rooms, and produces a correct film, without more, that will

not happen. to the history of the signature and not to the memory of the spectator. Children included. In addition, ending,

everything is very convoluted, it thickens. Time, stern judge, will place it in its place, in its shelves ofproducts.

rentalEasy neighborhood videoclub in those cloying afternoons of heat that are already beginning the summer.

" 0

" The cinema is something very physical ... the cinema is Sam Peckimpah, not Andy Warhol ... the cinema is to be seen. The

cheesy metaphors and video creations leave them aside.

I'm not really very objective when talking about someone like Lars Von Trier. Personally I think one of the most

outstanding filmmakers in the history of cinema. I think he makes a cinema so stupid that you do not even have toattention to

pay anyhim. Not even bad. "" Dogville "" do not know what goes. It is the bullshit raised to the hub of

pretentiousness. It is the foolishness of a kind of video art that believes God. From the beginning one realizes

. This girl comes to this town of abnormal pa to hide from gangsters. There, they fuck her. Ready. The

town is to feed him separately. Esque the thing that there is nothing at all and I have to imagine it

seems an insult to the viewer. Making us believe that it is an artistic resource for us to look at the

actors, that it has been done so that it is like a book (that we imagine it to be) buah) and that it is a metaphor

about the world Modern and blah blah blah. Please. let's be serious The movie can not be any worse even if it

tried. Nicole is not a saint of my devotion and here she demonstrates her coldness like the putative Grace. I did not know at

any time what was happening, and I get nervous every time I see someone manipulate something. nonexistent. When

I see those polladas painted on the floor for no reason but to save pasta to give it to the Kidman. I

do not remember any good movie of Von Trier. only an argument that was curious ... the one of "" Epidemic "" .. whichthen

isa tost���n.Lars Von Trier also made a second part that I refused to see, among other things because He

actually killed a burrito during filming. Like Almodovar when he did "" Talk to her ""

(another mess). Von Trier replaces actress claiming that "" she wants a different Grace in each part of the trilogy "",

because in addition esque is a trilogy! Cinema is something very physical. the cinema is Sam Peckimpah, not Andy Warhol ... the

cinema is to be seen. The cheesy metaphors and video creations leave them aside. I'm not saying that this isvideo

acreation. what I say esque is not cinema. It is another thing. "" Dogville "" rejects the cinema. the cinema has been

defined for a long time, and if we reduce the cinema to its minimum essence we find two veryelements

simple, TIME and SPACE. Everything comes from there. You play with those two elements. It's the only thing that is. And "" Dogville ""

rejects them both to give a propagandistic speech, a thousand times overheard and bored. The cinema before

anything, before giving lessons or have moral cavities or move or excite. It has to not bore you. Then say

what you want, but follow the rules. "" Dogville "" does not do anything.

" 0

" The movie is slow, soporific and pretentious. Poor Juan Jos��� carries on his back the weight of a

failed film that, however, in other hands, could have been a great movie.

Bodrio Danger stamp film where people talk about love, a mother, a girl, a memory'm going to try to

. Ibe brief. Jaime Marques Olarreaga directs this stinking film with so little talent that I think that if my little brother

had taken charge of the direction, the result would at least be bearable. The movie is slow,

drowsy ���fera and pretentious. Poor Juan Jos��� carries on his back the weight of a failed film that,

however, in other hands, could have been a great movie. Gui���n lacks chicha, but all that is

argument I think it has tir���n. The objective to achieve is that the spectator gets excited in such a way that he leaves

the cinema wanting to steal purses pq all the world that the director creates has overwhelmed him. However, what you

want is to end the visual torture as soon as possible. I say that it is pretentious because Jaime Marqu���s tries to

use a pseudo-poetic language through his images that he does not get, what results is a tedious,rhythm

slow. Reviewing the direction of actors, I must say that they are all fatal, and when that happens it is thefault

director's, so from here I recommend Jaime an intensive course in Argentina coaching with Augusto

Fernandes (not Fernandez), because it is already difficult that Juan Jos��� is lazy in interpretation.Valverde that

MarMaI loved in the Borgia, here also clicks and is that this girl, when it comes to sequences, slow, rhythms

cadenced and intentions pulling the dramatic, always puts the same face, and of course, tires. Oh! Mar���a Mar���a

that you see the plume with the Juanjo, the girl trembled and was not interpreted XD. Come on, I would also tremble

before the irreverent Juan jos��� dust Ballesta. I liked the BSO and Juan Jos��� (id���lico until schizophrenia) ,

the trash demotes.

" 0

"Another film by Miyazaki that is essential for the little ones to see if they can avoid

the inevitable, the years have not stolen a single ��� pice of validity.

There are films that have a life outside of their own projection that gives almost for another film. for example,

this is based on a comic seven deliveries He did the master many years ago, and they managed to convince him

to take it to the cinema, only the first two volumes, he came to Spain and the legion of ���censores? ���

shorten its duration, cutting the most ecologist part.Not happy with that, they decided to give the subject touch-ups,

like changing the name of the protagonist by calling her Sandra instead of Nausica� Por. By the way, to see it in its entirety,

in Japanese (yes, subtitled). The film is about a girl who travels in a plane It is driven by a motor and

goes into a strange forest.Toxic clouds and insects like jabalies roam at their widest, where they

find a kind of molt of an insect like a house and take the c��. Go home. After a while he discovers the owner

of it and manages to converse with him. Later on she goes to the village, we discover that she is a princess and that the world

is cursed by the guilt of those of always, the human beings. It looks like she has years of tape and this genius

He spoke in modern terms such as ecology and respect for nature. Through this recording it shows

the worst of the human race and in a crude way shows us what the planet can lead to. While this

goes to hell because of our fault, we continue to fight everything with force. The animation is correct,

especially taking into account that the recording is of the 70. And the argument very interesting, although very hard, with

dramatic overtones, although seen with tenderness and optimism. Maybe even too much. Resuming, another film by

Miyazaki is essential for the younger ones to see if they can avoid the inevitable. The

years have not stolen a hint of validity.

" 1

" A lot of criticism of American cinema, but while here stupid movies are made there we have movies

like this one

Who is the bad guy in the movie? Or maybe you have not seen it yet. So, do not pay attention tocritics

filmwho will talk to you about the rhythm, the performance of the characters, and other themes, which, since it's not amovie

minor Iranian, they will not be reduced to praise. They are Hollywood actors, famous, handsome and they sell many

tickets. But they have had the courage to accept a script against their own country (so, clearly, the film

hits hard at the USA and its government) without being a crime. Michael Moore's movie, that's cool, it's cool, and

European critics praise it, when it's not more than canned demagogy, but changing the political sign ,

although it is still demagoguery cheap and with little style made in USA. A film, almost documentary, where the

excuse of the life of an arms dealer, is the bait to catch us and that we continue listening to a true

summary of atrocities and depredations that have crossed our planet these thirty ���os, without ushim

paying attention to, something that incidentally, the film tells us too. It may not be a wonder, and do not stop

thirty minutes to explain in detail why child trauma the character detests strawberry ice cream,

but for that you already have those movies that your film critic would recommend. here you are going to attend a

history and politics class, when you thought you were going to see a movie. A detail. In all the written andtrash

filmedthat surrounds us, the phrase: based on real events, appears at the beginning, to get an effect on

the viewer. In this case, it comes at the end. You thought this was the exaggerations of some writers. Well

no, boy, welcome to the real world, and no little red pill. To criticize the American cinema, but while

stupid movies are being made here to launder money, on the other side of the ocean we have ���culas like Syriana

or The Lord of War, which may not be artistic wonders, but that tell us stories about whatis like

our world, without giving us a moral judgment, without telling us who is the bad, they simply show us the reality,

so that each one decides for himself, as long as he does not need a mental child, of course, because if not,

better to turn to Moore or Bush, depending on your political creed. Who is the bad guy in the movie? If you have not seen,

you think that the protagonist, or the evil African dictator, and better not read until you see it. If you have

seen them, you may think the same, or you may agree with me. The bad guy is the trafficker's wife.

The one that does not ask, does not look, does not question, to be able to live in an detico on Fifth Avenue, with a high

life train, etc., etc. But she is outraged when they put it in front of her nose, and she remains naked,

refusing to put on her clothes paid for by blood, but even with all the evidence in front of her, she does not denounce the

arms traffic, but rather she is followed by the security forces, and abandons her husband when he is

imprisoned, not before. That character, they are almost all in our society. As for the film. The best is the

thoughts of Yuri Orlov, the arms dealer, played by Nicholas Cage, who accompany us andus

guide, or his di conlogos with the character of Ethan Hawke, the police That's what he's after, akind of politics

real. But also the moments of black humor, very black, almost sÃ © dico, that appear during the film.

Publicized as almost a comedy, when a black child, in the middle of the Liberian night, asks Orlov if

his amputated arm will grow back, or many other scenes like that, the clueless people who waited see a

Rambo movie (also quoted, XD) I do not think they laugh a lot. In summary: The best to understand our world, unless

you like to read, then you have a lots of books that tell you what's happening in the world, and from those who

drink this movie (for example, Bloody Diamonds by Greg Campbell, to name one). Even so, a

quick and entertaining way to inform you about all this.

" 1

" This movie with mystery movie pretensions is the worst thing that has happened to my

DVD player ...

This film of distribution of bells with pretensions of pel��� mystery (JA!), is the worst thing that has

happened to my DVD player. without grace, without a defined plot line, with eight thousand open plots, with

flat characters, stupid, incoherent, with poor themes, with blatant and uncomfortable publicity, with Nonsensical

dialogue lines, with Rossy de Palma. is that it can not be worse! The only thing that can be saved is, without a doubt, Milo

O'Brannigan, the character played by Stephen Rea, a well-known photographer, cabrÃn, without scruples ,blooded

cold-, screwed, but with more reason than a saint. When appearing on stage brings a certain interest, a

certain curiosity, go, entertain, because the rest of the film, not even that.

" 0

" I did not like the movie of the month nor the boredom of the year. Let's give him a pass. I have not read the book, starting from there. That's why I miss something basic to see this film, and is to

see if the director, Tom Tykwer, with the screenwriter adapter, of course, has managed to capture the essence of the

novel, or at least He has approached diligently. It is already well known that when we read a book our

imagination flows until we create our own film, that is why it is very difficult for another to destroy that

charm. At least I will tell you in what � This film has screwed up, because the comparisons are going to make their

readers. The main fault is SILENCE. Ojito, it's not like I'm getting the movies where hepats without

constantlymeaning, although Kevin Smith's verbiage is one of my favorites. It has simply been tried to

transfer to the screen the hundreds of detailed descriptions, meticulous and convoluted that will surely

cover the book, and that translates into images, images that have no meaning. logo and when there are no dialogues because

there can not be any, things start to get tedious. Of course I prefer it to a Michael Bay guide,

but as a regular reader I realize where I am being held. Each time the protagonist intends to

perpetrate some of his crimes, you assure about ten minutes in total silence, and you are supremelyknow

fucked tothat in that silence the book's height is detailing with an impressive wealth the smells, sensations,

sorrows and desires of the protagonist. That's not co \*\* to put on the screen unless it's with a voice-

over, and we already know that it can be worse than silence. You know something about the story. Jean Baptiste Grenouille,

born without any body odor, has a gift: to distinguish all the smells of this world. That gift will in

turn be the curse of the obsessive search for the perfect essence. If you have to assess the work, first, of the

director Tom Tykwer, I have no objections. The director has done his best for the story and that is to

give it a picture and a way to handle the camera that bring you in a brilliant way, ashas been

that scenenarrated in the book , so you can guess that it has faithfully captured the environment that requires

adaptation. Maybe what I appreciate the most is that it's a killer movie and you can barely see a drop of

blood. The director has not needed it and that seems to me quite an achievement, given the current addiction in the cinema to

the red blood cells. The leading actor, Tom Wishaw, has found the dif�� Easy ballot to try to

convey the world in which Grenouille moves, and at least his eyes do a good job. I think he is an

obsessive, because he acts throughout the film as such, and is far above the other actors in the film,

since Dustin Hoffman does not embroider his best role precisely, and Alan Rickman does not have lines to

show off either. The question would be if for those who read the book Jean Baptiste has been the killer they expected. I

can not say, I hope that you can give light to this topic. I have a friend (that ricky) who says that there are

books that are scripts and others that are literature. "" The Da Vinci Code "" is a script. Any of Grisham is a

wink. "" The perfume "" I suppose it is of the second, because I know that I have omitted dozens of pages of the book,

and that gives me a lot of courage. For the rest, I have not found the film of the month nor the mess of the year.

Let's give him an approved.

" 0

" Poetic mixture of perverse c ymic and modern fairytale, black film and romantic pastiche. 13 rue

del barnabe led to the cinema by David Lynch

���pera prima by Jean-Pierre Jeunet, later recognized for other works with more media impact (Amelie), butscope

lower cinematographic, Delicatessen is a love story between can���bales. The

playfulness, almost na���f, of the film in its delirious titles of credits is already noticed. Then the story is already classic in the

recent European cinema, so film-ridden of this film (here we have Guillermo Fesser who billed The

miracle of P. Tinto and the adventures of Mortadelo and Filem���na trailer of this founding Delicatessen). There has

been a kind of nuclear cataclysm or something similar and we are outside Par���s. Abuilding stands

filthyin which lives a curious and spoiled community. The butcher who runs the business of the basses

is killing them and gives for chicken or cow what is still human flesh. Everyone agrees to the dismemberment because

there is a need to eat and no one believes that it will touch him in disgrace to be next. The arrival at the building of a

circus artist in search of his boss disrupts the routine and forces all tenants to rethink thechain

trafficking. The artist falls in love with the butcher's daughter, who represents the exact opposite of his father,

partly because he is a vegetarian. I do not reveal anything relevant with this slight synopsis (not being a friend to write

never details of the argument because it was not the site is not mine or I destripar what should not be known), but

evidenced the surrealistic narrative machinery of Jeunet.The comicity of the film is based on thick strokes

of humor as coarse as effective. The baroque of the scenes (which is, by far, the fundamental attraction of

the film) fascinates us so much that we are for a few days (and with all the films in those days). We

can see) infected with the plastic extravagances of a genuine and perverse artist, who knows if he was a

reader of some French edition of 13 Rue del Percebe of our Immortal Ib������ez. The building craves,

eaten by the haze, gothic castle populated by ghosts. Es Or is it that its inhabitants are not really? The

truculence of their proposal is lightened by the love story and the clown's humanity, but it is much more

expressionist, the distortion of light, a certain hypnotic ability to reconcile reality and fantasy, logic and

disorder in a handful of excellent images. Jeunet leapt to the US to shoot an Alien: the prodigies were

in France. The author did not return: he could not write his particular symbolic imaginary. Here it explodes in each corner

of the house, in the gestures of all the characters. Delicatessen is apocalyptic, eschatological cinema, beautiful in its

rust, political mixture of perverse c ymic and modern fairy tale, black film and romantic pastiche.La I

saw it in its premiere, in the big room, and I was fascinated. The review, on the television screen, generous, but scarce

always, did not disappoint me almost twenty years later. I have appreciated more the lavish and delicious music (

performed by unexpected objects such as saws or grinding springs) and I have been able to slow down the action's

vulture, look behind me. I'm stopping the reproduction when I felt like it. Home theater privileges, says a

friend. Jeunet and Caro, his other sidekick in these games, separated shortly after. If there is a fantastic

film, in the most legitimate and linguistic use of this adjective, it is Delicatessen. If you have not seen it,

b���squenla. Do what you can to sit two hours and let yourself be contaminated by this wonderful madness. The film

ends with an unbeatable visual apotheosis: the building, contaminated by the ridiculous and tragic epic of its

tenants, comes down. Addendum: the exquisite photography of the film is the work of Darius Khondji, who would later

work with David Fincher in the unsettling Se7en. Addendum 2: When an old woman dies, her daughter grieves for not

being able to say goodbye to her. The husband, famÃlico, resolves saying that still it is time.

" 1

" I do not say it's a bad movie but it's that you sell one thing and then it's another, and of course you're

disappointed. In spite of everything the movie will entertain you and you will like it if you are twelve years old.

A child, that we could call the class linnet, befriends the new girl, that we could call

the one that goes of list, and together they will create a world m��� Gothic and fantasy where to flee from their daily problems, a

world inhabited by trolls, giants, tiny flying soldiers and other creatures, and where they are the

masters of everything and reign in harmony. To access this world they have to go over the river with arope

hanging, once there they will live great adventures and fight against the dark Lord. And of course, you see this

synopsis, you see the trailer, and you read that it is from the producers of Las Cr���nicas de Narnia, and what are you waiting for? Well,

a film full of adventures, persecutions, fantastic beings and, in short, many special effects.

But the reality is rather different, and that is that A Bridge Towards Terabithia is more about the problems of two

unpopular children in school and the friendship that lies between them for me. Later, the film that seems

to be heading towards some adventure, ends up becoming a dramatic hit with a tragedy in its

final stretch and whose consequences will lengthen until the end of the film. Special request requires the father of the

boy played by Robert Patrick, an actor that I see more and more relegated to minor roles and minor

. A pity because a decade ago was an actor who promised a lot. I do not say it's a bad movie

but you sell one thing and then another, and of course you disappoints In spite of everything the movie willyou

have fun toand you will like it if you are twelve years old, if not the most probable thing is that it gets to bore you a bit like it was my

case .

" 0

" I predict what your poster could never predict, much Cruise, much Streep, much Redford, but a

short career in the Spanish cinemas.

Lions for Lambs is one of those disappointments that come from afar. Maybe the irregularity of Tom

Cruise when it comes to choosing the political roles and diatribes of Redfort that lately is not very

successful and when he puts himself behind the Camera is petulant and doctrinal until it is tedious and

sopor���fero.Varias things do not finish in the tape. The first is the error of structuring it in segments

to address the political pamphlet: a teacher trying to take his students on the right track, soldiers

in full military operation and a senator trying to sell the success of a military political strategy to the

press. Does not fit. It is well orchestrated but it has a Hollywoodian whiff that subtracts from the proposal that

is far from being a credible speech. Now it is fashionable to say that war is bad. There are many ways to

do it, in this film they have not risked and they have done it from all points of view, you see the war, theyyou

tellabout the war and they even justify the war but in the end the European spectator does not take the bait

of a pretty mediocre bet if we compare it with the rest of the anti-war doctrinal films of

the last times. In fact, with this premise, I predict what your poster could never predict, much Cruise,

much Streep, a lot of Redford, but a short career in the Spanish cinemas. Political cinema? No,cinema

desktop.

" 0

" Matters the truculence of blood and the portrait with brushstrokes of the filthy Spain of the time that

a real interest in demonstrating the depth of some characters with appo ���a.

Perhaps it lacks the necessary perspective to understand the reasons that make the most expensiveof

filmour cinema, at heart, one of the most disappointing. I do not deny his ambition. Nor the bombast of its

iconographic offer. The film fits in well, although once the image has deposited its residue in our

retina, the story that counts flaws, twists, lists its fundamental narrative to fraudulent courses,

where the truculence of the blood and the portrait with brushstrokes of the filthy Spain of the time that

a real interest in demonstrating the depth of some characters with name. There is an excess of dwarves. The

Vel dezquez and those who, in the gui���n, did not see that this majestic effort (25 million euros, say) leads

the viewer to very different sensations, but all confluent in the fiasco. One has the impression that one

has attended a pinacoteca in which the dwarves, the swordsmen, Quevedo and the valid ones of Spain speak.

It's good that Diego Alatriste speaks little because he does not understand that whisper as of borrach���n with asthma

that drags during the sparse parliament that allow him. Do not skimp D���az Yanes historical knowledge and put

the emphasis here where until now the historical cinema only deposited common places, typical of follet���n.

It was lacking that, on top of the face and with post-theater acting garrison, the film would smash it into the framework of

History, thus, with capital letters. In short ... That the euros that we are charged pay them at ease because we are so

educated and we are moved by the stories of brave men who defend Spain with sweat and smell of gold in

their hands . That Coppola also painted, like Velzquez, his particular Flanders in the Mekong and no one has thrown

the stuff at his head.��� Apocalypse now versus Alatriste? Both treat the same misery: the interference of

man in the affairs of other men, which is the simplified argument of the War. If the kind reader has

any kind criticism about Alatriste to take into account, take it. Go to the movies. Listen to the little voice of

Viggo Mortenssen. And when you get home, take out your "Platoon" movie collection. Oliver Stone, before

selling himself to such confusing ideals.

" 0

" Shocking, dazzling, imposing ... 300 is of an indisputable technical quality and acommercial product

perfect, as entertaining as it is impressive. A little more can be asked of a film.

I was very happy to hear that a film about the battle of the Term���pilas was being shot. I

feared the worst, honestly. He thought that not only history would be invented but also antost���n

unbearable. In part he was right, because he has been very little faithful to the historical facts, but, on the other hand, it

has been entertaining. In addition, we must not forget that it is about the adaptation of a film, not a

film that takes contemporary texts as a direct source. Battle.300 is a formidable movie in

almost every way. Visually it is a prodigious work, this consideration is not reduced even

taking into account the (ab) use that has been made of the slow camera, because this becomes an essential part of the

whole photographic to the extent that it allows us to highlight a specific image that would otherwise go

unnoticed, deserving to be appreciated either for its beauty, or for its transcendent plot. The plot

has a rhythm so that at no time does he allow the viewer to rest, forcing him to remain in tension

throughout the entire film, without giving room for boredom, contrary to what, unfortunately, often

occurs in films of this nature.300 is a tribute to the Spartan values, reflecting them, as well as

customs (exhaustive selection of the race, considering quite egalitarian of women, etc.), luckily,

more faithfully than what I expected. The Spartans have always seemed to me an exemplary people. I have them in a way

quite different from those who call them savages. ���But if even Plat���n praised

the Spartan values ​​and compared them, plaintively and regretfully, with those of that Athens self-destructed by its

decadent democracy! The courage, the surrender and the self-esteem of the Spartans contrasted full with the values

promulgated by Xerxes, king of the Persians. It is totally true the slave treatment that Persian commanders

exercised over their soldiers, contrary to the equal treatment that the Spartans exercised, for what I

consider insulting in that sense the protests arrived from the Pr��� ximo Oriente. Also, what will

an irak��� or an Iranian have to do with a Persian? What will the fanatic monotheism have to do with the Persian polite���smo? What

will a prosperous, conquering and flourishing people have to do with one that sums up in misery due

mainly to their internal wars? Anyway. it is as if we tried to compare (as it has been claimed by

some sectors) the Spartans with the Americans. Sometimes, comparisons, more than

odious, are completely ridiculous. Returning again to strictly cinematographic terms, signaling the

atmosphere. Photographic sphere, clearly inspired by that of the c���mic; to those of you who have read it, surely

this appreciation has not gone unnoticed. The tones, the lights, the photographic set in itself, even therhythm

narrativeand the scenes of the city of Sparta interspersed simultaneously with the main action, all evokes

some In short, 300 is of anquality

indisputable technicaland a perfect commercial product, as entertaining as it is shocking. A little more can be asked

of a film.

" 1

" A good movie, frankly funny, given that the different genres that come together in the film do it

easily, without cracks of any kind, with an achieved rhythm of comedy, so it becomes enjoyable from

beginning to end.

"" A not very awakened student is persuaded by the ghost of his twin brother, to take his place

as a showman of a nightclub and avenge his death. "" Appreciable film, which is perhaps one of the three

best interpretations in Danny Kaye's cinema, which for many will not be much to say since it is, according toaccusation

the popular"of a supposedly comical actor that falls worse than a toothache. " It is, I think, a

good movie, frankly funny, given that the different genres that come together in the film do it

easily, without cracks of any kind, with a got rhythm of comedy, so it becomes enjoyable from

beginning to end. This is always really difficult to achieve, so it has a lot of merit. The movie was a

huge public success and seen many years later it is not strange. The truth is that they like it a lot, despite

Kaye, although a lot of money has to be given to the beautiful and always good actress Virgnia Mayo. The rest of thecast

interpretiveis also not turkey moque. I recommend it to have a good time.

" 1

"The secret life of the emperor penguin, let yourself be carried away by the story, that although the ending is a bit

incredible, it makes a dent in our hearts ...

Since I was little I felt a kind of special fascination towards the penguins, I do not know how to explain it,

I have always seen them so nice, elegant and simple animals that I fell in love from my earliest

childhood , it is easy to have more than a dozen penguins of all sizes and colors at home, as well as

the most diverse materials, the reason Porn why I did not see the film before I did not, but several events

were delaying my viewing, until now, that taking advantage of its release on DVD I have done it. The tape, a

prodigy of 3D animation that gives an almost reallooking animals, received at the gala this

year'sOscar for best pel cula animated highlights on its soundtrack the songs sung by the actors that put

voice in VO from Brittany Murphy (who does really well), Elijah Wood, Robin Williams, Hugh Jackman and

Nicole Kidman, this Last time we heard her sing in "" Moulin Rouge "" by Baz Luhrmann, a film that I

love. Polar landscapes, almost realistic (Attention to the scene of the penguins walking through the blizzard),

and a very pronounced ecological language, and that is, my dear readers, man is the greatest predator

of the earth and like Attila's horse, where we put our feet, the grass never grows again. andubbing

excellent, despite the presence in different characters of the insufferable Carlos Latre, we have a film that

will dazzle us in every way and that is that the creation of all media (both water, snow, ice,

etc.) is one of the most successful, and I ask for forgiveness for repeating myself. you are attracted by the musicals focused on thenumbers

musicalof the film as well as in their colorful choreographies, traced for the film of real actors,

but you like them, let yourself be carried away by the story, that although the end is a little incredible makes a dent in our

little hearts.

" 1

" Transformers demonstrates that the mood of our societies has changed: from political incorrectness or

irony without blood we have passed to an audiovisual conservatism that is better Realistic in the staging

of the action, it soon becomes an empty spectacle that drowns the emotion for the benefit of the box office.

I take advantage of the appearance - not enough but always necessary in summer - of the refreshingattraction

audiovisualof that fireworks vendor that is Michael Bay (The Rock, The Island, even theare his

Pearl Harbor infumablesand Armageddon) to remember (maybe this is the only thing that makes the public go deeper into

years and movies engulfed to support the 144 minutes of this circus inconsequential and only in isolated scenes

bearable) the trajectory of an entertainment teacher like Joe Dante, whose mastery to make

fun and innocent films still leaves a mark on those we had the luck of being teenagers there

by the eighties. Transformers is good only when it smells like Dante, when its robots remind us of the naive irony

and the pranks of the Gremlins, or the heroism without dead of Little warriors. And the initiation to the first

love through the most crazy and incredible adventure has echoes of the prodigious chip and especially of Gremlins.

The scene in which the protagonist must go to his house to recover the glasses is pure Dante. The forced verbiage

of robots that look more like pets than the saviors of the free world is pure Dante (although in this

film is all its freshness neglected by a gui��� and a rhythm without the naturalness child of the teacher). In

Transformers the exaggeration of some prodigious (and maybe the best) FX dilutes the freshness and disperses the attention

on the typical adolescent that with Dante it worked and even arrived totries to attract

thrill.Transformerswith cars (what disappointment the conversion of the ramshackle and humanized second-hand car in a dazzling

Chevrolet Camaro) and girl who takes your breath away and other things (Megan Fox she is as tasty in her kinetic as she is

insipid in her interpretation) to the young public, who will soon feel identified with the protagonist, a

smart boy , with a sense of humor but with two candles. However magic Dante is what he has; everything

transforms through adventure and soon the young man in search of his identity will find it trying to save

the world? (Even in this Transformers is diluted in an Armageddon 2). With Dante nobody wants to save the world; the

adventure is enough. The eighties optimism of the Dante brand knew that, as inIndian movies

Spielberg's(by the way, co-producer of the film), while the character runs, jumps, flee, kiss and rescue the

emotion. It is not insured. The rest is enough, even digital FX. That's why the character of Martin Short in the

final scene of The prodigious chip does not return to his old life, but runs after another mission that makes him

feel alive. Transformers steals his characters to a famous Japanese TV series that there by the eighties he was

furious and anticipated what today is a manga explosion that translates all the entertainment movies made in the USA

(including Tarantino). And it combines with timid accuracy the coldness of the machine with the anthropomorphic iron���a that

makes us accessible and exciting the adventure of the robots. Although in this I prefer the endearing rivalry

of the curmudgeon R2D2 and C3PO, even the innocent adolescent vitality of Johnny 5 in Short Circuit (John

Badham, 1986), the Sayonara baby of the insensitive Terminator, or the heroism of the entra�� �able Buzz Lightyear (Toy

Story, 1995). And it is that Transformers demonstrates that the mood of our societies has changed: ofincorrectness

political, irony without blood or nudity without condom of the eighties, we have gone on to anconservatism

audiovisualthat, although it is more realistic in the staging of the action, soon becomes an empty

spectacle that chokes the emotion for the benefit of the box office. The best: The scene in which the protagonist must go to

his house to recover the glasses. Without a doubt, Shia LaBeouf. An actor who, without doing much, transmits annaturalness and

incrediblecloseness. The most obvious meganic knowledge of Megan Fox. The realism ofeffects

CGI digital, a prodigy of technology, imagination and patienceThe scene of the child in the pool (very much like

Jackson's King Kong or Shyamalan's Water Girl). Maybe Transformers would have been a

terrific horror movie, maybe.

" 0

" This hour and a half of pure savagery deserves a couple of drinks accompanied by that friend who has

all the ballots to finish in Carabanchel.

I must begin by saying that giving an opinion of this film in the way that has been released in Spain is

quite difficult. The fudge that the Weinstein brothers and the distributor have committed in dividing in two a

product like? Grindhouse ?, which had its grace in going through a double horror program, has ended with the sense

that it had to attend a gore festival and viscera that Robert Rodriguez and Tarantino had prepared for their

fans. As always, the box office ends up being the main objective of everything, and with the collapse of

this invention in the American halls have thought of getting us the money to the Europeans. They are going to pay for it

in the future, that's for sure.?Planet Terror ?, as an independent film, is a B series product conceived from the

beginning to be like that, without further ado to go mutilating and exploding all his cast and end up passing

your hand in the face in case you splashed something. The story is so bad that it is made on purpose, the

performances are so bad that they are made on purpose. The special effects are so crude that they are made on

purpose and the blood is so false that it has been bought in bulk in a whole to a hundred. With all that, it is fun

for the most part, irreverent, and although it becomes heavy towards the middle, it ends in an apothetical end of parties,

everything very much like Rodriguez. At this point I do not know if I He liked it for being aand loin, but has

mess of tomall the ballots of being the most insufferable film of the summer for a good number of unsuspecting spectators

who do not know very well d� Where do they get and believe that they are going to see some living dead to Romero.Claro, the spark

of all was in interspersed with fake trailers and can compare with the later? Death Proof? of

Tarantino. We had to see it knowing that we are before the two most personal directors of the Yankee panorama: they

do what they want and how they want, and they can afford the licenses they want. With this rip-off in

two, the trailers are still there, but they seem stuck with shoehorn, and when the film ends you have that feeling

that? For this I see it cool at home ?. Planet Terror? recover that Robert Rodriguez from? Open to

Dawn? and that nothing had to do with the most careful aesthetics of? Sin City ?, but the intention of giving all

situations a point of absolute absurdity and an air of of bad footage of the 70 becomes vulgar when it

has been taken out of context, and really, the context was the three hours of? Grindhouse?. It is the second film of the

zombie genre that we find this Summer (previously,? 28 weeks later?), butmutant zombies

Rodriguez'shave nothing to do with the rest. Apart from shredding very quickly, the troper���as

committed by these are emetic, (attention to the scene of Tarantino in the elevator) and with that I think that many

people will approach �� � to the cinema to see it. In this story there is no moral or lesson to be learned in life, only one

dead man behind another. Some situations, as I said before, do not make sense, but they do not need it either

because everything is a tribute to the most recent movies that the exploitation gave us. of the 70. The style is that

of? Cleopatra Jones? and the bad ostia is that of Rodriguez. The actors have done what they had to do: let themselves be

killed. They are basically stereotypes that populate this premeditated carnage, since we have the bad cabr \*\*

(Josh Brolin), the military ca ^ \*\* (a spectacular Bruce Willis), the hero pimp of the story (Freddy

Rodriguez), the companion of the pimp (Naveen Andrews) and the girl stripper and cale \*\*\* that survives everything,

even to an amputation and its subsequent substitution for a submachine gun. Then there are the fools that are falling

like flies, including my hated Fergie, vocalist of? Black Eyed Peas? and view in? Poseidon ?. The script is a

calamity, so the lines of dialogue are taken from the compendium of more than repeated phrases. of the history

of cinema. It does not matter much either, because the important thing is not what they say, but what it takes to open their mouths

before they cut off some limb. To continue talking about the film would mean finishing thescenes

keyof the film and that give him his point, so I'll end up saying that? Planet Terror? It's a bad

gore movie made with desire to be bad. There's an absurd accident and a girl shooting her leg, do you think we

should take something like that seriously? The gore is abundant and everything is put into this tape, so if you do not like the

gore you will not go to see it because you would put it green, and you knew what it was. Ena in the jar. To this we must add all

the violence of which Rodriguez is a specialist mixed with sex (scene interruptus) and drugs. If you are

sitting in the chair and you started raising eyebrows and turning your eyes, what did you expect from this? Without

showing my preference towards a distillery? To another, this hour and a half of pure savagery deserves a couple

of drinks accompanied by that friend who has all the ballots to finish in Carabanchel.

" 0

" The praiseworthy good intentions of its authors are not supported by the power of a solid and

solvent film.

How to go to "" Brokeback mountain "" free of prejudice, with everything that has rained since the last

Ang Lee film, before, even presented (and triumphed) at the Venice Festival? What if gay cowboys , what

if the homosexual western, what if the affectionate cowboys, what if the Queer West, etc. Before going through the box office,

the truth, I was predisposed in favor of this film. First, because the western is mygenre

favorite film(next to the noir series, that's it) and, secondly, because in a world full of rude jokes

that spend their lives in the middle of the mountains, alone or in the company of cows and sheep, it is reasonable to think

that affections and desires are accentuated, confirmed and consumed in the heat of the bonfire , after drinking a

cup of steaming coffee under a clean and starry sky. The most acute and witty commentators have been

wondering all these weeks about what John Wayne would have said before the first western gay in the history of

cinema. But, well thought, what was missing in the relations between the great Wayne and, for example, Robert Mitchum and

James Caan in "" El Dorado "" to be considered gay? Except the carnal consumption, rather little. But let's stop

psychosexual issues and start talking about movies. And, truthfully, cinematographically speaking,

"Brokeback Mountain" is far from being a great film, although it is politically incorrect to sayStart

it.well. Presentation of characters and characters, presentation of the situation, beautiful images, aphotograph

spectacular, some dream landscapes, the appearance of desire, consummation. All right. It is not that the actors are

a prodigy of naturalness precisely, but the film is visible. After the return to civilization, the thing

continues to progress properly. An intolerant and repressive society, the doubts, the cowardice to accept with the

head and the acts what the heart and the g���nadas send, the marriage as a way of escape and normalization. ,N,

etc. However, from that point, Ang Lee begins to give so many turns to the same issue that the viewer

ends up dizzy and somewhat bored. As it happens in so many movies of these last ten to fifteen a�� �os, a

"" Brokeback mountain "" has plenty of footage. In ninety minutes, the classic hour and a half, the film could have

been round. Approach, knot and outcome, especially when the original narrative material from which the

script departs is a short story and not a novel of eight hundred pages. But no. Ang Lee has decided to recreate in the

(bad) luck of the protagonists and does not finish to end the story, that goes coiling on itself until

the boredom. Therefore, "" Brokeback mountain "" provokes m It's weariness that sets it apart in the viewer. The first

hour of footage, remarkable, is declining until enough remains scraped. The praiseworthy good

intentions of its authors, its committed, necessary and admirable speech in favor of a normalization and

public acceptance of homosexual relationships, unfortunately, is not supported by the power of a

solid and solvent film. Critics and members of the Hollywood Academy, that's it, seem

willing to continue to touch the morale of their unpresentable President, rewarding the story of gay cowboys,

but this does not come, not far, to the depth and majesty of the just Oscar "" M $ B "" of the past

year. The truth, having released a prodigy as "" Crash "" (precisely directed by the screenwriter of the

Clint Eastwood film), the rain of awards "" Brokeback Mountain "" seems excessive and unjustified

Let's hope that time puts everyone in their place.

" 0

" If you ask someone who has seen what you think, you will be sent to see it on DVD if you appreciate your friendship.

There is nothing worse in this vor���gine of mindless remakes. than trying to copy an unforgettable film for its

time. "" The Poseidon Adventure "" of 1972, and turn it into a palomitero product that even gets to

bore.Wolfgang Petersen will not repeat with "" Poseid���n "" the relative success "The perfect storm" taquillero. More

good is going to have to ask Warner Bros. for forgiveness for the millionaire losses that this film has caused.

160 million budget, 60 million collection. Why do I talk about fundraising? Because it is directly

proportional to the content of the movie. The other day on Antena 3 I think they put a telefilm-remake of the

original of the 72. They could issue this version of Petersen and you believe that it is also a telefilm. The situations

are so chewed that it's scary to ask how much your screenwriter has charged. No emotion,interpretations

less. From the beginning you know who smells like death, and above, the scene of the transatlantic overturn, apart

primordialof history, is millions of light years from the scene of the sinking of the Titanic, and that they are

separated by almost ten years. A waste. Kurt Russel has always been nice to me. Its culmination is in "" Blow in the

small China "". Here is a character that breaks the horns to reach the surface. Nothing

relevant. But it is that neither his companions do much. Richard Dreyfuss passable, Josh Lucas passable, Emmy

Rossum passable. All this set of mediocrity has led to poor collection, because if you ask

someone who has seen what you think, you will be sent to see it on DVD if you appreciate your friendship. Otherwise, and you

accidentally end up paying for the input of this sub-product, do an experiment. Finish seeing it and

���chale how long it has lasted. It will seem an eternity its hour and a half of duration.Perfecta to see at home with the

possibility of going to the bathroom, take pipes, and smoke a pair of cigarettes. Keep the money for the pirates, who have

two weeks left.

" 0

" Death of a President is a provocative and political film because of his approach, which hides a

profound criticism of the American ethics abroad and in the interior.

The fake documentary is a genre that until not so many years ago hardly existed, not to say directly that it

is a fairly recent creation. Nowadays, more and more directors are betting on this format, which

adapts perfectly to the stories of political and social denunciation, especially if this is the case. They are narrated with

drops of a corrosive and sentidocido sense of humor.Gabriel Range, renowned director of the BBC, is launched with a

story especially risky as it presents in a false documentary the murder of George W. Bush. Itnot

isnecessary to be any lynx to deduce that by such plot the British film-maker has received all type of

crÃticas from the United States. Despite this, Range does not at any time carry out an apologia for violence or

pretend to justify the acts of its supposed characters, but instead shows the terrible consequences

generated by hatred and violence. If the story that Range raises was true, we would be before one of the

documentaries of the year, but being fiction, the film is somewhat lame as it does not offer any Incentnincentive

extra(like the fake ads from the great CSA) to the viewer. The film focuses on the testimonies of the

different people involved, alleged file images and the various forensic evidence. Before such a flood

of information, which is known in advance that it is false, the film loses its interest and becomes

monotonous and boring. A President is a provocative and political film because of his approach, which

hides a deep criticism of American politics abroad and in the interior. However, and

despite hitting full in the format to tell this story Gabriel Range fails to carry it

out.

" 0

" Film about two snakes that chase a woman through history to become a

dragon, the one who kills her. Special effects from end to end, explosions, bugs on all sides,fights

impossible, etc. ��� Argument? What else?

Director: Hyung-rae ShimDuration: Short, and short. Na more than an hour and a half.Standing: March 1,

2008���You remember a table game many years ago that was called "" The Cobra Empire "" ? They were three heroes who

had to reach the island of the cobra, crossing each one or the desert, or fire or ice. Then they

came for the cobra, and if I looked at them I killed them. It was quite entertaining, unless you were the cobra,

silly character like none. Yes, the figure was horrors. What is this attack ofnostalgia

thirty? Well, they come out in the movie, the cobra and her cousin. I promise. The film is about two

big snakes like the pipeline that comes from Algeria that they have to sacrifice a 20-year-old girl

to become a dragon. One is bad and the other is good. Total, that the girl suffers an accident

that nobody suspects in 1500 and the issue is postponed. But since we all have several lives, 500 years later

the girl is resurrected (turned into another, come on, reincarnated) and the snake dance begins again.

As in a pharmacy ad. Few films are seen lately of these with bug. I think it is a

risky and courageous bet, given that dare to take in frame 2 the bug, and that he carries much of

the weight of the proceedings is. The gui���n is not a marvel, but we have two snakes, aarmy

lethal, some flying bugs that fire, some bugs that go with missile launchers, helicopters, tanks,

etc. ��� Is there room to put all this and also give you a deep guide? Well no, and thanks. This is pure

spectacle. For those who like it, great. Resuming, film about two snakes that chase through

the story a woman to become a dragon, the one who kills her. Special effects from end to end,

explosions, bugs on all sides, impossible fights, etc. ��� Argument? What else? More bugs, this is

war.Recommendable to see one of bugs that do not stop fighting and destroy everything.Besitos.PD: That gratísimo film

surprise.PD2: It has its gui Aos to Lord of the Rings and his battles, to Transformers and bring the

battlefield to earth, To Spirited Away because the dragon is the same and King Kong for hisscene

skyscraper.

" 1

" Zodiac puts the viewer in the shoes of the researchers who worked on the case of the multiple murderer

who operated in San Francisco at the end of the 1960s. And he does it with such great detail that it is

overwhelming.

The last ribbon of the director of jewels like Se7en, The Game or Club of the Struggle arrives at the cinemas. In view

of these three films, it is clear that David Fincher likes complex frames, with twists and turns in which

nothing is as it seems. It also seems that in his films the characters are above all else, but

without neglecting an artistic direction that brings much realism to their work. Considering this, we can

affirm that Zodiac is the sublimation of his way of understanding cinema, since it is based on the real story of the

Zodiac multiple killer. It is not the first time that a film is inspired by this particular serial killer,

Harry the Dirty or The Exorcist III already approached the character, although they did it with a verylanguage

cinematographic, while Fincher to bet by an approach bordering documentary. And it is that Zodiac follows

with scrupulous fidelity the events and investigations that surrounded this mysterious character in the late

sixties and during the decade of the seventies. And this is the main attraction and revulsion of the film.

Since we see on the screen the very careful credit titles, we have to wait two and a half hours ofinvestigation

policethat in many moments reminded me of JFK or El Dilema, which will deter many

viewers. No matter how you want to sell it: Zodiac is not a thriller. Those who accept this last and

approach the cinema will discover a great movie, with a mime put on the characters and the atmosphere as

we see few times. �cula is based on real events and, like real life, is brutal in some moments,

but without recreating the easy blood. In fact, Fincher is betting more on the psychology of the murderer, putting the

viewer on the side of those who try to unravel the psychopath's mind. There are nofinds

spectacular, no miraculous resolutions, no incredible twists. The director has not given a little margin

to the usual cinematographic resources and has been given to the police investigations and Robertbook

Graysmith's. Of course, in a film so based on the characters, someperformances were necessary

outstandingand that is what Jake Gyllenhaal, Mark Ruffalo and Robert Downey Jr are doing, with a role that fits perfectly

. To highlight the artistic direction that has captured the passage of almost two decades in the city of

San Francisco brilliantly and allowing the viewer to travel thirty years ago. �s, when mobile

phones and computerized files were a matter of science fiction. The almost documentary aspect is accentuated by

a photograph full of medium shots and without too many artifices. In short, Zodiac is a film with

an exhaustive and complex plot, as is the reality. Its main virtue and at the same time defect, according to

the spectator, is the null concession to the entertainment cinema, which does not mean that it is not entertaining. That

yes, to enjoy everything it offers requires great attention and, even so, it is not easy to follow everything that

happens on the screen. In spite of everything, if we do not lose too much the thread we will be able to understand why thecrimes

Zodiachave become the obsession of many in the last forty years.

" 1

" The taste of Coca-Cola Zero is unbearable: Nicolas Cage pretends to be an anti-smoking biker who does not drink alcohol

but sweets ���? and he's addicted to monkey documentaries.

It is true that some filmmakers give off a whiff of rancid that is difficult to get

rid of. In his day, Daredevil suffered from a style that was at least questionable, with the little horns jumping

over the rooftops between ridiculous dialogues and totally forgettable pop / rock hits. Mark Steven Johnson began to

release those bad effluvia, and the feeling that they were going to accompany him throughout his career was very

strong. Just yesterday he was released in cinemas around the world Ghost Rider. Mark got to work again, and

the result is not more or less than we could expect. Just as in the adventures of the Man Without Fear, weourselves

findwith a dreadful as few, punctuated with televisual digital effects and not very dynamic (or

coherent) argumentatively. However, in some details, the pretensions of his predecessor, such as

the villains, led by Black Heart, which sadly remember the ill-fated mallets of Elektra, are reduced. On this

occasion, Jonhy Blaze is a circus artist who makes a pact with the devil (by mistake, first stupidity) and to

which, later, Mefist���feles himself foolishly deceives. Peter Fonda plays the worst Sat���n I remember,

decorated with bad special effects, but without a wisp of charisma. The taste of Coca-Cola Zero is

unbearable: Nicolas Cage pretends to be an anti-smoking biker who does not drink alcohol but candy ���? and he's addicted to

monkey documentaries. Eva Mendes plays an unlikely girlfriend confused because her boyfriend burns

his head. The eternal sidekick is not even for jokes? In short, aguachirri.The soundtrack is despised,

when everything seemed to indicate that Rokeros and Metals subjects beat perfectly with the character; no longer

crush us with passenger successes of MTV, but one of the issues is interpreted by Ozzy does not solve the

mess. The action sequences are a good plummeting and in the middle of the roll is already Mirandos looking at the clock.

Perhaps the only characteristic is the characterization of the motorcyclist himself and the intro that tells the story of the

Ghost Rider (personally I also highlight the extraordinary leather suck, of the that thereno one to

isfind, at least to a medical price). These bad movies would only need a certain dose of sinverg���encer���a

and bizarrismo to be nice Ethics However, in the times of CGI and qualification for under

thirteen, series b dead, nothing but causing no bostezos.Es a shame all this, when years ago

entr We used to go to theaters to see things like Robocop with our children's faces, and yet here we are? I

still have not loaded anyone with the UCI that I keep at home. Concluding, if you are going to see The Ghostalready

Rider youknow what awaits you: overdose of sugar, absurdity and pretty bored? and if not, tell my

companion.

" 0

" In Sunshine, the leaden slumber provoked perhaps by the proximity to the Sun numbs the interest of a spectator

who wishes that soon, as soon as possible, everything will be reduced to what? In his screenwriter, we are all: dust, only

that, dust of stars.

The genre of science fiction has been tilted for a few decades in the demanding frontier that joins a cinema of

leisure and popcorn? DescreÃdodo grandiloquent diÃlogos and m He is enthusiastic about the carnage offered by aliens,

terminators and any other creatures that camp thirsty on the screen, with another cinema equipped with

topics of wide intellectual depth, debtors of the discourse that flooded with great success theirreferents

literary, but transported to language they can numb the passion of the most naive spectator. To

this desire to unite spectacle and message have contributed excellent works? solidified some as

myths of the s? Fifth art - that they got in their day (and still get today) to be re-read with enthusiasm and

critical interest. These include the Blade Runner capitals, 2001: a space odyssey and Encuentros

in the third phase, or the most recent but also interesting Gattaca, Twelve monkeys and Minority Report.A

some of these jewels seem to have paid tribute to the uneven Danny Boyle in his mediocre Sunshine,

building with it a bulky gui���n (from the ink of Alex Garland, also responsible for the m��� It's interesting

28 days later) without feet or head, whose only contribution resides in the beauty of their images (which is

nothing since ��� able) and the success of focusing its narrative and aesthetic interest on the figure of the Sun - a star little

used in this genre - and not on colorful and disturbing planets such as the Moon or Mars. Even so, even his

parasitic contribution (with dignity) of spaces, times and illuminations already present inmasterpiece

Kubrick's. And the nothing disturbing presentation of the fifth passenger is closer to the only entertainingHorizon

finalof Anderson than to the terrifying Alien of Scott.Boyle is overestimated, signing a pretentious product and

burdensome, which should have been fun without sentencing, and not the reverse as it happens. A real shame, because the

chosen environment was successful and of a praiseworthy visual beauty (we must not forget that the photography firm Alwin

H. Kuchler, also present in the C� policy) Code 46 of Winterbottom). Perhaps history would have given more

emphasis to the mythological seduction by the sun, as Soderbergh's uneven Solaris does with his

enigma. ��tico planeta-, with no monsters running around the ship, dispatching each crewmember, shamelessly, one by one. Or

not, perhaps it would have been sensible to decline the action by terror, erasing mysticisms and otherscript

intellectual refinements from the. I do not know, I do not decide, but what I do know is that when Boyle decides to

mix ingredients, the salad becomes sour, even though they were sold separately and would have been

delicious. �� That is why I like Trainspotting so much, because in it there is no more ice cream than the one that is put

on the capirucho, and because it was born with the will to entertain, avoiding dramatizing or poetizing the world

of drug consumption. In Trainspotting everything is fragile and hooligan: the music, its images, the dialogues, everything. In

Sunshine, the leaden sopor caused perhaps by the neighborhood. ��a to the Sun numbs the interest of a spectator who

wishes that soon, as soon as possible, everything is reduced to what according to his scriptwriter- we are all: dust, only that,

Dust of stars. By the way, what a pleasure to enjoy the worthy secondary Cliff Curtis, outside his little characters

of evil terrorist? Although, how not (sends the America of the political correction), let the

first one air it out, or that Asian beauty that is Michelle Yeoh (Memories of a Geisha, Tiger and Dragon , The morning

never dies), whose pose of sculpted seriousness weakens my will and strengthens at the same time other faculties of

less noble noun.

" 0

" It is curious that in Spain, a country where football moves more money than any other sport, do not become

more afraid. based on (or supported) on it, although, it is also true that if all the films about

football are going to be like this one ... Turn off and let's go

Now it's the part in which I would have to say the typical thing, that already it is worth to the Spanish cinema, that always the same,

and that blah blah blah, as I always say and it hurts the mouth to repeat, I will try to ignore the issue and go

directly to give my opinion on the ill-fated film, where neither Willy Toledo, an actor that I quite

badly, both in the cinema and in person (and yes, I know him in person), or Javier Guti���rrez (who had a bad

concept until I saw him in "" La habitación de el ni "o "" by Alex of the Church), they manage to shine; neither Lidia

Navarro, from whom I have thrown all the footage thinking where I had seen it and it was in the adaptation of "" Closer ""

to the theater in Madrid together with Bel���n Rueda. It is curious that in Spain, a country where football moves more money than

any other sport, do not become more film based ( or supported) in him, although, it is also true that if

all the films about football are going to be like this one. Turn off and let's go, neither the gui���n (simple, and very

lazy), nor the plot (simple and lazy too), nor the performances (overestimated Toledo, lazy Gutierrez.) Not

even the "" match "" that the main character is supposed to referee (neither the Recre went to the UEFA, nor the

Valencia won the league, nor the players are the real ones). At the moment hooked to the

audience. On the other hand the tape is repetitive with so much music in its soundtrack, again and again

pretending, with so much sound that the tape seems more funny and great. Certain that more

ribbons should be made on football, as an amateur I am I find curious, but, please, with something more serious, or

at least with a cooler and surprising argument ���vale?

" 0

" Is it possible to separate private life from political life without entering into conflict? Can you choose without

betraying? Is it possible ... forget?

Krzysztof Kieslowski: "" Freedom is a contradictory concept with human nature "". Any choice

is a restriction and a denial of other possibilities, which become unfeasible from that moment. The

freedom for Kieslowski supposed something unattainable, since the human being is limited, but also it was an

illusion. And in his innermost forum he was always looking for her, understanding and understanding. To empathize with

Kieslowski (as far as possible) we must understand that, in spite of his real resignation, he was willing to dream

of something as naive as theoretically unattainable. We all want to reach a certain degree of fulfillment. The

real issue, according to the director himself, was not whether or not we are free, but whether we really want to

be free. If we are really willing to unleash the chains of our inevitable human condition. If we want to

separate ourselves from the road that comes from the factory. Our choices have great importance in this, starting from

a "virginal" and non-existent point of view, which could only be reached with our disappearance,

logically. All these reflections lead fatally to the film we are dealing with. "" No End "" is,

surely,the most pessimistic work of Kieslowski, his dark creacinms in the search of small chinks to

the freedom, towards the naïveté of dreams that end up bursting in our own faces. "" Bez Konca ""

is a before and after in the filmography of the Polish director (many films of his they could acquire that

meaning, but none in such a vital and radical way as this one). It means getting into the jaws of

politics more inside than ever, so, when leaving them (if it is possible to do so with life), do not return jam���s.This

movie It would be the beginning of the relationship between Kieslowski and Piesiewicz, future co-scriptwriter, also in works

such as "" Veronica's Double Life "", "" Blue " "," "White" "or" "Red" ". "" Without End "" would be the anteroom for the poet

"" Dec���logo "" (also with the hand of the companion Piesiewicz), work summit in the cinema of Kieslowski.

The suffering of the author in the first person is evidenced here. The painful consequences of living under Martial Law,

of feeling the repression towards the union "" Solidarity "", completely prohibited in that framework. The light of

creation, of art as a form of denunciation and human expression, of ideas as a form of social awareness;

all of them inexorably become our worst enemy and lead us to our own

condemnation. Any decision will be an error that will shackle us for life. And the only escape, if

there really is one that is valid, is death. We could say that it is the film in which Kieslowski

approaches me. s dangerously to surrender. Everything done, the look towards his past, his deeds and creations,

turn dark and pessimism takes over his person, creating a film in which all hope

"" alive "" vanishes. Indeed, the worst moment of his life he made of this a truculent film of renunciation. "" Without

End "" has links in common with the future "" Blue "", many will say. For the story, its characters, its

development. But they are simple appearances. Both end in an abrupt curve. However, one gives to the sea, to

hope. Another one goes to the abyss. "In" "No End" "and Julie in" "Blue" ", after the death of their husbands, they try to find

a way to escape, be it through sex or of loneliness. On this tour they will meet with various details

(sometimes invaluable to us) that will show them that freedom is "abused", which is something much more

complex. what many try to make us see. The Kieslowski reconciled with love and freedom (and already

detached from any political aura), after the aforementioned blip, shows us again his innocence, stolen for

a moment in "" Without End "", and returns to to believe in the human being in "" Blue "" (already from the "" Dec���logo "" conf���at���midamente

in )l). But in the film that we occupies, dazed, decomposed, mistrusts any choice in search of

freedom. The politics and the society of the time weighed too much on already exhausted shoulders. Forreason, and more

thatthan ever, here the answers will not be easy to bump It's more, there will be no answers. He himself did not know the

direction to take. The film becomes dense, very uncomfortable, we will not know what to grab. All the symbols and metaphors

are incredibly elusive, from the mousetrap to the mysterious and seemingly "vain"

appearances of the late husband. But everything has a meaning beyond the metaphysical or spiritual, showing us

clearly, on this occasion, the impossibility between private life and political life. Ethics The public and the

personal, at the time of choosing, adhere resulting in inefficiency in the search for a separation

between the two. We are told that there is no effective freedom. The woman, the main axis but not unique,

hesitant, does not know what direction to give her life. Not telling herself at first, she finally

accepts that she needs her husband, that his life without him is totally incomprehensible (which happens backwards in

"" Blue "" ) and that you can not forget him. There is no sex that covers. And, in his internal forum, despite his efforts, he does not want to

ignore him. His despair is imminent, and his surrender lurks. Meanwhile, the husband, aware of his

own despair, observes. More critical than ever, Kieslowski doubts and doubts the worker (Artur Barcis), another

of the key players in the entire filmography ���a of the director. A character who does not know whether to stay

or leave, feeling that any decision will lead him to his personal prison. The ties of a

wrong policy will cause us to find our own treachery. The Pole brutally attacks

communism, once again, and again ��s, had to pay the price (as it happened in "" El

Azar "") to irritate high-ranking officials, who, skeptical of the possibility of a hidden criticism that

they came to understand, they decided to censor the film. "" Without End "" is a film full of messages, symbolism,

coincidences, opportunities, beliefs, faith, personal convictions and freedoms in search of love. It is a

complex film like the one that more in its work, since it does not give nor tries to give answers. It is the mostKieslowski

thorough, closest to the limit, which causes, at times, the logical discomfort of not understanding if you are not

prepared to understand that there is nothing to understand, and that, indeed, exceeds that limit

approaching the hell itself. But nobody said that the journey was easy. Ulla and Barcis are real examples.

Both self-condemn. On the one hand, the renunciation of survival is seen as the only way to

preserve dignity. But will it be valid? Will it be, at the same time, worthy? It is simply another escape, which will

not allow us to find our desired response. For the other, we see vital hesitations ofcharacter

Barcis's, perfectly adaptable to Kieslowski himself, contradictory, paradoxical, human, therefore. That

worker who knows the limitation of the elections in such an organic environment, that is consumed inside,

but at the same time resigns, and that, throughout all the "" Dec� ��logo "" will appear as a soul in pain,conscience

Kieslowski's, silent counselor of the protagonists, trying to bring their experience closer in the right moments,

limit, in which they try to take a decision. However, I will not do anything. I will be. The decision will

only be ours. When help is asked, despair makes an appearance. Like Ulla at the moment that is directed

to us, the spectators, in search of an explanation. She does not understand, but we can noteither. Who

offer her answersknows if in the future, in the darkness and rot that surrounds us, we will find

subterfuge. Innocence dyed green. Point v���treo in which our happiness (or part of it) has a place.

In the same way that Kieslowski, unfathomable, vast, impenetrable, kept it inside him.

Imperative, forced, it is necessary for the viewer to dominate and be able to integrate into the film if he does not want to suffer anbewilderment

insurmountable. And, therefore, an unbreakable stupor. In the same way, it is also basic to be aware of the

artist's life trajectory, of his political and social experiences, otherwise he will not be I can understand

his position and his ideas. Dark step of the Polish director, until the creation of the "" Dec���logo "" focuses his films on

the moral, ethical, social and political ��tico in search of a possible and relative freedom. From then on I will place

total emphasis on the spiritual, human and transcendental, leaving aside political "truisms". But

always present chance, volitional decisions, love and freedom. An inseparable set. It

should be noted in "" No End "" the presence of a great Grayzna Szapolowska, present in later titles such as "" No

Amar���s "", which performs a commendable interpretation , contained, full of necessary gestures, endowed with great

success. "" Bez Konca "" stands as a point of inflexion and, apparently, also as a point of union ofcharacters

vitalfrom then on in the surroundings of Kieslowski. In addition to the co-writer Piesiewicz, here he also meets

the one who would later become his inseparable musical collaborator: the exceptional Zbigniew Preisner. With it he

got unforgettable masterpieces. In this film stands out with a mysterious, disturbing and subjugating

beginning and a dark and no less mysterious ending (with that rhythm. ���f���nebre?). Concluding. Disturbing and

reflective film of the late Polish director, who, despite sin a bit of pessimistic and non-conformist, is still

a very personal work and an exercise in great cinematographic knowledge. It will not be his greatest success, but it is a

must in his delicious filmography. A new opportunity to know with and through the place that theoccupies

personin society. A singular juncture to know in his image and likeness, better than anyone, that we

know nothing. To be more sure than anyone that we are not at all safe. To look for a truth that

was not true: our truth.

" 1

" A wonder of terror that will delight all those who love to eat the nails of

pure nervousness. What will you take advantage of! I, for the flies, do not plan to go sightseeing in Australia ... at least until

I forget this movie.

Despite being a movie in terms of horror movies, the Australian Wolf Creek

arrives a couple of years behind in Spain. It depicts the dantesca adventure lived by three young people

during a summer vacation in Australia. Two British girls and a young man from the country who, on board a

second-hand car, entered the most inhospitable places of the land of kangaroos with the intention

to admire the beauty of its scenic landscapes. But a stranger. out of the darkness and halfway through his

journey, right in the Wolf Creek National Park, he decided to cut the planned tourist route. Wild

Creek is a clearly debtor film of The Texas Chainsaw Massacre Hooper and the first Las Colinas have

eyes. The yrido and solitary stage in which the action takes place, and the ruinous and rusty scenery in

which the vicious and bloodthirsty character of Mick Taylor unfolds (almost, almost, for its brutality , a cousin

of the atrocious Leatherface), are the main instruments used by its director, Greg Mclean, to

create an atmosphere as distressing as it is unhealthy. The fear and insecurity felt by the adolescent trio

before the unknown, are sensations that are transmitted equally to the viewer. He senses that something strong is

about to happen, although he does not know exactly what, how and when. The trembling secrecy of the

camera, the cold atmosphere that is breathed and the black darkness of the Australian night, are part of that

psychological and tense setting with which the debutant Mclean influences, subliminally, on the thickness of the

audience. And for that reason, just when the film enters to sack in one of the most agonizing and brutalof the

episodesgenre, the public inevitably feels identified with the impotence and the fear of some victims to

whom it costs us absolutely nothing to guess their macabre future. Goosebumps, cold sweats and

cramps in the spine, come on. The routine way in which the story begins - through a

presentation of the three Young people and demonstrating a certain conscious af porn by the rigorous tourist

postcard, has nothing to do with the rest of the footage. Step by step, without hurry, forget the landscape and focus

only on the peasantry. The entrance to that deep Australia, as described in Wolf Creek, is similar to that

of a slow descent into hell. The unpleasant hints they release, the two girls,

the parishioners of a dirty bar in the middle of nowhere, serve as a presentation (or preparatory) of

what will later be the apparition. n in scene of the same Satan���s. A demon that, in the beginning, will be shown to the

newcomers as a savior and enchanting angel. A real cinematic bomb; although abomb

bitter and frighteningly sinister. According to a sign (both in the promotional poster and in thecredits

initial), the film is based on a veritable fact; a verician who personally would put in a quotation because, in

spite of his chilling real appearance and the credibility that his images offer, it seems to me like another

sibylline trick to elevate the unrest of the spectator a few more degrees. Instead of aevent

true, I would bet on the fantasy reading that the director and scriptwriter has made about the disappearances

of a series of people in Australian lands. Or, at least (and without falling into a spoiler), this is whatme

leadto think about his four final notes and a fade on one of the protagonists in particular. Without further: a

wonder of terror that will make �� the delights of all those who love to eat the nails of pure

nervousness. What will you take advantage of! I, in case the flies, I do not plan to go sightseeing in Australia, at least until I

forget this movie. And that the kangaroos I whistle.

" 1

" After a resounding success in Italy, the film triumphed throughout Europe. A lawsuit by

Kurosawa paralyzed its release in North America. Clint Eastwood returned to Rawhide's platies without knowing that for

much of the world he was already a western star.

In 1964 Clint Eastwood co-starred with Eric Fleming in the series Rawhide, which narrated the wanderings of two

cowboys and their transports of cattle from one place to another. For years he had tried his luck in the movies,

looking for that great role that would make him known. He had worked on films of the mule speaker Francis, in

films of series B like Tarantula or in cheap westerns like Ambush at Cimarron Pass, classified by thehimself

actoras "the worst of his career" " . Although Rawhide gave him enough money to stay with his

wife, artistically the role of the inexperienced and impulsive Rowdy Yates did not report anything. Already in the shootings of

the series Eastwood was fixed in the way of doing of the different directors who went happening through her, although

obviously the moment so that it was put after the camera still it was far. For the moment I had to find a

way out of the vicious circle of television. Surely he would never have imagined that this opportunityhim on

awaitedthe other side of the Atlantic, in the old Europe, where a rejuvenated Western genre and anorchestra director

Italianwere on the verge of change the life. The birth of the subgenus known as spaghetti western

occurred before the director Sergio Leone even considered rolling a film of such a genre. By the

time the Italian decided to shoot a story set in the old American West, about 25

western films had been filmed in Italy by Italian directors and teams (includingfather

Leone's own, Vincenzo). But the work of Leone marked a turning point: even with few means, the director

managed to compose a magnificent work that distanced itself from the major��� of previous films, not only for having higher

quality, but for enjoying a different, very personal treatment, close to the "" westerns "" mature as Just

before the danger. Since the decade of the 50 co-productions between Italy, Spain and Germany were very

frequent. The main reason for such collaboration was to lower costs and ease to assume the economic risks

of any film that will be carried out. Here he was renewed when Samuel Bronston

landed in Spain for a series of mega-productions of different genres. Bronston brought money andequipment

American, built studios, platies, and, most importantly, brought the Hollywood method to Spain. . A whole

series of technicians and filmmakers were formed under the tutelage of Bronston. And here it was a very important breeding ground

for the step that Leone was going to take in his career. Spain was the perfect place to shoot

a western: it had the landscapes, the media and the technicians. And entire towns dedicated to the film industry.

At the beginning of the 60's the set was ready. Only one story was needed. The western, as a myth,

had been abandoned by the Americans themselves. The genre subsisted, although in 1963 it represented 9% of the

total productions in Hollywood. It was becoming less profitable, and the producers of the big studios

preferred other kinds of stories. The creators of the invention had abandoned it to their fate. The witness should

be picked up by others. Artists and filmmakers from other countries, who had grown up watching Westerns in movies, and

who had drunk from the sources of John Ford and the other great Hollywood directors. And the story

that should have inspired the beginning of the Trilog���a del d���lar came from the most unsuspected place: the

far east.The director of Yojimbo (The mercenary), the Japanese Akira Kurosawa, recognized the influence that the

western had had at the time of shooting the film. Among other factors and reasons, Kurosawa appropriated the

imagery of the Far West, the Hollywood myth of the cowboys and lonely heroes, and sifted it to

adapt it to the conscious and the History of Japan Adapt��� a police novel (Red Harvest, by Dashiell

Hammett), moved it to medieval Japan and the rod��� in the manner of the western, as if recreated Ra�� �ces deep with

samurai instead of gunmen. Sergio Leone found in The Mercenary the story he was looking for. While I was

watching her at the cinema, I decided to adapt the story and turn it into a western. Thus the circle was closed: a history

of Gangsters becomes a history of samurais to end up being a history of gunmen in the Far

West. The myth was revised again and again. Leone always claimed to be "" translating "" into Italian, rather than

simply copying Kurosawa's film. However, after the premiere, Kurosawa (with all reason) demanded

Leone for having copied his film without acquiring any right or having mediated any conversation. The courts

proved him right, and Kurosawa and his associates received 15% of the total proceeds from the film and

exclusive rights to the film in Taiwan, Japan and Korea. The main character of the film, the Stranger, the man

without a name, should be interpreted by an American. Leone had Henry Fonda in mind as his Forastero: he

foresaw a surprise effect that would cause a sensation. However, the Fonda agent did not even deign to

show him the script that Leone had sent him. Leone then tried to get James Coburn, but it was

too expensive. Afterwards, Charles Bronson rejected the paper, stating that the script was "simply the worst

I have ever read". However, he said later: "What I did not understand then was that it was not the script that

mattered. It was the way he was going to direct what would make the difference. " Finally Leone found

his man in a young promise of "" empty look "" seemed that could fit on paper. His name was

Clint Eastwood. Apparently, Leone did not seem very convinced, but the possibility that the cach��� of the actor

rose in the next few months convinced the producers that Eastwood should be the man. Tonino Valerii,

assistant director of Leone, said: "I do not remember Leone ever really saying 'yes' to Clint Eastwood." On the other

hand, Eastwood, interested in the script, did accept the offer from Leone. It also contributed to the desire

of his wife to spend a vacation in Spain and Italy. Eastwood not only dedicated himself to interpret the

Stranger, but also I helped design it. He bought the black pants at a Hollywood Boulevard store. The

hat was obtained in Santa Monica, and apparently his famous poncho was acquired in Spain. It was alsoidea

histo constantly have a cigar in his mouth. It has also been said its characteristic look and thoseeyes

half-closedwere the product of the sun and the high-voltage lights that were used for lighting.,

Leonewho already had He had worked in Spain before at the beginning of his career, he made Almer���a (and also

Burgos and the Sierra Madrileña) his far West. Many of the locations for his scenes I already knew

from his previous visits. Others arose by chance while traveling, and others arose after the search

of locations. But the truth is that the trilogy of the United States and Spain were inextricably linked. The

last characteristic element of the trilogy in discord was the Physics Ennio Morricone, who had been

Leone's classmate, was not the director's first choice. Sergio Leone was not impressed by

Morricone's previous work, and he interviewed the composer after being pressured by the producers. However

, I decided to give it a chance. Under the direction of the Italian Eastwood, he began to develop that way of

interpreting that has become his particular stamp: wordlessness, hissing voice, muted tone, a

glacial look that over the years has become really expressive and a smirk that made his

ruthless gunslinger into a crook that even killed in the back we fell simp��� tico With Leone he also learned

that a low budget can be enough to make a great movie, and that there was another cinema outside of

Hollywood where someone could be killed in the same plane and where a director could really make his

film. Once the filming finished Eastwood returned to North America believing that he had shot anwestern

Italianthird, from whom he would never hear again and who had reported an acceptable sum of money and

a vacation in Europe for his wife. Meanwhile, in Italy, the name of Il Magnifico Straniero was changed to the

definitive For a handful of dollars, without the actor being notified of it (so that when the first

cr�� Ethics were published in the United States, he thought it was another film). After a resounding success in Italy

the film triumphed throughout Europe. A lawsuit by Kurosawa paralyzed its release in

North America. Clint Eastwood returned to Rawhide's platies without knowing that for much of the world he was already a

western star.

" 1

" A film that invites reflection and that manages to give a lesson in ethics, commitment and cinematography that is

totally gratifying, becoming a necessary document and of forced viewing. A song to the freedom

of expression.

After a few initial minutes of the film where we are presented with various semi-silent scenes (with only sound and

background music), which serve as a choral presentation of the characters and which reminds us of the beginning of films

like " "The hunter" "of Cimino or something more vaguely" "Schindler's list" "of Spielberg, we can predict that the

film will formally be impeccable, and this is confirmed for the rest of the footage. In the

work of Clooney as tedious or a simple co���azo, with a past theme in terms of historical environment andimportance

current, and that has lacking rhythm somewhat prominent, but nothing more. It's far from reality. The film possesses

a brutal narrative force and an ethical message not only exemplary but necessary and totally valid even today

because the visual manipulation and the cheap partisanship continue to exist, the politics of fear is still alive in

many parts of the world (especially in the United States) and promotes and remembers brave andjournalism

committedwith society and its problems. Leaving aside a bit the plot and narrative issues,

which are widely valued, the visual and technical treatment of the film is masterful but difficult to value

for many people, since it is a film of a formality based on minimalism and the correction .N

Enviable is how Clooney tells us this story, his resources to give dynamism or tension to a scene, the reason

for the narrative use according to what plans or the beautiful setting scene worthy of an authentic maestro.Remarcables

are the use of the lenses in this film with a tremendously intelligent focal game, the

sequence planes to endow realism and amplitude to the scenes, the frames so measured, the scenes with

depth of field and the exceptional use of showing a lot of information in a scene and the same

frame, or the movements so subtle and almost negligible in occasions of the camera that are not free,

much less. The silent scenes or semimudas are a boast of direction, see for example the scene that we lose

the image of the reply of Senator McCarthy to the program that was broadcast 3 weeks before inculp��� ndolo, where the

character played by Fra nk Langella moves through the shadows in the office while we do not stop listening

to McCarthy's conversation, a representation of the fear of possible government reprisals or the fall of

a television. medium for a risk committed. Clooney uses silence or scenes with only background music

to praise a moment or a person. Many times silence says much more than words and here is an

example. Also, the use of the characters in off is splendid in the film, and something very successful on the part of the director. The

unbeatable photography of Robert Elswit manages to transport us visually towards the 50, helped

for a minimalist music that complements to perfection the beautiful and careful images. Awork

fascinating lightingthat received a deserved Oscar nomination in its respective section. The

performances are very convincing, but it highlights one over the others, and is that of the excellent and vindicating actor

David Strathairn, who performs a portentous reproduction of his character, the man who stood up to

McCarthy himself with his CBS team, Edward R. Murrow. "" Good night, and good luck "", is a film

whose tremendous quality is likely to be difficult to detect by an immense majority of spectators because in the

subtlety of its details lies the greatness of Clooney's work, by how he presents the characters, how he uses

the contrapicado to magnify the journalistic and popular figure of Murrow, how he presentsmoments

importantwith silences, how he uses the eyes of the actors or how the light opens the field to the image among

other things. A director who already stood out in his brilliant if somewhat irregular "prima façade" "Confessions of a

dangerous mind" and here reaffirms his undeniable talent, both visual and cultural. A film that portrays

fantasticly a time of political repression, lack of freedom of scandalous expression and the struggle

for a better future. cula is a hymn to freedom of expression, comes to say that the struggle against

injusticealways be present and although the objectives are not achieved or perhaps theis lost

illusion,N, we must not leave that commitment of the struggle, in this case it speaks to us of the struggle using the power of the

word and its importance in our society. A film that invites reflection and that manages to give alesson

educationalof ethics, commitment and cinematography totally rewarding, but above all, a necessary film and

mandatory viewing.

" 1

" Last Days does not stop explaining something that could have been said in a short film. And it would have been very good,

but an hour and a half watching Michael Pitt wandering around is too long for you not to think about if you're

being teased.

The true fans of Nirvana can be happy with this movie, but it will not be the same with the

young poperos who have only bought merchandise on Kurt Cobain. In one of his songs, the

artist said: "I'm so happy. I have found my friends. Are they in my head? "" And then I continued "" and

I'm not afraid, I light my candles, stunned, because I've found God? " There has been a lot of

talk about Gus Van Sant's new film saying it was not a biopic to use. And it is true, as far as ag���nero, but Last Days

perfectly adapts the spirit of its famous protagonist. We have before us a small biography of the

last days of a myth of music. Even so, do not expect to find Nirvana songs or a review of theirLast

glorious moments.Days is the interpretation that Van Sant has made of what led the singer-songwriter to

commit suicide. . Following the narrative structure used in Elephant, the story proposes the viewer to look at it in

different ways. The same facts are explained again and again, which change depending on how you look at them. The

center of the story is a young man named Blake, who emulates a Kurt Cobain who spends the whole movie walking

around in gardens and forests, or sleeping in the first place he finds while muttering somewords

unintelligible. His loneliness and inner pain is not understood from what Blake can explain or

teach us, since it is not much, if not through the secondary characters and their interrelationship. n with the singer.

The general rhythm of the film is very constant, and too slow. The amount of information thatgives us

each sequenceis minimal, and it is a little difficult to follow the proposal. It is impossible to sympathize or hate a

series of characters who do nothing. Gus Van Sant has not formally honored Elephant, and in Last

Days he does not stop explaining something he could have said in a short film. And it would have been very good, but an

hour and a half watching Michael Pitt wandering around is too long for you not to think about if you're being

teased.

" 0

" Movie composed of small large (short) films that come together in an absolutelyresult

brilliantand recommended for all those who are in love with all possible forms of love to imagine

In love with life, in love with love, with their children, with memories, with fantasy, with the odd, with

the impossible, with a landscape, with a city, people who fall in love with people and people who do not know how to fall in love. Par���s

Je t'aime are numerous stories, each of them directed by different renowned directors such as Alfonso

Cuaron and with a cast of actors that goes from the unknown to the commercial like Natalie Portman. The

stories in general are ���bles and although there is some boring is not the only technique for all, it is impossible to

get bored watching this type of bets to the "" Manuale d'amore "" because if you do not enjoy watching any of the

stories , sure you can match another. I really liked the merger that the directors have achieved with

the story they told as they all happened in famous places / tourist Par It's a feat of great

beauty, no doubt. This accompanied by the changes of rhythm and narrative characteristic of each director means that we are above

all a range of shapes, colors and even smells. A film composed of small large films.

(shorts) that come together in an absolutely brilliant and recommendable result for all those who are in

love with all the possible forms of love to imagine.

" 1

" Boring and predictable story that splashes us with continuous flashbacks and parallel actions, while the

footage progresses in a soporific way.

Oliver Stone is put back behind the camera to narrate the fatal events that occurred on

September 11, 2001. The special thing about this proposal is that it focuses on two members of the police. to port

that were trapped and were rescued alive. Starting from a successful start, with a presentation of the

attack that is almost the best of the film, Stone shows us the experiences of a group of police commanded

by John Mcloughlin, Nicolas Cage, They go to one of the towers of the World Trade Center to try to help,

but after a few minutes of entering, they have the misfortune that the building collapses on top of them,

as we have already seen in the chilling images who gave us the television. From this point on, the

film takes place in a non-living of the families of the two affected, who wonder if their husbands and

fathers (respectively) will be alive. In these roles are Maria Bello as the wife of Cage and Maggie

Gyllenhall of Michael Pe���a. As you might suppose, his characters are quite typical, women anguished on

their part and theirs, policemen trapped under hundreds of rubble waiting for help to come, and

d��� Give each other mutual support not to fall asleep, fearing not to wake up if they do. Because of this, the Andrea

Berloff script becomes a boring and predictable story that splashes us with continuous flashbacks andactions

parallel, while the footage progresses in a soporific way. One fact that has surprised me and that I do not see any

justification for, is the fact that why Mar���a Bello has such blue contact lenses, I do not know if there will be

any rational explanation for it, because in no other of its actions has resorted to it. Let's leave

these anecdotes to continue with the World Trade Center, and say that Oliver Stone's new film does not

surprise by any place, which logically has some very good moments and that They reach the sensitive fiber

of the spectator, as when Will Jimeno (Michael Pe���a) asks the rescue team to act more

quickly to help McLoughlin with its consequent consequence, but apart from that and some others, we

find others that take the viewer completely out of his chair, making smiles and

comments rise up over the sound of the screen, and a clear example of This is the appearance of Jesus Christ in

one of the hallucinations of Jimeno. In short, a faithful account of what the two survivors lived, but

which cinematographically leaves much to be desired and which could have been shown in a different way, although it would have

to be altered a little events, because although it costs to say it, the cinema is focused for the public and

not for the director's delight exclusively.

" 0

" All the criticisms that I have read of this film agree that it is a garbage, which prevents me

completely from saying what I think about it, that is, the sensational, funny and stimulating that I think

Viola, you can not break with me, his ex-boyfriend tells him, nobody breaks for the football. However Viola thinks that

soccer is a good reason to leave this boy. He is a liar who tells him that she plays well

and tells him in public that he can not play like a boy. Viola needs to meet a man as he is. And on the

other hand she believes that she can play soccer just as well as a man. Viola can achieve both

when her brother runs away from home for two weeks and she occupies her position in the male boarding school. Thanks to her

boy costume, Viola has access to the Sancta Sanctorum: on the one hand she can meet men from within,

without having to put up with the disguise they put on in front of the girls. On the other hand, she can train in the men

's soccer team. The most fun of "She's the boy" is to see the girl trying to hide what she is,

maybe because she leaves the discovered an inevitable truth, that we are not the same. The comedies of Shakespeare, and

this m���sa���n, are always love stories that come together. Viola, the protagonist, is the glue of all

couples. The handsome Duke has been pining for the pretty girl for three years, but he gets nothing; the beautiful one, Daphne, has

gone out with all the boys but she is still sad, the ugly girl in the story does not go out with anyone because they

have labeled her ugly. They all lack something, and it seems that Viola has a magic wand. Daphnehim

letsread one of Sebastian's poems by mistake. In his role as a man he has a date with the ugly one and this stops

being ugly. He seems even capable of uniting his parents. She is a girl who, if they put her in a convent, turns her into

a matrimonial agency. All the criticisms that I have read of this film coincide in that it is garbage, which

prevents me from full say what I think of her, that is, the sensational, fun and stimulating that I think.

Sometimes critics are like doctors, the dietlogos, priests, governments, prohben you everything you

gusta.Francisco Marinero: comedy is limited to the foreseeable troubles of the girl when she has to go to the

showers or when her voice betrays her. Roberto Piorno: She is the boy is the proptot���pica comedy pija

adolescent, cheesy and romantic that so well usually marries the tastes of the American public of that

age.

" 1

" Bob, Dante and Randal create the most endearing family since the Adams. Try talking about Clerks, or all of Kevin Smith's movies in general, without resorting to the word "freak" "It's

hard but necessary. The term itself, at least as I handle it, implies that the person in

question does not have to be aware of their oddities. For example, Pilar L���pez de Ayala in Alatriste is a freak

because she acts as if she were being guided by a UFO and I doubt very much that she is aware of the strangeness of her

behavior. Instead, let two 30-year-olds decide to work in a fast-food chain and

spend the whole day discussing life (Star Wars trilogy versus trilogy of The Lord of the Rings) not

only does not seem freaky but it is one of the most "" healthy "" decisions that can be made. Bypassing the dialogues

( that is not that they are good or bad: they are real) and the visual scketchs (the homage of The Silence of the

Lambs is brutal) Kevin Smith's films excels in the media because at no time arises that his

characters be immature, pariahs, or some memos. It is appreciated that, for once, the characters do not

realize the absurdity of their way of life and at the end of the film they achieve their longed for "" maturity "". In Clerks 2

the opposite happens: they reaffirm their positions and Jay, Bob, Dante and Randal create the mostfamily

accessiblefrom the Adams. That is called being honest with oneself and, truthfully, it makes you leave the cinema

ready to make any fan of The Lord of the Rings vomit. It's an option: you can be a whiner like

Tim "" oh, I'm weird, I suffer for it and all my characters suffer the same as me "" Burton or, directly, you can

take on what you are and live happily in your world. And if someone scratches you, you just have to go do some

karting. I wish there were more people like Kevin Smith in the world.

" 1

" If you have a brilliant trio and a great story, the result obviously can only be more than

satisfactory.

My fear before seeing this movie is that the great expectations that I had before I saw it,

went away in vain and was not as good as I thought. That fear dissipated at the moment nothing else appear the first

scene, so shocking that augurs the magnetizing power and the evocative force that keeps you in suspense

throughout the film.In American Gangster, not we can only contemplate the work of a man who manages to prevail

in the world of the mafia, surpassing the classic bosses who do not get off the throne, but unlike the

majority of the films about mafia that have been made, we carefully observe the two parts of this

conflict, that of the one that persecutes the mafioso and that of the mafioso himself, but with a much morepoint of view

detailedand that involves the viewer from the first frame. Specifying the two interpretations, with a

very convincing Denzel Washington from the start and a Russell Crowe eating the screen, and in the

scenes where the two of them are together at the end, is a masterpiece of interpretation as a A long time

that I had not seen. American Gangster is a new twist to the view we normally had of

this type of movie, something that is appreciated and more so if enjoy everything it offers, without having to resort to

cheap blood or the usual stories.

" 1

" There was only one filmmaker who was able to uncover the essence of that fragrance that inspired a song by

Nirvana.

'Perfume' is the film that converts the verbs "" to read "" and "" see "" in antinims, and the surprising novel that

many of us discovered in our adolescence, in a story plant�� �graduate: bland, sweet, tedious, annoying

... At least, the names of five directors who knew how to get closer to the story could be cited to convey to the

viewer the restlessness and uneasiness that came with it. ��an his pages. Even so, let's not cheat. There was only one

filmmaker who could uncover the essence of that fragrance that inspired a song by Nirvana. If one wants to

speak well of The Perfume, we should limit ourselves to observe that the direction n Art is the right one; the

ambience, typical of the eighteenth century and narrated in the novel, the correct one; and the production design, the

successful one. However, if you decide to delve into the essence of the story that fascinated half the world in 1985, you will

soon come to the conviction that the chosen approach could not have been worse. It fails in three

fundamental elements: the measurement of the times, the proposal of casting, and in the most unforgivable: the

structure of the gui���n, which becomes a bad plagiarism of? Amelie?. With all these ingredients,

can a good perfume be made? The History of Cinema answers us categorically that it does not, and it reminds us of thecase

extremein which a technically perfect film ruined the study system prevailing in

Hollywood, due to a gui�� Inconsn inconsistent (Rebeli���na Bordo, 1,962). A long time before, John Huston, with

his first feature, had shown that the primordial basis of a good film is in a good gui���n. The

Halt���n Malt���s, in fact, is based on a best seller with which other filmmakers had failed. In general, there

are too many cases in which renowned directors did not finish to convince when approachingprojects

literary. It happened to Brian de Palma with La Hoguera de Las Vanidades, to Roman Polanski with Oliver Twist,

even to Coppola, to include a love story that was never in the nick of Mina Harker or left of

Stoker's pen. But there was also a genius who knew how to release words to transform them into images,

even if it meant having to invent a new narrative structure in cinema. It happened in Lolita. This

genius is not found in the collaboration formed by Tom Tykwer and Andrew Birkin. Tykwer has not adapted the

novel to the screen, but to his own possibilities as a director. In this way, he recreates himself in sniffing the

first victim to show his virtuosity behind the camera. Now, a close-up that shows the technique of

drying flowers. Now, a detailed framing of the cross that leads to Laura's neck. Later, he flits through

the lavender fields, and ends up crossing them at breakneck speed to narrate a nasal chase, in

which he copies some scenes of Ang Lee's worst film. ���sa in which Hulk is jumping through the mountains like a

nice mariposilla.With this self-contemplation, the only thing he has achieved, in addition to an excessive footage, it is to

despise the drafting times. Remember that the choice of the twelve fragrances - peak moments in the

original story - is reduced to a blow to the head (to eleven, in particular). Experts say that the mission of the

director is not only to place the cameras properly, but he is the only one who, at all times,

has a global view of the film. �cula. Here, Mr. Tykwer overlooked an important fact: the pages of

that book emanated aromas. Birkin managed to succeed by adapting The Name of The Rose, since it had the

caution of focusing the script on the detective plot and avoiding the philosophical conclusions of Umberto Eco.

But, in El Perfume, he has made the most serious mistake of going one extreme to the other, without paying attention to the virtue of

moderation. On the one hand, the novel is literally adapted and the voice-over reproduces bold paragraphs from the

story, making the film particularly tedious. But, on the other hand, many descriptions are obviated,

with which it is possible to blur the central characters. Nothing has to do with the "" being great and abominable,

comparable to Napoleon, grotesque, deformed and repulsive in the eyes of women "" who created S���skind with

attractiveness f��� of the British actor who gives him life. And the thing is more than clear. This role was always

for the actor John Hurt, the narrator, and the film for Stanley Kubrick. After leaving the cinema, I reach several

conclusions. The idea that a Europe that films together, remains united, is moving to me. The

contracting of La Fura dels Baus, a great success. The high technical quality of this tape, an aspect subject to

the popular theories of relativity or, rather, of comparison. And, although I admit that "the

resurgence of German cinema" sounds like glory, the statement that Tom Tykwer has succeeded in adapting this novel

brilliantly, seems crazy to me. , there must be the just ones and, if possible, they are

well done. Directors who want to experiment can always do so by telling their own stories, which will be

projected before a small group of intellectuals, who revere what they do not understand and call "transgression"

to what is not. Fortunately, there will always be those who notice that the emperor was

naked.

" 0

" In Search of Happiness is another of many films dedicated to selling the American dream to the world.

That reality surpasses fiction, in addition to being a very recurrent subject, in many cases it is true, just

like what is said in another very hackneyed phrase, that art imitates life. There are occasions in which aevent

realis so incredible that it seems to be taken out of the mind of some scriptwriter, and coincidences of life, very

likely that veritable event will end up giving rise to some movie. "Cula "" inspired by a true story "". Well,

that is the case of In Search of Happiness, although the fact that it is based is not one of those stories that

become news headlines in half the world. Chris Gardner (Will Smith) is a man who drags a

bad economic situation due to a bad investment in medical devices. However, despite

precariousness, he tries to improve his life thanks to his innate ability for mathematics and to aprogram

trainingof an important securities agency. The truth is that the film is closer to the melodrama of

"" use and throw "" than to something else, with all the respect for the real Chris Gardner, which has a cameo

in the final scenes. It is a genuinely Hollywood by-product, with the sole reason of being to

demonstrate and export the validity and validity of the American dream, since any person, if it is proposed and

act Cona with perseverance, is able to achieve unattainable a priori goals. Well, there really is another goal, something

more hidden among so much cheap sweetening, and it's the search by its protagonist for a new

Oscar nomination, and who knows if the statuette itself. However, Will Smith is not up to the

circumstances and the wild promotion that has been the subject, and performs a flat interpretation, without

transmitting any type of emotion, feeling. The gui���n is nothing more than another crude copy of the typical

stories of human overcoming (so fashionable lately), full of empty phrases and emptiness. �as,

commonplaces, ridiculous situations (��� that Rubik's cube scene in the taxi please!). The characters are a

stereotype behind another, and no one expects the least evolution in them. Saying that In Search of

Happiness is predictable is little, since from the same trailer, any viewer is able todraw

mentallythe knot and outcome of the plot. In short, In Search of Happiness is another of many movies. They are

dedicated to selling the American dream to the world, although on the way they forget to mention certain details such

as luck or the innate ability of a person and that others do not possess.

" 0

" Comedieta of light and cool action to throw the afternoon and leave with a smile of good vibes.

The female breasts are a mystery of humanity. How can they be fluent and without lozan���a and with a

textile element like the cors��� or the wonderbr��� become a constant challenge to the laws of gravity?

Why is not there a male version to be able to show zucchini from the garden between the legs? I say it because

both protagonists wear tits that do not even one hundred carts, God forbid. The movie deals with two characters at the

time of the development of the railroad in Mexico. One of them of the upper class, another of the humblest class

possible. By chance, they are forced to work together robbing banks, which makes them

heroines in their country, championing a small revolution against the power that the Unitedis trying to establish

States. Or, more or less, about that, no? Hey, look, I was thinking that this was going to be an infumable truce and

it was not that bad. It is a film of very light action, with a very predictable guide, without frights, but

which leaves a good taste in the mouth. It has its moments of humor, its picantones scenes, but it does not get to throw you at

any time of it. Because it is so light, it lets you follow the movie easily, so you can be at the

cinema thinking about your things that you finally find out about everything. The setting is quite curious and the

actors do it very well, and see that Pen���lope is not a saint of my devotion. By the way, I spent the whole moviedecipher

trying towho was the voice of the bad guy, and I think it's one of Cars, does anyone know

who it is? ���n light and cool to take the afternoon and leave with a smile of

good vibes.

" 0

" The mad Robinson family kept him attentive to the screen. So we will give the film a notable,

especially since it did not move from its seat.

Last Saturday, March 24, thanks to carrefouronline, we were able to attend a special pass for the customers

of their store, where we enjoyed the new Walt Disney movie. Disney's story is

once again fueled by family misfortunes, and this time it tells the story of a younggenius

orphan. Beyond the sentimentality of the film, which touches the hearts of adults and children, the

plot turned out to be somewhat complex. Follow the story through �s of the implications that the intervention has in the

past for the effects in the future, it seems to me that it is something too complicated for our young critic

that of this part of the film. In any case, the crazy Robinson family kept him

attentive to the screen, at times, even excited, but did not end up liking him as much as "" Colleagues in the

forest "" , which continues to classify your favorite movie. So we will give the film a notable,

especially since it did not move from its seat. Something tells me that our young 4-year-old critic is starting to grow up,

and he can stand the complex films for his little head without leaving the chair.

" 1

" An anti- logical film, essential and that achieves what it intends, without a doubt, to delve into the

consciousness of the spectator. The silence of the stalls thus made it clear.

When the film ends one is silent, crestfallen and thoughtful, while the black fade that

ends the tape of Paul Greengrass, seems to penetrate to your temples, and that, that fateful 11-S of a��� or 2001

something changed for everyone, and as I read there, we all lost something, (as we lost in my city on 11-M). The

tape mixes with mastery a drama, a thriller and a documentary, agitated and not mixed, as James Bond said;

Greengrass composes a tape where we see the characters not as heroes, but as any normal person,

go, as one of us in that position; It makes us also feel part of that flight, that we

suffer with what you feel in the air control, or with the decisions that were carried out that day. The

actors, all unknown, of many of them interpret themselves (well, they are the

"protagonists" of what happened), a script with snippets of history and much improvisation, and a story that,

even knowing the end, it keeps you stuck to the seat, an antològica tape, essential and that achieves what

it pretends, without doubt, to deepen in the conscience of the spectator. The silence of the stalls so

did it Patentea patent.

" 1

" Gags are not funny or even original. It's a bad comedy and the worst of all is aopportunity

wastedto do something interesting and really funny. Do not waste your time

Maybe I did not understand it ... I had heard interesting things from this movie so the disappointment was even

greater when I discovered that it was that kind of movies where it seems that something very funny is going to happen andhappens

nothing, one of the most frustrating movies I've seen and the worst thing is that I do not remember having said anything on any

occasion. Smear of smiles from time to time. Worse still is the fact that it has a good cast with

actors who have done good comedies and therefore one expects something more than half-finished andcharacters. Waiting

meaninglessaims to be one of those comedies closer to Porky's style ? s, however the

alleged gags are not funny or even original. The film tells the story of a group of young people

who work in a restaurant, therefore we have excuses to see fluid scenes in themeals

customers' unpleasant, but nothing that has not been seen; Maybe the only original thing is the game played by the

characters that tries to show each other the genitals in a surprising way, but after a

while it does not have much grace. As I said the characters are diffusely written, only in the case of the

character of Justin Long, a boy who faces the decision to continue his life working in the

restaurant or doing something else, seems to be more defined but Even that? In summary Waiting is a bad

comedy and the worst of all is a missed opportunity to do something interesting and really funny. Do not

waste your time A star.

" 0

" El pisito tells a true story of a man who consented to marry the old woman who rented him the

room to be able to inherit the apartment and thus fulfill the golden dream (institutional) of marrying his girlfriend of

all life. Adult cinematography, free of clichés.

The trembling blackness of the Spain of the saba������ and the coffee with hunger that Azcona and Ferreri capture in El pisito

seems in the light of the now a picturesque, picturesque portrait, a motley novel� Den of the life of our

grandparents that does not have validity in these new times, but the present time denies us as it wants and the

rotating ones of the information agencies vomit titres that could be attributed, without any effort , to the

Spain of that postwar period. What Azcona does as no one has done in the Spanish cinema is to write with bad

temper on the tip of the ballpoint pen or the keys of the heavy Underwood then. Azcona moves away from the

typical landscaping of exaltation of the military and of the patriotic thing in which the cinema was bored and drowned

to make some screwdriving, lyrical and beautiful arguments in his stark vision of the poverty of man

and the popular consent of moral and economic constraints that caused what Valle-Inclion, a few

years before, baptized as Esperpento. The dissidence of El pisitio comes here: to open in a channel (with sa���a,

with the very last sa���a sometimes) contemplation mon�� He notes that the Spanish footman made his national navel.

Everything crumbles with the classic prose of the sainete and between joke and chascarrillo collects Azcona apuja

bloodyto the censor, that is, to the conscience of a country that came out as he could. a war and that was

fooled by a flamenco nourished and cheerful tablao, an anti- logic manifestation of our homeland culture and simpar

icon of how much we thought beyond the Pyrenees. Berlanga, Bardem, Neville (in their own way) and Ferreri

formed an adult cinematography, exempt from clichés and totally exportable in the way ofneo-realism

Italianthat made three quarters of the same but with a Pl���yade more nourished by dissidents of the regime,

artists worried about politics and who saw in the cinema (let's say in art) a vehicle ���culo id���neo to

vent a little bit and, on the way, give to think (that my grandmother said) to some citizen accomplice in theplot

history. Thenarrates a true story of a man who consented to marry the old woman who rented him the

room to be able to inherit the apartment and thus fulfill the golden dream (institutional) of marrying his girlfriend of

all life . In the style of 13, Rue del Percebe, an exemplary comic in all respects, Ferreri opens his camera to

many characters: he does not let himself be carried away by the dramatic skills of Rodolfo, the groom- husband-widower who

interprets formidably a never well-considered Jos��� Lu���s L���pez Vazquez. What Ferreri does is give us a

huge additional information in each plane: not a single thing happens but there are several and all have readings

that affect the main one, to put it in some way. Ferreri flees from the short shots and works prodigies

when, mutely almost, he plants the camera in the center of the narrative action and lets the characters go running

over, occupying the space, creating a a very rich choral representation that has been triumphantly

copied by other directors to show, like Ferreri, the thick imbrication of several plots that are

juxtaposed, without opposing each other, to create the plot un�� �voke that we think we are seeing.I think now in Woody Allen, but

that is to go out of my way.Azcona, who then did (ah��� goes) The stroller, The executioner, Pl���cido, Thecousin

Ang���lica, The national shotgun, The girl with your eyes, Belle Epoque, The tongue of the butterflies and Ay, Carmela, who

remembers, some will have forgotten, is the master of distancing: his characters populate the lines of his

works and there is no sign that can be understood as an author's mark: Azcona se He decided to plant hisclass universe

middle-, his neighbors' stairs, and accelerate, as if it were a wristwatch, the ancient mechanisms

of comedy, of black humor, that is the real, perhaps the most serious of all. The idiosyncrasy of the Spanish people

of that time (already seen with a distance) does not remain in the embodiment. of social referents:

Ferreri and Azcona go further and delve into where it hurts the biempensante class and the holder of power.

They make hilarity of death, of marriage. They show with genius that living in Spain between the 40s and the 70s,

let's stop there, it was a heroism that the divas of the couplet and the rural histories did not alleviate. of

botijo ​​and boyfriend talking to the bride through a fence. Poverty annuls ethics. The need for

housing, never before so evident in the cinema, encourages morality to align with the interest. As a result

of this marriage the ingenuity, the trap, the gracious image of ugliness are born.

" 1

" The love and affection of the farmer Vincent is overwhelming and it is demonstrated in how he falls in love with his naive

victim (and reh���n even if he does not know) until he decides to pass for the altar, something very similar to what happened in

the great I drink your blood between rapist and victim.

I see of the tire and without any reason Motel Hell, of the year 80. Farmer Vincent runs a roadside motel

with his sister Ida (Porky's Balbricker) and is famous ( less in 150 kilometers around) for

its smoked meats. I imagine that with this you do not need to know more about the movie. I do not know why he plants the victims

in the garden and hypnotizes them with leiser rays before cutting them up and smoking them. The affection andoverwhelming

affection of the farmer Vincent isand is demonstrated in as he falls in love with his naive victim (and reh���n although he does not

know) until he decides to go through the altar, something very similar to what happened in the great I drink your blood

between rapist and v��� victim.The farmer Vincent has a brother sheriff who knows nothing of the "" secret "" of his

older brother. Go sheriff shit. Hilarious cl���max between man - pig (it is the farmer Vincent, of course) and

wood: duel to lighted chainsaws !!! In the end the farmer Vincent, in a moment to remember, reveals that he

used preservatives in the flesh (!! !) while agonizing. Unpayable final section.

" 0

" In general, a high quality film with a good story, with a staging that removes hiccups

and excellent work by Zhang after the cameras.

When I saw "" The Curse of the Golden Flower "" he did not know his director in passing. The only thing he knew about the

film was that it had the participation of Gong Li and Chow Yun Fat, who had held a nomination

the Oscars to the Best Costume and that the critics towards her were divided in two great groups: the very good ones and

those that they labeled it as disappointing. For that reason, when I began to see her, my expectations They were very few. And

precisely because of that, as the film developed, my expectations were crushed by a monster with

a speed that left me stuck in the site. And it is that the film counts with a gui���ns���lido (which does not

stand out), an amazing work on the part of the director, actors who eat the screen and with a

staging more than spectacular (and without needing digital effects). Let's go in parts. As I have already

mentioned, the work of Yimou Zhang (the director) is magnificent and full of enthusiasm (the scene of theguard

Emperor'swith the ropes on the cliff is spectacular), something that is appreciated, since Zhang demonstrates

very good taste when shooting the action scenes. Scenes of action that at no time become

cloying or exaggerated, simply. beautiful And it is that more than fighting it seems that the characters dance. With

highly dangerous sharp objects, but it seems that they dance, since it is such the harmony of the movements that

you can not stay more enthralled watching as they do those impossible pirouettes with anstyle and grace.

amazingGui���n is good, although not outstanding. The film is based more on the staging and

the story that tells that in the script. The cast of actors looks tremendously well, although they are not their

best roles they show that they are immense actors. Especially the two leading the cast, Gong Li (which

we did not see from "" Corruption in Miami "" and who played a magnificent role in "Memories of a Geisha" ") and

Chow Yun-Fat (which we saw recently with very dirty teeth on a ship in the Caribbean seas). Both

perform a very credible and correct act and are perhaps the two actors and the two characters that stand

out in the story. In the technical field, it stands out in two areas: in the dressing room (surprising) and in the

sets (immense). In both you can see the hand of the director, who shows a great care in everything related to the

staging, as shown in "" The House of Flying Daggers. "" The soundtrack, although resultona and

correct, out of tune in some In general, a film of great quality

with a good history, with a staging that removes hiccups and excellent work by Zhang after

the cameras.

" 1

" Approve by the hair and the soundtrack, because the last 20 minutes are very poor. Could it be that

the American comedy is hitting bottom?

Todd Phillips is a saint of my devotion. First, because Road Trip is more appealing to me than American Pie,

second, because Old School is the closest thing to Animal House that we have done in the last day. each and third

because Starsky & Hutch finally worked. School for pringaos (memorable again the Lord of the

translations) is an unsuccessful attempt at comedy because it is not so comedy or is asas

desmadradacab�� �a wait for the team Phillips-Armstrong, almost infallible until today.The movie is not a co���azo, but it is long

(107 minutes of comedy are many even for Virgin at 40) and does not have the amount of good gags necessary

for that duration, only that of the paintballs and the joke with Moby stand out from the rest. Heder should

start to select his papers a little, because if he is not going to happen the same as a Thornton who here seems to

play the same role as in the impending Mr.Woodcock. Despite all this year Heder has made an

ideal match with Will Ferrell in Blades of Glory. A little too bland. Try it by the hair and the soundtrack,

because the last 20 minutes are very poor. PS: Could it be that the American comedy is hitting bottom, � Has anyone

seen the pitiful trailer of the last of the Farrelly?

" 0

" The fact that the suggestive story of the "Dei Gloria", the eighteenth-century brigantine that shelters the treasure

so precious, is blurred and hardly counts, does not exactly favor the result of the film.

Imanol Uribe is not exactly the height of subtlety. We said it because of his "" Carol's trip "" and we must

repeat it now, in view of this adaptation of the novel by Arturo P���rez-Reverte . Go ahead that

"" The Spherical Chart "" is not a bad movie, although maybe it's not the good movie that could have been missed. of

the interesting work of the Cartagena scholar. The book is powerful: it describescharacters in some way

archetypal, but with a specific weight. The translation to the celluloid by the Basque filmmaker is not at that

same height. The story is attractive: an unemployed sailor meets a devastating female (in the best tradition of the

vampires of cinema, but updated) that hooks him to an impossible company, with several,

blow-upsto which It's dangerous, lurking, although the main danger of the couple is so close: inside, specifically.

But the praying mantis that should be the female character of T���nger is far from being the putrid,

deceitful, treacherous, calculating woman that P���rez-Reverte imagined. . This has to do, of course, the very

Aitana S���nchez-Gij���n, to which the roles of villain do not go mostly, but it is also the fault of one's own

Uribe, who was never a paragon of perfection when directing actors. Carmelo G���mez spends three quarters

of the same thing: his Coy does not have the entity, the baggage, the residue of his "" alter ego "" literary. Enrico Lo Verso is an

unconvincing Palermo: he never sees the bad sa���a to kill a fly, he is not the adventurer tanned in a

thousand battles and with more bad grapes than the Snow White Stepmother who describes the book Thus, "" TheLetter

Spherical"", in its cinematographic adaptation, turns out to be a neat product, told with professionalism but

without any personality spark, confirming that On the day they talked about creativity in school, Uribe must have

missed, perhaps with mumps? It does not want to be a demolishing critic, because there are products that deserve it

much more: here is a correct production design, a story that never bores (it is impossible in the

stories of P���rez-Reverte, where many things happen, and almost always stimulating, or at least striking), a

cute couple (although G���mez is beginning to get fond���n, and poor Aitana the Basque director makes her

fornicate as if instead of making love she was sticking with her lover, being ridiculous instead of

erotic), beautiful landscapes Coastal and submarine, the search for a hidden treasure, bad (some

shoddy), good (something carajotes) and mediopensionistas (she, hell and paradise in a single body). However

, the fact that the suggestive story of the "" Dei Gloria "", the eighteenth-century brigantine that shelters the

treasure so precious, is blurred and hardly counted, does not run precisely in favor of the result of the film.

Certainly, the vicissitude of that Jesuit ship that tried to avoid the expulsion of the Company, at the hands of

Carlos III, would deserve a film for herself . That yes, if possible, that Imanol Uribe does not direct it?

" 0

" In the "" supposedly "" country of opportunities where you can be who you want and in a historical moment

where the mafia faces the biggest change, "" modernization "" takes place this story that transforms

dreams.

2007 closes with one of the best titles of this year. American Gangster directed by maestro Ridley

Scott, one of my favorite directors and one of the most faithful to his actors, who becomes fetishes of

the performance by repeating experiences in his different films. And if there is an actor that Ridley is addicted to, that

is Russell Crowe. This actor who is like good wine (the older he is the better), has ancapacity

admirableto create within each character an authentic universe. Each character has his tiks, way of

speaking, walking. This man is one of the greats. What about your castmates Denzel Washington who

is a real animal before the camera and Chiwetel Ejiofor who begins to solidify his career, all these

actors have something in common? ��ny is that "" what they have achieved "" cinematographically speaking is the product of many

years of effort and of supporting slamming doors in the face. Ridley has consecrated them as they deserve through

several of his films and now brings them back together with a truly spectacular interpretive result.

A 10 for all the actors; Secondaries, special figurations, are all superb. The interesting thing about

this story is not what it tells us about the Gangsters, but how the American dream can be reached and truncated

. In the "" Supposedly "" country of the opportunities where you can be who you want and in amoment

historicalwhere the mafia faces the biggest change "" Modernization Transcurn "" this story takes place that

transforms personal dreams into reality and realities into nightmares. In this film, as in theentire filmography

director's, his magical way of telling the story is full of magic in each of his frames and that is

precisely what matiene your interest from beginning to end. Fair doses of action, poor photography and a

horribly ugly Puerto Rico miss are some of the negatively highlighted things in the film. It is true

fuck, how can you put a Miss Puerto Rico with that skin and that face, in short it is very ugly. In conclusion

highly recommended film. Churchill at War, Body of Lies, and X Factor Are the films that Ridley

released in 2008 and can you guess who is in the cast?

" 1

" While I did not have any hope that the plot would hook me, I at least hoped to find a good

supply of sophisticated tortures ready to be tasted. Unfortunately, this time neither one nor the other.

Before starting to disembowel the fourth installment of Saw IV should be clarified that this tribune hurts

criticize a saga of this caliber. The killer sagas of terror and devoid of any type of pretension are,

as you know, very appreciated by this, and the wanderings of Jigsaw (already turned into a parody of themselves)

seems confirmed that they will arrive at least until their sixth installment. Saw films meet many of the

requirements to become a mythical franchise to me. ��s pure style Friday the 13th or Nightmare on Elm Street:

Understated general characteristics, such as generosity when it comes to showing blood and monsters (rubbing the

gore in the third installment and severely attenuated in this last) the succession of deliveries without almost time for

respite, the exploitation of the moderately surprising successes of the first part and the inescapable lack of

coherence and pretensions, are shown in each one of the films without any type of trap or cardboard. Saw does not

deceive anyone (at least not anymore) and the viewer who comes to the room must be prepared for what is going to be offered.

However, despite my appreciation for the casquera bet that these tapes represent , I can not help

feeling disappointed by his fourth installment. If Saw III had almost completely relegated the spirit

closest to the thriller that could be intuited slightly in the previous installments (especially in the first)

placing almost one hundred percent of the action in a succession of the most macabre and hilarious tortures, Saw IV

brings back those channels little more or less autoparÃdicos towards an indefinable style. ��cula again tries to

become strong in the final surprise, with more brains than ever in fact, turning the gui���n into a galimat���as

impossible to follow by anyone who has not seen the previous deliveries. It gives the feeling that Darren Lynn Bousman

tries to recover the seriousness and to grant to the series of films a spirit of geom���trica work, thought and designed

as a whole from the beginning . This pretension, if any, falls under its own weight with a script that

knows, if possible, more absurd than ever: The bulk of the plot is based on a police that follow the

dark Puzzle plans, step by step and without missing a comma, totally and absolutely unbelievably, and,

as in previous occasions, the narrative jumps between parallel stories focusing his attention, in the second

instance, on the delirious and unjustified (at least not correctly) origin of the psychopath. Once again aending

surprising and unexpectedadorns and accelerates the closing of the movie with two surprises this Once, a very

interesting one related to the temporal line and the other, resobada and above more stupid than ever, concerning

the characters. All this seasoned with the already famous and effective melod���a brand of the house. In the visual section

the film loses many integers with respect to its predecessors. The traps devised by Jigsaw areon this

ignoredoccasion; Practically no importance is given to torture and most games are not very

specific and are very confusing. Except one or two macabre jokes, the rest is difficult to know the procedure

to be adopted by the victim, and above all rolled with a crazy camera that gets in front of the clarity of

situations. If it were not for the initial autopsy, a strong point of the movie, the disappointment would be irreconcilable. In

short, even watching Saw IV with a compassionate look, defender as I consider myself of this type of

proposals, I just followed the thread to the director. Even though I did not have any hope that the plot wouldme

hook, I at least hoped to find a good supply of sophisticated tortures ready to be

tasted. Unfortunately, this time neither one nor the other.

" 0

" Rare piece of end-of-career competition for a talented director with vice to assemble what, in

principle, seems very difficult: classical black cinema and American-style youth film .

Brick is noir teenager, a rare piece of end-of-career competition for a talented director with a vice

to assemble what, in principle, seems very difficult: classical black cinema and high school film

the American. Brick does not exhibit the predictable shrillness for being an amateur work (almost) and for raising such a

risky discourse. It is supplied with a very solid black film approach, truffled by the acne of

youth hormones with pins on the lapel and posters of rap idols on the plate of the box office of the

institute. What is the aesthetic quality of Brick, what matters here is his deed, his simple ministry of purpose

fulfilled: there can be no slander when assessing his draft in the p��� public, even if one knows, for

sure, that these deviations from the norm are not going to make cash nor entice producers -wives of silver who

see prequels and sequels, hamburger merchandise and shirts for August in all these products of

new design whose final result is (always) puzzling. Nor is the spectator going to make

this parade of bullies, rich children and people, usually openly sinister (the character of the

Spielbergian Luke Haas, already rejuvenated in adult with perspectives Rian Johnson's ingenuity makes the

researches of his protagonist, very convoluted, twisted at times, seem more important than the

discovery of the reasons why his girlfriend has appeared dead. Unfinished, imperfect characters:

young people without lyricism, entrenched in a society without emotions in which they let themselves live, weighed down by not

guessing what dark vices, perceived as an extension forced the movies of teenagers talluditos,

hooligans, irreverent, back from a lot and without having lived yet barely anything. I drop, as inadvertently,

the last stone in the pond: Brick is a movie Creative word: it appears clear and it is cloudy, cumbersome: it

sacrifices the elementary exposition of the events by a distracting drawing of the social class that

undertakes to portray us, disfiguringly.Well look, it does not excite, and I could. I understand who this

failed experiment has reported joy and entertainment in the same lot. To me, on the contrary, it

produced an intense anxiety, boredom at times, pleasure only at times. Even the mcguffin is

incompetent. It will be that I had no arrests to let myself be led by his bizarre argument.

" 0

" A film of essential animation, with a soundtrack maybe not as good as in the 2nd delivery

but very very valid and a very pleasant rhythm , so much that it was short.

Come on. Come on, do not be so tough comps. It is amazing how the work andogress have been improved graphically

miracles of this good-for-nothing, we love it. Much has rained since we first saw the

appearance of this character in the cinema, but despite all this time and the aforementioned

improved graphics, Sherk retains all its freshness, wit and originality. Sherk's writers once

again have hit the nail on the head, an excellent script, makes us live an excellent movie evening. The film fulfills

the expectations expected and what continues to amaze me, is that way of combining "" the moral "" of all life,

that of the stories. with a visual and verbal language absolutely current and intelligible for any type of

spectator (children, adults, geeks.) Characters like Rasquit���no our beloved Puss in Boots and theirlooks

sweepingwill conquer you with all security. As a novelty in this release we have a Molotov cocktail

of story characters that are masterfully introduced into the story. A film ofanimation

essential, with a soundtrack maybe not as good as in the 2nd delivery but very very valid and arhythm

very pleasant, so much that the movie was short. It could be that since in this film we have seen the details of

Sherk in his married life, his evolution as a character towards fatherhood and the struggle to preserve his

emotional stability (Values ​​that must be to inculcate the new generation of oaks that is coming to us)

reveal a sequel, that since we are in the era of sequels, look, at least the type of sequels is

expected and celebrated for their genius.

" 1

" Very funny, mounted with fear, with a lot of indicative posters of the most chik and with an elaborate

plot that does not take more than ninety minutes of good cinema.

Pop cinema, but seriously. "" Matador "", written and directed by Richard Shepard is one of the best of last

season. And it is for several reasons. He has a marvelous actors couple, with Pierce Brosnan brutally

funny, wonderful, in the best performance of his career and the always effective Greg Kinnear in another

emotional role of "" looser. "" The story is original: a murderer for hire (Brosnan) "" burnt out "", like the last

Zidane, and a businessman whose life does not smile at him specially (Kinnear) who tries to emerge from a

crisis for the p�� The loss of his son next to his wife (the fantastic Hope Davis), they meet in the bar of a

hotel in Mexico. (almost like "" Lost in Translation "") A funny (andis formed between them.

freaky) friendshipPierce Brosnan leaves the ballast Bond and falls apart in a hilarious composition (Spanish

spokenincluded) Half of the strange couple, Kinnear. David Tattersall's photograph ("" The

green mile "" or the last three episodes of "" Star Wars "" ) is impeccable, with colors that come out of the

screen and that seem to be taken from an Almod���var movie (like the title), and the soundtrack is tremendous (starts

with The Jam and ends with The Killers), although Rolfe Kent's score is reminiscent of "Forrest Gump". "Very

funny, scary, with a lot of indicative posters of the most chik and with an elaborate plot that

takes no more than ninety minutes of good recommended cine.Muy, the Brosnan / Kinnear couple histrica.Una phrase:

"" Perhaps men Success did not have their hands stained with blood.

" 1

" Mediocre frame by frame, foreseeable minute by minute, unconscious, neutral in its false appearance

of novelty.

Roland Joffe is not a promise of quality, but has a pull supported by sober choral spectacles like The

Mission or even the very concise and dramatically contained, despite the excesses that could They must have been committed,

The Scarlet Letter or The Screams of Silence. Captivity takes the new batch oftelefilms

policeto the CSI its formal stage. The imposing complexity makes it stand out from the psychological thriller

that his poster and his advertising pretend to immerse himself in a shameless (and boring) game of falseshadows

Chinesewhere everything is what it seems and nothing is out of predictability. The theme is more finely crafted

in The Collector (William Wyler, 1965). If one has seen enough movies, there is no surprise, there is

no turn that dazzles us, no evidence that we are witnessing something different. It is more of the same,

but in another tape. Quoting CSI, that prodigious series of wonderful arguments, that boast ofconcision

narrative, or Without a trace (both programmed by our private) is to deny its cinematographic nature and

to bring it to the fan of the televised. At one time, cinema was always something infinitely more attractive than

television. Today there are no such certainties. There are series of outstanding quality that exceed the attractiveness of the

product made to go through the box of the touring multiplex. Now (without going any further) I'm hooked on

Heroes, a more than worthy review of the film filmed but without having to resort (like his brothers on the

big screen) to excessive budgets and special effects of relumbrance (Quote Spiderman or the4

Fantasticor The Hulk). Captivity oozes vulgarity. A vulgarity enthroned by neutral characters,

barely attractive, oblivious to any hint of empathy. At one point in the film, we do not care what

happens. These disturbed behaviors that plague the billboard have us already a little fed up. Enough of Saws.

Enough of psychopaths. Enough trembling video clips of overwhelm. You can always look in the DVD library (

word that scares) and pull the silence of the lambs. Now they announce a sequel or it's a prequel to the

sequel or it's an attempt (legitimate) to trace the origins of evil, the primary nature of Dr. Lecter and

see if as a boy he was already so subtle in his bad temper, so fit in his political bestiality.

" 0

" It was one of the first films to deal with the issue of discrimination and racial intolerance, without

presumptions and without? ���o���er���as ?, a film in that a white man educates his children by teaching them to respect

people, whoever they may be, while facing the obstacles of a petty society and reluctant to

accept differences.

We are before a sublime film, captivating, at times sensitive and at times memorable, worthy of

being considered one of the best productions of all time, conquers you with a simplicity that reigns

from the beginning to the finish. Adaptation of the homonymous novel by Harper Lee, tells us a drama about the

best and the worst of the human being and cruelties are often able to commit. With a verybeginning

different, intriguing and originalfor the time, I'll tell you something about the plot: everything begins in the small southern

city ​​of Maycomb, in the middle of the depression. Atticus Finch (Gregory Peck in which was the role of

his life), is a humble lawyer who lives with his two children and his housekeeper without many luxuries, but with

great dignity. The children of Atticus are obedient, responsible and educated: since they were little, they learned with their

father the principles of justice, of respect for others and of equality - the relationship between father and children It is

therefore strong and strong, also because Finch plays mother and father at the same time. But all this is broken

when our protagonist accepts to defend the black Tom Robinson (Brock Peters), accused of rape agirl

white. Atticus then becomes the object of hatred and racism of some inhabitants of the city,

angry that Finch defends a person of color. On the other hand, at the same time that he tries to win the

case, he tries to protect his children from those feelings of hatred of which he is a victim. On the day of the trial,

Atticus proves the innocence of the accused, demonstrating to all the hypocrisy and cynicism of such accusation,

simply by the color of the person's skin. Even so the verdict is guilty for Tom Robinson. There are

at least four great moments to highlight throughout the film: 1) When Atticus's daughter, Scout (Mary

Badham), in a scene in which her father is cornered by several villagersaway by simply

, he leads themhaving an innocent conversation with one of them - when asked about his son, companion in Scout school

- and where we can observe the innocence of a child. Sina without malice faced with a person full of hatred and

prejudice. 2) When Finch tells his children the story that gives title to the film and that they only understand

at the end of it. 3) The Maycomb Sheriff's warning to Atticus that "" they are going for him "" and 4) Thescene of the

exitAtticus court, after defending Tom Robinson, when all the Blacks present in the room

stand up and greet him with pride. We also remember that the veteran actor Robert Duvall makes

his first appearance on the big screen, on paper, in this film. from Boo Radley, a young man with someretardation

mentaland a mysterious past that is a source of admiration, fear and fascination on the part ofchildren

Finch's, who collect small objects of wood and soap that Boo carves and deposits in the hole of

a tree in front of the house. As for the great protagonist of the film, Gregory Peck, we must say in his favor that it

is delivered totally to the character, with a heart and a sincerity beyond doubt, doing - as I mentioned

in a previous sentence - the role of his road It is very difficult to imagine another actor playing the role of

Atticus Finch, whom we should consider a true hero, an honest, just and tolerant person, a

lawyer from provinces with some ideals above all kinds of pettiness. How could it be less, achieved

by that role the Oscar for best actor. Mention that the film also won the statuette for the best

artistic direction, a whole story in the story, since the spectators really feel immersed in the

time portrayed in all its details. The great adaptation of Horton Foote also took the

statuette. "" Killing a ruise���or "" was one of the first films to deal with the subject of discrimination and

racial intolerance, without presumptions and without "" ���o���er���as "", a film in which a white man educates his children

teaching �ndoles to respect people, whoever they are, while facing the obstacles of asociety

pettyand reluctant to accept differences. In short, a good story, a good director, an

excellent actor and a black-and-white photo taken care of? It was sung that I had to come out a

masterpiece.

" 1

" It is presented as an option for lovers of Zhang Yimou, Gong Li and visual spectacularity. The

rest better than refrain.

Disenchanted and bored. So I could define myself after having seen the new film of the great Zhang Yimou. The

truth is that I really wanted to see this new work, and despite the virtues it has "" The curse of the

golden flower "", it is an excessively long and heavy work The virtues are obvious, and never better

: the photography, the artistic direction, the design of production and Gong Li, stand out and demonstrate the

talent that is in this production. I can not forget Chow Yun Fat too, although it does not stand out

especially. Anyone who sees this movie in a cinema will be amazed by the

spectacular and ornate images of a culture. so distant and ancestral, that it combines the different chromatic values,

in an exceptionally beautiful way. See those general plans of the exterior of the palace, the different costumes

worn by the characters, the official abode where the Emperor is staying before get to the palace, those

rocky landscapes in which there is a battle. In short, a visual show for which it is almost worth

going to the cinema, and I say almost, because the biggest mistake or problem of this film, is that it becomes eternal. With a start

in which they give us information ,N, but it does not just happen "" nothing "", the story is becoming more and more dense,

while introducing new mysteries and family dramas, which try to alleviate with small sequences of

action that are too choreographed, and that have long since lost their grace. I think that in the first half hour of the

film, many people wondered what the hell they were doing in the room, and if it would be better to try to sneak into another

or failing to spend time on something more productive. Yes, this appreciation is very strong, but the picture

was like that. I could expand more, but even the final part, in which great things begin to happen. , it does notus

leavewith a good taste in the mouth. Battles that remind at times to those of "" The Lord of the Rings "", but without the

magic of these, to end with a somewhat bitter ending (which is not bad) but not it provokes no

feeling in the spectator, already removed from many minutes ago, of the spirit and the feeling of this

peculiar real family. In short, "" The curse of the golden flower "" is presented as an option for

lovers of Zhang Yimou, Gong Li and visual spectacularity. The rest better than refrain.

" 0

" The truth is that I love films about intimate relationships between people but if one is not

going to be able to do a good job it is better to turn to other great classics.

I do not know if the fact of being a loner and lonely person made me adore the films that talk about

social relationships; the comings and goings of a group of beings somewhat stunned and, above all, very selfish,

usually known as humans. However, I must also recognize that when a

feature film of these characteristics does not meet a minimum of expectations, the result is more negative than with

another type of g��. Less pretentious. Something similar thought when I saw Women in the park, the last work of

Felipe Vega. An alleged drama that narrates the sentimental crisis of a couple and the repercussion that thisbrings

problemon the closest environment: his daughter. The intention of the director has been to add reality on the

subject and in some respects he has achieved it (some other dialogue, the interpretation of B ���rbara Lennie, the

urbanized images of Madrid) but the main problem lies in the lack of depth and search,

especially, because we talk about feelings. As a finale, to try to get out of the way, the end turns

suspiciously and gives the feeling that this trick is intended to cover the lack of creative research,

but the only thing that is achieved is to increase the incredulity of a story that is supposed to be very real. It is also not

very clear the existence of certain characters and their importance in the development of history (thestudent

heavywho overflows with questions and when he begins to show us his interior disappears - and it is a

shame because it is one of the most interesting character - or the friend with Ana's rapist aspirations). The truth

is that I love movies about intimate relationships between people but if one is not going to be able

to do a good job it is better to resort to other great classics since being worse will bring you more

benefits at the box office (musicals with people who can sing us, comedies with humor casposo, pel�� Conculas with

many nudes and little argument, dramas of suffered widows without money that go to the market with a Gucci suit

and hairdresser's mo���o, etc.).

" 0

" The story advances to the rhythm of the bloody razors of this peculiar barber (as well as a master

Johnny Depp) and the tribulations of a no less strange pastry maker (an excellent Helena Bonham Carter) .

Cinema is one of the few arts capable of surprises, and if not there is an example that illustrates this

approach to perfection. How can it be that a declared non-admirer of Tim Burton and nothing enthusiastic

about musicals like the one who signs these lines, may like a film that still Both elements? Sweeney

Todd, to which we will refer with the short version of his title, is undoubtedly one of the films of

the season, and that sound with force of face the most prestigious prizes in the United States. Sweeney Todd is

a Tim Burton in its purest form, adapting a musical that told the legend of a 19th-London barber

century. From the credit titles, you can already see the personal narrative style and the powerful aesthetic that Burton

gives to all his works, and it is clear that this time, the blood is �� that will reach the river, almost

literally. Sweeney Todd is the story of a betrayal, of lost love and its consequent revenge, which is

enhanced by musical numbers of great wit and formal beauty, although this last one is still a

contradiction in itself. The story advances to the rhythm of the bloody razors of this peculiar barber

(as well, a master Johnny Depp) and the tribulations of a no less strange pastry (an excellent

Helena Bonham Carter). The film loses strength with the scenes of the soft Jamie Campbell Bower, and would have been

grateful for a greater presence of the great Alan Rickman.Sweeney Todd: The Diablic Barber Fleet Street is the

last great Tim Burton's visual and aesthetic epic, in which, in addition to the form, it is fully in the

background. It will excite the Burton fans, and the rest of us are comforted by the fact that they have stopped infantile stories

and have returned to this type of truculent stories, which they dominate to perfection.

" 1

" A modern musician who does not age at all. Taking advantage, not only of my wedding anniversary, but also that the cosmopolitan channel has once again replaced

some "classic" "modern" , I found myself, again, with this jewel of the current cinema, and that is, I had forgotten how

magnificent is the film of Bill Murray, Andie MacDowell, Chris Elliot, directed by the always great Harold

Ramis, it is true that in some moments can come to gratify the repetition of situations, since Murray and

all of us, relive again and again the same day, although, also That grated has its attractive touch, and

the evolution of this life over and over again. It shows in addition to Murray (who was going to tell this man that

Sof���a Coppola was going to rediscover as "" serious actor "") Andie MacDowell, in the era in which he was one of the

beautiful faces of cinema (now to become typical of cinema independent), and Chris Elliot, at the time of

full relevance for the series "" B���scate life. "" The only catch that I see is that someone does not enter "" the game ""

of the same, and the repetition of situations seems a sovereign stupidity, it can happen, but it is not the

typical, and Murray in some moments is too overactive, but hey, they also overact and they are

famous in the whole world. There is an authentic freak to the film, with an official website about the famous

groundhog Phil and where we solve doubts about it, by the way, the day The marmot is February 2,

in case someone was curious.

" 1

" Casino Royale runs at a good pace, maintains an interesting pulse with the viewer during thegame

poker. A very successful guide to show us how James became Bond.

The director Martin Campbell, who already entertained us (and a lot) with "" La M���scara del Zorro "" and "" The Legend of

Zorro "" among others, now surprises us with a new sequel to the secret agent m� It's famous James Bond.

Previously I already directed "" GoldenEye "" rather less fortunate than the current one "" Casino Royale "" I sincerely went to the

cinema to see this film, which is practically obligatory, since in addition not like any of the007

previous(specifically GoldenEye seemed a colossal boredom), but I have to admit that I

found a pleasant surprise. Martin Campbell has left the skin in this film (imagine after the crap of the

previous sequel), has told us the story of a Young Bond who is released as a double zero agent, with his

mistakes his sweat on the chest (arf arf), in f���n, m��� s human and what I always say "" cre���ble "". And who is the new

macizorro? Ai nenas is Daniel "" morritos "" Craig (aaaaaa I have a weakness for blondes), an actor

most of the time secondary, with 47 films to his credit, still A had not had the opportunity to

be at its best as in this film. If daughters, are you taking bread and wet? Of course

and by far the best James Bond who has known this legend (although he takes the whole

movie doing licks). And who is the companion of this stallion? (I walked that you are wishing that the despelle begins

) then ���Eva Green! Recovered from the baldness that lashed her coconut tree in "" The kingdom of heaven ""

becomes a dams bond girl. Eva is a great great actress, we like her, we respect her, we felllove

inwith "" So���adores "" she has a peculiar beauty (I'm going to ignore the part where I say that on her forehead we can play

Basque ball calmly), but? Sincerely, she is not the type of actress that I would have chosen as a

girl-bond, she does not hit anything, let's go and much less since she has lost so much that she has the look of "I'm

doing a diet that you shit and I want bread bread" "that is to say, the eyes disheveled by hunger, much better

in" "So���adores" ", Eva, we like you with curves? This role, was for Evangeline Lily (Lost) or Vahina

Giocante (Lia says), this if it had been a spectacular���sima girl-bond, especially trying to

play Vesper? better is that Martin wanted to give a touch of sosez to this character.Casino

Royale runs with good pace, keeps an interesting pulse with the viewer during the game of poker.

A very successful guide to show us how James became Bond. Finally, to highlight the impeccable Judy

Dench, an actress who should be honored urgently and who repeats along with Daniel in the continuation

of "" Casino Royale "" whose premiere is planned for the 2008 and that will bear the name of "" Bond 22 "", is still

confirmed by bond girl and cast remnant.

" 1

" It seems that Billy Bob Thortom has definitely lost his way and needs to find his place in the

cinema. And it is decanting dangerously for the comedy gamberra teen of misfits made in USA.

It seems that Billy Bob Thortom has definitely lost his way and needs to find his place in the cinema.

And it is decanting dangerously for the comedy gamberra teen of misfits made in USA. Which is not that it

is all bad but those of us who think that he has been a great actor deeply felt his loss. School of

Pringados is one more story in the cinema of the unsuccessful. Jon Heder (seen in Patinazo a la Gloria) is Roger, a common

guy, who works as a mobility agent (those people who give you fines and do not fall into the category of

guards or police) and not only is a failure at work, the same can be said of his personal life. He is not

able to talk to a girl without fainting and not even want him in a program of Big Brothers as a

volunteer. That's why they give him the telephone number of Doctor P. He ends up in this way in a class where he will try to

restore his self-esteem and teach him to be a real man. This is what the trailer at least showed us.

The reality is that half of the film takes place with the confrontation between Roger and Doctor P for the

love of the neighbor recently conquered by the apprentice. Do you lose grace? Yes, the reality is that even though Inot

'ma fan of this kind of a hundred the first part is much more entertaining than the second and I managed to get

some laugh out of it. I can not miss on the tape the presence of the unmistakable Ben Stiller, it seems that if they intend to

do something that smells comedieta has to put the head even if it was a cameo. Another Lost in Translation

in the film is Michael Clarke Duncan (do not ask why they have cheated him because it sure was in the form of a

green note) although it seems that as a secondary in this type of comedies can win the bread very well.

Otherwise the direction of Todd Philips that already has filming with movies like Starsky & Hutch or Road

Trip. It seems, that I know that he has settled down a little and does not dare to do what he once suggested that he could oust

the Farrelly as the new genius of the comedy gamberra.

" 0

" Flat film, bland, with hardly any argument and with bad jokes Age Age was a great box office success and I think a big group of fans around this saga, and I say saga because

Ice Age 2 does not It will be the last one. However, I do not belong to this group of fans and I can hardly understand the success of

these films. Ice Age 2 is a simple movie, with very smooth jokes and sometimes even very bad and

with a very low plot load. The biggest problem with the film is that it works like several comic strips

together without much relation between them, it gives the impression that in the studies of this movie they said

"" We are going to make a movie on the thaw, that each one makes a short on the subject and then we join them "" and

this is the impression given, because many of the scenes are totally alien to the plot of the movie. Another

big problem of Ice Age 2 is that they have fallen again in the same stone as with the one, the best thing about the

movie is the squirrel (or go to know that it is that bug) that is looking for its acorn, its appearance In the film it

will be about six or seven times as intermissions of the rest of the film, and curiously the two best of these

scenes have been chosen as trailers to promote it. In the Ice Age saga instead of usingimages

fastfor the trailers as they do in most movies, they take a scene completely, they put the

credits at the beginning and at the end and we have a trailer . This causes the movie to start and say "This I have already

seen" and the truth is, I do not like this marketing technique used for Ice Age. And again another

error that is repeated, is that the film is totally superficial, does not touch just any dramatic story

as they usually do in other animation productions, see Shrek or Finding Nemo. As this

happened in the one, now in the two the story of anfemale mammothis almost completely ignored.

abandonedthat joins the team and of which obviously attempts to introduce a love story that really

gives us the same,It does not matter if she has been abandoned or that she has to separate from the group or

whatever, and the film as I say is totally flat, it does not have that sentimental touch that

most animated films have. Anyway in Ice Age 2 it is also visible that these studies only

try to imitate the big ones and not develop their own style as PDI or Pixar did, and that is why

many characters or situations remind other productions already seen. They have even tried to introduce a

music number that turns out to be disastrous at least after the dubbing, it would have to be seen in the original version

to prove it, but most of all Probably it would be just as bad, as I insist it seems that one of the

animators said he was going to do a musical short and they have put him in the movie, so Ice Age 2 works.

As for animation, things do not They have changed a lot, since the characters are well done but the backgrounds

are tremendously ugly, in fact this was very criticized in the one, but since it is on the thaw it is

more likely that they could create landscapes more It's green and spectacular, as flat and white as it was in the

first installment, and indeed this is done in one of the first scenes you see when the thaw begins. However

later it seems that the animators got tired of working and all the scenarios are land, that is, little

more than painting the brown ice. In short, Ice Age 2 is in my opinion a flat movie, bland, with

hardly any argument and bad jokes, but it will undoubtedly be a box office success for the second time. If you liked

the first one, you will like the second, but do not even bother going to see it, because both are the same and make the

same mistakes.

" 0

" The enthusiasts of Breaking the waves, Dancing in the dark, Dogville, Idiots, Europe or other good

works of dogma 95 like Mifune, Celebration ... abstain, this is the most expendable . Although if you're freaky

or scandinavian, you'll be excited.

Well, even if it did not seem so, given the deep and dramatic burden of his filmography, Lars Von Trier has a

sense of humor, his. And the boss of all this has made it clear, that's his way: austere and with

Danish jokes. On this occasion, he moves us to an office in which an unemployed actor is hired to

perform in front of the employees the role of a boss they do not know and that is an invention of the real owner

to fall sympathetic to his subordinates and that they charge their anger against the imaginary director of the

company. Personally I have not barely said anything. The humor is very local and they say that the Danes are

laughing when they call them idiots and as I do not, of course, nor smile. As ignored by almost all the rest of

Europe, is that between Danish and Icelanders there is a rivalry that comes from 400 years ago when it was

Iceland under the dominion of Denmark, so these gags are not it takes the grace if you are not an

involved party. However, there is some magic scene that works and, of course, long dialogues,lighting

naturaland a form of filming called Automation. Von Trier release the camera's hand and uses a

system after having placed the camera on a point of view artistic compiled in a program

corrections were they study, are they discarded? In short, there are a lot of random possibilities that

a computer controls. The result in my opinion is somewhat syncopated and with the image quality of

my nephew's communication. If the filmmaker's intention is to show us that man is a worm for man when of

work it is, much better have told this in Smoking Room, Glengarry Glen Ross or The Method. As the

enthusiasts of Breaking the waves, Dancing in the dark, Dogville, Idiots, Europe or other good works

of dogma 95 like Mifune, Celebration ... abstain, this is the most dispensable. Although if you're freaky or

scandinavian, you'll be excited. I have passionately defended these works to those who say that stripping

the cinema of artifices is as silly an involvement as the choice of some to give birth without an epidural, this time

callus.

" 0

" If in the third you felt the same sensation of pathological boredom that I felt it is better that you strike out of

memory the existence of Saw IV, if on the contrary you enjoy the insubstantial gore and you do not care about the

obvious endings ... Go ahead!

Did you think he was dead? Yes, of course, we all did it but when they do the autopsy Jigsaw has

left one of his cryptic messages in his stomach in order to save humanity from themselves. In this

last installment (which will surely be preceded by Roman masters very soon) we find another

orchestrated series of bloody and gore tests and a bit of pre-assassination history in the that we know the

protagonist after the clown of the first three deliveries before his final adi���s. Saw IV tries to offer a

little more of the same. There's not much news, it's a kind of huge Deja V��� that not only brings nothing new but

plagiarizes itself (concretely to its predecessor Saw III) and does not get to like the novice or

reconquer the viewer of his first deliveries. Let's recognize that with its first part a part of the good

lover of horror films thought that finally could find a reference in the current cinema that drop in

any talk of the genre, but after seeing As the saga developed, it is better to forget all the other

tapes that have caricatured the good idea of ​​the first to turn it into a joke of itself. If in the

third you felt the same sensation of pathological boredom that I felt, it is better that you effectively strike out of

memory the existence of Saw IV and leave things as they were, if on the contrary you enjoy with thegore

insubstantialand you do not mind the obvious endings from the beginning. Go ahead! All yours.

" 0

" Catch from the first minute, it flows like no other, with an engrgic and effective direction and assembly,

fleeing from dead times and unnecessary scenes. Martin returns to demonstrate that today you can see good

movies in Hollywood.

Lately I'm getting tired of reading the chant that is running out of creativity in Hollywood,

there are many sequels and remakes, etc. The bad thing is that many times this comes from the pens of the most

famous critics of the country, who apparently do not remember that practically since its inception the cinema has nourished

by second parts and remakes. Just to cite a few examples: King Kong knew several sequels, including

The Son of Kong, as well as Frankenstein and many others. Ben Hur de Wyler and The Ten Commandments of De Mille, are

two remakes of films from the silent era. And I would continue because there are thousands of examples. Nor is it worth redoing

Asian films in the Hollywood style, because in the early days of sound they also didthings

similar, like shooting the same movie with other actors to sell it in other markets in their language. So

the current situation is not a novelty. I've also noticed one thing and that is that the same people

who pique the remakes are silent their reasoning if they are signed by directors of your

liking, like Martin Scorsese. All this comes to Collation of Infiltrados, the new film of thedirector

American. It is a remake of the Asian film internationally known as Infernal Affairs, which is indicated in

all the reviews and commentaries, which often affirm things like that the remake is probably superior to the

original, without have seen the latter. I can not make such a claim because I have not been able to enjoy that

film, well it's really a trilogy, but I can say one thing, and that is that the Scorsese film is an

excellent one film, one of the best I've seen this year, if not the best. The story of two infiltrators in

the mafia and the Boston police, catches from the first minute, because of its hellish pace. The film

flows like no other in a long time, with an enigmatic and effective direction and montage, fleeing from downtime

and unnecessary scenes and that despite a close duration at two and a half hours. In addition the cast

is magnificent both the protagonists and the secondary ones. A special mention for Jack Nicholson, who has always gone

through the motions and histrionic as always, giving us an indelible scene that shows all his experience in

front of the cameras. It is the scene in which he accuses the character played by Di Caprio of being the mole of the

police. In addition, the wise Scorsese, who had been lost for the cinematographic cause for several years, knows how to

stay in the background in that scene giving him court both to Jack and to Caprio. , which maintains the type very well.

The script keeps the interest throughout the film, the characters appear well drawn,

including secondary, we understand their feelings, their motivations, not being It's redundant orexplanatory

over-, an evil of many American thrillers. Maybe the plot of the love triangle is a bit

blurred, but I guess it's because many scenes have fallen in the editing room, along with the high

sex charge character of Nicholson, who finally is more intuited than shown. As usual in

Scorsese, the music in the film is dominated by pre-existing songs, some well-known, giving little space

for Howard Shore's original score that, on the other hand, does not know how to find the tone and

even annoying in some scenes, something that already happened in his score for the previous film of the

director, The Aviator. Only saying Gangsters and Scorsese would be enough for everything the world would run en masse

to see the movie. If that is not enough, then add an energy direction, a precise guide and

actors in a state of grace. This film once again shows that today you can see good cinema in

Hollywood, even though it is a remake.

" 1

" It does not seem to me neither intelligent, nor scathing, nor funny, nor anything that they wanted and what many

want to see. It stays at the doors of everything and its eschatological gags, deep down, are the only thing that is saved.

I'm late for this criticism, but now I understand why. Something inside me resisted, he told me not to

see it, not to waste time. However, some criticisms more or less favorable and that of "" will have to

see it, lest that. "" I was finally pushed to witness this show. And when I say show I do not say

"" wow, ���vaya spectacle! "", But "" pff. often show. "" The plot is as simple as the rest of the

film: after a quick presentation of the protagonist and his surreal surroundings, we have him in the USA, where his

bosses expect him to make a documentary that serves Kazakhstan, his country of origin, to learn from the great

power. All��� Borat starts a crazy journey full of bizarre situations. and, finally, if I do not give more

details it is not for not revealing anything, it is because it does not deserve more. The fact is that this false documentary does not filter either

as a documentary or as fiction. No, neither as a hybrid nor as anything. It is supposed to have two strong points:

acid criticism, corrosive, blah, blah, blah, and blatant and irreverent humor. Well, let's start with the criticism.

Borat, on his way, encounters characters that are supposed to represent the deep North American. We have

some racist, some xenophobe and other colorful characters. Intelligent philosophy? I have read that somewhere

and it seems to me that the levels of demand are very low. It is true that there is a willingness to bring afloat

the dirty rags of a society really backward in many ways (at least a significant part of that

society), but it is always far from interesting, shocking or devastating. It is a compilation of

loose anecdotes from which nothing can be extracted, unless one has never heard of the USA.

Bowling for Columbine is a crushing criticism, not this. They may say that he is a pamphleteer, but he contributes a lot and

one has the sensation of having discovered something. Not here. The other issue is humor. I think, after seeing many

comedies of all kinds, that the big problem is that most people lack a sense of humor. One may

not like a gag for two things: he does not understand it, he does not share that kind of "" jokes "", etc. or it looks

over. I mean, he understands, it's the kind of humor he likes, but his demands do not come. If you are the

type of person who laughs at family gatherings, who is astonished by the anecdotes of Tio Paco and who

considers Ram���n Garc���a As a comedian, then this film will seem very shameless, irreverent and

all those things. If he is back, if he thinks that there are few people who have the ability to make him laugh

at home, if he is selective, he has discretion and Los Morancos does not make him draw a grimace, then he will see

Borat does not arrive, he tries but falls along the way. And you can do good humor and a deep criticism at

the same time, that no one is deceived. The cartoons type "" The Simpsons "", "" Family Guy "", etc. They are a great

example, or "" The life of Brian "", to name some film with real actors. In short, it does not seem to me neither

intelligent, nor scathing, nor funny, nor anything that pretended to �an and what many want to see. It stays at

doors of everything and their eschatological gags, in the end, are the only thing that is saved. If he does not supportjokes

cruel, mockery, humiliation, etc., then do not even consider seeing it. The burradas are the only minimally

remarkable.

" 0

" It is such a disgrace that has made me laugh, piss off and get excited in some moments. Delirium: 1. m. Disturbance and mental excitement, caused by illness or strong passion: hallucination is

one of the clear signs of delirium.2. State of excitement that does not obey reason or to one's own will:

this infatuation is a delirium.3. Disproportion, nonsense: this movie is the delirium of a fool. Well, I think

I had never started with a dictionary definition, but it is that what can best be defined the last

film by Tony Scott: DOMINO. I was waiting with much desire and expectation after the excellent Fire of

revenge. In it already advanced much of a new style more extreme, if possible, in the use ofeffects

visual. This film is only a crude copy of his previous film but multiplying the giddy viguid by

1000. And it is a pity, because during the first hour I put a lot of love to him. I had a certain pass, but then it

falls. It falls in such an insulting and shameless way that you do not know where to go. I do not care if two

of the 90210 guys come out as a comic and autopardicic element, that there is a cameo by Tom Waits, that Christopher

Walken makes a funny historical one, that Mena Suvari reappears in screen to the joy of many, that there areplotted traces of

good suicide bombers andhis previous movie, that Keira Knightley does it fairly

well, that Mickey Rourke is fine in his role, that Gregson Williams copy and paste phrases of his own

works, that the director has a good musical taste? It is a gimmicky truism, videoclipero and the worst of everything: there is

no one who sees it. Not because it is very bad (there are incorrect moments quite attractive) but because if you go to

see the cinema you will have to include in the seats a bag against seasickness. It can be deadly. A film not

recommended, not because it is bad, but because it can not be seen. But I liked it: PEs such a disgrace

that made me laugh, piss off and get excited in some moments. What am I going to do? for a story that

might be interesting, they write it badly and the unattractive throw it overboard with an out of place style

that detracts from seriousness. Mr. Scott, can you recover? to see this film, but more than anything as a

reference of visual effects and postproduction. Come on, for professional inspiration

" 0

" The savagery Sly proposes is entertainment as gratuitously violent as absolutely great.

An hour and a half of pure fun that is, very, very bloodstained.

After a long pause (more than fifteen years), Sylvester Stallone returns to tie the red ribbon on his forehead in what

is the fourth installment of "" Cornered "". As I did recently with "" Rocky Balboa "", Sly is also responsible

for writing and directing the comic. In a section of Thailand, Rambo makes a living hunting

snakes to sell them to circuses and touring places. ��sticos of the area. His life goes on quietly until

a group of missionaries hires him to take them up to Burma, because they intend to

distribute medicine to one of the towns that suffer the attacks of the fearsome army. Little place. As

expected, the group is captured, so the heroic ex-soldier, along with a group of mercenaries hired

for it, must return to push machete and submachine gun to rescue them. Surely not be? There are few who

approach this proposal with a frown. What can offer a quarter of something that is

already exhausted and surpassed by the passage of years? And let's not forget, the good guy from Sly is already sixty-

two years old, will not he be too wilted for these trots? Well, the answer to the first question is as

simple as opposed: everything and nothing. Nothing, because if what one expects from a film like that is a minimum of

coherence in argument, or the minimum existence of a gui�� It is moderately elaborated, it can be passed

by it. It is completely impossible to take "" John Rambo "" with seriousness, since in that way one could

even consider an attack for the seventh art. More than foreseeable drama, absurdly flat characters and

archetypes, deliberately Manichaean situations, are just some of the constants of the film, which will

surely make the hairs on the edge to everything that is predisposed to it. But this movie is �cula is

aimed at those who understand cinema as well as entertainment, those who know how to distinguish between art and

leisure, because in the end, it embraces both equally. Go, those who know how to enjoy a good

session palomitera.Porque salada proposed by Sly is entertainment as gratuitously violent as

absolutely great. An hour and a half of pure fun that is, very, very bloodstained. "" John Rambo "" is a

survival as before, with good very good and bad very bad, with incredible ���bles and trepidantes

scenes of action rolled with firm pulse, and in which no shame is perceived at the time of beheading, opening

in channel, to strangle, violate, or to explode human bodies. It's been a long time since the American cinema did not

dare to release products like this (the most recent proof is in the sweetened "" La Jungla 4.0 ""), but it is

that "" John Rambo "" does not stop at being an update of the action cinema of the 80s, it goes much further,

becoming a spectacle Totalmenteculo totally gore, up to even the first works of Peter Jackson

or Sam Raimi as far as hemoglobin is concerned. Prodigy that is achieved thanks to aspecial effects

tremendously visceral, capable of turning into a shower of blood and guts to any extra that appears

on the screen (literally). As to whether Stallone is able to maintain the type or not, it will suffice � to say that the

half of di���logos that maintains with the other actors are reduced to monos���labas with the glazed and lost look

in the horizon. But what else does it matter? John Rambo has returned, more explicitly violent and implacable than ever, and

that is what really matters.

" 1

" Snyder bets to make the bed to American sedentary patriotism, letting in several

moments of the film that the Spartans fight on the side of logic, freedom and justice, in the face of

barbarism Persian, devoted to hedonism, racial interchange and religious superstition. He could have

signed with his blood Mr. Bush this script.

An effective hype and the warlike enthusiasm of the comic fans have been enough for the

cinemas to be filled to witness what promised to be a show, with a novel aesthetic and a

breakthrough and reactionary style that would make us enjoy the beautiful. Both promises, their aesthetic proposal and their

political incorrectness, are surely, in addition to their best tricks to play at the box office, their greatest weakness,

and in my opinion, the most resounding cause of his mediocrity.certain aspects that stand out

However,for the viewer's consolation are not detrimental. Regarding the aesthetic proposal, 300 is a product dependent on previous products such

as Sin City (in relation to the adaptation from the comic and the attempt to simulate it

audiovisually) and also Gladiator or Troya, from which it takes not only narrative elements, musical cues and

visual retouching, but also the fact of having been shot in a great percent using the

famous blue screen. This dependence on virtual sets is a necessary resource if you

want to "" resemble "" the comic you want to emulate (respect or fidelity, they call it), and in no case should, if

does with craftsmanship and artistic sensitivity, disparage or defraud fans of the cellulose format.

That is not the sin of 300. His demerit comes to manifest itself in the way of mounting those frames and

trying to endow them with emotion and epic. It is here where Snyder succumbs to the easy recourse of the music video clip or the

advertising spot, underlining an empty estecitism that one ends soon enough, despite the beauty of

some frames. It has been preferred to please the adolescent public (the one who goes to the movies more) than to give

depth to the whole without having to lose visual strength. The slowing down of some images is a

pilgrimage, as well as the stale romanticism with which we areto rest from so muchthrown in.

supposedhopliteLikewise, the all-powerful presence of the narrator? Resource never used by Miller in his comic, he

multiplies the information without necessity, disintegrating the viewer's gaze and carrying too much the scenes

of a narrative that they themselves contribute for themselves. This same resource however, in Sin City was

ideal, since the script was based less on the constant action of the characters, but on human sets

that were oscillating along all the footage. On the other hand, Sin City drinks not only from its paper referent,

but also from the black novel, in which the narrator becomes a more important figure in history,

guiding to the reader towards the final tragedy. The script of 300 required to be unfolded in twonarrative axes

different, if we did not want the spectator to end up indigested by so much battle. Thus, Snyder and

Johnstad thought of recreating the parallel history of palace intrigues between the faithful wife and the

opportunist politician. The alternation between the two stories would thus allow us to fill almost two hours of footage,

give an apparent adulthood to the gui���ny and in turn, as we have already suggested, keep the audience entertained until the

foreseeable end, without It is a pity that this virtual technology is used without an artistic

purpose on which to lean. I hope that next directors will give us products in which the concept of

beauty is less virtual and opportunistic. The comic we forgive his closed and personal aesthetics, but his move to

audiovisual language wanders through a thin line that hints at the emptiness of his frames. 300 does not

excite, rather it perplexes by its rumble without shrapnel. It is like a big wind bun, big and inflated,

but without more content than the one that imagines our desire. The recourse to the two narrative axes can be

understandable, but supposes on the one hand to deviate from the comic, and on the other hand to opt for reinforcing the political

and ideological character of a proposal that only has room (for those who have a certain ethical sense and

want not to it would stop having fun seeing savagery) if we take this film as what it is or should

have been, an audiovisual show without more. Tarantino is an example of a filmmaker who understands well what

the essential rule of this genre should be: not to take himself very seriously. Snyder, however, is committed to

making American sedentary patriotism the bed, revealing in several moments of the film

that the Spartans fight on the side of logic, freedom and justice, as opposed to the Persian barbarism,

devoted to hedonism, racial interchange and religious superstition. Well, Mr. Bush could have signedwith his

this scriptblood. If you hurry me, I could sneak the message of the importance of the will and the

effort in front of the cobard. And tradition. Or simply the description without intellectual crutches of the

stark reality of a war based on pictorial pictures retouched with photoshop. But no, 300 seems more like

a spot to recruit marines (the passage of the Term���pilas acts as Iraq), or a progressive video that

sells the weird as cool, that a film to have a good time. Its beauty (canned) lies in the power of

the frames, which are isolated, as in the comic, beautiful and suggestive. But when the movement

vivifies them they turn into zombies (which is Snyder's specialty). Nothing for now seems to resist the strengthlooks

that one finds when hethrough Miller's comic. If you have not enjoyed it, make yourself the

beautiful landscape edition that Norma publishes. For now I'm content to watch on DVD (onlyarrive in my neighborhood

premieres for acn��� viewers). ) the seemingly promising (also) A dark scanner (or A look at the

darkness, as the maltitulan instead of a dark explorer), based on a story of the cinerable Philip K. Dirk.

And if not, we will always have the least strident but solid Le6n de Sparta, which he unworthily claims to

feed on (parasite is more accurate) 300.

" 0

" Has sympathetic moments, but little else. The script is quite linear, without sudden turns, telling us

a story that does not end up making fun. Maybe you have to go see her with another mentality.

I've bite again! I've bite again! A killer comedy, ���and a moj���n de a kilo !. And that happens to me for

not informing me before. It turns out that Napoleon Dynamite is involved in nothing more and nothing less, one of

the cult films (which has nothing to do with culture) of those that I do not know what are they going Nothing,

ale, to see this monster, with the endorsement of criticism and public. The film tells the story of Ignacio, who

happens to be Super Nacho for engaging in wrestling . He is a f de man and should not fight, but he

discovers that doing this can help a lot of the children of the orphanage where he resides (he is a kind of

religious). In between, a hungry fighter crosses with more bones than meat and a lustrous nun that

makes him lose his oremus.Na, that I neither liked nor like. It has nice moments, but little else.

The script is quite linear, without sharp turns, telling us a story with its introduction, its knot and its

outcome. The actors are not bad, but the thing does not end of fun, maybe you have to go see it with another

mentality. Resuming, comedy, without any moment of self Cute delirium and quitesituations

infantiloid(for a film for adults).

" 0

" Better to drink I'm a legend like one more popcorn, but no girl teaching curves (bitch Sam does not

count). And keep everything the same. When you enter the cinema, leave the brain out.

The generation of Matheson (novelist) and Lawrence (director and producer) read books, in addition to watching movies.

Both, like the one who writes these lines, were inoculated in their spare moments disturbing stories of horror and

science fiction, and B-series films that today-many of them-recognize themselves as cultural references. In

those stories we found good moments of action and fear, as well as suggestive metaphors about the world and

ourselves. However, the generation for which the story of I am legend is narrated is a

generation that no longer reads (or barely), but devours movie frames made in the USA whenever can. And that shows

in the rhythm and lack of courage with which the scripts of productions like this we areare handled. I am a

talking aboutlegend is an efficient production, like many others with which we are aims to make live

a more bearable Christmas. For this, a literary claim known to the viewer is taken as a reference,

and if you do not know who Richard Matheson was, do not worry, we addedpresence as a publicity hook

Smith's(in a new plan h��). American hero) and his hiphopero style, slipping his gymfor aNew

tipazoapocalyptic but dignifiedYork, accompanied by his little dog Sam. The rest do special effects that

hypnotize the most skeptical. And that's it. Success assured. I am a legend will not be a lasting product in the memory

of the Spanish spectator, much less in the contributions to the genre of horror or science fiction. But this does not

detract from an unbeatable technical work, some disturbing scenes, and it stops counting. If we try to

lean on its literary referent, comparisons will reveal themselves more than odious. In the short novel of

Matheson there is neither scientist hero, nor more survivors where to support the plot, nor vampires with brain, nor

final made in the USA. Matheson emphasizes the loneliness of the character, without post-9/11 political metaphors. It focuses on

the psychological aspects of Neville and uses the icon of the vampire to give it more scientific realism

and suggest a juicy reflection on the concept of social normality and its perverse effects. In

Lawrence's version there is hardly a psychological approach, even though the script begins by suggesting the opposite. In this sense,

the scene of the video store is remarkable. But soon the action becomes what it should never have been pretending not to be:

pure spectacle overly dressed in a tricky political propaganda with a lightlycolor nothing. It is true

conservativethat the The director could have taken advantage of the potential of Matheson's book to suggest

a powerful metaphor about accepting the other in situations of socially accepted fears or prejudices.

But no. It is more of the Bush era to end up administering to all livingthe vaccine ofliberalism.

beingsconservativeWhere is the novelty of Soy leyenda? Well, nothing less than in the curious relationship that

establishes the gui���n between the alleged skepticism of the New York citizen after the attacks of September 11 and a

history of terror and science fiction conventional. "My name is Robert Neville. I am a survivor in

New York City. If there is someone there, please. You are not alone "". This is the desperate message thatlaunches on the radio

the protagonistto anyone who might be left alive. Dr. Neville survives in a ghost town, desolate, a

perpetual zero zone, threatened by infected, dehumanized beings. "I come to light the darkness", affirms

a promotional spot. And at least it is allowed to give the secondary role (as an announcer of hope)

to a Brazilian character (�� A diplomatic guide to Lula?), That although it will serve as a Crusoe Friday, depressed

by the solitude, it does not stop being a mere beneficiary of the blessings of the sacrificed American friend. ,

Francis Lawrence, draws with this one not so tenuous (and of course of a political correction that puts the hairs

as escarpies to all attentive spectators) metaphor about the supposed state of �� �nimo of every American who

boasts as such (patriotic, to be more exact), threatened by the despair of terrorism in their own

home. And at the same time it reproduces for the last time the megal���mana iconicity of the American redeeming hero, always

ready to give his last breath for a free world. Do not be afraid, American. Science and ourfaith

unwaveringin our way of life will make us resist and in the end win the war against this virus. For that

company we have the best, a hero who despite being human, does not allow himself to be led by discouragement and his

efforts will ultimately bear fruit. The objective is to raise the morale of an America disenchanted by so much

critical discourse, that more than helping generates discontent and apathy. Let us leave communist patra���as and trust

in pap��� State, which watches with loving justice the designs of a country born to succeed (with the help of

God, of course) .But What a political reading of what is acan matter to European viewers

mere spectacle! Better to drink. I'm a legend like one more popcorn, but no girl teaching curves (bitch

Sam does not count). And let everything be the same, for that we have the USA protecting the free world and offering

fun our Christmas evenings. When you enter the cinema, leave the brain out. In the end, we will always have

the great novels of Matheson. For those who have not read this emblematic author of the

science-fiction of the fifties, you may be interested to know that many of his works have been taken to the cinema

with more or less success. Noteworthy is the devil on wheels (Spielberg, 1971) -both short format but

eternal in memory-, The Incredible Waning Man (Arnold, 1957) -maybe the most suggestive of all and the one

closest to the theme of I am legend-, The Last Step (Koepp, 2000) -a disturbing film, but absorbed

by the phenomenon Lesser The Sixth Sense, Beyond Dreams (Ward, 1998), Somewhere in Time (Szwarc,

1980).

" 0

" Great film as a patchwork of daily life, bittersweet as well as tender, with reflections as

accurate as sharp, an almost round story, that only slight bumps of rhythm prevent you from achieving

excellence m�� �s absolute. Essential.

During the last few years a norm has been established in the American cinema to praise smallproductions

independent(which in reality are not so much) in order to become the "sleeper" of the year,stories

high quality, with the help, yes, of the propaganda promotion that nominations for the Oscars suppose. Thus,years

during the last fewwe have received films such as "" American Beauty "", "" Between Cups "" and the most recent,

"" Peque� " ��a Miss Sunshine "". This year it's the turn of the new production of Jason Reitman (after his remarkable debut

"" Thanks for smoking ""), already known by half the world due to his nominations Oscar, including a

well-deserved nomination for best film, is "" Juno "", a film about adolescent abortion, full of

iron���a (not sarcasm) and that stands for m� Own songs in one of the most outstanding films of the new year

that begins. The great risk that runs this new film of Reitman, as they suffered in certain media the

previously named productions, is to be swallowed up by its own propaganda paraphernalia, in thaterror

habitualof letting itself be dragged by the repercussion of the film to wait for the absolute panacea of ​​the genre, a gross

error that prevents us from truly appreciating the values ​​of such an estimable film. This new film by Reitman,us

showsthe daily life of Juno MacGuff (quite revealing surname) by the way), an insolent and associative

teenager fond of rock and to expose expletives and chascarridos of the most pungent, that by an oversight

becomes pregnant of Paulie Bleeker (Michael Cera), a shy and emaciated teenager t��� I spend the hours

training for their athletics competitions. In the face of such an unexpected situation, Juno (Ellen Page) decides to look

for renting parents, since she has not had the courage to abort on time. While reading anmagazine

ad, discover what could be the ideal couple to adopt your child, formed by Vanessa (Jennifer

Garner) and Mark (Jason Bateman). But the mixed feelings and unforeseen love will make theadoption more complicated.

whole history ofThrough such an argument to the work of directing actors, Reitman demonstrates

a wisdom ���a for comedy beyond doubt, in one of those cases in which it is shown that a good

director does not have to flaunt his technical knowledge and be above the action narrated,

but that should help her to flow with fluency. In that sense, the Canadian director is shown as a fish in

the water at the time of getting the best out of themselves from all the actors that make up his films, with a

simple staging, but always looking for the best framing to make m� It is believable if it fits the excellent

interpretations that he knows how to get out of his "creatures." Obviously, any praise of the great work of actors would

not be possible without a concise, sharp guide, with some sensational di ,logos, full of iron���aa while

tenderness. Keyword this last to describe the tone of the whole story, since, although in most

moments there is an ironic distancing with the events that the characters suffer, everything is

covered in a sweet and condescending look, an ambiguity between iron��� and tenderness that works with the

precision of a Swiss watch. Helped that if by a cast in a state of grace, capable of endowing each

of the characters with their own personality, of knowing how to limit their terrain without exceeding or being minimized

by the other characters, although evidently, Ellen Page as Juno is the main value of the film.

An actress destined to go far, with an action throughout this film that shows that we are

facing the best actress of her generation, capable of going from the most radical insolence to the more naked tenderness

(extraordinary that final plane on the hospital stretcher) without the least apparent effort. The rest of the

cast, as I said before, is at a great level, especially Jason Bateman in the role of Mark,

a frustrated musician caught by a relationship so intense that it drowns him and does not allow him to pursue a I dream that I

can feel again through the rebellious adolescent of Juno (the total catalyst of the emotions of

all the characters that star in the film). Perhaps it would be necessary to make such an accurate exception,

an actress who has never proved worthy of the privileged position she has as an interpreter in

American industry. This is Jennifer Garner, whose role as Vanessa is very limited, and not

precisely because of the prominence in the story, but because of the obvious limitations as an actress of this

beautiful Texan. It is very evident throughout many scenes of the film, such as Ellen Page, with fifteen years

less and the less experience that this implies, a talent fest is stuck at the expense of the limited Garner.Juno

has diverse influences both in his tone and in his measured bet as a multi-ethnic choice, he adds the

most reflective comedy. In a year in which comedies as accurate as "" Supersalidos "" or "" Lio embarrassing "",

sometimes bet on a morality prevailing in much of American cinema (without detracting

too many m��� ritos), Juno ran the risk of going through the same paths, but in a display of

expertise of this fantastic guide, she knows how to escape even from any moralistic execution, since,

Although on the one hand history denies abortion as an alternative, it knows how to camouflage it with so muchability

chemical(the Asian company that fights alone against abortion in a very ridiculous way), that even the

final motive for which this fact does not occur is motivated more by fear than by anydecision

moralistic or reactionary. Even that end where an absolute ode to the dysfunctional family is made as an option

as valid as any other, results from a political incorrectness (gentle, yes) evident. The story advances

through the characters, as it should be in a good human story, contrary to the greatproduction

Americanof the year, where the development of the action motivates or direct the human decisions of the characters that

inhabit them. This also helps to develop these wonderful characters, with reflections on love (there

where one thought that it was intense and strong ties are broken, and on the contrary where least expected to emerge in

a latent way), the dreams lost in adolescence and the fear of being embarrassed in the decisions made by

a setback that will damage lives forever. With a great soundtrack, full of songs ofcut

independentthat add more that remain, like that great start as a seventies video clip where Reitman gives

clear evidence of the insignificant draft of a pregnant teenager in our society. ,

a great film as a patchwork of daily life, bittersweet as well as tender, with reflections as accurate

as piercing, an almost round story, that only slight bumps of rhythm prevent it from achieving excellence

m��� Absolute Essential.

" 1

" As a whole, a great animated film (from beginning to end) that will delight all those who

deign to take a look at it.

The downside of not having time is that, one day, like someone who does not want the thing, you find yourself writing the critique

of a movie you saw in August. How sad is the world. To what we were, "" Ratatouille "", the film

about a rat called Remy and his curious goal in life: Ser Cocinero.La pel�� �cula uses its trick to

have a crazy, fresh and perfect starting point throughout the film and without abuse, since every minute

that passes we are surprised with a scene that makes us writhe in the seat (from the laugh, it is understood). Without

a doubt the film is a great joy "" made in Pixar "" after Cars. Film that although correct and entertaining

was still a pure visual product totally hollow telling the same story that we have been

listening for years. But good. Let's go in parts: The direction: it's more than obvious that Brad Bird is passing it off as a dwarf,

and what is more admirable, that makes the public I pass it as a dwarf.The gui���n: round, although not great

(but little is missing) reinvents itself and tries not to fall (and almost succeeds) in some stupid t� ��pics

and jokes manidos.Los characters: (I say the characters because server has not been able to make a fair assessment

of the original version of the voices) are perhaps the most salsa they give to the tape, they congenian very fast with the

spectator making this enjoy the beautiful. The Soundtrack: undoubtedly a great soundtrack of the

always correct Michael Giacchino that accompanies the movie ���cula without stridencies and without taking prominence to the

images.The Animation: is responsible for both the characters and the story are as good as are.

Undoubtedly the Pixar is exceeded (although less spectacularly) with this film that has the

most impressive scenes (Cars was pure crap for quick consumption) that we have seen in relation to

animation in recent years. From that magnificent and hilarious beginning on the farm, passing through the

pipeline to each and every one of the scenes we attended in Paris. s.A whole

movie of animation (from beginning to end) that will delight all those who deign to take a

look.

" 1

" A dramatic movie, from which you occasionally see ... and with which in the end you have aaftertaste

bitter, of the type: why? Milks would have had to see this thing? Was not I happier a couple of hours ago?

A dramatic film, from which every now and then plays. and with which in the end you have aaftertaste

bitter, of the type: 'Why would milk have had to see this thing? I was not happier a couple of hours ago? ' In

effect, it is another filth of filth that has sneaked through the back door. History tortures us

for more than two hours mixing the lives of three miserable people: a bitter husband who takes

care of his son while his wife works, a wife mother of a girl who leads a bitter life and a

pederast (without comments). The thing is that the parents' normal 'they get out of sheer boredom (like the one that

produced this story for me) and they almost run away, while the pedophile ends up self-castrating whendies

his mother. Glad to live, come on. So they can say that the gore lovers are sick. sick will be

the one who has enjoyed this story, I say. Well, the original title is 'Little Children' and I guess it

is a game about the two parents have a child, that there is a pedophile in the middle and that in the end, the

real cr eso is the husband who stays at home with his son, since he is unable to make a decision (and when he

takes it, he gets stuck watching some teenagers and forget about it, go stupidity). Here is translated

as 'secret games' to mislead a little and see if it gets something more public. I personally thought

I would spit and that's why I got it. Go slip, parity. Kate Winslet is well in her role as ahousewife

bitter and wealthy. because these folks do not lack anything. Go panda of scoundrels. Pity that

the story does not give more than s���. The uncle, Patrick Wilson, did not fit me, too much like Paul Newman in

a rather dull and repellent gallant paper. The rest go by. As a curiosity, the film was

nominated for 3 Oscars, which shows how different the criteria of these people are from the others. I'm not even going

to bother looking to see if I ever won. The director, Todd Field, has done a lot of things, both as an actor and as a

director. He has worked for television filming many series, combining his work as director, actor and

producer. Fortunately, I do not remember seeing any of his works. In short, another bitter,

sad and disgusting film, of which the 'serious' critics usually say that they are good movies, but here � are zero

stars.

" 0

" It is quite scary, it is very bloody, it manages to keep pace and tension constantly allowing

us to breathe a bit and even make us laugh with the aforementioned gags. Intelligent

proposal that manages to entertain, surprise and succeed as a whole.

The journey of a group of workers from an English arms company to Hungary to foster the feeling

of teamwork and corporatist company becomes a terrible nightmare. The proposal of

departure is attractive to then get back to put half a dozen characters unsuspecting, stereotyped

and very recognizable in the hands of a sadistic murderer, cruel and unscrupulous, ie in the proposal of

forever. Since it is difficult to be original at this point and after fifteen parts of "" Friday the 13th "", as

many of "" Halloween "", the sagas of "" Screem "" with all its imitations and after the Recent years "" Saw "",

"" Hostel "", "" Tourists "" and company, the attempt to distance oneself from all these previous ones comes directly in

the mix of genders. The great and also English "" Shaun of the Dead "" (Zombies Party) mixed humor with genre

zombies, in this, Christopher Smith also combines certain doses of black humor with, in this case, the scaryterror

, realistic and brutalthat is usual in this new fashion of scary movies in which

Western tourists are finally massacred with unimaginable sadism. "" Severance "" works. The film

takes the part of terror very seriously and does not neglect the comic part. It is quite scary, it is very bloody, it

manages to keep the rhythm and the tension constantly allowing us to breathe a bit and even make us

let out a laugh with the aforementioned gags. Intelligent proposal that manages to entertain, surprise and

succeed as a whole.

" 1

" The falcon malt���s, one of the definitive films of classic Hollywood. When one finds oneself before a script where the memorable phrases are so many that you can barely

remember them all or choose one to open an entry like this one, and when that script presents a story whose

plot keeps one in suspense until the end, and the rhythm works like a Swiss clock and the characters

interact with each other in such a way that one comes to think that the real thing is on the screen and not in what we

feel and touch, without a doubt it can be said that it is not only before one of the best works of the

genre but it could hardly come out something unworthy of a job like that. If we add to that the talent of one of

the best American directors in history and a cast that is difficult to beat, there is no doubt that

we are talking about one of the greatest classics in history. of the cinema. Ladies and gentlemen, join me in the

search for a rare and precious statuette that was in his day a gift for the Emperor Charles V: The falcon

malt� A. Before a work of this caliber it is always difficult to write without having the sensation that everything that

is said will fall short. I do not even think that anyone who loves cinema can talk about the falcon malt���s without

getting carried away even a little. Anyway, to start somewhere, I'll sayI think I'm not wrong if I say

thatthat the film is the best remake in the history of cinema. And it is that if sometimes it seems that Jimi Hendrix has

composed "" Hey Joe "", it is also sometimes difficult to remember that the novel by Dashiell Hammett had already been

taken to the cinema in 1931 Ricardo Cortez had been the first Sam Spade, and we had a whole Dwight Frye

playing mat for El Gordo (what a pity that he did not repeat the paper toorders

Huston's!) Both John Huston and several writers participated in the writing of the script, and the director worked

two days on the storyboard, although it seems that they were quite faithful to the novel. Until then, Huston hadhis

madedebut in small roles, although he had soon become a screenwriter. As is well known,

we are talking about one of the best cinematographic debuts in history, since this wasfirst film

Huston'sas director. And it is that Huston helped to lay the foundations of the American film noir, and created animage

imperishableof the hat and gabardine detective. Although I'm not really into a black novel, presumably

that figure already existed in the black novels of Hammett himself and other authors of the genre as Raymond

Chandler, but at least as far as cinema is concerned There we have the definitive interpreter of that type of

personages, Humphrey Bogart, marking in fire in the history of the cinema an image that still influences at the moment

in film-makers, writers, cartoonists of comic, etc. Of course I think that Bogart owed a lot to the mistakes of the

actor George Raft in his transition from villain of the movies to the hero and tough guy who made him a

superstar. Raft had already rejected the role he would later play Bogart in The Last Refuge, where

the drinking friend of actor John Huston participated writing the script. . After another film the wick was

ready, and it just took a spark to launch Bogart's career beyond the stars. And since

Raft's contract stipulated that he was not obliged to act in any remake, and poor George

considered that The falcon malt���s was going to be another film of series B, rejected ��� play Sam Spade. And finally,

as they say, the rest is history. And I do not think there's any doubt that Humphrey Bogart was born to

play that role. The story and the paper were there, just a little talent to make Sam

Spade a legendary figure, and Bogart knew what he was doing. A hard and insightful detective, idealistic in his

way, affectionate and cruel to women at the same time, a strange romantic misogynist, knowing when to speak and

when to hit, smoker and drinker, and everything always done with a lot of style. I think that even Harry the Dirty did not

see a similar revolution in a police character on the side of the law. Well, let's talk a little about the story.

A woman (Mary Astor) goes to the detective agency Spade & Archer to have herreturned to her side

sister, who has supposedly run away from home, accompanying a bad guy. Miles Archer, fascinated by the beauty

of the little lady, personally takes charge of following the bad man, but is killed. His partner, Sam Spade,

then takes over the case. The brute whom Archer had followed died shortly afterwards. Spade becomes

the main suspect, and while the police follow him closely he discovers that the woman has lied to him, and that his

supposed sister does not exist. Behind the mysterious subject there is a statuette of great value, and abut

shyviperish little man named Joel Cairo (Peter Lorre) will go to Spade to help him get the precious

object. So we will have Sam Spade trying to unravel a murky affair in which he will be up to his

neck, and where little by little we discover that nothing is what it seems. The troublemaker and also A magnificent

actor Peter Lorre was at the height of Bogart playing that small but dangerous little man who does not

like to be touched, and whose appearance is as elegant as his methods are twisted. Few things are more

threatening on a screen than a villain with a bandana and a bastin. It is fair to give him his fair share of glory.

In addition, one of my favorite moments of the film is the first meeting between Spade and Cairo. As is Spade's

interview with Kasper "" Fat Man "" Gutman, who does not He stops proffering a sort of strange sayings

praising the vital attitude of Spade, a man who likes to talk and likes to get down to business and is also completely

unpredictable. The character of Gutman is one of the big plump characters that the cinema has given. It was

played by the British Sydney Greenstreet, an actor who had spent his life on stage and

debuted in The Falcon Maltesse past the sixties. They say that his physiognomy served as a starting point for the

creation of the viscous Jabba the Hutt. Detective Tom is Ward Bond, a regular throughout several

years of John Ford's films. I also like that, more than secretary, woman for everything from Sam Spade, the intelligent and

resourceful Effie, played by Lee Patrick. By the way, the dying guy who delivers the hawk

Spade is Huston's own father making a brief cameo. Perhaps he was lying like an ordinary Mary Astor when he

said it was impossible to keep a phrase from the film. I think surely everyone would have heard of one

in particular. One of the policemen asks Spade about the composition of the statuette. "" From the material with

which dreams are forged, "replies the detective. Bogart's great contribution to the script, who was inspired in

turn (I guess it should not be too surprising, does a better scriptwriter exist than he?) In one sentence of a

play by Shakespeare. The falcon malt���s, one of the definitive films. It was so good that apparently it served to

baptize two terrible mechanical devices that ended the Second World War.

" 1

" A film that flees from the usual line in Spanish cinema, but that does so by resorting to aargument

repetitiveand lack of spark.

Disorder is one of those Spanish films that are characterized by fleeing the usual line of home cinema

, which has always tended to abuse comedy and permanent sexual tension . In this case,has been

the psychological aspect of the characters and the scenariosworked on, giving the film a moreatmosphere

characteristicfrom other latitudes, but equally correct. It is not that the The plot is very original and it is not

developed with special brilliance, but a quite correct interpretation of its cast, especially of the

usually wasted Ingrid Rubio, and a good production work, make the The final result

has been acceptable, although I have particularly missed a more lively rhythm and a complexity

of the plot, which might have won the whole with the introduction of some turn or surprise that did not make it as

predictable as it turns out to be. Fernando C���mara directed in 1997 Memories of the Angel Ca���do, a film that already

inquired in this line but which is aad a supernatural touch and uncertainty in my,

the convertan in a very interesting production more than hand. In any case, Trastorno

deserves to dedicate a while, but not in the movies, where I do not think it will be projected again, but in the home chair

and with a gin and tonic and a pack of pipes to pass the time.

" 0

" A film that pretends to be serious and realistic, but completely forgets that the original novel is annovel.

entertainment

A couple of years ago a film unwittingly took the hair of many of the viewers and it's not that he

lied to them, but yes, he presented the plot in such a realistic way, almost like a documentary, which caused

that many people will spend it asking, investigating and navigating in the incipient Internet trying to

discover if the plot of the tape had really happened. The film is called TheWitch Project

Blair, and the phenomenon is apparently about to be broken with the Da Vinci Code tape. And we all

like the stories of mystery and conspiracy and if a tape like this one, "reveals" "in a more or

less credible way a" "secret" "jealously guarded for centuries, with the" " potential "" to change our history, because

the truth, we do not need to put much of our side to create a realistic fantasy.must confess that

II am one of the millions of readers who have been seduced by the "" developer "" book and that I stayed until the

wee hours of the morning reading and reading trying to discover what is the next clue, what is the

next key that must be solved, so entertaining and intriguing it was that in m�� Once upon a time I came to

exclaim: "" One more chapter and I fall asleep. "" On the other hand, the tape, on the other hand, in Instead of taking advantage of theaspect

exciting and funof the book, it concentrates on creating a drama, a film that pretends to be serious and realistic,

completely forgets that the original novel is an entertainment novel. As the intense

persecutions, threats and fights are replaced by scenes quenarran the "" true story "" of Mar���a

Magdalena, with two on produced flash backs that go back to two thousand years ago s.The long minutes and

even hours that Robert Langdon and company spend trying to decipher the intricate mysteries and codes, on

the tape are instantly solved with a photographic memory. and

although it seemed impossible, the scriptwriter failed to copy the plot as it was and in his attempts to

"" improve it "" he turned it into a long, tedious and cold experience flooding abusively with flashbacks trying

to tell the past of some of the characters, but completely forgetting to give them growth during the

plot, blurring them only as one more ingredient, so that the shtick is complete or not as the true

drivers of the story. And it fails, moreover, to portray more strongly the relationship between the two protagonists,

which in the book is very important and at the beginning of the film. they force it, so that within a few minutes

both of them are running away. But perhaps the most unforgivable mistake, in my view, is that the production

managed to sneak into the Louvre Museum, filming in the Great Hall, they managed to have access to the most famous painting in the

world, to waste it in a couple of simple shots. A great failure for all involved, except for

Sir Ian McKellen, impressing his character and of course one of my favorite actors.

" 0

" We, who seem to have been among the few who have not had a religious experience during their

viewing, and who have not seen God at the bottom of the popcorn carton, will limit ourselves to saying that it is

enough boring.

"" Secret games "" is one (other) "" ���cida look at the typical American family "", "" a heartbreaking and notall

atcomplacent look at the daily hell of marriage relationships "", "" a modern fable "" or the last

work of the "" new neo-independent USA cinema "". I have not invented it. All this is said out there, in thepress

specialized. We, who seem to have been among the few who have not had a religious experience

during their viewing, and who have not seen God at the bottom of the popcorn carton, will limit ourselves to saying

that it is quite boring. bastard of "" Crash "" and "" American beauty "", the film by Todd Field radiographs the

life of a quiet and typical American residential neighborhood, of those that at this point We all know that they

are full of psychopaths, unhappy, onanists, unsatisfied housewives, sly children and thecart

ice cream. In this case, the story centers around two parents, which now can no longer be said parents;

progenitor A is Brad (Patrick Wilson), a young man without a job, married to wealthy Kathy (Jennifer

Connelly), a rather castrating wife. Progenitor B is Sarah (Kate Winslet), a young and educated woman who

has married Richard (Gregg Edelman), a husband who should be castrated. Both know each other by walking their

children, and taking into account the vital habit in which they live, what happens has to happen. In the background there is also

a pederast who has just reinserted himself, Ronnie (Jackie Earle Haley), and a somewhat radical andpoliceman

intransigentwho is basically good, Larry (Noah Emerich). The typical of one of these neighborhoods. Although

the two parents are clearly the protagonists, each of the characters has its own story, which

is fully developed throughout the film. This helps a lot to last more than two hours, so

nothing to go to the movies with piles, no matter what the cream ad says. All the frames are quite

waterproof, and are united because the director has to place one of the protagonists always on

screen. With which the film lacks structure, jumping from person to person and from place

to place without end. In addition, Todd Field allows himself certain luxuries, such as shooting an American football game, which

although relatively integrated into history, give it an even more heterogeneous finish to the set. But all

this is not the authentic annoying thing. Not even the boring pedantuelo and gafapasta tone of the whole movie,

with visually very elaborate scenes that require the characters to pirouette through the frame to

position themselves as God intended, or the fact that everyone walks around ��� quoting Flauberto or Tolstoy. The worst

and unbearable is the insidious voice-over with which Todd Field machine guns the viewer. At all times there is a

man telling us in depth, with great detail, what each of the characters thatfeels

appear on the screen. Terrific.Also, "" Secret Games "" has won three Oscar nominations, one for

his gui��� and two more for his cast, which as is usual in these films are the most

remarkable. The most grateful role is that of Kate Winslet, who comes out nude and with little makeup, and that always

gives an idea that she gives everything for art. For the rest, it is a fairly conventional performance, which neverthelessearned him

hasa nomination for the best protagonist. Jackie Earle Haley has the same but foractor

supporting, for his performance In a pederast the same could have been lud���pata, drug addict,

clept���mano or journalist of the heart. Although his performance is probably the best in the film, the character is

not too well drawn. But that s, is a pederast, which always tip very high in this new

neocine.El male protagonist, Patrick Wilson, said in an interview, some time ago, one of his

prop �sitos for the new year was to participate in films that did not have to undress. They will be again.

Both spouses, Jennifer Connelly and Gregg Edelman, are simply to appear, and in the case of her,

to show off body, in contrast to Kate Winslet, which is what Todd Field, who could make him look,

pretends to pass us off as an unattractive and unattractive woman. In short, a pretentious and boring

film, which once the nominations are resolved will begin. to fall into oblivion. Recommended for people

living in bad neighborhoods, so they know that there is nothing worse than being middle-high class.

" 0

" A Masterpiece orchestrated by one of the geniuses we can enjoy who we are from this

generation.

What are those movies that come to mind when one talks about that concept that is

"modern classics"? It's an odd concept that we cynephils meet constantly. Can

Believe in not, but it exists. Many have the respectable opinion that a movie must survive for 20

years as a cult movie to become a classic, others think that there are films that are born if. one

way or another, the movie I'm talking about, Seven, is one of those movies that come to mind. Head. The

film of "" the head in the box "" for many, in the same way as for many other American History Xfu��� the

film of "" the mouth on the curb "". So many movies from the nineties are remembered, and it's funny. Everyone

remembers Seven.David Fincher is that indispensable director (along with Quentin Tarantino) to understand the

cinema of the 90s. That of "" reinventing "" cinema is a lie, it is a hoax. Cinema does not reinvent itself; the cinema is either

recycled or copied or it continues to do the same. Because the cinema has been defined for a long time. So younot

cansay that about Fincher, what can be said is that he revived the cinema. He picked up a classic script with the

clichÃ © of the old cop about to retire and the young and energetic cop just arrived in the city, and made it

in a reference title. In a cult movie and a Masterpiece. Andrew Kevin Walker, who is a great

craftsman of the gui���n tanned in the tv series "" Historias de la Cripta "" or movies like "" Brainscan "" (aB series

fantastic), wrote �� from a simple idea, seven deadly sins, seven murders. It did

relatively little that "" The Silence of the Coderos "" had returned to make fashionableserial killers

clever. AKWalker thought it would be a good idea to put that project in motion and try to sell it. The

perspective I gave the script was quite unique in the sense that it was much more obscure and perverted than

any other movie of serial killers. David Fincher came to fight with the producers of Alien3, and

desperately sought a project with which to vent. At first Seven did not attract attention until

he reached the moment when John Doe, the killer masterfully played by Kevin Spacey, surrenders.

Fincher thought: what movie did a serial killer deliver himself to? That's what pushed him to direct. Because of

course, that can be a pretty bad script error, but everything has its because, because behind the script of

Seven there is another guideline, that of the assassin himself, who is weaving his story and his crimes so that finally, they make

sense. Seven has an almost perfect gui���n. But is not. What happens to Seven is that the first half

is somewhat caught with pins in some aspects. The action is very forced in some points of the guide so

that it is as it is shown, being quite improbable. But the second half is perfect. Round And if a gui���le

gives a public a second half like that, the public forgets the faults that they may have seen, if esque

has seen them. Porue despite having many traps, Seven dissembles better than anyone his mistakes. For example, he is a

bit forced as Sommerset (Morgan Freeman) discovers the writing behind the fridge on the gluttony stage. Through

small, tiny, plastiquitos found in the stomach of the unfortunate who forced to

eat to burst. The detective takes those plastiquitos to the scene of the crime, and in no time

discovers that they are of the ground, concretely of having moved the refrigerator. A bit unlikely, but Hitchcock said

that one, when working the suspense, does not have to be totally credible, therefore, it does not have to be an

error. There is also the fact of how they discover Doe's house. Mills (Pitt) and Sommerset (Freeman) go, by

hand of the latter, to a confidential information vendor of the FBI, which seems to be controlling all the

books taken by any citizen. That is, to see if the pe leea reads about Hitler, about how to build

atomic bombs or kill chungos. So they get a list of names, which take them directly to

John Doe. This is a very risky resource, because people can not believe it, but as it is something

we do not know anything about, what governments do with our lives, they allow quitelicenses

extreme, and in the gui� n is disguised very well putting a small Cmico conflict between detectives.El

development of history will mark the killings, and is made from the point of view of the detectives,

d We only have a perspective on the crimes. We only see another point of view at the end, when John Doe speaks,

but we see it from the point of view of the detectives. Possibly the only sequel that is from the point

of view of the murderer, is the one that occurs in the house of the same. The house almost offers the unhealthy point of view

of the sequence. Fincher opts for a coarse and depressing movie. Something very risky, because it is not pleasant to

see, does not give the public anything in which to feel comfortable. Everything is dirt and rain. Something typical of the cinema of the

seventies, and of a film in particular Klute, by Alan J. Pakula. In which Fincher relies as a reference to

tell the story so sickly. The movie itself does not show much violence, just suggests it, and I do not want

to say that "what our mind can imagine is much stronger", but the tone of the movie

makes the suggestion of violence is much stronger than the violence itself, and above all, the attitude of

the people before it; very well represented by the owner of the puticl��� where the victim of lust dies. The

photo and the assembly and, above all, the assembly of sound, are masterful. The hopeless atmosphere,

absolutely bestial, very typical of Fincher, cuts your body. And this is also joined by a sequence of

credit titles that is worth millions, something totally brutal, that seems to be taken out of a movie. It reallyyou

tellsthe tone of the movie, and from the beginning you're with the knotted stomach. You do not feel like eating when you finish

seeing her, you're disgusted to be a person. The same as with The Fight Club. The end closes better than a

zipper, it is absolutely round. The crimes make sense, and you feel terrible because, in some way, you

understand the murderer. And do not blame him. You are like him, even being atheo. A Masterpiece orchestrated by one of

the geniuses we can enjoy who we are from this generation and who are still alive.

" 1

" Perhaps it is one of the most worthy premieres of the Spanish terror of the last years. Nacho Cerd��� should be

followed by

Nacho Cerd��� as a hurricane on the Spanish scene in the 90s with shorts like "" Aftermath "" o "" Genesis ""

becoming part of the bouquet of young promises of Hispanic horror. Even considering him director of

cult. Time after his name began to be forgotten after not getting a film debut that many fans

expected. After almost two decades of waiting he announced himself to hype and saucer his long awaited debut by the hand of

Julio Fernández who is practically the king of Spanish horror production at present "" Let's not forget

all the titles of the Fantastic Factory "". With all these ingredients the fan���ticos al g���nero can also

celebrate the inclusion in the gui���n of the Martian "" Karim Hussain "" "" Creator of t� Unclassifiable titles such

as "" Subconcious Cruelty or Abscension "". Authentic delusions for tanned stomachs. A tight budget

where practically all the weight of the action falls on two unknown Czech actors. Anastasia Hille "" Actress

already hardened in terror with small collaborations in the others or The Hole "" or Karel Rolden "" Also

specialized in the fantastic with interventions in Guillermo del Toro's films "" Hellboy, El Laberinto del

Fauno "". abandoned is a technically impeccable film, a magnificent photograph, great ambientaci���ny and with a

handling of the camera of the director really antol���gico.Momentos of frank horror although they mix with a gui���n

on unclear occasions, half the footage decays all the tension created in an alarming way to re-lift

the flight in the last minutes. The work of their int��� rpretes is another point in their favor. Be as it is and in spite

of some imperfections the director's debut at least hopeful, where he shows that he knows that

terror goes and knows all its springs. Perhaps it is one of the most worthy premieres of the Spanish terror of the

last years. Nacho Cerd��� must be followed. A 7.

" 1

" This sensation of audiovisual gazpacho possesses only a purely artistic and non-artistic motivation.

Verbinski, under the business tutelage of an entertainment financier like Bruckheimer, has done the

duties that he has been sent.

When one witnesses the show that is (without a doubt) the new installment of the Walt Disney Studios Motion

Picture Marketing and Distribution (more its partner, the Jerry Bruckheimer Films), it does not know very well if it has attended

a pirate movie (unorthodox, of course), a ginkana of circus antics, one of the fat and

the skinny, a surreal comedy about how to be John Malkovich, or even to a naif love story. And is

that this incursion to the end of the world is also the step to the self-sufficiency of a producer that is known a

priori winner. For this reason, the script is something secondary, which has only needed? By the

tanned writers Ted Elliott and Terry Rossio (Godzilla, Shrek, The Fox Mask ) - a wise choice of

disparate genres and characters, extracted from the child's imaginary of potential clients (children and not so

young). This sensation of audiovisual gazpacho possesses only a purely artistic and non-artistic motivation.

Verbinski, under the business tutelage of an entertainment financier like Bruckheimer, has done the

duties that he has been sent. And he has done well, and with impudence. Pirates of the Caribbean 3 is too

keen on the box office, and its security to sell a product that before leaving had already exceeded the

expectations of making its producers rich. That's why Pirates of the Caribbean 3 ripples its plot, allowing

cloning licenses with schizophrenic speeches, or Rollingstonian pirates who defend the pirate code and

the musical memory of the parents who accompany their children to the halls (� Is it the reverse?) And the tangle of its script

is supported because it is seasoned (like almost all American fast-paced cinema) of anearthquake

audiovisualthat dislodges the eyes of the respectable and keeps him quiet in the chair, gobbling his popcorn

and sipping the usual ration of syrup made in the USA. When leaving the room there will only be what we saw, that is,

mere smoke of sounds and colors and a good few euros less in the pockets. And to continue swallowing fireworks

, that life is two days and Treasury and death do not forgive. With Pirates of the Caribbean 3, Spiderman 3

and all his cousins ​​brothers we are presented with a cinematographic menu. In our cinemas, it was not very encouraging for those who

would have liked to see on the poster other titles equally juicy and more packed (see Zodiac,

among dozens more), and He finds prefabricated dishes that seduce at first sight, they become more

of kitkats with which to kill the worm that one has of good cinema (or if cinema at all), and not

retreaded digital sets by experts in marketing. Anyway, see you at the cinema (or at the amusement

park).

" 0

" A compelling argument for those who criticize the subsidized, subsidized and decadentcinema

contemporary Spanish.

Even though I often do them with little faith, I am still one of those who try to defend Spanish cinema from

the angry criticism that is usually received by people who do not even bother to see the movies before

skinning them. And I say with little faith, or no, because there are cases in which the task of looking for the positive side

becomes quite uphill. And believe me when I tell you that this is a clear example of this.

Today, Cinema is an aberration that aims to parody the Spanish cinema of the time of uncovering, and that it does

through a miscellany of characters that are a blatant, disrespectful and uncouth copy of some of the

real artistic icons of �� "Past times, which little or nothing has been tried to change to avoid a

mockery that in the end is not offensive because precisely this film is not more than what he has begun to

criticize. A guile without wit, blunt dialogues, characters defined with bad taste and little imagination are the

predominant notes in this mess lit up in the light of some of those magnificent subsidies that the

filmmakers of this country charge again from the state, and that makes them the only workers who do not

need to do their job well to collect it in a magnificent way. At a time when the market is in charge, and in

which writers, singers, innkeepers and vendors are subject to public acceptance, these artists

do not need the approval of the respectable, because even private television sets are obliged to

subsidize them and pay huge amounts, even if their work does not deserve them, which is often,

like this, shameful. This shows in the little care that has been taken in this production with the details, since

on one occasion you can even see the reflection of a microphone in a bar. Although without a doubt, the most flagrant of the

negligences occurs when in one of the scenes the protagonists walk down a corridor and pass in

front of some posters announcing a bullfight of Jos��� Tom�� �s, El Fandi and Finito de C���rdoba, that in

1977 (when the movie was set), were children of the breast or even had Iwant to lose

do notor waste any more time talking about this garbage, in which they should have felt ashamed of having

participated Fernando Tejero, Alberto San Juan and Miguel Rell���n, actors with a name and a trajectory

behind him. Maybe if they dedicated more to writing quality scripts and less to be at the door of the Congress, in

the demonstrations, signing manifestos anti PP and figuring in the m� Political events, the Spanish cinema would not

be, according to the CIS, one of the meno s appreciated by the citizens of this country.

" 0

" David Fincher leaves us a good film of excellent manufacture but it does not surprise or dazzle, even so it

leaves a good taste in the mouth.

The first thing that the viewer has to know when choosing this movie is that it has little or nothing to do with the

previous films of the director, here David Fincher, does not look for the visual show of The Club of the fight, nor to

leave the spectator without respite with an in crescendo tension when discovering each new assassination as in Seven, nor

does it aim to create an oppressive atmosphere like in the room of the p� Unique In this film we want to

convey the frustration suffered by journalists, policemen and the population of California during the

70s by the alarm caused by a serial killer, which became one of the most famous and

inconclusive cases of American criminal history. The second thing to notice is that it is an

excessively long film, 2 hours and 40 minutes, that although ��an have been cut in the assembly room, are

necessary to try to put all the details, tests and records that are necessary for the explanation

of the plot, that is another important aspect to consider, here � the viewer has to be attentive to every

detail that is said as it is a police thriller to the most classic American style of that time.

That is one of his strong points, the atmosphere of the time is impeccable a few years 7 0 perfectly

recreated, as is the acting work, highlighting Mark Ruffalo and Jake Gyllenhal,mention

Robert Downey Jr. deserves special, an actor who seems to be recovered from his additions although it seems that he will be

pigeonholed papers of precisely addicted, does not wake up my sympathy but here does a job more than

correct. The plot tells the years and murders committed by the serial killer known as Zodiac, and how he could

keep in check to the police, FBI and CIA, since it used cryptograms to recognize the authorship of its

crimes. It is precisely these cryptograms that draw the attention of the character of Jake Gyllenhal, who is

obsessed with the case and is the only one who, even after many years, continues to investigate and close the siege on the

main suspect of the investigation and almost solving the mystery of the identity of Zodiac. It is his

tenacity in resolving the mystery that gives meaning to a life that for the rest, is presented to us anodyne,

that obsession to solve the mystery is what ends up destroying the rest of those involved in the resolution, except

Mark Ruffalo's companion, Green Emergency Doctor, Anthony Edwards (���if someone is bald, his image of

the last ones to ��� Is it that of a bald man, because to put a hairpiece so impossible that exposes the falsehood

of his character?), seeing that his career and marriage are in danger of falling off the quest that would end with the

rest David Fincher leaves us a good film of excellent manufacture but it does not surprise or dazzle, even so it

leaves a good taste in the mouth. Perhaps his detractors who accuse him of very videoclipero see here a better directing work

, which for the writer is one of the great directors of recent cinema.

" 1

" The film does not stop being a sum of gags, some with a lot of grace, others with none ... Vehicles for total and absolute brilliance of Jack Black, like Nacho, the fighter, if well the film does not stop

being a sum of gags (some with a lot of grace, others with none), the film ends spontaneouslythe odd

and one walks towards the exit of the room withquestion in the head that the tape does not solve, and

that is not that pretenda.Jack Black incredible, squeezing absolutely his humorous vein, his

gestures, and especially his sense of humor, since of the first one who laughs is himself, so fat he,

stuffed in those Mayans and wearing "" trick "", as for his castmates, maybe he will make a peln

shade (or would eclipse with its unique beauty, the Mexican actress Ana de la Reguera, well worth the price of

admissionsee those eyes jet black every time that appears on the screen (and that is, I must admit, I can get

the brunettes). I did not want to finish without talking about H���ctor Jim���nez, who plays the role of Skeleton, and is that with

just 2 gestures and many (too many) screams, he pokes the audience in his pocket, this guy has a

lot of comedy to show us. By the way, the soundtrack is on Danny Elfman's account, so you have to

walk "" o���do vigizor "". In short, a funny tape, full of gags, of those 5 scraped.

" 0

" The only thing that is saved are the special effects, and the performance of almost all the actors, depending on

the extent of their role evidently, highlighting Cillian Murphy.

Where is the tension in this movie? Why did I have to swallow almost an hour and a half of footage to

reach something minimally? Disturbing ??; that by the way, that final part of the tape is just as

disturbing as the fact that you get less back after paying for a ciabatta in the neighborhood

bakery. promised? Sunshine? in all the trailers that we have seen along these months it

crumbles absolutely when the first palm of the crew of ���car II, spaceship in which

the characters of our history travel, in the future a��� or 2057, with the praiseworthy objective of trying to save the

dying end of the star Sun. And it is that this film is one of those that dies to the pointer. And of course,

in which you know almost certainly, with a minimum margin of error, in what order to occur; Most of them have a

cold face that sings long. The fact is that I have always praised the cast of? Sunshine? inposts

previous, and I do not retract what I've said so far. It is a good casting, some actors are better than

others of course, but thanks to their interpretations, and other technical details, this film is saved fromForgettable

being described as??. I think the problem is in the direction. For the viewer to suffer for

what is happening on the screen, and for the life of any of his characters, it is necessary to start with

an open-hearted presentation? to calz���n removed the virtues, defects,

vulnerabilities and potential of each intervenor of history, to make it closer to the public.

It seems that you know them as little kids. Only this way you feel their loss, and evidently so youris stressed

bodywhen you see that they have death stuck to the butt, and when they end up leaving to the other neighborhood. Well,

Danny Boyle has focused so much on showing us the nice special effects he has achieved for the

film, that we care about a pepper who, when and how a character dies or another. Man, asgoes

the tapeon, you have more attachment to one than to another, for your way of facing the crisis; but

none of you would take it to your house or take a coffee. With this little blood, the tension of the film is

practically nil. And when you see how the first victim of the plot, with the limp hanging from the neck, the

espicha with hardly any interest, you fear the worst. There is more tension in the meetings of my community of neighbors than in

this film. Only one detail to detect boredom: I instinctively searched 6 to 7 times a more

comfortable position in the chair to continue watching the tape, and the kid in front has stretched so much in

the final credits that I have wanted to find a bed for him to throw a dream before leaving.

And to top it off, the culminating moment, as is the outcome of the story, with a half-monster as avillain

final, is mounted so psychedelic (with scenes in slow motion that end in pause,

subliminal images or unexplained blurs) that makes you lose the reference of what is happening. So much

desire has had Boyle to make an apote���sico final that unintentionally drives you crazy. What is said, that the only thing that are

saved are the special effects, some very cool (some other props it's funny, like the

golden spacesuits that make them look like the crew members who wear a Ferrero Rocher bomb) and the

performance of almost all the actors, depending on the length of his role evidently, highlighting Cillian

Murphy (for his role as good movie) and Chris Evans (for his learned role as a rebel). Ah, I recommend

you take a pair of sunglasses to the movies and the teng You are on hand because you need them.

" 0

" In the most pure style "" Torrente "" in the film we can see, among others Danny DeVitto (producer of the

original series) and The Rock, in a very curious role. One of those tapes that you can always claim not to have

seen.

I know that this is the typical tape that everyone will refuse to see, that tape that one always ends up avoiding and that

in the hypothetical case that he does, he will blame it. to alcohol or to various psychotropic substances, their vison, of

course, is the ideal tape to watch with some friends at home (in a drunken state) and thus be able to enjoy

their discarding situations, and that they include in a sequence my adored "" canon de Pachebel "" (although

its context is insane). Reading the argument one can think that we are before an action tape, seen

his poster one thinks of a comedy at the most pure style "" Crazy Police Academy. "", nothing is further from both

perspectives, since this Mockumentary is an "" episode on the big screen "" of the Comedy Central series

(famous among other things by the mythical "" South Park ""), "" Reno 911 "" series that parodies the famous "" Cops ""

for a while too n Espaa.Al ms is let out in style "" Torrente "" In the film we see, among

others Danny DeVitto (producer of the original series) and The Rock, in a very curious role. Finally, along with

Borat, one of those films that you can always claim not to have seen.

" 0

" A story with a lot of hope and good intentions. Ready in the water in a few words, it's a Tim Burton story with a lot of hope and good

intentions as Frank Capra. Although the marketing surrounding the film sells the film as horror,

the new Shyamalan is a full-fledged story, a story for adults who want to be kids again and

find a opportunity with a bewitching Bryce Dallas Howard. Paul Giamatti, a luxury actor after a

few memorable roles in Entre copas, Cinderella man or American Splendor, is the disenchanted and humble

protagonist who acts in an incredulous way but who later becomes one of the more tireless fighters

for "" the cause. "" With inevitable references to the Iraq war, Shyamalan's film is the least Shyamalan of his

career (in the absence of seeing The Protected One). The good / bad thing about the directors is that they have identity signs ortics

plotthat they usually repeat throughout their filmography, and in this case it's nice that almost everything you

fear along the film (the typical questions of if he will be dead, if there has been a leap in

time, etc.?) is not fulfilled: "" what you see is what it is "" In addition there is a fierce criticism towardscritics

film, who portray as destructive pessimists those who pursue their prejudices. It is

imperative, after The Forest , talk about James Newton Howard when he works with this director. Every time

I go around and I think that, even though Discovering Never Jam is a fabulous score,work

Howard'smust have won the statuette. Undoubtedly it is his best work, but with Lady in water it seems that he wants

recover or take advantage of that masterful creative waste for this film. Obviously not "" is achieved "", but gets

excited. It is worth pointing out the moment that I think most emotional of the film that on the album is titled The

Healing. Take note. To give you an idea of ​​where the director is going, I reproduce the phrase that appears

at the end of the final credit roll: "" For my daughters. I will tell you this story one more time. But then

go to bed. "" A delicious story with very few "" buts "".

" 1

" A tontorr���n festival of family-friendly topics that does not contribute anything to the adult world, but

that will enjoy the smallest you.

In the summer of 2003 it was released throughout the world as God (or Almighty Bruce, which is how you would

have called if the people who "translate" the t��� titles would have deigned to respect the original title), a

film directed by Tom Shadyac (director of authentic cakes like Compulsive Liar, Patch Adams, or

Dragonfly: The Shadow of the Libellula, but also of geniuses like Ace Ventura: Pet Detective),

starring Jim Carrey, Jennifer Aniston, and Morgan Freeman doing himself. That is, God. The film

had its own points of humor, and it was funny despite the cloying catholic halo that enveloped it,

but it literally went away It is a good idea to go to hell in becoming the typical and unbearable romantic comedy of the

table, predictable enough to say enough. As God was a success and it was not long before the sequel was confirmed, but

there were difficulties with the cast, since Jim Carrey could not repeat because he was busy with other

projects (which were later canceled.) and, if Jim Carrey was not there, obviously (and fortunately) there would be no ��a

Jennifer Aniston, or continuation of the plot established in Como Dios. So Tom Shadyac came up with the

idea of ​​exploiting a character that, a priori, seemed interesting, and removed a story around

him. It was nothing more and nothing less than Evan Baxter, who in God God gave life to the now well-known Steve

Carrell. In I still like God (or Evan Almighty, we continue with the invented titles.), Evan Baxter He has just been

elected nothing more and nothing less than a congressman, and he moves from Buffalo with his family, to live in an

urbanization in northern Virginia. Once there, his life suffers a major shift when God (Morgan

Freeman, how not) orders him to build an ark, because the flood is coming. The result ends up being little more

than disheartening . The tape bores and does little grace. 95% of gags and jokes, orsituations

funny, are childish and easy (Carrell wants to kill him when he does that of "" do the dance ""). And

to top it off, something more serious happens than in its predecessor: it becomes a typical and repellentlycomedy

familiar, of easy morality, and even politics and ecology. Logic In addition, the story is absurd nonsense: God

announces a flood, and instructs Evan Baxter to build an ark, while a couple of specimens of each

species arrive at the place where it is built. the piece of boat. At the end (and eye because this can be

considered SPOILER), the flood does not exist as such, and one is left with the squares when wondering what

all the fuss is for absolutely nothing. A tontorr���n festival of family-friendly topics that do not contribute

anything to the adult world, but that will enjoy the smallest. A pure and hard crossover

between Como Dios, ��� Go Santa Claus !, and An uncomfortable truth. The only thing that can be saved from my point of view, theeffects

visual(which, although they sometimes sing with the bugs, the Tutuki Splash part seems quite successful) and.

the final credits, nice and funny.

" 0

" Boast of design and meticulousness, a creation of the geniuses of the house Pixar perfection is impossible, what would that one say. But Pixar is getting closer and closer; that's what, in what? mam?

Disney leaves you. Cars, the latest in animation for the big screen, is a showcase of design and meticulousness, a

creation of the geniuses of the house, however, It suffers from little imagination in the message, something

to be lamented after a past full of intelligent wonders of the drawing. However, the triumph is

assured, especially among the children's public and those who love racing. Rayo McQueen, the hot

protagonist, is in danger of becoming a swindler. do champion him worried about the triumphs and the

? flashes ?. His greatest dream is to win the California Piston Cup, a title held by the greats that would make

him a young motoring star. But on the way to competition, he went astray and goes to a

small town on the legendary Route 66. There he meets his future friends and understands ��� that life is not

just about winning? All very predictable but possibly necessary given the characteristics of the product.

Humanizing a car is not an easy task, and to compensate for the lack of expressiveness, which is nevertheless very well

achieved, the always willing sentimental resource is thrown away. You need an affordable moral but without

going over and, of course, a nice ending. The tradition is not going to change at this point, but at least it is to be

thankful that some topicalities have been avoided by all means. Irreversible. Even taking

advantage of the pull of Formula 1, figures such as Michael Schumacher or Fernando Alonso (stuck with a shoehorn in the Spanish

version), they let themselves be seen? in a round? cameos? which include the odd surprise. Something of all that chirr���a,

as well as the pretended love story, whose only function in the gui���n is to make time, and the gr���a? best friend?

of McQueen. What's the real good? of the story is ugly and silly does not contribute anything ("what, sometimes,

be friends with? the bad guys?). Despite the slow development and an excess of localism that runs the risk of

being ignored by a certain part of the respectable, those of Lasseter do not disappoint in terms of gui���os and double readings

refers. And, of course, her ingenuity effortlessly manages to bring in several sequences the sudden

sweetening of the moment, including the essential song of the indispensable Randy Newman, Our Town, interpreted

by this chronicler as a shameless mockery towards the Pocahontas type ballads. Everything is possible. But what

really thrills is to see the machines in action. It is a real pleasure to appreciate the game of textures, colors,

reflections and precision of which Cars boasts with a shocking superiority. The movements of a camera

that does not exist do the rest. So, enjoy with speed and do not miss, as you already have to know, the

credit titles. Nor is the short film from the beginning, El hombre orquesta, a delight that is worth more than two

hours of projection. Question of minutes.

" 1

" Very estimable comedy with some dramatic tinge, but without the blood ever reaching the river.An authentic scriptwriting filigree of Diablo Cody, and the wise realization of Jason Reitman, that does not elucubra

with the gui���n adocen���ndole of absurd takes that try to give a page of qualit���, do that "" Juno " "done

Belittle by little but with no possibility of escape, with the heart of the spectator. At the beginning, the first fifteen

minutes, it seems to be a" "yanquilandada" ", a story uniquely possible in The United States of North America,

very far from the rest of the countries. However, and after Juno's confession to his parents, about his current

state, the story takes a few impresivislbes vericuetos, which constantly change course, gender,

situations, going from humor to drama, from romantic comedy, to socio-cultural notes and veryscenes

sensitivelike Jennifer Garner touching Juno's bulging belly while she looks at him strangely but

satisfied. A scene that will have vital importance in the final decision of Juno. Everything perfectly basted,

with great dialogues, excellent interpretations, with special mention two actresses: Ellen Page,

simply arrogance in her role as a disbarred teenager, which serves as a catalyst for some people,

somewhat lost in their wrong lives, and Allison Janney, wonderful in her role as Juno's stepmother

(simple and vibrant the outline of the ecography ), an actress already with proven experience but who, I fear, until

now had gone largely unnoticed by the public (I included myself, although I remembered her from other works). At

all times entertaining, the It increases with each minute, offering us a lesson of life in the mostway

pleasantpossible, without absurd morals, ri���diculos moments or infantile condescences. nominated for several

���scars, being the film The cheapest movie that has been cast in the short list of nominees. He has it difficult, but in the

section of the best gui���ns��� I think he has authentic

" 1

" We do not have large doses of violence and he has a strong moralistic charge that does not come bad in these

times that run. And possibly the smallest ones love it.

I can not miss the original name of the movie "" Laputa Castle "". I do not know if they should

change the name for the Spanish version, since they could have edited two, exactly the same, and they would have

had twice as much profit. That these very deep names have a lot of commercial pull. Well, let meI

go beforestart. The film is about a girl who is on board a kind of airship.

This is approached and the girl falls into the void. When he is about to lie on the ground, a necklace that he carries

wakes up making him float. Below, a boy with a certain resemblance to Pedro (Heidi's, not Almodovar)her

picksup and helps her. And I'm not going to tell you more, that for one that is worth it I do not destripo. We have a

recording with a total aftertaste to "" Spirited Away "", although a little worse. The introduction is

incredibly beautiful, with machines that seem taken from the imagination of Leonardo Da Vinci. Although the truth

be told, then they do not have much to do with the film, but it is interesting. The cartoons remind us a lot

of Marco and Heidi (I was waiting to see if the monkey Amelio came out, but in the end it does not appear). The argumentnot

isincredible, like Chihiro's, although it's not bad. And what I still find incredible is the imagination

that these people have to make unlikely cities and unviable junk. Is awesome. As a point

against, which is a bit long, but I do not mind. Resumiendo, that you go through the video store to rent it right

now, which is one of those that you like to see. We do not have large doses of violence and have a strongcharge

moralisticthat does not hurt in these times. And possibly the little ones love it (although they

remind you that girls do not fly, no matter how many necklaces they have).

" 1

" Film of intrigue on fantastic scenarios, with a lot of storyline and some other scare to

release tensions. To see it with the senses alert, so as not to get lost.

Silent Hill is based on a video game that I will never play, which looksand I'm not

like a bit of a freakfor these scares. The film is about a couple who have an adopted daughter from about eleven years She is

nocturnal and usually tries to kill herself during her nocturnal rush, screaming that she is in Silent Hill. Total,

that the mother still with the opposition of the father, goes to Silent Hill, which is an abandoned town of the United

States, which suffered a chain of horrible fires to make its atmosphere unbreathable . But nothing more to get

there, and when they are pursued by a motorcycle police, they suffer an accident. When she wakes up in the car, her

daughter is not there and the police try to stop her. A strange mist flies over them, with a continuous cloud of

ash. He's in Silent Hill. Hey, what's the most interesting movie? I expected some special effects without

rhyme or reason, with murderous mutants and heroines who start being housewives with curlers. But no, not much

less. This film has a solid frame, with a very worked atmosphere, suffocating at all times. I was

delighted that there are two parallel investigations, one of which runs between two parallel worlds. The

only issue is that to know well you have to be very attentive. To each frame, the thing is entangled,

solved at the end, but if you have not followed it well, you have a bit of a foolish face. And the end I found

very serious and very well closed, without dumps or nonsense. Resuming, film of intrigue on

fantastic scenarios, with much plot thread and some that another scare to release tension. To see it with

the senses alert, not to get lost between name, dates and characters.

" 1

" "" The Illusionist "" is an impressive film that lacks the three deadly sins ofHollywood

today's: pretentiousness, scripts made in the bathroom and divas / as the only part solid of the film.

"" What a clumsy copy "" I said when I saw the poster of "" The Illusionist "" a few days of launching the first pics

of "" The Prestige "". Edward Norton, Jessica Biel and Paul Giamatti. "What an odd cast", he asked me again.

Total, my whole predisposition does not pass or a revenge to advance in premiere with a theme that my

beloved Nolan must have embroidered. Result: what the asshole are sometimes? "" The Illusionist "" is an

impressive film. Maybe you will equate that name with an "excellent" "but that's not what I mean either. The

way in which the story is told in the film is faultless. It does not stop flowing, and as such, it keeps you in

constant attention what happens on the screen. It's like one of those books that costs you to leave them despite

having eyes like br���tolas. Nothing seems out of place, and you will find its way and why before thecome out

final credits, something that is very complicated in today's cinema. Directed by Neil Burger , whose first

film "" Interview with the murderer "" must see, the film is the adaptation of a story by Steven

Millhauser about a wizard in the Vienna of the Victorian era. Filmed entirely in the Czech Republic, "" The

Illusionist "" has managed to finish the consistency of its gui���n with fabulous exteriors. All the

recreations, including the theater where the protagonist magician acts every night, are unbeatable. What I want to

tell you with all this corny retah���la is that the atmosphere that the director has managed to recreate surrounds you as much or

more as the story that counts. From this story, it is better to know what is just and necessary. Fear gives me to mention

some scenes of the film, simply wonderful, since you will be grateful to be ignorant until you

see it, because each step and each event is as unexpected as the previous one. A Magician, (Edward Norton), a

lady (Jessica Biel), and a somewhat neurotic police (Paul Giamatti). Their lives will be intertwined to anend. What a

unconventionalsurprise Paul Giamatti gives me. After wanting to give you two \*\* in "" La Joven del Agua "", heme

givesa Victorian Grissom from aupa. His interpretation as a policeman struggling between licking asses or serving

the law is as simple as it is brilliant, and they should do a spin-off for him. Edward Norton does not surprise me,

because this guy is fine where he is. Tell me a single movie where you are not more than successful. Of Jessica

Biel it can only be said that her performance is not visibly below her partners, and that is

much in a film where the Norton-Giamatti duel is antològic The bad guy is Rufus Sewell - when not. One of the

actors that more villains has incarnated, and that makes him a specialist. His drawing of a king without ethics or morals

adds more to the main chorus and that is why, as I have already told you, the result is round poder.Ya

come to tell me some that is crap, but "" The Illusionist "" lacks the three deadly sins of

today's Hollywood: pretentiousness, scripts made in the bathroom and divos / as Only solid part of the

film. It's a romantic tale (abstain fans of "" A todo Gas ""), with good very good and bad very bad, and

as their slogan says: "" Nothing is what it seems ""?

" 1

" An absolute, regrettable and in very bad taste lost of time ... and money. Last year the new project of Eli Roth, Hostel was released worldwide . With a budget of

$ 4,500,000, the Roth movie that was promoted along with the name of Quentin Tarantino (excellentstrategy

commercial) ended up collecting approximately $ 80,000,000 worldwide (the meat sold) , being a

considerable success for the director of Cabin Fever.Aquella, although passable by the hair, it was not nothing of the other

world: His -burrid���sima- first half, full of tits and good looking women, It was a kind of American Pie

videoclipzada, more hooligan and set in the Eroupa of the east, which gave way to a fun (but not for all

tastes) half-hour long fest , of violence more or less explicit and, depending on how you look at it, a

peculiar sense of humor. As the formula worked, and as it usually happens in United, the sequel was more

than assured. Then we have it here: baptized as Hostel, part 2, and that turns out to be p Ara m���, for now, the first

film of the year. In Hostel, part 2 is perceived as a reluctant Eli Roth with a film that does not appeal to him.

Everything is very neglected: the plot continues where it was left by its predecessor, making an applauded effort not to

follow the typical plot of the sequels of this kind of films , introducing the characters of

Roger Bart and Richard Burgi to dynamize the plot a bit and that the set does not end up being acopyasteo

commercialof the first part. In all this, it fails. It ends up falling into the same usual topics, (all)

the characters do not finish working (very badly described), and the film ends up being, as expected, a

copypasteo of its predecessor. but more boring, more light and without a hint of the sense of black humor that was

breathed in Hostel, part 1 (now we have to call it that?). Absolute, unfortunate and in very bad taste

wasting time. and of money.

" 0

" This wonderful documentary tells us about global warming in such a pleasant and unpredictable way

that Gore becomes the clever guy he named at the beginning.

Al Gore is a smart guy. And for several reasons. An uncomfortable truth, directed by Davis Guggenheim, has

allowed him to enter the world of documentary film in an extraordinary, unique and simple way. This

wonderful documentary tells us about global warming in such a pleasant and unpredictable way that

Gore - the rival candidate for Bush in the US elections several years ago - becomes thisguy

cleverfrom whom I named at the beginning. This uncomfortable truth that we are presented with is a real fact, which ishappening

constantlyin our world and which, obviously, must be solved. One when he hears global warming and

proposes a human solution remains quiet, in a normal state. Another thing is that they propose to know or

understand that global warming, no matter how much human solution it may have, we provoke it. Yes,

we humans. This is how Al Gore has us stuck to the seat, with this simple phrase (and positing

possible later solutions, of course): we produce global warming. Of course, if

one is interested in ecology, the environment and all this will not interest you either. An uncomfortable truth.

The Guggenheim film aims to inform all of us of this terrible fact, but Guggenheim also knows that we will

not be interested in all of them, so here the public decide Not only the most interesting part of this documentary is

to realize that these drastic events that we are continually witnessing, like Katrina,consumption

exaggerated energy? , but also to see the way this message goes:

precise, entertaining and very interesting. The message I sent to the public would be the following: do not miss

an uncomfortable truth, so precise.

" 1

" We are facing an entertaining film, which works as a great freak drama or as a

review of the science fiction genre with new and attractive ingredients. Highly recommended and enjoyable. Do not

miss it.

This is a great movie with dysfunctional family, clumsy and entraceably loser, and above with

monster, and what a monster !. I went to the cinema totally clean of synopsis, trailers, reviews and commentaries (I

was only aware of the good reception in Sitges and the box office boom in Korea) so I did not expect anything, except for

some suspiciously wrong comparisons by the distributor in the poster: After? Tibur���n?

and? Alien? arrives? The Host ?. Nothing farther from reality. The film by Bong Joon-Ho ('Crènica de un serial killer

') is another story, it is a very interesting genre shake: action, science fiction Conn withmonster

giant, drama, HUMOR, political s���tira and even self-parody. The director himself has declared that he

has also paid homage to Godzilla or the Loch Ness monster, and that he has sought inspiration in the San

Fermín enclosures. Oh, yes, as you read. The film starts with an introduction totally dispensable, but that already makes us

suspect the black (or yellow) humor that will distill 'The Host' (ALL ��� 'Gwoemul') "". We are on notice,

we just have to sit comfortably to enjoy. Next and without further delay, we see the initial rise,

located in Se ,l, the presentation in society of "" the thing "" and its consequences, focusing on a veryfamily

peculiar. From there, the tragedy, the horny tone and the tension go hand in hand in thisfilm. I want to

South Koreantalk about the mutant monster, a cross between crocodile, dinosaur and giant squid. An

authentic enjoyment of special effects and sound effects (essential to see it in a movie theater, dear

friends of the pack animals.) A joy of a creature that moves with speed, with elegance and

jumping of a� ��pa. I appreciate that most of the time is seen in broad daylight and that does not stop being

integrated. It's a luxury bug! As I mentioned before, the film plays almost all the time with humor and

drama, and that is the laughs of the four people we were in. the cinema rumbled in the next room

, bizarre humor called. Except for a sequence that made me frown a long time of

embarrassment (moment ground and crying). Anyway it does not depart from the tone of the film, and we have in mind

that it is an oriental movie, with all that that entails. The acting plane is impeccable, all the protagonists

are sensationally well defined, well evolved and well interpreted, especially a memorable Song

Kang-Ho that is my idol from now on. In short, an entertaining film, which works as a great freak drama or

as a review of the science fiction genre with new (nonetheless original) ones and attractive ingredients.

Highly recommended and enjoyable. Do not miss it.

" 1

" Special executions without a guide, and action without any warnings. Warning to all my readers, do not go to the movies to see this movie, which is a giant tru���o.warned.

Quedais Alone in the dark comes, the title of a game that came out for PC makes a stack of years. It was an

absolute novelty, in addition to a revolution. He had a good script, three-dimensional graphics and asystem

camerathat was the ca���a. Well, this movie only looks like the game in the name. The film is about a man

who lived some strange experiments during his childhood in the orphanage, until that suffered an electrical discharge

, that instead of materle as it ought to be, gave birth to the film spawn this. A few years later, theyus

tellthat they are after the search for artifacts left by an ancient pre-American civilization (of when

this was a pangea, m� Or less) that had contacted other worlds and I do not know which podinas more. Total, which

then come out some bugs that eat humans, and these defend and die and explode everything and it ends and

you breathe. But then it continues and you want to cut your veins, and when it seems that it is not over, it goes and ends.

Incredible. What do you want me to tell you more? Special gigs without gui���ny action without rhyme or reason.actors

Tont���simoswho act without any coherence. And the worst of all, beyond the Dantesque ending, is thescene

sex. Who fucks with the underpants? What woman does it with a bra? Come on man, give joy to

life, you do not mind taking hyperviolent scenes of death and destruction but you do not get "" chicha "".

" 0

" The story they tell does not have much interest. Actually, almost nothing happens in the whole movie, and if

Mr. Crossbow was not there, this would be an infumable truce.

Today I read a magazine of these juveniles and Juan Jos��� Ballesta was on the cover, and they gave him a

very funny interview. Among the pearls I saw, one was "" I have signed autographs even in tits "",

although I am more grateful for one that said "" I am going Dick watching my movies "". I guess with this I would not have

cut it off. The film is about Samuel who is 18 years old and a very rare brain disease, like

epilepsy. His parents have always had him overprotected, rightly so, but when he reaches the age of majority he decides to

go with a cousin of his to the beach. Total, that whatever it is appears in the capital living alone and adapting to

life without parents. And the thing is happening between voices in off that more dizziness. Look, the film does

not even criticize it. Actually, almost nothing happens in the whole movie, and if Mr. Crossbow was not there, this

would be an infumable truce. But as it comes out, the thing has its pass. The story they tell is not very

interesting, it's just the life of a kid who has the problem in his head, but for the rest it's

the usual problems of housing, work and sex or love . The subject of the voice-overs, as I said,

which I usually like a lot, seems very abusive and steals the little rhythm that the film could have.

I also highlight, in the positive, the role of the grandfather that appears, which I thought was a very good job. But nothing,

that the movie is curious but little more. Resuming, a typical Spanish movie that does not contribute much and does not

let you see too well. Few things save it from burning.

" 0

" This sequel will delight the fans of the genre and all those who want to see an

interesting and consistent proposal with what it intends.

Juan Carlos Fresnadillo returns to the cinemas and manages to leave through the big door. If already with his short film

"" Esposados ​​"" became known, and later with "" Intacto "" he showed what he was capable of, "" 28 weeks

later "" gives us a sequel that It could well be included in the select club of "better second parties than the

first ones." The argument is simple, and tells us the situation in London twenty-eight weeks after the outbreak of

" "anger" "that made havoc among the population, and that we could see in" "28 days after" ". With a start of frenetic

, fast and anguished film, Fresnadillo places us in the skin of Don (Robert Carlyle), and in what lived the

outbreak and what he had to leave behind. In that start we are shown some very powerful images and with great

force, like the race Don has to take for the meadows, while hundreds of zombies chase him.

Later we are presented with the current situation, the rest of the characters and we are living the

events that are unleashed after the new infectious outbreak.aside the possible readings on the

Leavingsituation that takes place in England, and the problems that originate in families, governments and otherdilemmas

moral, Fresnadillo chooses to show us a very fast movie, in which the camera in movement abounds and the

grain in the images, giving it a closer touch in some moments. Another virtue is the use of thecamera

subjective, since it places us in the vision. Den of the protagonists, especially in the scene in which the children and the

woman go down the stairs of the subway, totally in the dark and only serving to see from thepeephole

infraredof the weapon that They carry. In those moments I remembered "" The project of the witch of Blair "", tape that

managed to reach a realism and anguish seldom achieved previously. Gui��� and history weaken in

some situations, but Fresnadillo manages to save without excessively resenting the film. The absence of

people, the crowds, the decisions of the high commanders and the snipers, the journey through a

desolate London aboard a moped or the butchery of the helicopter, are some of the sequences that

make up "" 28 weeks after "", and that make the zombie theme continue its resurgence, after the recent

good proposals that we have been finding. This sequel will delight the fans of the genre and of

all those who want to see an interesting and consistent proposal with what it intends.

" 1

" While it is a dramatic and terrible story in its outcome, it is a testament to dignity since there is

something extremely worthy in dying doing what you love.

The recent death of the "" Crocodile Hunter "" Steve Irwin is a good context to talk about this documentary

directed by Werner Herzog, director known for films like Fitzcarraldo or Aguirre, the Wrath of God and that

narrates life, work and death of activist Timothy Treadwell. Trewellwell was a guy obsessed with protecting

grizzly bears from Alaska and every year, for thirteen years, he traveled to Alaska to spend the spring and summer

alone in medium of the bears, not only looking to study them but to live with them and in a certain sense to be a bear more;

Treadwell recorded all his travels on video and audio, and in his free time he traveled for free through schools and

television programs teaching about these animals and the need to protect them. However, the risks

that Treadwell ran were passed on to him. the account and in October of 2003, almost at the end of one of his trips, he and his

girlfriend Anne Huguenard were killed and devoured by one of the bears that he vowed to protect. The documentary, narrated

by Herzog himself, brings together both Treadwell's films and interviews with friends, family and

detractors, as well as the forensic doctor who studies the remains of Treadwell and his girlfriend; in this sense the

documentary does not seek to glorify the figure of Treadwell as it is clear from his way of thinking that the guynot

wasentirely in his cabales.Quizas the most salvageable of the documentary is that in the end it is possible to understand

what these animals meant for Treadwell and although it is a dramatic and terrible story in its outcome, it

is a testament to dignity since there is something extremely worthy in dying doing what you love. This is a

must-see movie, five stars and is on DVD in zone 1.

" 1

" The sum of CGI effects and the history of? Transformers? It has caused in me the sensation of seeing a

film without a soul. Art has it in the visual, but does not transmit anything authentic in its plot. Everything is typical

and clichés that seek the answer of always of the spectator.

What meaning do you give to the word "entertainment"? Think about it for a moment. If we get a

dictionary from the Royal Academy of the Spanish Language, and look for this term, we will find the following

definition: action and effect of entertaining or entertain ?. We do not get anything out like that, do we? OK, we keepwe

trying. Iflocate the word "entertain", it says the following: "to have fun, to recreate the heart of

someone ?. This is going to be long, so abbreviate; if we are pulling linguistic meanings we willarrive

finallyat the clear concept that entertainment is a feeling of pleasure, produced by ancause

external or internal, perceived through the senses. Come on, that doing it with your boy or with your girl is an

entertainment. In this way we enter a spiral of never ending, because moving that definition to the

world of cinema could be affirmed with It is clear that the same film can clearly produce afeeling

differentof fun in one or another spectator, that is, it may or may not entertain them, depending on theircircumstances

personal, including the age, and their ways of being and thinking. Come on, with this roll that I'm releasing I

want to tell you that my concept of entertainment applied to? Transformers? I went through the followingpaths

sensitive: special effects that cut the breath + history without typical and moderately intelligent. Which

would have made him enter the movie section? Very good? (excellence is not easy to achieve). And

I'm sure many of you will agree with me with this demand, many others will give more importance

to CGI effects than to history, and other more history than fireworks. The

fact is that, in my opinion, this binomial has not been fulfilled. And I start here to dissect the steak. I start with

what everyone calls more attention and what more has been sold to us. I can say with absolute

confidence and conviction that this film is one of the best that has been done to date in CGI effects. The

precision in the details of the Transformers is impressive. I had never seen so much mastery in recreating a

jumble of irons with a flexibility without limits and at the same time 100% authentic. Best of all is the

presentation of the Autobots, a hackneyed hide-and-seek scene in the garden, and an explosion of hallucinate

final battle, which is an org���a visual and sound of mastod���nticas proportions. What I would have liked is to be

able to delight pleasingly with those details, not only during the transformation process but also inrobotic

itsstate ���tico, because the work that the ILM students have stuck on has been milk (18 hours in each

photogram), and deserves a longer pause in contemplation. But I understand that if everything had been slower I

would have slowed down the movie horribly and it would not be a Bay movie. The slow-motion scenes

and the close-ups of the resting Transformers are almost the only thing that lets us see the majesty

of a multimedia work? that borders on excellence. Another but it is Bay's way of making the camera move. In

other films it may give the sensation of greater reality but in this case it loses the focus before so much

confrontation between Autobots and Decepticons, and the clash of its structures. Sometimes it is not known who is the

side of one or the other (except Optimus Prime and Bumbleee whose colors are very characteristic). By the way, according to the

press dossier they gave us , the Transformers fans were consulted on the Internet about their new

production design for this film, and apparently they gave it the go-ahead. . So now they can not

complain if their metamorphosis is not the original, that is, if they are transformed into objects different from what they

originally were. Unless you have consulted 30 fanatical creatures nothing more, which would be almost a crime

after a deception And the last but very important: the ability to surprise to these amazing advances

in terms of CGI is completely lost with both promotional trailer? Ripper?. Because I am clear that this

is the adjective,? ripper ?. The politics? Hype? which is currently followed with the blockbusters has the enormous

inconvenience that destroys and exterminates any hyper-organic sensation that you can feel in front of such a

show. If I did not manage a movie blog, the next thing I would see of these films before its release are

the few trailers that they put on TV a week before appearing on our billboards, Why am I going

? to this preview in terms of images of? Transformers? and I piss off the taste. A pity. And now to thething

tricky, the story. I've asked Michael Bay a lot; Knowing your cinema, you should have thought in

advance that this filmmaker cares about what I am fishing for. Nothing. Only aplot is enough

moderately sustainableto decorate it with clipera images, strenuous at the limit. That style so rampant, but

effective at the box office, has been so far. And surely with? Transformers? you will be ranked as the

master of action-science-fiction. With a godfather like Spielberg I would not be surprised, they are already doing it. The

mistake I made is to believe those opinions that I have read that affirmed with This film

is the best thing that Bay has done in his career. Maybe so, but in his style. I believe 100% that the story

of? Transformers? It could have been much more than that, it could have been mildly intelligent without needing to

be complex. Simplicity is not equivalent to imbecility. In this film it has fallen into the error of being supported

by a script that has been written looking for the appearance of complexity, with the interlocked hand of

plots, but that finally resorts to the easy, without risking: the topicazo of the graciosete kid half graced

with scarce economic resources that does everything possible to take out a few carts to buy a car and so on

to have the possibility of approaching the unattainable chicha unattainable dream, who lovescars

expensiveand the money guys who are handsome but without brain. And that in the end he gets it, afterencounters

forced, with his natural charms (and a little clear action). Or the top of the marines battalion formed

literally by 4 soldiers who look like 300 when they fight, and with an emetic American pride (he missed the detail

of the USA flag). I like Hollywood movies but not the patriotic. Or the topicalcabinet

crisisthat uses superspecialists analysts who leave in slips another brainy nerd and acallus

hackerwith unimaginable programs to decipher They are the only signs that no government specialistDoes

has managed to unveil.the touch of humor that Shia LaBeouf imprints on the film, which is the onlyliberate

one worth anything within the cast that makes up,? Transformers ?. I could see it in VO and I can confirm that this

kid is the perfect successor of friend Harrison Ford in the Jones franchise. Save the film at themoments of the

most criticalstory. Anthony Anderson also leaves his mark. Jon Voight is not credible asMinister

US Defense. Megan Fox and Rachael Taylor are two chocolates that lack liquor. Josh Duhamel seemed

to be on vacation at the Montesito and was dedicated to splitting his face with transforming robots to

relax. And of John Tunturro better I do not say anything, to see if I offend the clowns; One thing is that this film

has a humorous touch and another thing is that there is that chaos with the performance of some. I'm sure that the Spanish

dub will save � of the burning of one of those actors. And after all this you will tell me what did you

expect if it is Bay? Well, what if? Transformers? it had been considered as one of theevents

cinematographicof this year it would be because it is a round movie. And, I'm sorry to say it's not.

The Star Wars? or the saga of Indiana Jones are round movies in terms of entertainment because theycombine

perfectlyspecial effects (of their time) with attractive stories, skillfully developed in spite of their

topics, which they keep you with their eyes open for each and every minute they last. That's what I was

looking for, considering that Spielberg's hand was there. In short, and taking up the binomial of

the speaker at the beginning of the criticism, the sum of CGI effects and The story of? Transformers ?, according to what

I have told you, has caused in me the sensation of seeing a film without a soul. Art has it in the visual,

but does not transmit anything authentic in its plot. Everything is typical and clichés that seek the answer of always of the

spectator. It has not entertained me enough. I'm sorry, I can not say that the movie is good. Or

tell me, when they give you something, do you fix it more on the package or on the gift? What matters in the end is the

gift, the other is only dazzling paper. 90% of the spectators who are in the age range

between 7 to 17 years, and some m��� s talluditos, flipar���n in colors with? Transformers ?. It is an exemplary product of

the current cinema in which we live: business and more business. Make money with popcorn films to continue

making more pomomitera films, and thus continue living in this industry. Hopeful to find something

more in? Transformers? Knowing that there was enough material to give it a distinctive touch, we will stay in

check. We would have loved the fireworks but we will always think that they did not like to

throw them.

" 0

" It has one of the most original and fresh arguments Pixar has had in recent years. How far is

that sosez named Cars!

Pixar has done it again. 'Ratatouille' has one of the most original and fresh argumentshas had

Pixarin recent years (although 'The Incredibles' seems superior to me, at least in terms of Entertainment is

concerned), and that has offered the cinema in a long time. The script is a marvel and the execution of this, perfect.

The character design is the best of Pixar (the parrot with the critic, and the own protagonist rat,

called R���my), and technically is the best movie. Computer animation animation of the story (something that will be

overcome soon, given the pace of the technology). Only a small a pega: the subplot with

the relatives and companions of R���my, which seemed quite tiresome and that took me out of the

rewarding rhythm of the tape until they make an appearance the above. Luckily it is something

fleeting. Of course, how far has that sosez been called 'Cars'!

" 1

" The film is gaining interest as the plot progresses, especially thanks to some ellipses very well

achieved that make it seem that the story is told in real time.

The first man went to see 4 months, 3 weeks, 2 days, of Cristian Mungiu, a tough and intelligent film, which

deals with the issue of clandestine abortion in Romania in the late 1980s It represents the first installment of the

series Tales of the Golden Age, a project of the director, whose aim is to talk about that time without making

direct references to the communism of Nicolae Ceausescu, politician, communist and Romanian dictator who was shot

in December 1989, accused of genocide. A shocking fact is the objective data that inspired the

film: between 1966 and 1989, that is, until the end of the Ceausescu dictatorship, more than half a million women

died in Ruman���aa cause of illegal abortions. The story of this film is centered on twogirls

studentwho share a room in a residence in a city in Romania. One of them is pregnant and

wants to have an abortion. They have everything ready to perform their duties in a hotel room, but things will

not work out as planned. The character of the friend is fundamental because all the strength of the film

falls on her. The director was lucky to meet Anamaria Marinca, whose performance is exceptional.

After doing theater in Romania, the debut of this actress on the screen took place on British television

, with the production "Sex Traffic" ", which gave him a BAFTA award. Back in Romania, he participated

in this film with which he was nominated for the European Film Academy awards. The director, Cristian Mungiu,

who before becoming a filmmaker had been an English teacher, directed in 2002, "" Occidente "", which won thePrize

Internationalof the Directors' Fortnight in Cannes of that same year. But he will be known internationally

for this modest Romanian-Belgian production, which won the Golden Palm of the Cannes Festival last year. And

perhaps more films will come from his country of origin, since for the first time in the 60 years of this festival, a

film Romanian wins the famous award. In 1965, a short film produced there had already won the Palma. And in a country

where only about 15 films are produced per year, it is appreciated thatscale films such

large-as the of Mungiu. At the San Sebastian Film Festival he won the Fipresci Grand Prize. After

the first fifteen minutes of the beginning, maybe a little slow, in which the director does not get to

catch the spectator, the biggest achievement of this film is to get him to leave Taking interest as

the plot progresses, especially thanks to some very well achieved ellipses that make it seem that the story

is told in real time. Filmed like a documentary, without alterations, without music (except in theletters

final credit), with the will to capture a reality as it is, we find scenes that last

around ten minutes in the that there is a fixed plane, in which the work of the actors is the only thing that

counts. And, without a doubt, the best thing is the last twenty minutes, with a forceful plan that leaves a mark

and with a final that invites the viewer to comment on what happened on the celluloid. A greeting!

" 1

" A recent masterpiece that should not be missed under any circumstances and that leaves films and

dummies to movies of -or less- the same theme. Ethics as 'American history X'.

'This is England', the new feature film by British director Shane Meadows, shows us the life of a group

of authentic skinheads, brewers, revelers and lovers of good Jamaican music, welcome a child of

twelve years, without any kind of social relationship, and make him one of them. Everything is twisted whenreturns

Combo, an old friend who, influenced by nationalist and racist ideas, tries to sow hatred and

xenophobia in the group. The tape is shot in an austere way that fits like a glove. It has a

perfect rhythm that does not decay at any time, and the direction of Meadows is exquisite in every way. The

story is a tremendous emotional blow, that overwhelms the coldest of men, and that touches issues as

thorny as nationalism, racism, and the delicate moments that England spent in the during the

eighties, without falling into any kind of partisan discourse. The film shows successful and crude, almost

documentary, the personal consequences of each of the characters before the war in the Falkland Islands, and

(one of) the political movements of extreme tendency that emerged here He then. Interpretatively

speaking is a joy. All of his actors look as if it were the last role of his career. Thus, until the

protagonist who is twelve years old, Shaun (Thomas Turgoose), going through an immensely Stephen Graham

playing the lunatic Combo (character got the most: seems that you are really seeing a skinhead of

"" the chungos "", which dangerously caresses a madness that Graham manages to capture with a resounding success),

to the small group of skinheads protagonists. All are very natural, believable, and never overworked

. A recent masterpiece that should not be missed under any circumstances, and that leaves in

films and dummies films of -more or less- the same theme. Like 'American history X'.

" 1

" Unfortunately, Obras en Casa does not offer any special incentive to justify its viewing. In the comedy there are some very recurrent themes, exploitednauseam by the different

adcinematographies, but that for some An odd whim of fate almost always achieves its goal: to triumph at the

box office. There is no doubt that one of them is the domsticas reforms, which in real life can be the worst

dramas, but on the big screen always acquires comedia.Da tone chance that atend of

a Another French comedy that dealt with the same subject, The House of Your Dreams, was released last. Both were

taquillazos in the Gallic country, but in ours the first one passed without pain or glory. Now it's the

turn of Works at Home, although the mill's question is to "bring" something new or is it more of the same?

Unfortunately, Brigitte Ro���an's film does not offer any special incentive to justify its viewing.

On the contrary, the screen parades an endless number of supposedly physical situations that will blush withfrom

embarrassmentthe most painted spectator. The scenes follow each other hastily, as if the argument

was just the pretext that serves to fill in between gag and gag. The gui���n is not more than a mere excuse for the

appearance of a Carole Bouquet in the middle of hysterical attack, which should cause loud laughter among

the French public. At this point, and given the kind of comedy that comes from France, the mostconclusion

obviousis that one of the things we do not share is the same sense of humor. However, the film

has a positive point, and not everything could be horrible. Obras en Casa also addresses the issue of

illegal immigration, and aims to convey a message of tolerance and coexistence in harmony. The keyword is

intended, since Brigitte Ro���n uses the alleged social complaint to turn illegal immigrants

into victims of their bad jokes. Works at Home is a comedy that exploits a worn format, and he does it without

offering anything new. What is more incredible of all, is that after seeing tapes like this, one ends up

remembering with love and affection that prank of This House is a Ruin, and miss the Tom Hanks

clumsy and clown.

" 0

" A compendium of topicazos in bulk that does not correspond to the quality of the comics, nor is it a deserved

tribute to the author of these characters that have marked many childhoods, such as mine.

There are things in the cinema impossible to adapt or that the result is not the most satisfactory. With the

first installment of Mortadelo and Filem���n, Javier Fesser managed to surprise me, translating that magical universe of

incomable c���mic, which got me hypnotized in childhood , thanks to a good story well told and that I

managed to see those hits of c���mic, those characters that made me laugh so much. In short, I managed to see

the camera through the screen. In this case, there is a failure of principle, in the script, the story does not get hooked

from the beginning andtop, so preparest with topicazos as fciles jokes, made phrases scoring andalucismo

pure and hard because if exaggerated and besides, and a question from when Ofelia was originally Galician? .The

case is that during most of the footage, one is bored of not seeing anything interesting that surprises him, as he

always did Ib���ez's comics, and some stitches are saved that A slight smile awakens you so that you

do not fall asleep in the armchair. And I prefer not to mention the new Mortadelo, because he practically does not have any

role and the one who has, is not worthwhile either. Pepe Viyuela, in his line, only lacked that

gag of the ladder I remember as a girl in which he put his head on the stairs and the whole sketch tried to

get it out, without success. And for me, only Janfri Topera, who plays Bacterio, Mauricio Venacio, the Super, and

Emilio Gavira of Rompetechos, because they are the only ones that maintain the essence of the first film and that do not

go into exaggerations with their characters. In short, seeing the result of this second part, I hope not

they go through the head, a third, because already, really, end with the Earth.

" 0

" A tribute ���o���o, but sympathetic, to the "" nottinghills "" and "" bridgetjones "" and "" loveactuallys "" and "" cuatrobodas ""

that flooded the screens during the 90s.

Another decade that we are hurrying, and the writers filigree to recycle everything recyclable. After

exhausting the "standard" film of English romantic comedy (a whole sub-subgenre), the voraciousrewriters

Hollywoodbegan to spin the concept, and have taken the last drop to squeeze: 'Love and other

disasters' (miraculously, the translation of English is accurate: Vacations of the Titulator?) The Synopsis does not is going

to blind with its brilliance, precisely: Emily "" Jacks "" Jackson, a young employee of Vogue in London is

so determined to fix the love life of his friends that he never has time to take care of his, quite in

ruins, by the way. The appearance on stage of an attractive assistant photographer from Argentina will be the opportunity

that his friends were looking for to return the favors to Jacks. But in this XXI century we live, young, handsome and

single usually equals gay. Or not? Or is it? The missing person in combat Alex Keshishian (whom they

left alone in front of 'In bed with Madonna'), which Simon Phoenix, has been thawed and put back into

circulation for write and direct this curious attempt of metacine, romantic��� and cloying, but modernillo

after all. The first thing Keshishian does is to place us in the same starting point of the typicalcomedy

British sentimental, but with a monster and correct Brittany Murphy instead of Hugh Grant. The character of the

Murphy is a copy of Audrey Hepburn with clothes (or without it) current, but do not worry, because it is a

metacine.La simple plot progresses, with a gallery of characters that we all know from 'AnApril

enchanted' or 'Four Weddings and a funeral': rich and foolish friend, sick and sensitive gay friend, perfect stranger.

Everything is traced, but, ah, metacomedia !, in the world today almost all Jacks friends are gay

perfectly integrated into their community. What a change of scenery, huh? And perhaps the most important element of what

Keshishian proposes is Jacks' floor mate, Peter (also correct Matthew Rhys ) is. screenwriter

. And he talks with Jacks continually about romantic comedies, repeating themselves the sobado schemes.

This allows Mr. Keshishian to spin the gags for which it is worthwhile to see 'Love and other disasters', which

ends up being a tribute ���o���o, but sympathetic, to the "" nottinghills "" and "" bridgetjones "" and "" loveactuallys "" and

"" cuatrobodas "" that flooded the screens during the 90s. Apart from this detail, that's it, nothing to highlight:

address Routine, routine photo, routine music. so only a little art direction takes off, that

puts us in the impossible world of the simple employees of Vogue who live in simple and basic lofts and

have simple multimillionaire friends. But as Galileo said: "" And yet, it moves! "" Not much, but it

moves. a 5 pelao.

" 0

" Many lumpy jokes, and hundreds of naked women, who find Pajares and Esteso attractive,

so they still look like science fiction movies.

Sunday in the middle of the day, I dig in the caspoteca and I take a classics out of the uncovering. "Are you going to put that shit on me?"

Says my half kiwi cheerfully. "" Just a little, to see what I see "" I answer in my role as a man,

bending my ears. The film begins, after three minutes I'll take it off and she says let's leave it for a

while, out of curiosity. At two and a half hours we woke up the three, that good siesta protected by theage

goldenof Spanish cinema. The film is about a hospital that is almost bankrupt because of bad fame. In these

appears a new doctor (Pajares) who is actually a scammer who fears the blood. The providence

drops the minister of "" incompatibilities "" with a u���ero, which is used by the chief surgeon (Ozores) to

enter and give prestige to the hospital. And the thing is getting tangled up, appearing there Esteso, Ar���valo,

Juanito Navarro and many women in balls. A classic. We're supposed to have seen a critical critique ofsecurity

socialat the time, but the reality was more like a comic by Mortadelo and Filem� .N Absurd situations

resolved even more absurdly, based on a gui���n without feet or head. Many lumpy jokes, and hundreds of

naked women, who find Pajares and Esteso attractive, so they still look like movies of

science fiction. Resumiendo, bad movie of the uncover, whose main virtues are the joy in

nudes and the nice criticism that is made of Social Security. Nose sticky as pathetic as alwaysscene

. Randomto get an idea: Of the first, a girl that her boyfriend has cracked a

tit. Esteso says that you have to inflate, Pajares that make a mouth-teta and Ozores that you have to blow by covering the

slit so that the air does not get out. A nurse comes in and says Ozores "" Do you want something to touch your

nose? "" Hahahahaha, I mean I fuck with these people.

" 0

" McClane wanders through a dark and apocalyptic universe in which the loss of values ​​anddisorientation

collectivemotivate his participation in this new adventure. As a film of action, quite modest, at

times outstanding, although in others it lacks plausibility.

Computer science as a weapon of attack and manipulation in the post-11-S world, a state of civilization whose

features derive from very diverse social expressions, attitudes, jargon, beliefs and ways to operate from the

legitimate power or from the underground of society and the same industry on which theis sustained

system. The anarchy, in the last instance, is the common factor, the West carries a complex of guilt thatus

leadsto propose methods of self-destruction, take advantage of the global network to destabilize what that same network

aims to stabilize and unify. The unconscious and scary "" geek "" played by Justin Long was dreaming of

ruining the entire system by just pressing a button. In fact, the idea seems as sinister as

attractive, and this character largely reflects a latent delirium in our social gear, although never

clearly stated: destroy the system because of that idea of ​​guilt. John McClane, living myth of the

cinema of the eighties, appears in this context as an element of sanity and social sensitivity and replies that it is not

about the system, but about the people who suffer. McClane is like a hero who travels from his past of

deeds, in which he saved the lives of many people, and for which he never had the deserved recognition, until

our present ruled by corruption. And a nebulous sense of the social, effective counterpoint to the chaos and

inconsistency of Matt Farrell. In this way, the story establishes a significant chemistry between two

characters that support the weight of a very simple discourse, but effectively synthesizes theelements

secondarythat allude to different nuances of the global delirium in which we live. Therefore, The Jungle 4.0not

isso much a film about John McClane in his twilight as about the current state of society, from a

prism of delirium, sponsored by misinformation and incompetence of state authorities. The

question lies in elucidating whether the role played by a character like McClane fits into the different

strata of the film: on the one hand, the preponderance of computer science, computers as "leit" -motiv "" visual.

On the other, the representation of global chaos. McClane, from Crystal Jungle (a film we will talk about in

the next days), through the sequels that followed, was an involuntary hero and an�� �nimo that ""always

wasin the place and time less opportune "". That, together with his way of expressing himself (both at the same time as

direct and without taboos, with use and abuse of tacos) constitutes the essence of the character, a profile thought to

develop in small places where events of maximum tension. Introducing McClane in

the current context to be the hero who will save the system (the SYSTEM, not a specific group of people in

a particular space) involves creating a bias with respect to the character and the texture. That is to say, the

capricious way of recovering the character to use it as a propagandistic element and af���n to the "syndrome" is noted

post-11-S, to the detriment of a greater consistency and thematic and narrative coherence. First of all, it is still

a very worthy film, despite the bias we have referred to, that portrait of a John McClane aged,

embittered in a life in which he did not get rewards for his heroics and a family Unstructured,

distrust of her daughter's suitors, impudent grute father, agrees,

broadly speaking, with the outbreak of total chaos, which implies desestructuraci���ny and distrust with the pr� ��jimo.The

chaos, emphasized in the visual through the dark and ocher tones that predominate in the photo, is not limited to

spectacular artifacts and the vision of the mad masses, but emphasizes ��� in the atomization

of society, in particular, aspects such as excessive specialization in the different areas of our -supuesta-

"" society of knowledge "": v��� As a computer expert does not even know what is

morphine. Or the character known as "" El brujo "", who is confined in his computer "" throne "" and enjoys the exclusive

control of the electric network, an example of a social unconsciousness not devoid of cynicism . In short

, McClane wanders through a dark and apocalyptic universe in which the loss of values ​​and

collective disorientation motivate his participation in this new adventure. As a film of action, quite

modest, at times outstanding, although in others it lacks plausibility (see the "" duel "" between McClane and

all a sophisticated avi� In combat, McClane is an anonymous hero and a human being, not a superhero. But

the transcendent aspect of the discourse, which alludes to a global tragedy that implies institutional anddegeneration

spiritual, exceeds and exceeds the role of the character. In the last scenes, before dying, Thomas Gabriel (

lun� ��tico that represents the destruction of the system sponsored by a creator of the same system), speaks to

McClane and mentions the "wrong place and the wrong moment", a forced attempt to return

the character to its original scope. The phrase does not fit with the story or the situation of the moment. Then it is

when the bias is most noticeable and when we discover that this film, with or without McClane, would be another product

, among the many that They are coming, about the current state of affairs.

" 0

" Splendid exercise in visual juggling, surrealism in spurts, cinema made for the delight of those who are already

tired of seeing films made to be understood, rationalized, compartmentalized, hierarchized, stabled ...

The rough argumentative that Hollywood cinema is born of a necessarily commercial model and dependent on

proven formulas of success and popular support, stumbles on proposals such as this one. The science of dreams is

the mental turbulence of Michael Gondry, his overwhelming relevance as a modern surrealist author. It can not be

understood in any other way and it is completely uninteresting to use the traditional narrative machinery when what

is intended (and in my view is achieved) is to explain the mechanisms of dreams, the capacity of the

fantasy to drive the destinies of the world. Therefore Gondry does not need a stable guide, ascript

fictionalized. It is enough for a team to be in tune with its hallucination and a group of actors who, without overacting,

resize the usual registers to deliver a sober dramaturgy, in their schizophrenia, clean, in their

displeasure. In this sense, Gael Garc���a Bernal creates a distinct, cre���ble (and already difficult) character, located in

the vertigo of this society entrenched in a continuous sensation of shock, of imbalance, ofhostility

unforeseen. Stephane does not discern the real of the fabled: the one is assembled in the other without visible fracture.

His creative wealth is the overwhelming iconography of the film: released Gondry from the weight Kauffman (How to be John

Malkovich, Forget me, of which he was a contumaz scriptwriter), is allowed to invoice a disconcerting,

unique film, frayed by sections, always convincing in the sense that it meets the expectations that it

contracted. One has the impression (I had it for most of the footage) that the cinema is

definitely this: a consensual imposture, a letting itself be contaminated, a continuous weakening of the

resistances that we forge so that the fantasy (the illusion, the dream) does not shake the solid

architecture of the real world, the only one that we objectively possess. The science of dreams contains beautiful

images, impossible inventory of objects that populate the imagination. Fen feverish of a subject whose dispensary of

pleasures is provisioned of an infinite and disturbed world of lies. It is the lie, its preeminence in a

tautologically evil universe, the one that raises the film, the one that structures and destructs aguide

capricious(if there is one), convoluted and brilliant, a lasting work of a director who has annose

exclusivefor the politically not already incorrect, but monstrous. When one leaves the cinema and sees the cars or

shop windows full of real and tangible, useful, valid garments, It is strange thatdo not come out through their eyelets

ants with helmetsor that the computer screen on our detour desk does not decompose intobeams

elementaryof light containing winged horses and cello paper arrows. Azuln blue. A breeding ground ideal for

Freud fans, the film is obsessed (jubilantly) in not providing valid handholds to separate the

precarious reality (the office, the boredom, the routine) and the colorful vi���eta of the dreams, thecomponenterico componentendure���

fundamental onon which this jewel of the creativity that willis built, I do not put in doubt, until

becoming a small one. ��o classic. What cloaks and hugs, is accepted: it is inevitable. The protean argumentnot

canbe sustained without there being decays, gaps, parentheses in the interest. Our own capacity for

attention wavers when it is overexposed to such a striking and forcefulportentous visual gags,

gesture ofof everyday objects converted into visual poems, into metaphors of the psyche of a hallucinated person. added or a

recommendation: you have to look for the original version and flee like the plague of any bent edition, for more

than our benders are, said be forced, always professional and convincing. The protagonist

speaks French, English and uses Spanish, his mother tongue (he is Mexican) to verbalize his dreams. No one

expects a waste of humor: this is not what pretend the French Gondry. The science of dreams is areflection

very adult, in a lyrical, sometimes childish tone, about human communication. Just the opposite of

forgetting me, his previous film (in English Eternal sunshine of the spotless mind) where what was spurred reflectionnot

wasthe imagination (the dream, more properly) but the memory, its catharsis, its revered honor as the

primary resource to sustain the balance of our reason.you, kind reader, your horse of

Havecardboard , his time machine, his reality show inserted in a vein. All that: amplified, made the most important

exercise of deliberate creation. Never before, never before in a long time, a film has given me so much

joy. Or, to put it another way, it has been a long time since a cultural experience (let's say a book, a disc, a

film) did not leave me so transposed, so inclined to happiness and, at the same time, so sheltered in the sadness

that the argument delivers, sibylline, soft, slowly: it is very difficult to talk about feelings, that

our bodies communicate very well in the sensual, in the bed, in the physical, but that every day, athuge steps

terrifyingly, we are hiding in individuality, distrusting the other, opening gaps

then complicated to close to separate our own from the alien, the lived from the fantasized, the accessible from the

metaphorized .Stephane Obrero, the sad composer of calendars, is the perfect image of alienation. The

scarcity of circumstance surrounding the character is not gratuitous: they have in their dreams their

fiercest defense. Go to the movies, have fun in the armchair, even if they go out (like me) drunk with absurdity. I

wonder (it is a question that I leave open) what this man will do, so promising, so great in his, with

a conventional argument, with a wearable history, with a thread that can not be understood, without jumps in time, without, without

coconut comedurascarton horses.

" 1

" It does not have the magic of The Lovers of the Polar Circle. I am left with some beautiful images, as always in

Medem, with Said, the Man, and with the man / woman relationship that this film poses: Man = War; Woman = Life;

Man = Violator; Woman = Whore

Or what is the same, Medem vs Guer���n. I recently saw "" Ca���tica Ana "" and "" In the city of Sylvia "" and I

love being able to talk about them. I will give you my impression. Those who know me know that I am a big fan of Medem, so

the expectation that I had to see his last film was huge, as was my disappointment. "" Ca���tica Ana "" has

little things Medem but does not have the magic of "" The Lovers of the Polar Circle "" in any frame. The overreacting actress,

is an ordinary girl who says she is beginning to study interpretation, and she has a long way to

go, to start: she must learn. The story has nice things, I will not deny it, but it talks about something, which does

not reach me at all. A girl who after hypnosis comes to contact with their previous lives, allwomen

youngwith great histories and tragic deaths. The reincarnation would be a long topic of discussion but in

principle, I do not know if for the education of my biologist mother or for my philosophy studies. I do not believe in it. I

'm left with some beautiful images, as always in Medem. I stay with Said, the Man. I am left with the

man / woman relationship that this film poses: Man = War; Woman = Life; Man = Violator; Woman = Whore

" 0

" An unnecessary, ostentatious film that remains in a ridiculous attempt to continue with the fame and

prestige that the trilogy of the rings gave it.

Some remakes sound very bad nothing more to mention, others arouse interest depending on who makes it

and others are annoyed to call them remake and not "" tribute. "" In the case of King Kong It was very difficult to overcome the

original, but the fame that preceded Peter Jackson and his love for the film could suspect a twist

made with love and great respect. But I know I know the three hours and something of the film happens to sound

interesting to cause serious suspicions and even a certain fear. What can Jackson have added in the version

of a movie that lasts about half? Well, the "" filling "" is not worth much. One of the most important aspects

of the film is the historical recreation, very well done and supported by a direction. Outstanding art

; the animation of the Kong is very accomplished and very humanized (rightly some illuminated support

certain proposals: P), the actors who are moderately decent? but undoubtedly the best of the film is

Naomi Watts, Naomi Watts and Naomi Watts. Now I tell the cons: the duration, Jackson's tiresome pomposity

reflected in innumerable and repetitive impossible shots (and many of they are airs),action sequences

surprisingly boring and typicalwith digital effects that at times are disastrous and

shameful. And I do not list all the inexplicably stupid details like nudging dinosaurs, that

the girl does not get sick with so much bobbing in Kong's hand, etc? Yes, it has great moments between the eighth

wonder of the world and Watts that are really suggestive, but do not compensate for an unnecessary,

ostentatious film and that remains in a ridiculous attempt to continue with fame and the prestige that the trilogygave him

of the rings.

" 0

" Ca���tica Ana is a film that honors its title, a chaotic and frenetic journey that confuses the

viewer, and in which Julio Medem is recognized by nowhere.

The day in which the preparations for the filming of Ca���tica Ana were confirmed was a great day for Spanish cinema.

We recovered one of our greatest creators, Julio Medem, plunged into deep depression, among

other reasons, by the savage persecution of which he was subjected by certain sectors of political andlife

publicfor his documentary La Pelota Vasca: La Piel Contra la Piedra. Julio Medem's film is difficult to

describe, since the symbolic elements , politicians and even magicians, have always been very present in their

films. But Ca���tica Ana is one step further. The story tells the life of Ana (Manuela Vell���s), a

young artist who arrives in Madrid to make her dreams come true. However, Ana keeps a power, a

hidden danger in her subconscious that in her peaceful life in Ibiza she was able to repress, but now it is coming

to the surface. Julio Medem is one of the most personal authors of Spanish cinema, and to understand their works and

appreciate them, you have to let yourself be carried away by their history and their characters. With Ca���tica Ana the same thing does not happen, for more

that the spectator puts of its part, it is impossible to get to connect with the characters, much less with the

journey of the protagonist, Ana and her chaos. As the film progresses, the journey becomes a frenetic

free fall that drags the public to unsuspected places, where nothing makes sense. The entire ribbon

is full of symbols and metaphors, but this time they curl the curl in such a way that no one is able to

accept them, let alone understand them. The entire film is narrated through a countdown, which makes

the audience feel as if it were the protagonist of a bad dream of the who wants to wake up as soon as possible. At

no time is the style of Julio Medem recognized, with a dark and suffocating atmosphere, with somesequences

really unpleasant and improperof the San Sebastian filmmaker. What they are abundant are the gui���os toworks

previous, like Luc���ay and the Sex, or to directors like John Ford. For her part, Manuela Vell���s does ajob

very natural, although she can not hide her clear lack of interpretative skills. Ana is a film

that lives up to her work. Title, a chaotic and frenetic trip that confuses the spectator, and in whichis not recognized

Julio Medemby any side. It is a very intimate and personal journey for the Basque director, surely

very necessary, and from which we hope he will leave strengthened in order to face his upcoming projects.

" 0

" A missed opportunity to revitalize a moribund gender; inexplicably, but moribund. The abandonment to which the black cinema has been subjected for decades by the industry, is something that

I have never been able to understand. The films of this genre, when done well, dazzle the public, and

become reference films and cult for many. Solitary Hearts tells the story of two assassins

who acted mid-century and they were dedicated to seduce wealthy and lonely ladies and then

kill them and rob them. But what could be a good story has remained in little more than nothing due to the

lack of expertise of its director Todd Robinson, who has not even managed to create the necessary atmosphere to catch to the

spectator, nor has it succeeded in making the performers that make up the cast play credible roles or

convey the least sensation to a spectator who little m��� s that endure the time can do. The fact that

nothing else to start appears the telephonic title of "" based on real events "" already portends the worst, because it

seldom deserves what is coming after him; and, of course, this is not the exception that confirms the

rule. A dislocated John Travolta, shielded by an unused Gandolfini and a misplaced Salma Hayek,

does not contribute to improving the final product, which seems vacuous and lacking the necessary drive to

revitalize a once-acclaimed genre. The fact that the distributor itself has postponed its release on several

occasions is a clear sign of the lack of interest in promoting a genre that has been phagocitated and marginalized by

an industry focused on exploiting the only aspect commercial of the cinema, without taking into account, and without

remembering, that normally all the successes are preceded by a good work.

" 0

" Great Woody Allen It is known that he portrays the bourgeoisie as very few and that his regularity, associated with his prolific career as a

filmmaker, already elevates him to the top. I have a weakness for Allen, I'm not going to hide it. He is a storyteller

who magnifies himself in his trade and in his visual style with each one of his films. On this occasion it is

the turn to portray the English bourgeoisie with a fairly conventional love story that

also develops rather slowly. The director changes the Jazz for the Opera and rolls for the first time in

England He portrays it only as he knows how to do it, showing typical, charismatic places, but always without

abusing and concentrating on supporting with the locations that atmosphere of the upper class. Johnatan Rhys Meyers

plays the young protagonist and does a good job, although sometimes he gets to notice a little limited with

those little eyes all the time of falling asleep. Emily Mortimer, beautiful and successful in her role as thewife

protagonist's. Scarlett Johansson comes out, as on the other hand she was also expected, ravishingly sexy in her

role as a fatal woman, mysterious and vulnerable in equal parts, closing this triangle of passions, deceptions and

sex. On the other hand, the rest of the actors are equally formidable, like Matthew Goode, in his sauce as a little

daddy. After watching the film, it may not turn out to be very original to point out that this tape is,

evidently and to a large extent, indebted to the previous one "" Crimes and faults "", but maybe if it is to compare it with

"" The sixth sense "". "" Match Point "" is narrated with a pulse but with great parsimony. A rhythm that makes us

want events to happen once and for all. In the end, as in the film by M.Night

Shyamalan, it will be an abrupt twist of the plot in charge of retaking the tempo and making us vibrate. In "" Match Point ""

also closes the story with the sporting metaphor with which it begins and one falls exhausted before the wisdom,

control and the hand of Allen, a smart scriptwriter, a director he is a restless orchestra, tremendously

intuitive and truly a lover of his craft and of each of his own workshide his

. Nor does heinfluences, nor does he need to: Dovstoievski, Bergman, Hitchcock and much of Woody Allen himself for a very successful

reflection. Sobren about luck, destiny, the meaning of life, justice, morality,

guilt, selfishness, love, sex and the nature of social and professional advancement. You do not need to

demonstrate nothing to anyone after his almost three dozen films, but he appreciates and feels with each viewing,

his willingness to remain genuine and faithful and not wanting or letting disappoint all his followers

while maintaining a remarkable quality in each One of your appointments. Each Oto uno a gift always very special. Thanks,

Woody.

" 1

" It has remained for history as one of the most radical experiments of its director and has not lost an

iota of its audacity with the passage of time

Hitchcock apost��� strong in which it was his first filming in color and the first of his company Trasatlantic

Pictures, founded with the British film mogul Sidney Bersntein. I decided to adapt "" Rope "", a play by

Patrick Hamilton whose action happens entirely in a real-time Manhattan optician. The story is

modestly based on the actual murder committed by two students at the University of Chicago, Nathan Leopold

and Richard Loeb, also inspired by the Richard Fleischer film Criminal Impulse ( Compulsion, 1959). In

what, without doubt, constituted a great risk to decide the story in long shots (plane-sequence) of about

eight minutes each. When passing a character in front of the camera the back of the character would serve to

darken the image and make the junction there. The duration of the shots is due to the fact that eight minutes is the time that

a roll of film loaded in the camera lasted at that time. In spite of it (and to which many fans and

critics mention) there are some nthis undisclosed cuts. For example after the initial credits there is a

cut and the plane gives a 180 degree turn. There are some more cuts of that type during the movie. As an anecdote,

although the film lasts 80 minutes and is supposed to take place in real time, the action actually It

covers about 100 minutes. This was achieved by accelerating the action: the dinner lasts only 20 minutes, the sun gets

too fast, etc. The September 2002 issue of Scientific American contains a complete analysis of

this technique (and the effect on viewers who really feel as if they are watching a film

of 100 minutes). It is easy to imagine the tremendous difficulty that the shooting had. The furniture and the walls were

completely mobile so that the camera could be moved freely by the decoration and, due to the duration of

the shots, the floor was full of marks where the actors must pass by or thedeposited.

furniture beThrough the window of the living room you can see the line of buildings in New York. To simulate it, awas built

huge cyclorama(three times the size of the ���tico) that reproduces almost 70 kilometers of the city's panorama.

This cyclorama was illuminated with 6000 incandescent bulbs and 200 neon tubes. The lights of the windows are

turned on and off to simulate the normal life of a city (lighting and color are really

important in the film, see about the final scene where the lighting It accentuates the tension of the

moment). Fiberglass clouds were built that moved as the filming progressed and the tonality

of the sky changed as the night approached. In short, a complicated filming. To what has already been said is added another added

difficulty. Hitchcock was a director of montage, who considered that the fragmentation of shots in a

film served to enhance the story (in the popular imagination the scene of the shower is well engraved of

Psychosis as a perfect example). So he had before him a huge challenge against himself: adapt his style to the

shooting in a single plane. And it is certainly curious to observe how he does it. There are moments in which a movement

from one character to another does the same function as a plane-contraplane, a panoramic serves as an

insert (so typical of you) or relates a look with the object of said gaze without the need to cut the

plane. It is certainly a fun and interesting exercise for an amateur to see the film paying attentionHitchcock

to those and other details.always mentioned that suspense consists in making the viewer know

more than the protagonist . For example, let him know that there is a bomb under the protagonist's desk and that he will suffer

as he does not leave the room. Well, here, Master Hitchcock takes his definition of suspense

to the extreme by making a whole corpse in the room during the whole movie without being

protagonists know and without us knowing how they will find out the truth. It is that tension that makes

the action advance and is increasing little by little from the first moment of the movie. �cula. Every detail is designed

to maintain the attention of the spectator. As a small example I will say that the character of James Stewart takes 20

minutes to appear for the first time but when he does they have spoken so many times of ���ly and have drawn his

character with such clarity and interest. We're eager to meet you. His entry into the scene is really

impressive. In the credit titles of the end of the film, the characters appear referenced

according to their relationship with the murdered boy. (David). The only person who is not mentioned is the character

of James Stewart. The film was censored in numerous cities in the USA due to the implicit homosexuality

of Farley Granger's characters and John Dall (unfortunately not much has been improved since then).

The film has remained for history as one of the most radical experiments of its director and has not

lost an iota of its audacity with the passage of time. The problem comes precisely from its main

virtue: the filming in a contiguous flat-sequence encorseta a little the staging. Despite this it is

an excellent film that will keep the viewer nailed in the seat from the beginning until its resolution.

" 1

" A good film, which keeps you connected to it from beginning to end, with great actors and a great

handling of the camera by the director, has surprised me in that aspect. And that's it, something else would only make

you gut the movie.

Vlex returns to the Church, one of our best directors, to give a class and not mathematics, if not

how to make good movies and, above all, what comes out of the balls. I have read a lot about not being his

style, or that he has lost his stamp, it seems as if a director had the obligation to follow exclusively in

a single style and thus fall into the routine . But ���lex is sufficiently clever to offer us in

each of his films a different point of view, in which he sometimes succeeds, and sometimes not. A great

success, to begin with, is to include two of the greats such as John Hurt and Elijah Wood. And another great success, without a

doubt, is to include two other big ones, Leonor's breasts, in case we forgot that we are in front of a Spanish

movie. I will talk about the story a little bit in the end I just screw up and tell you something thatnot

should. Martin (Elijah Wood), an American student, arrives at Oxford with the intention that Arthur Seldom

(John Hurt), a famous professor of logic, will direct his doctoral thesis. The two will be involved in a series of

crimes that they will have to solve through logic, philosophy and the mathematics themselves. a

good film of intrigue, with small ups and downs, but that keeps the viewer hooked from beginning to

end. And it is not for less, because the beginning is worthy of praise, and it is where you can see the mastery of the

Church with the camera with an incredible sequence shot. that reveals the first crime. After this, it is true

that there is a lot of dialogue and can be quite burdensome, although the protagonists do well in their

roles. It's really like watching an episode of House, you do not know what the hell they are saying when they try to know

what illness the patient has, but they keep you hooked. But in case the viewer falls asleep, ���lex ,

once again, it has been ready and it has been said: there seems to be a lot of dialogue around here. I put boobs in here, and a

butt in there and that's it. And the one in charge of giving us such images is none other than Leonor Watling. He had not

seen Elijah Wood's eyes so open since he had the ring in his possession. Regarding the role of Leonor

(Lorna), there is little to mention apart from the scenes mentioned. Not because I do it badly, quite the opposite, but because it

hardly appears throughout the film, except in those blessed scenes. I can not forget the soundtrack by

Roque Ba���os, which is exceptional, with all the words . An authentic luxury. In short, summarizing, for those who do

not want to read all the rollaco that I loose: A good movie, that keeps you connected to it from beginning to

end, with great actors and a great handling of the c��� Mara on the part of the director, has surprised me in that aspect.

And that's it, commenting on something else would only make you gut the movie. The last thing I'm going to say is that

as soon as I finished the film I got a crazy desire to eat spaghetti.

" 1

" The final result is overwhelming: a lot of action, a lot of emotion, a meticulous music, the best Batman

possible, the best suit and an excellent gui���n.

Christhoper Nolan's Batman leaves the previous versions as mere sketches, or only weak

approaches to the essence of the murderous man and his onionic world. It's not that both of Tim Burton's Now

badly - I close with vitality the real Batman moving away from the television clown -, but his praised darkness and

vision are overcome by this new version (and Surely) aa���os light of the last fags that

Schumacher achieved with the character, considered -together with Superman and Mickey Mouse- as the bestcreations

fictionalin history.No one has to be fan of the c omic or the character to enjoy this

entertaining movie. Nolan (capable of imaginative Memento and bureaucratic White Nights), demonstrates

versatility, good handling of action and editing and a correct vision both in the visual and in the gui Enn

together with David Goyer (lover of comics as demonstrated with interventions in the scripts of the

three Blades (directing the last), The Crow, Nick Fury and the impending Flash and Ghost Rider), that make

possible a first hour without the encapotado, without that merme with this the interest or the final result. The

introduction is fragile and explanatory, and sets the basis for a more mature Batman in its conception. This was influenced

by Frank Miller's eighties comics (mainly by "" Batman: A���o uno "), author who established a

harder and more raw image of the hero, besides It has to do with the result of the excellent

choice -and the performance- of the gal���s Christian Bale, a little-known theater actor despite his extensive career,

which becomes the point of reference here. The former child protagonist of The Empire of the Sun,

where he also loses his parents in his childhood (and more from the failed The reign of fire, Shaft and Psyche ���pata

americano), puts the body and face to become -without discussion- in the definitive Batman by presence

and act. Only the first hour acted more and better, than all the other Batman together. Gotham is dark and

nocturnal, but also diurnal and stolid, all without clashing. The gallery of secondary actors of renown

(Neeson, Freeman, Caine, Oldman, Hauer) intimidate for their interpretative quality, managing not to be just a fill of

a super production of this type. Couples performances, confirming the Irish Cillian Murphy (leading actor

of Extermination), here in the role of the villain called The Scarecrow. Both the origin and the

various accessories - car, batcave, gadgets and the famous and vilified costume - are based on a

credible and well-grounded base. Difficult to find loose spots, perhaps an excessive - but spectacular -

car chase on roofs. More can not be asked to a Hollywood adaptation of this type. The

final result is overwhelming: a lot of action, a lot of emotion, a careful music, the best Batman possible, the

best suit, an excellent script. Oh, what do you want! let the Joker come too!

" 1

" Some gui���os make it very fun, skimming the parody for performances with touches Tarantinezcos.

Precisely the actors-all good-make the incredibility of the script look believable. The trite twists of the

plot and the stereotyped characters lower the score somewhat.

Extra���ay and enjoyable movie. From the very beginning titles, where in a futuristic scene in which

two cybernetic scorpions are dueling, the analogy of what is going to happen is shown with the two

main characters: Michael (Kurt Russell) and Murphy (Kevin Costner). In comedy tone introduces the

other two important characters, Cybil (Courtney Cox) and his son, then turning to the action with arobbery

spectacularto a casino in Las Vegas (machine guns full fire against Fire). Continued as a road

movie - with a duel to the best western style and everything! - to culminate with a thrilling police scene of suspense.

Varied. Despite the varied mix of styles and genres, the film becomes interesting for not having

pretensions of any kind and for a furious rhythm and montage, without falling for it in the v���rtigo video clip

although the debutante Lichtensein, is justly recognized by them. Some gui���os make it very fun,

skimming the parody for performances with touches Tarantinezcos. Precisely the actors-all good-make

the incredibility of the script look believable. The trite twists of the plot and the stereotyped characters lower

the score somewhat. Casino robbery, five ex-convicts and their different problems, intrigues, betrayals,

persecutions and deaths in bulk. All the actors said in good shape, Cox (Ace Ventura,

Friends) standing out for an unexpected ease and well-known beauty. Let's agree that Kevin Costner dressed in glitter and

wig and Elvis style jopo, is not very common, both for his seriousness and for putting himself in the shoes of a repeatable and

accomplished villain. You can not miss the clip that accompanies the final credits with Russell playingin lip-syncing

Elvis Presley- with all the cast making morisqueta and dancing - in a clear self-parody of his old

performance in the telefilm "" Elvis "" (1979) of John Carpenter.

" 1

" And now the obligatory question arrives: ���and if someone tells me that he has not read the book and does not want to

do it ?, because in that case the film will love you, because as the base of the script is good, for those who

do not know everything that is missing, you will like it.

And, as it could not be otherwise, here I come talking about this map. You will remember that I spoke at the

time of this book (and, if not, look in I Geek April 2006) and put it through the roof: in fact the book

was quite good (there is nothing like Lord of the Rings, but books like that there is only one). Maybe that's why

the film seemed so mediocre. We return again to an important issue: Who would think of summarizing

such a book in one hour and forty minutes? The story in the armchair loses a lot of solidity: they stop

explaining a lot of things. Unrepresented characters appear ("In which village of Alaga���sia did the

horns lose the ?rgalos?" Since the elf seems half in love with Eragon) and adds and continues), not to mention the

"" peazo "" throne that Galbatorix has. Nor does it explain where Durza comes from, the name of the dragon is put by

Eragon, she does not invent it (in fact, in the book the name is given a certain importance, since it was the name

of a very famous dragon in the history of Alaga���sia), not to mention that Saphira is constantly

opposed to Eragon (and, of course, it is not " "what the blonde says", as they say in the film). Let's talk about something

else: that nobody who has not read the book knows where the power of magic comes from? I'm not going to say it

here in case someone He does not intend to read the book, since it is one of the things that makes the book

consistent and, in fact, will be important in the second part: anyway, if someone has curiosity,

that you ask me in the section "" comments "" and I will answer you "). In short, the script has been quite

sloppy. And now comes the obligatory question: siand if someone tells me that he has not read the book and does not feel like

doing it ?, then in that if the film is going to love you, because as the base of the script is good, for those who

do not know everything that is missing, you will like it. Another point: let's talk about the place where the vardenos: we must

recognize that the mental image that the writer (Christopher Paolini) left in my mind of such a place, does not

correspond at all with the scenario in which the battle of the end of the movie! (As far as

I know, the Varden lived inside a kind of "hollow mountain", not in a kind of valley with abridge

shabby woodenin the middle). In summary: if you have not read the book, probably the movie you like. If you have already

read the book, you probably like the film, but you will be quite disappointed compared to

here. It makes you vibrate.

" 0

" A film that perfectly meets the expectations created by the best marketing campaign of

the last years. Milimtrically calculated to make us have a good time.

We are going to present you a tape as we found it in the place that used to be Central Park. This is the

impressive approach (although not so original, remember that of The Blair Witch Project) of the

movie. �cula with the best promotional campaign of the last years. The result perfectly fulfills the

expectations created. We are offered exactly what the trailer promises: a giant monster destroys New

York, while everything simulates being shot with a homemade camera and without assembly, with the result as it would be if it

were recorded in several shots in a single night. The result is calculated to be

realistic and credible, and at the same time it manages to maintain the tension and that the spectator does not miss,

cont�� Taking the story as it happens, with several story surprises superbly placed in the plot,

including a secondary narrative perfectly embedded in the montage and offering a dimension -added to the

story and an excellent I do not dare to say that the film is revolutionary, because I do not think it creates a

school (although there are [REC] by Balaguer��� i Diary of the Dead Romero to take the opposite), but it takesexce

advantageThe latest advances in digital cinema to offer something never seen before, at least

not seen in this way. We are also faced with a product that is already more than a film at the beginning. Thanks to

the different viral websites that have come out on the movie, we can know where the monster comes from and other

elements involved in the story (the oil company, the Japanese drink, the antisite group, etc.), things

that by the format of the film itself can not be explained within the context of it. Total, a

very enjoyable film, which perfectly fits the commerciality with an original approach, and

accompanied by an interesting phenomenon of viral marketing on the Internet.

" 1

" An interesting and innovative approach that Bong directs with a good pulse and better cinematographic eye, which

quickly engages and that offers, in addition to a good time, a lot to think about.

Imagine that one morning a gruesome monster emerged from the sewers of your city and began

to eat with our neighbors. ""Nothing new under the sun"" ? would we think? "Now the special forcesarrive

of the army will, or a heroic and callous policeman, or a gigantic robot that will save the day". That's whathaveus to

movies of terror and actionaccustomed. But here's the boy prodigy of South Korean cinema, Joon-ho

Bong - who already offered us his disheartening view on terror at the celebrated Memories of Murder - to

ask ourselves: is that really what will happen? When the catastrophe hits: Who will really be there to

protect us? Gang-du Park is a loser with few lights who works in the beach bar of his father on the bank

of the river Han, where the inhabitants of Se disfrul enjoy a pleasant summer day. Both are visited by

Hyun-seo, the teenage daughter of Gang-du: he loves her madly, but his work as a father "and head of the

family" leaves much to be desired, despite his attempts to to please her as to save every cent she

earns to buy her a last generation mobile. While Gang-Du does the service, the Sundays notice

an odd shape hanging from one of the bridges; moments later, a monstrous creature has emerged from the river and is

campaigning freely hunting the terrified transients. Gang-du, desperate, only you can see how the beast

drags Hyun-Seo consigo.Es amazing how the film addresses the Thematic Monster: parodindola and

desmenuz Going it from the first moment. The transition between the knowledge of the endearingly familiar

Park family and the irruption of the monster is so abrupt that it causes, at first, disbelief. Faced with

all the precepts of suspense, the monster is shown in its entirety from the first moment. To

design it, they seem to have attended to biological criteria rather than to fear: the monster is simply and

simply an anthropophagic whale with legs, nothing of the terrifying mand��� Tyrannosaurus bull or the drooling

teeth of the Alien. The quality of the animation accentuates that impression of seeing something too real to

enter the game of the monster movie. In the first minutes of the film, all the topics (including

that of the heroic American soldier) fall apart. The film will continue in a bittersweet tone, a mixture of

tragedy and comedy. black The reunion of the brothers of Gang-Du (a licensed alcoholic unemployed with apastbowler

revolutionaryand awho can not get past the bronze) before the supposed funerary altar of

Hyun-Seo is paradigmatic: the four relatives writhe in pain on the floor while they hit

each other and the journalists' flashes sting him. The Park family is kept by the government in

quarantine while the authorities are alarmed about a virus supposedly transmitted by the monster. However

, a call from Hyun-Seo will let them know that she is alive, captive in the den in which the creature

stores its prey. In the face of general indifference, the Park family must unite, overcome their own

frustrations and sacrifice everything to confront both the monster and the greed and hypocrisy of a

society that allows itself to be manipulated by a montage directed from the higher spheres. An interestingapproach

and innovativethat Bong directs with a good pulse and better cinematic eye, which hooks quickly and offers, in

addition to a good time, a lot to think about.

" 1

" The only thing that offers us is a petty entertainment with the typical American hero whose amount of

inconsistencies is endless.

The gossips say that everything is already invented in the world of cinema. That originality has died and that we

witness the same film again and again with small variations. The pity is that some of those films are

not just remixes of all the previous ones but they do not have the vision or the ambition to contribute something

new or original to them. its predecessors. Let's say Death Sentece that is an Eye for an Eye with an American look

History X. Yes, I go to a production of dubious quality and 95 to explain why Kevin Baconme

bores. A happy and perfect family is destroyed by a senseless murder, be it a poor

kid at a gas station or a poor girl in his own home. As we all know, American justice has never

worked well so it is always better to finish the job yourself, while Sally Field is more modest and

let justice screw up and free the murderer for lack of evidence seems that Mr. Bacon saw the

previous film and decides to boycott the trial to be able to be the executioner of his own revenge somewhat

bloody and sloppy. It is obvious that there is not much difference except to put a man in the main role

grants the license to allow himself more scenes of gratuitous action and violence to spice up the footage. One of

my multiple theories says that if a tape does not It is a comedy that begins with recordings of homemade videos of

a happy family, it usually ends up being an absolute disaster. In the case of Death Sentence it only makes water, it is not

totally discarded thanks to the presence of Kevin Bacon who seems to have made a pact with the devil

not to grow old and thus be able to make such diverse films (something as ��� like his colleague Nicolas Cage) so that in the

long run his name is not a guarantee of a good product. Still lost in this universe appears John Goodman in a

role that purely surreal is even cosmic. The pity is that the promotion is so seriously his own product

qualifies Shakespearean production or Greek tragedy when in fact the only realizer of Saw that

offers us is a petty entertainment with the typical American hero whose amount of inconsistencies is

endless: How does a guy who has never had a gun learn to shoot a gun? Why does not the police

stop him before? It is necessary raparte to look like a gang member?,.

" 0

" Ambiguous film about a hot topic. Little convincing work behind the scenes of the actor and director Peter Berg, who tries, I suppose, to contribute his

bit, for the general reflection on a theme of hot news, as is the propagation of

international terrorism. He tries from the point of view of the cinema of pure action, where suspense and

intrigue are his two powerful weapons. Powerful on paper, but this time does not seduce much to

say, given the rigidity of the speech, amyn its socio-political ambiguity. s is narrated in away

nervous, often wanting to give the impression that everything happens at a forced pace, with dramatic tension

that makes everything accelerate, as it will be. It's normal in a subject where terror causes death and destruction

wherever it happens. For this reason, it uses a montage that I suppose will say Berg, which is vertiginous, but whichreally

isdizzying, with a multitude of free close-ups in my opinion. The script is not very successful, and there are many

dead moments in the central part that cause the rhythm to decay. It is a good thing that, at least,

we are getting to know the character of Colonel Faris Al Ghazi better, which in my opinion He is long the best

character, magnificently played by Ahraf Barhom. His loyalty, honesty, courage and sense of

justice are truly praiseworthy and truly appreciated. The best part is undoubtedly the last part,

where the pure and simple action finally takes over the whole shed. It is shot with lively rhythm and althoughare

some dark planesstill seen, at least the dramatic intensity is achieved, until reaching a

quite acceptable final resolution, with that double whisper to the ���dos of the protagonist to his companion and of the

grandfather to his grandson. A whisper that clarifies what in truth constitutes in too many occasions the essence of

terrorism and the actions of the special groups that fight against it: revenge. In short, that as a

film of action It can entertain, but it does not convince at all if it has tried to make us reflect

on a burning issue that threatens us all equally.

" 0

" A relevant film, a first-order visual spectacle that reminded me, at times, of the

tone between the circus and the transcendent of the Cirque de Sol. Pure gold: a unique visual entertainment, an

outstanding find.

Zhang Yimou is no longer the poet of the intimate, the Chinese director who signed / film��� The red lantern, there in the

early nineties: now he is the dazzling artifice of A rare visual pyrotechnics, dazzling and beautiful.

Yimou is a teacher whose talent consists in procuring us beauty, giving us an exercise ofmannerism

plasticunder which, fascinating, flows a way of understanding the cinema to which we were not accustomed. The

brittle, flimsy and melodramatic history of this Chinese dynasty muddied in betrayals, deceits and passions in

the purest culebr���n style Televisa requires such an overwhelming package, embedded in a suit so rich and

expensive, so hypnotic, that there comes a time when history is not told by the characters, nor are their

dialogues that explain the evolution of the plot but the costumes, the apothecary movements Mass physicists in

battles, choreographed with a sense of quasi-graphical detail that I would have liked for Zack

Snyder in his great 300. The staged staging does not attract the attention of the spectator : the adrenalized,

subjected to an icic overload that comes out unscathed, but paralyzed, fascinated. ��� That history is

plémbea, plomiza and pla���idera? Delighted to give the reason who wants to reduce the

pictorial, cinematographic and aesthetic magnificence - which are three different issues, although vectorized towards the same

essence, pleasure , knowledge, Art - of this movie? Even the small set of martialscenes

artshas seemed competent, not being me - at all - fervent fan of such excesses. There arecharacters

half-assembled, stories that come from old and that are imposed on the story that occupies the film and are not

convincingly told, there are actors who are not tall (the children, in general), there are aspects

that do not go unnoticed by very exalted that we have the experience at chromatic level, in its textures,

in its admirable and more than fluid editing: everything is excused, everything what an excuse The curse of the golden flower is

a relevant film, a first-order visual spectacle that made me remember, at times, the

tone between the circus and the transcendent Cirque de Sol, which I was able to see and enjoy this summer in Malaga.

And that it does not seem for the enthusiasm dedicated to the unique plan that the narrative thing has been neglected: the gui���n,

with some very weak wicks, with a simple story worthy to begin a nap with The TV buzzing an

archetypal culebr���n, is taken with care, bringing the essence that suits each plane (when

we should usually think that it is the plane that goes to look at each tab� ��a of the film script).

" 1

" I'm left with that sweet taste of having seen Superman again, and that bitter taste of goingdeep

toointo the characters and their relationships

If he's up to the task, if he is not. If too much romance, if not. If Synger's approach is wrong, if he

has made the best superhero film of the year, we have been debating for several weeks what Brian Synger has

devised for the return, he hoped. ��simo, the last citizen of Krypton, and we are 60% enthusiastic, and

40% of not so much.With it I mean that NO ONE, ABSOLUTELY NOBODY has put to birth the film, not even

me. The only thing that has been done is to shed piece by piece a film that, with the expectation created, could not

pretend otherwise. The same has happened with "" X-Men 3 "", or "" Cars "" and will happen to "" Pirates of the Caribbean 2 "": they are

all the perfect vehicle to look for the corners to what is sold as a round film. Sitting on this

statement of intentions, I must say, to begin with, that I thank Synger forever for giving

Superman a fund that he did not have before. to. A human background, vulnerable and with worries that go beyond looking

for the bad ones and seizing them. My adult side is satisfied. The child was somewhat confused. No one said that

Synger would copy a Superman movie and give us punches without rhyme or reason. As he already did in the two incursions

into the world of the X-Men, more importance is given to the emotions of the protagonists, avoiding that the sequences

of action are the only thing to be filled. � the screen during the footage. Visually it has no comparison with the last

superhero inroads on the screen. Technology at the service of the character. In "" Superman Returns ""

there is action, not all desirable, but there is a lot. The airplane scene is something that was demanded from hac���aa���os.

So, when you finish watching it, you have the impression that not only have you seen aeffects film

special, but you have attended the presentation of a new Superman, different from the one of the 80, and that is going to

stay for the next years. What I like: Brandon Routh has done a great job. The greatest success

of Synger has been to hire an authentic stranger who, in a few minutes, you already identify with the man of

steel. When he decides to put on a poker face, he embroiders it (the scene where he spies far from Lois's house), and in

the last part of the film, the It's dramatic, it makes you really believe that "Superman" is vulnerable, something that

seems to be the director's goal. I do not know what would have been the film without Kate Bosworth. Now I understand why they

have chosen her as the best Lois. It is undoubtedly the reincarnation of the Lois of the comics, a strong,woman

independent, and in love even the hero's strings. Kevin Spacey I can only say that it is the best actor

who plays the villain of recent years. It could not be someone else who gave life to Lex Luthor. And now, not so

good. There are no round films, and special effects can not save everything. Maybe the eagerness to see

Superman again in the movies causes that the history does not have the rapidity that you want. I do not like thesilence

absoluteon why Superman has been missing so many years. I know Synger saves it for the sequel,

I hope, but it would not have been a bad flashback, or at least an advance. If for the producer it was

sold as the continuation of "" Superman II "", he did not see himself as Superman was leaving, so he does not know why he returns.

I do not like the plan of Luthor. A continent made of rock ?, and devastate the USA. Why? Luthor has always been

good in conjunction with some supervillain who put the force, and in the absence of this, you have to strip

Superman of his powers for Lex to beat him up. We already saw it in "" Superman "", but with less cruelty. ��� Will

General Zod be the bad guy in the sequel? It's better for Synger. Please wait for answers in the sequel

about the "final surprise", you know? I find out where he has been, nor do they tell me

when? That's it. Now it's your turn to comment on the film. I'm left with that sweet taste of having seen

Superman again and that bitter taste that the "Hulk" error has been committed, going too deep into the characters and

their relationships distracts you from what you really intended. You see.

" 1

" Failed attempt to bring to this modern vogue of infogrphic genius a way of makingcinema

classical, from the use of lenses of the time to a black and white too strange and unreal.

This imposture that takes refuge in black and white and pays an apparently cinifile tribute to the immortal

Casablanca is, in the end, a failed attempt to green the vintage spirit of the time, its textures

foggy, the Warner logo unchromed and the air between the nostalgic and the philanthropic (love of cinema, you

can understand) of Soderbergh's work. What comes later is a heavy history of espionage, in which

there are no good or bad but characters housed in a strange time, of moral constructions burst by

war and a multinational endeavor to rebuild what devastated the barbarism that they themselves forged.The

survival, the estraperlo of the feelings, the hard battle of the cold war recently invented, they generate a

thick guide and little accessible for the spectator, who finishes slightly interested (how not) but

pitifully troubled by The anguish of this guignol of political traces that goes to the patterns of the genre

(the romance, the lies, the worked dialogues) and accelerates them to the runr���n of these now times so

the print is downright sad. One leaves like depressed of the cinema, without having attended to anything concrete.

In any case, a pragmatic evidence of the instinct of man to accommodate the inconveniences of his

own madness. Weary rhythm and weighed down by a sometimes inappropriate clutter of small irrelevant lateral frames

, the film takes much more care than the background. It is usually the norm of this director and

has not yet made a film where the plot is the one that drives the images and not the other way round. The use of

interspersing documentary scenes in the plot makes it a little more bearable as well as the acting effort of a

committed casting, but George Clooney is oversized in his role, does what he should not (being able to

avoid it as we suppose he knows), that is, overacting, conferring on his role an evidence of drama, of

falsity. This does not happen to CAte Blanchett, every classic day.

" 0

" Desprop���sito would be the ideal word to describe this exercise of ineptitude in the form of a video clip whose

realization only makes sense if it is not for Mr. Michael Bay to fill up the pockets.

Desprop���sito would be the ideal word to describe this exercise of ineptitude in the form of a video clip whose

realization only makes sense if it is not for Mr. Michael Bay to fill his pockets by exploiting a saga

that does not give for more. The big mistake of this film is its own existence, that is, this film is

totally unnecessary, it does not bring anything new, it does not teach anything that we have not seen before and the fact of

Trying to explain the origin of the Maniac and Leatherface family is a big mistake, since one of the

great successes of La Matanza was exactly not knowing why those people acted in that way. And afterwards

, once you finish watching the movie, you realize that there are only a few minutes of origin and that

most of the footage is repeated one and again the same formula that of course we already know by heart. The

film is boring from beginning to end and that lasts less than an hour and a half, but is so repetitive and

predictable that the only thing that manages to rip the staff are a few yawns far from their

pretensions something provocative of viscera and blood that today is the minimum that can be requested to atape

horrorof these characteristics. But things get worse as boredom seizes the viewer,

starting with the uselessness of the man behind the camera, I do not know what the hell there will be.wanted to do in

Mr. Liebesmanthis movie, but it is very damaging to the view the continuous flat / contralateral and the

dizzying camera movements and if we add the darkness to that that invades every scene of the film,hardly

we canidentify the figure of Leatherface. A Leatherface who, like all his family ofdisturbing and

murdererssickening in film is lost all the charisma that tena assymbol of horror and figure

m ��tica of the slashers movies becoming a derisory character. I'm not going to delve into the stupid

biker couple that only shows the narrative awkwardness of a gui quen that has no meaning. Or in the

bland gang of young victims. The Origin is just pure prefabricated casquer���a, a banal spectacle

of viscera that distorts the true spirit and origin of the Texas Massacre.

" 0

" Perfect combination of gross action and consistent argument. This movie is the caña !. The best of the year

2007, long and long ...

So many hours dedicated to this film irremediably lead to a viewing with wide eyes.

That the script does not escape, that the actors do not escape and, by God, that we do not have to close those eyes to the

half hour of the film. Many times as much expectation is the worst enemy of a good valuation, although

I have not sat down to see it with the idea of ​​scrutinizing each of the details of? 300�? �. Maybe that's why I can

say that this movie is the caña !. The best of 2007, long and long. Since I saw? Infiltrated? I had not

felt that wild and illegitimate restlessness to see how they fall one after the other on the screen. ? 300?? �

is violence, violence and more violence. Dialogs extol that violence. The poses of the actors increase

that violence and the excellent cinematography of the film is the result of violence. The rooms are going to be filled with

people screaming at the same time as Leonidas? ������������Espartanos !!!? while they whip the wind as if they had

swords. This is the film that will consummate your revenge in front of your girlfriend for that time that I put you to see? The

Diary of Noa ?. Eye, I do not say by machismo that it is a movie of t���os, but Snyder has mounted a maxi-battle

of 2 hours that must be faced with a high level of testosterone. An example: my girl saw the first half

hour until Leonidas got blood. Ah��� everything is over for her. The argument is simple: Leonidas

hates the Persians. The Persians want Sparta. Leonidas travels to face with 300 men the thousands and

thousands of Persians. Fight. Battle. Blood. Mutilations More fight. More blood. The mutilations

quintuplican? The little one of Zak Snyder is that, counting on a wonderful graphical novel of Frank -genio- Miller,

has managed to make an excellent film without the decay ,N, the interest and entertainment not

even a second. Of course much is due to Miller's bloody history, but how many times have we

seen a good story in the hands of a firecracker sopor���fero. The succession in the battle of Asian

hordes that Le���nidas and company face becomes increasingly stimulating, both visually and so you have

fun watching the kids scattering everywhere. With? 300? � you do not even take your eyes off the

screen, just maybe to take away that imaginary blood spatter. From Gerard Butler I can only say that

there will not be another pu \*\* ca \*\* Spartan better than him. I wanted to sign up with Leonidas wherever I needed to.

I go with ���la kill Persians, not Persians, elephants or whatever you want. I shout those of ���������Espartanos !!!, that Imyself

throwinto the river if necessary. Lena Headey, the next Sarah Connor, is the wife of Leonidas, and surprises the hu \*\*\*

she throws at him throughout the film. This is her boss, and the sensual and sexual of her character is just knowing

that if it were not for her son, she would be next to Leonidas auctioning off the wood. Unrecognizable Rodrigo Santoro as

Xerxes. This kid, who appeared 3 minutes in? Los Angeles de Charlie 2? � is one of the incorporations of

? Lost ?, and how King Xerxes gets out. One of the best villains we can see this year. What fails: the

character of the hunchback Ephialtes. He supports with nothing. And that many people can remember to? Troya? mixed with

bad ost \*\* by Robert Rodriguez. Of course? 300? � has nothing to do with the rest of the

pseudo-peplum that has visited us in recent years. If you plan to attend a historical lesson, leave it for the

History Channel. There are 300 Spartans against a million Asians, so expect only brutality until

one is standing. With the aesthetic of c���mic that the green screen gives you,? 300�? � are the two hours more

acoj \*\*\*\*\*\* that you will spend in the cinema for a long time. Perfect combination of gross action and

consistent argument. You should avoid buying thrown objects (popcorn, bottles, cheetos, a simple

red licorice) if you do not want to fall into the temptation of using it against the child who sits down down, since

I've seen him in the entrance I want him?

" 1

" A film to be awake and let yourself be carried away by that great love story between two sick people who

need each other. Wonderful.

There are occasions in which to speak of certain directors supposes an incomparable cin���filo pleasure after seeing or

reviewing his works, and the case of the South Korean film-maker Park Chan-Wook is indeed one of them. Once more a

success in the target of good cinema with this work on loneliness, the need for a loved one and find

the place in this world. The argument places us in a psychiatric center which goes to Young-Goon due to

his refusal to eat since they locked their grandmother, and the fact that he literally considers himself a cyborg and

fears that if he eats he can lose that ability. There, a series of characters swarm in, which is more strange,

but it will be Park-Sun (played by the popular Rain) that will most relate to each other. with her. This entails the fact

that Young-Goon asks him to use his "" skills "" to steal his compassion, with the purpose of killing all

the doctors and residents of the center, since that very compassion It prevents you from doing so. You see, the argument

can scare more than one, and considering that we are talking about an Asian film, which are always

received With some suspicion on the part of the spectator, he runs the risk of passing unnoticed this wonderful

work of physics. The work behind the scenes of Park Chan-Wook is again commendable, with a new demonstration , just

as he did in his popular trilogy on revenge, we are facing one of the best values ​​in

the world cinematographic scene. A director capable of taking each and every one of the technical andresources

stylisticof modern cinema and endowing them with a personality on the screen that leaves them speechless with theperfection

formalthat they achieve. Picados, travellings, close-ups, etc, always endows them with a visual capacity that

reminds us of a magical realism that recalls films like "" Amelie "" but raised to the maximum power in the

particular case of the film that concerns us. Use of framing, colors, audiovisual magic is all

festn of cinfilos references and visual metaphors that make this director in one of the most innovative

of current cinema, but the one that more. In the acting section, highlight the excellent interpretation of its twoactors

mainSu-Jeong Lim playing the role of "" cyborg "" and the aforementioned Rain creating the fun Park Sun, who know how to

endow their interpretations with a special magic, without falling into excesses or gestures that, taken to the

extreme, would be overdone, an excellent acting job. The film is of a metaphysical richness that

only after several viewings can be acquired its true dimension, the use of surrealist images, of the

contrast of colors to which the director has accustomed us , always in accordance with the emotional aspect of

the characters, all this entails my It is an air of unique, innovative and original film in its results,

rather than in its own argumentative conception. A visual imaginary full of ideas, stylistic resources and

wonderful scenes. To quote as such the extraordinary scene of confinement in adjacent rooms of the two

characters, their way of contacting each other and their surreal struggle to overcome their own emotional orconflicts

psychic, with that communication through the two glasses and the thread. Or without going further that plane of the kiss where

she "" takes off "" literally from the floor of emotion, simply great. There are so many and so many images that

remain in the memory in this very rich film that it would be impossible to list them all, even of atone

cosmicthat provokes a smile of charming complicity in the spectator ( the scene of the charge of the batteries or

the horror scene of the killing in the hospital), or of black humor (the conversation with part of his grandmother put

in a little bag as a farewell is descacharrante ). Perhaps to put a but it would be fair to admit that the

script sometimes is somewhat schematic, where the images and visual appearance sometimes exceeds the

development of the History, given that so much visual and stylistic imagery does not find its counterpoint in any

realistic aspect that gives these moments their true emotional value at 100%, luckily compensated

skillfully by the director through fine inserts. iron���ao visual humor. In short, u n film that continues in

the line of great films that this extraordinary director shows us year after year, although this time

maybe something more s probably misunderstood by the average viewer that previous films, due

precisely to the very conception of the film and its intentions from the beginning, the argument marks a lot and

probably is not suitable for all p��� public. A film to be awake and to be carried away by that

great love story between two sick people who need each other. Wonderful.

" 1

" La Camarera is an excessively soft romantic comedy that is closer to the���o���er���a than

Chocolatto the magical realism of Como Water For Chocolate.

If there is something that sells today in our society, it is the morbid, and there are all the pseudo-television

programs whose sole purpose is to take the light the most morbid stories to feed the greed of the human being

for the rugged events. With all this, it is almost incredible but I say to applaud that such a

dramatic event as the murder of Adrienne Shelly has not been used as a promotional tool of The

Waitress. From here, we reiterate our sincerest gratitude to the press department of Fox Espa���a, for

not playing with the sensationalism and the pain of others in order to increase the expectation in around one of his

films. Having said that, it should be noted that La Camarera is a comedy with some melodramatic

and romantic overtones excessively cloying. The story is intentionally halfway between drama and

comedy, although the end result ends up being very soft and sentimental. The script has deep

ups and downs, and the characters, who to fall sympathetic are too ridiculous, are poorly written and worse

developed. It also intends to use the culinary elements to give the tape a magical atmosphere,

but in this it also fails, and it is far from big movies. such as One Touch of Cinnamon or As Water for

Chocolate. The interpretations are correct, although it draws the attention that Keri Russell sounds like a possible

Oscar candidate for a job as correct as anodyne. The Waitress is an excessivelyromantic comedy

softthat is more close to the Chocolat queo���er���a that of the magical realism of Como Agua Para Chocolate.

History does not excite or make people laugh, it incurs in numerous topics, and its end is more predictable, if

it has the courage to endure such indigestion. Sweet until the last consequences.

" 0

" How far can a camera go? Do you have the moral permission to film everything your lens can see?

One of the first fiction films that the genius Kieslowski approached. Throughout the footage you can see its

special cinematic approach, still a very different work and less aesthetic and poetic than what it would

later. a film of simple structure, but its motive is quite complex and can give rise to

diverse ramblings. It is not surprising that for many, in a first viewing, it is somewhat difficult to follow

and experience a slow development that does not allow to guess which direction it intends. No to take or what you intend to

explain. And it is that much of the films of Kieslowski have their final meaning once finished. At the

same moment in which you start to pose the film, reflect deeply on it and attach it to

real life is when you manage to understand the path that the director wanted to draw. Despite the difficulty

mentioned , "" The Amateur "" is probably the most direct work of Kieslowski. Some dialogues were written

between the director and Jerzy Stuhr, the main actor of the film (Filip). And the result was a film of

evident autobiographical character. That Kieslowski turns the camera towards his own person, is something that all his

followers know. He always does it in a very subtle way, so that the spectator himself can investigate, since

initially he will not even notice it. Never reveal, just whisper. Each and every one of his works

speak of portions of his personality, and, globally, they all look towards the same direction: freedom and

love. Drawn both in different ways, but always as a background. And "" Amator "" is not an exception. On the

contrary. The protagonist puts us in the shoes of a filmmaker in his first steps, with its virtues and its

defects, its facilities and difficulties. Obviously, although he never recognized it openly (he never spoke of

his own person), all the footage refers to his complicated beginnings, to his moral fears and to the

confrontation of ethical principles to which he always made alusi���na when filming. In many interviews he

assured that usually he wanted to leave his unfinished films, that he could not film the

real tears of the actors, that he was unable to portray his suffering (paradjically-a word that

it is repeated in the work and person of the Polish director-, he did it better than anyone else) since he considered it as an

attack on the intimate life of the people, and that his moral principles are seen an on the tightrope on

numerous occasions. And that is true in a social and political framework like that of Poland at the time.

The censorship and the communism could use against the filmed people any question happened in

films and documentaries. Communism spoke of freedom, but free will was no more than a lie.

A utop���a.El fact that the Polish director previously filmed documentaries hints at the why of

many of their moral conditioning and internal struggles. For this reason, Kieslowski always considered the

difficulty of filming, the right to exercise as a kind of God when it comes to capturing reality in his

works. How far does our morality allow us to arrive? Can we record something that can be used against

people? Can we film a real death? Should not we let people die without their inner peace being

degraded? Thus, the film is about the vicissitudes of a person who begins with a camera only to

film his baby, to take his own micro-world and hide it in his family. Not so that the world

sees it. But little by little it is submerged in the world of the filmmaker, filming documentaries, recording films. And

its moral and human principles are in question. When it comes to showing the public their concerns about

real life, the main problems arise. How far can you get to film? The film is ideal for

"amateur" filmmakers, to understand a bit the complexity of filming and to know how to apply certain

t��� techniques, not only mechanical, but also human. The axis of "" The Amateur "" could coexist in everything related

to the power of a camera. Its power to show, but also its fatality to destroy. In this way, the film

is developed masterfully, starting with the innocence of a beginner and continuing with his shyness and

doubts, all this leading to the destruction and loss of everything he loves. It is as if the camera subjugate

everything that concerns the real life of the character, as if the lens had the power to, through fiction,

alter reality, damage it. , it moves in a special way the way that Filip is losing his

family, his work and some of his friends. ���Culp of ���l? Of them? From the camera? That will only be discovered

when you turn the lens towards yourself. Then he will understand that everything filmed, his work, begins and ends in his

own person. Understand that decisions can not be taken lightly, that cruelty and humanism must

coexist in each and every one of our relationships. The world fades around him, but then, in the

loneliness of his loss, he may know that the only owner of his life must be himself. He alone is responsible

for his own acts, never of those of others. The freedom always present in the work of Kieslowski. In this work, in

addition to converging the pessimism of knowledge and the optimism of desire, we can observe that the Polish director

shows off his first political ideologies. Ethical and social. Censorship is present on several occasions throughout

the footage, with Filip's work partner, with his child, surrounding him in his daily life. Thepartner

workis the ideal example of ethical and moral cinematographic doubt. Use a person as a medium, to

move, or simply show reality as it is, to portray the life of a person with difficulties.

But, then, are you not using it? It is obvious to everyone who listens to Kieslowski speak, that many

times, it pains him to film remnants of reality through the camera, he considers it a too dangerous andmedium

powerful. He could not decide on the realities of these people, he stated bluntly that he did not have such a

right. Also, as he said, all this could be used against him. of the people who were in charge of the project or

simply appeared in it. The initial scene in which the falcon attacks a helpless bird is a clear example

of the concerns of Kieslowski in those times (of which in the following years he would renege). It is a

clear metaphor (remember Irka's nightmare) that reflects the struggle between the one who has power and those who are

underneath, the struggle between the bearer of the camera ( a kind of power that is allowed to play with the filmed) and the

characters of that everyday reality that are filmed. Characters that, like the bird, can be damaged by

that filming. The eternal struggle between the individual (the director) and the collective (real life). Fight always

present in the moral cinematogr.fica.En social and political framework plagued with censorship, his documentaries did not more

than delve into a wound that he considered very deep in his interior (it affected him personally to

a point that radically changed his way of expressing himself publicly). And, on more than one occasion, we are

assailed by the eternal question of "to whom the film really belongs" (which also It happens in the present, let's

not deceive ourselves.) Who has the final decision on final details of the film? It is clear that the one who

invests the money (when there is no other way to obtain it), commercially, had the last word (in the case

that affects us at least). And more in that situation, which brings back to mind the feeling that appears in more

films of Kieslowski that we are puppets that we hang by a thread. But that thread can be moved by our

will. So, in the end, I know there is something that is yours, property of Filip: his own learning, his knowledge

that he is only responsible for what he records when he appears in that environment. As for the technical plane

of the film, in the cast great strangers who scratch at a great level. Especially Jerzy Stuhr, who has already appeared

on different Kieslowski recordings as "" The Calm "" or "" Declogist. "" It is admirable how Kieslowski does

so much with so few resources, with a absolutely aseptic projection, without effects or blows of any kind.

An evident visual limitation, but that remains in a second plane and does not make the result of

the work more expensive. It seems to be from the visual magic of "" Veronica's Double Life "" or the trilogy of "" Three Colors "", but it's

totally logical due to your budget. "" Camera Buff "" was the movie that launched Kieslowski at � Success (very

relative and limited in space, by then), and despite the shortcomings already mentioned, it made it possible to

advance in the cinematographic field and investigate in the human soul, in the deepest feelings, and

through a more precious aesthetic, musical and poetic. In short, a very interesting work to get

fully into the moral and ideology of a filmmaker. Maybe it is difficult to taste it in its fullness in a first

viewing, but if we carry out the obligatory reflection that it deserves, we will become part of its

depth. It may be that the only point against him is that same, which is a type of film that you can not enjoy

the first time, because you do not know exactly in what direction Kieslowski wants to take us. Fact that does not

affirm, at all, that it is the most complex film of the late Polish director. The legacy of Kieslowski is something

that the cinema thanks and needs (above all to remind us that the time in which ��� was one of the

poorest for which the seventh art has passed) and that, in his style, no one can recover. The human and

artistic spirit is something that can not be emulated, no matter how hard it is put. For many, it is the masterpiece of the

movement called in Poland as "cinema of concern" moral "", of which Kieslowski was one of its fundamental

banners, together with the initiatory film that occupies the criticism that binds us. The viewer is the one who has the

Last word and will grant (or not) meaning to the film, labeling it as a pedantic or elevating reflection.

There is no other carrier of the c�� �mara other than our own lens.

" 1

" Disappointing for two reasons: for the film itself (bad, unambiguous) and for the amount of good

feelings and greedy expectations that it has been creating between the p��� public

The conventions of the criminal genre are not many, but they are firmly established in theimaginary

collective cinematographic. Corrupt police. Detectives' offices with immense curtains ofsmoke

black cigarette. Cadds on the shore of a river, preferably near a factory. Fatal women, blondes,

in many of the times. The film noir has been nurtured by these subjects to affirm their name in the History

of the seventh Art, but Brian de Palma has given them entirely to the side. He has gone off on a tangent, he has allowed himself to be

bamboozled by a vulgar screenwriter who confuses the black genre with the series Aterriza as you can, and he offers us

a patience of our film noir made to the modern one, that is, with means, with actors with a hook, with an

admirable photograph, although unattended in its most explicit evidence: the gui���n.Parte Brian de Palma from a

true story that still traverses its twists and turns in post-criminal critics and various fans

of classic Hollywood mysteries: the murder of aspiring actress Elizabeth Short, The Black Dahlia, found in a

solar, the body split in two, with signs of burns and the mouth obscenely painted by knife from one ear

to another. The material is convincing, but marra de Palma in the treatment of history. It occupies itself in excess of

the two protagonist policemen (the pugilistic start is long, tedious and confuses in too much) and it disengages itself

exceedingly of personages who seems that they are going to have a weight, but that later they are abandoned, they are left

entirely and only give color to the plot (the role of exuberant Johannson). Brian de Palma has wanted to

compose a typical noir and has scribbled a boring collage whose decoration reminds us of the gloriousseries

blackof yesteryear (or now: LA confidential, masterly) .The film disappoints for two reasons: for the

film itself (bad, unambiguous) and for the cumulus of good feelings and greedy expectations that has been

created among the public, � I've taken back a kind of movies that (unfortunately) are no longer plentiful. One has

been waiting for this candy for several months and then it turns out that it is cracked, a���ejo and the strawberry that it promised

is not such but a bitter, sticky, bland taste after several licks. They tinkled in our memoryfilms

admirableof this same director as The Untouchables of Eliot Ness or Trapped by his past, who also play

this theme, but here Brian de Palma has spoiled the material of first order of James Ellroy (who pari��� LA

confidential, without going further) and has drowned, knowing how to swim in more dangerous waters.It is not valid in his excuse

that the guide is dense and very populated by characters. It is not admitted that the stylistic discourse of De Palma is

refocile in powerful images, in an argument still known in his work. It is not worth all this because

we have seen on other occasions that Brian de Palma has plenty of talent to air these problems with

undeniable creative efficiency. Even products of a minor order in his extensive work oozed, by

sections, all its quality. I remember his impossible mission, or Femme fatale, that cake of Banderas inplan

full heat. Then he draws conclusions that do not admit ripostes: the man has lacked desire, or (as it

usually happens) they have gotten a hand in the project many hands and in the end frog came out when prince

began, is worth this easy singsong Woody Allen came to say in a recent interview that in Europe his

work was infinitely more autonomous because the producers gave him the money and a blank check of ideas

to go where he wanted, from the way you want. Maybe De Palma has to drop by London or

Par���sy and sign his most personal cinema in these parts. It can be. We have what we have: a lost occasion, a

disappointing film. This cinema requires more turbidity, so to speak: it requires less containment in the

forms, a more extroverted air. It is not enough that the sets are portentous. Nor with that there is a

dead blonde and a fatal woman that muddies and muddies everything. The best (to finish this dismemberment)

is the part of fiction within the fiction: the scenes in black and white of the aspiring actress Elizabeth

Short, then macabrely murdered, in her casting tests. That character, in its brevity, convinces more than

the other hundred and odd minutes of boredom. All very sad. All very sad. With what I like Sam

Spade.

" 0

" Spectacular pesti���o where tension and dramatic rigor shine for their absence Some will hated me without delay for attacking a movie of the handsome Clooney, some for not understanding the

message liberal and critical of the film, and others for not knowing how to appreciate the taste of a film shot in black and

white classic style, or for not giving up before its current recognition in Hollywood. The tension and the dramatic rigor

of the film are conspicuous by their absence. The camera effectively tells the story in black and white,

but it is not "" Schindler's list "" or much less and, in this, the cinematographic language and the setting

scene do not pass mediocre. The actors do what they can with a flat, tedious and predictable guide.

David Strathairm poses very seriously all the time, with enough sobriety. Clooney appears very elegant, very

correct and nothing more. And the story between Robert Downey Jr and Patricia Clarkson goes so unnoticed, that itnot amount

doesto anything other than absurd. The actors smoke, that's it, a lot, it's already known that incinema

Bogart's classicit was already very good and, in addition, to try to go a���nm��� sa the against, that better than to exalt the

consumption of the tobacco in a society in which at the moment it aims to leave the habit. The television can be an

instrument to educate or to evade. The television is manipulable. Yeah, yeah, what? Well, that's it, nothing more. Not a

dare to really portray the witch hunt, or the Mc Carthy era, or risk approaching acriticism

sincere, serious or interestingabout nothing at all. "Good night and good luck" is a spectacular pest. The one

who sat in the cinema next to me, after the first twenty minutes, fell asleep like a baby and then

survived the longed-for end by plugging into his mp3. I envied him for it, although I decided to see it to the end,

even if it was only to be able to write about it here today. What a huge disappointment with a film

that I expected a lot more. The best thing, without a doubt, was that, thank God, the torture did not exceed an hour and a

half.

" 0

" The Shadow of Suspicion, however, does not have the capacity to surprise, an essential and inherent factor in

any good thriller.

The new production of Michael Douglas can be summed up in only five words: Nothing new under the sun.

Extremely attractive in its initial approach, careful with the technical details and remarkable at thelevel

interpretive, The Shadow of Suspicion, however, does not have the ability to surprise, essential andfactor

inherentin any good thriller. On the contrary, Petievich's novel seems to be aimed, on many

occasions, at underestimating the viewer. Kiefer Sutherland, brilliant. Those who saw The Bodyguard (things of

the age, I am fascinated by it) will remember that Kevin Costner was the best in his role because he had worked

protecting the life of the President of the United States. . When his seductive partner lets him fall that "" the

pressure was shot "", he replies, without flinching, "" that was not his turn "". The magic of cinema has wanted us

to discover, some years later, that whoever was on guard that day was none other than Michael

Douglas himself. The veteran actor? also producer of this pelcula- we enter into the world of

elite bodyguards, grouped around the Secret Service, with the special mission of ensuring the life of the

m Top American leader and first lady. A very interesting approach, among other

reasons, for the amount of work that these professionals have to date; but that, quickly,

loses its attractiveness when giving way to a plot destined, in many moments, to underestimate the spectator. Itnot

istoo credible, for example, that an experienced agent of the security forces, with more than-

twentyfive years in the service of "" Your Majesty "", is dedicated to propagating the four winds a bombshell of

information, which has come from an infallible confidant who has provided him for more than ten years, and who would putin

the president's lifedanger. As unlikely an aspect as knowing that the top spheres of theservices

secret, knowing that there is a "" a mole "" between them, adopt as the only security measure the polygraph, to

detect He is the traitor. And no more credible is to target the drug traffickers of Barranquilla or former

agents of the Soviet espionage services as possible interested in the death of a punctualpresident

US. It is true that enemies do not lack this country, but it sounds like a joke in the year 2.006 to guide the

gui���n in those areas. The screenwriter Nolfi, based on the novel by Gerald Petievich, (which was bought by

20th Century Fox, before being published, to make this film) manifested in an interview, with motive

of the premiere of the tape in the USA, "" who had tried to make the story absolutely real "". It must be because of

that, that he could not think of anything better than to write a culminating sentence to be pronounced by one of the

characters in the story: "" In 141 years, it is the first time that there is a mole in thesecret services

American"". Phrase that is not entirely uncertain, if we take into account that according to the investigations of a certain and

famous New Orleans prosecutor, which Oliver Stone collected in one of his films, there would not have been a mole but

a pack in the sixties and with respect to the JFK murder. A phrase that, knowing the political

history of the aforementioned director, is ridiculous. As ridiculous as it is the mobile that has "" the bad "" of

this evil thriller, the personal quarrels that arise between the two great protagonists because of a

woman named Silvia who, in the end, it turns out that it was called Cindy (something that bothers the "" pijoteros "" who

realize everything), or the love affair between Douglas and Basinger. The latter, two monsters of

the big screen, myths of the cinema of the eighties, that will complete the cast with Kiefer Sutherland, who already

made his first steps the same decade with that of "" Today is a good day to die "", in Mortal Line; and with Eva

Longoria, an important revelation, for the camera, of the last hour. Actually, I do not know what kind of audience the

Shadow of Suspicion will go to. Of course, not to the followers of the "political thriller", -as it has been

cataloged-, who will not take more than ten minutes to find out the whole plot. Only the great scriptwriters and

filmmakers of Hollywood History have been able to deceive the smartest spectator. Some of

them, because they were really cool. Others, because they were based on stories from the Queen of Crime, Do���a ���gata.

In any case, the novel, the gui���ny and the film that today occupy us, are light years of all of them. Nothing

new under the sun.

" 0

" You can not escape the elongated shadow of this cult novel that serves as a source. It has eliminated many

complicated issues to deal with or to transfer in images; and it has sweetened the end.

Why can not we be happy? Maybe because we can not satisfy all our desires, sometimes,

even contradictory. And more so in a world where we are exposed to the constant bombardment of stimuli, new

products and experiences that we "want". "The novel by Michel Houellebecq, turned into a best seller, and an author as

much loved as hated in France, reflected on it, on the morality of Western civilization, on

sex, racism, and much more, in his work. All a direct punch to the stomach, difficult to digest, and

practically unadaptable to the big screen.Therefore, "" The elementary particles "", directed by the German

Oskar Roehler, can not escape the elongated shadow of this cult novel that serves as a source. It has

eliminated many complicated issues to deal with or to transfer in images; and it has sweetened the end. This has

made him swallow the (negative) criticism of the readers of Houellebecq. In his search for "" reasoned knowledge ""

to put order to chaos, is Michael (Christian Ulmer), a scientist who tries to find the "" indivisible "" and

"" impresindible "" of existence. For her profession, and being a cold mind submerged in formulas and theory, she

sacrificed her childhood love, Annabelle (Franka Potente), to whom she returned ��� to find with the passage of the

years.The other side of the coin is his stepbrother, Bruno (Mortiz Bleibtreu), a professor of literature totally

immersed in the crisis of the forties: "" ���Los Only events that remain for me to live are

illnesses! " He does not "" want "" to his wife nor has he developed his vocation as a father. On the contrary, Bruno

has developed his sexual stimuli to the maximum, he continues with his practices onanistas, and does not stop putting a face

of debris before the details of the young and numerous feminine presences that surround him. Nor does he hide his

racist tendencies, which will be translated into a book project where he insults blacks ("one of theraces

dominant sexual"), led by the bitterness of his frustation. As an aggravating factor , Bruno's past is

conditioned by different traumas, such as the Oedipus complex towards his mother, Jane (Nina Hoss), a? neohippie?

that he chose to live in freedom without worrying about his children. On the particular trip to find himself,

the stops include both a psychiatric center and a nudist camp. But his destiny, if something does not

remedy it, seems madness. And trying to decipher the irrational equations of love and sex, Bruno, as a

contrast and example, and Michael, as a biologist, will be precursors. of a ���avance? inspired by the utopian novel

"A Happy World", by Aldous Huxley, which would bring us to a "rational" society "where love and sex have been

replaced by the cloning and artificial reproduction. Eliminating the evil we have the remedy. So that outside

These worrisome chemistry and biological reactions of human relationships, that more than excitement and pleasure

produce dislikes and other more severe pathologies. This is, of course, a part of the irony of the novel

transmitted by Oskar Roehler, who nevertheless prefers to take his film to a more recognizable and bearable ground

for the p��. Public as is the conventional melodrama, focusing on the two love stories. It contains a

correct narration, like that sequence of Bruno's seduction attempt to one of his students. And it holds very

good performances by Moritz Bleibtreu, who knows how to keep close-ups full of pain, anguish and

loneliness; and of Martina Gedeck, like Christiane, the nymphomaniac she meets in the nudist camp and destined to

become, so to speak, the love of her life for Bruno. And even if its protagonists achieve

"happiness", "this probably is not how they would have" "desired" ". And that leaves us with one of thosesmiles

icy.

" 0

" New test in the direction of David S. Goyer that after the disaster of Blade Trinity, seems to have improved

a little, but that still has a long way to go to make a good film.

Nick is a misunderstood boy who wants to flee to London to study a writing course and Annie is the

problem girl of the institute. Both will have a collision because of Nick's friend who owesmoney

the girl. After this the girl will believe that Nick is guilty of betraying her to the police which will make him go

after him and accidentally end up killing him. But Nick will return in the form of a ghost and the girl seems to be the only one

who can perceive it, although this really does not quite become very clear in the film. New test in the direction

of David S. Goyer that after the disaster of Blade Trinity, seems to have improved a little, but he still has a

long way to go to make a good film, something worrying considering that his next project

is the spinoff of Magneto. The film manages to have an interesting presentation of characters and at the beginning of

turning the boy into a ghost the thing is pretty well captured. But there comes a certain point in which the

sequences become tiresome and it is when the girl comes into play and her repentance, and the extra���ov���nculo

that is established between the two that does not quite take place. Although Goyer it moves away from the static video in

this film, it continues to abuse a lot of songs during all the footage and practically every five minutes,

where, among others, we find groups like Death Cab For Cutie, Broken Social Scene , Snow Patrol or A Perfect

Circle. The film remains a lost opportunity to go further and offer something that goes beyond the typical and

ends up being a product that only serves to pass the time and that's if we're not very pretentious.

" 0

" The directors have made a quick inventory of clichés of the genre and have put them in a tourmix: the

resulting shake is They and has appreciable flavors, although the final aftertaste is � Rough, bland, poor.

To begin with, this is a film of fear: everything is designed to produce fear. The trick is to hide

the nature of evil for almost the entire length of time: we do not know until the last few minutes what threat

the protagonist couple pursues. It would have been better to never have known it: or to know it from the beginning not just to

have saved us the eighty minutes of tape but to not get bored so much. They bore. The film is

wrapped up in artistic pretensions that do not deserve any unfavorable criticism. Everything is well written: the

images, the crescendo in the fear, the final climax. History convinces visually, but thatwriting is

remarkable physicalnot supported by a script that truly attracts. He is wishing that the thing

concludes: to know what is behind the noises, the silences. And at the end, when we know, we agree with the

idea that it has not been worthwhile to mount so much artificial fire for such a final traca.Sin eminent to

disembowel that traca, mild, I say, the kind reader must, no However, dedicate those eighty minutes. You will be

bored sovereignly, you will feel that maybe in the end it is all a huge tease, believe that outside,

in the street, it is raining or sunny or cars make a symphony with the cl���xons or a blonde cal���n rides a

chicken because her boyfriend has just confessed that she is with another, more blonde and more ca���� .N All this can go

through your head, but you have to give it a chance, even if it's to accelerate with that sprint that thetake

protagonists, the couple suddenly awakened in their house, a huge, unusual house , incredible, that is, not

believable, by some sounds that end up taking them literally to absolute horror. Say that the directors have

made a quick inventory of clichés of the genre and have put them in a tourmix: the resulting shake is They

and has appreciable flavors, although the aftertaste final is ���spero, bland, poor. Ten minutes have passed andno longer

wehave the sweet tannins, the mouth flavored by so much ill-fated emotion.

" 0

" I would recommend it to you without any doubt for having the opportunity to see something different in movie theater and also

with an interesting message. It has become one of my movies of the year and I hope there are more ...

Watching movies like this one, you really realize why Clint Eastwood beats the battle to directors

like Martin Scorsese in the Oscar ceremony. Not only because he manages to make a wonderful film in

which the quality of both the script and the story , surpasses and even manages to get the actors' work,

however well done, to be overwhelmed by the plot and the mastery with which this film is directed.

But also because Clint Eastwood dares to delve into something very difficult that is fundamental in American life and

history such as pride and to criticize the search for h��� you do not play in something as cruel asis.

warFrom the beginning, the intentionality of the film is shown through the testimonies of the

people who were part of that famous photo of the raising of the flag American in the battle of

Iwo Jima, that for me is novel, since in the majority of the movies they release us an insulting moral in the

end that turns out to be almost a joke and that in the majority��� Those times could have been saved. Then

we can see, details that remind us a lot of the principle of Saving Private Ryan and being Mr.

Spielberg, one of the producers, I would not be surprised that some An advice or suggestion has been shown in the

film. But as important things, I emphasize above all the two main ones for which I recommend this

film: A magnificent address of Mr. Eastwood, not only for his plans of c��� mara, which is riskier.

But to come accompanied by an extraordinary photograph and a way of approaching a film in a

very different way from the ones we saw, observing habitually that there is a original view very much

appreciated. Each time, Mr. Clint Eastwood shows me his versatility when it comes to directing topics of diverse

nature and that he is becoming, if not already, one of my favorite directors. And above all a script that

confirms that the Paul Haggis-Clint Eastwood relationship is the most productive and surprising. Through

numerous flash-backs, they tell us the story of that frivolity, without losing even a second the rhythm of the

plot and without losing the thread of what is happening to the viewer. This, together with some great dialogues

that manage to make you go from laughter to crying from one scene to another, make the message of the film

arrive directly and without hesitation with scenes superfl���as that do not lead anywhere.If I have to add

some glue, it would be a poor music that sometimes does not accompany what is happening in

some scenes and a somewhat deficient use of the computer in some scenes of the battle in which it

is quite noticeable that the scenes are not real. And to finish, I recommend it to you. Sina without any doubt for

having the opportunity to see something different in movie theater and also with an interesting message. It has become

one of my films of the year and I hope there are more.

" 1

" Apocalypto is one of the best films that has left the 2006, and if you forgot the denimo to discuss with

its director, you will enjoy it as it deserves.

Tremendous politics I have with myself for this film, so I would not be surprised that this time the sticks

were very spread out. I have not seen "" La Pasi� " ��n of Christ "", and I think he never will. It's not forreasons

religious, it just bothered me at the time that Gibson turned marketing into a

phenomenon that nothing should have blockbuster. Even so, I am not interested in your point of view of the death of Christ and

I have as much right to avoid it as he who refuses to see "" The Bingueros "" of Pajares-Esteso. That's why I get

"" virgin "" to "" Apocalypto "", because that technique "" I count what I want and how I feel like it "" IGibson

've metin a movie " A movie that seems to me perfect in cinematography but that touches the co \*\*\* for its

constant inaccuracies. If you have been in Mexico you will know that the excursion Imprescindnm���s essential of the trip is the

city ​​of Chichen Itza, and that in its journey in bus a very nice guide will try to explain to you in record time

the history of the Mayan civilization. Mel Gibson has done the same thing that my guide did, but he has addedpissing

violence, savagery, anguish and a veryend. Even so, there is not a single minute of the film

that makes me take my eyes off the fantastic story that the director tells me through the misfortunes of

its protagonist, Jaguar, and that lasts about 2 hours and 10, that am��� flew by me. The argument I'll

tell you very simply: Jaguar Paw. This is our hero and his life, and I do not intend to advance

any of the argument at all because I have verified that the less you know the more surprising is each cast of the film. That's

right, through the eyes of Jaguar you are going to see a very small piece of an entire civilization and a culture, but

also a massacre, a slavery and a way of life that (Now the foll���n comes) Mel Gibson has shown in his

peculiar style, and maybe it is not the most correct. For that reason, let's divide the concept of the film between cinema and correction. n

historical As for the cinema, I do not have any buts: gui���ns���lido for its four sides, continuous action without

filler scenes, unknown actors that immerse you fully in a culture that seems m�� It's alive than ever,

breathtaking natural settings, impeccable costume re-creations and a final 40 minutes, to be

called "after the Jaguar" that added to my lifetime favorites. There are four key scenes on which rest

the rest of the footage, (populated, crossing, city and escape) and are so necessary that it is not possible to think that the

history extends of absurd form. Mel Gibson is undoubtedly an artifact that as a film

director is demonstrating that his technique goes in an upward direction - now, as a historian, he has won abeating

safe. we go with the historical correction. I do not doubt at all that Gibson has not been documented, it is more, itme

seems tothat he has soaked himself to the point of exhaustion; However, this is like newspapers today: each

one tells the same story from the point of view that suits you best. Gibson brazenly searches for thefactor

morbid-violentof what he is telling. Were the Mayas the way Mr. Gibson tells it? for it is true

that they committed sacrifices, but the director does not stage "" a "" sacrifice but a real orgia of cries,

prayers, blood and mutilation, ah�� � it's nothing. Although on the other hand, our hero is also Maya, and he is still

our hero; therefore, is not the typical story of good and bad within the same racial group? That

Gibson has gone through the bullfight the contributions made by the Mayans to all their future, sure that s� �� That

Gibson portrays this culture as if they were the canals of "" Las Colinas have Eyes "", too; but keep in

mind that Mel Gibson owes nothing to this town, and has told his film as he feels it. Recall

that in "" Mission Impossible II "" we placed the falleras next to a step of Holy Week. I know it is not the

same, but that way you can explain that an American director does not have to be faithful to the maximum with some ancestors

who ultimately do not care about anything. Attention final scene of the film. Cabreo reason for our

Mexican friends. We can comment on the post and thus not deflate anyone who wants to go to the cinema to

see it. If I have to get wet, I get wet: "" Apocalypto "" is one of the best films that 2006 has left, and if you

forgot the courage to argue with its director, you will Enjoy as you deserve.

" 1

" As a curious complement to the universe of manganime, there it remains. As a completely independent film, it

fails.

One of the sleeves that I enjoy the most recently, is 'Nana', and when I finish watching its film version in

flesh and blood, I can only say that I am alarmingly disappointed. The fact is that this "" movie "",

"" adaptation "" of the manga of the fabulous Ai Yazawa, has shown me that 'Nana' is only compatible with the universe

of the manganime, since when entering the cinema it fails miserably. or the universe of 'Nana' or those

responsible for the boring and incomplete script of the length that occupies us. Everything is quite mediocrillo: most

of the sequences are little more than "" anti-cinematographic "", with fixed sequences totally insipid

without music, where the assembly is disastrous, and the word TELEFILME appears everywhere. Only a couple of

counted sequences are saved from this, and they are the sequence of Ren's farewell on the train and the last song

of the Trapnest concert. of grief Not only are they characterized as fatal, but the casting

is quite inappropriate for an adaptation of a manga where there are plenty of apparentlymen and women

attractive and handsome. Ren and Shin, among others, ARE NOT NOR OF CO���A Ren and Shin. The Nana Osaki that appears

is the Coca-Cola Light of evil, and Nobu and Yasu completely lack the overflowing personality they enjoy

in the manga. And Junko and Kyosuke? ���ANDEANDAR���N! The only guys who give the hit are Nana Komatsu, Leila,

Sachiko and Sh���ji.���Ah! In what I know that nobody is saved is in the interpretations. All verytheater

schooland quite shabby, something as well as a role of cosplayers to act rather little.As adaptation,

regular. The essence 'Nana' is there, but it is very wasted, and has no sense of humor, as only

manga has. In addition, it is a victim of the newly-invented-for-a-server "" Alatriste syndrome "": it wants to cover so

many things (tomes), that history is it ends up getting out of hand, and it pretty much. ThatI

luckily'm reading the manga, that if not I think I would have learned a lot. I come to the same conclusions as

with the "" live action "" de 'Death Note': as a curious complement to the universe of manganime, there it is. As a

completely independent film, which is what I value in these cases, it fails. And finally to finish, as

the only one hundred percent outstanding element, the soundtrack.

" 0

" This excessive mixture of laughter, shame and disgust is no more than a surrealistic and insulting

carnival of blows, wild tests and bloody pranks that does not deserve to reach the billboards.

Grace is there, but it is so apparent that it does not sustain a feature film made up of pieces linked

with the only storyline of unconsciousness. The hardest thing is that its promoters are not: they know very well

that people will writhe in the chair while asking for m���sym���s, which gives an idea of the comparison with the

? bread and circus? of our ancient Romans so that the populace did not see further than their rulers

are interested to see. The leaders are some heartless producers of MTV, a television channel that has seen

the audience rise with a group of crazy people capable of doing anything. It is their religion, which leads them to

place a bloodsucker in their eye to suck the blood, tear teeth and vomit after. ���Vomit,

in short, that it is pretty disgusting! They pour money into their insane guinea pigs and leave them at

ease: what are you able to overcome with a wilder test? ? Well, you have They have no appreciation for

their skin, for their body. Something that comes from time back: I thought I would be lost by not having seen the first

part, but no. That yes, an unknown force seizes us once inside the room, since they

hook the stupidities, each one more absurd than the previous one. Perhaps one of the graces is in the dubbing of

Castilian: professionals strive to endow their voices with that tone tontorr���n sure they have in the

original version. Is it possible for a spectator to imitate the foolishness that takes place on thefor an hour and a half

screen? We suppose not, but we will not be censors of any form of stupid life. We recommend

spending a single euro on this dubious work shot camera in hand, with close ups and with the signature of

guys like Spike Jonze, as if this constituted any guarantee.

" 0

" There are many cinematic guides in a recapitulation that resembles a parody of the genre that at the same

time seems to want to apply a renovation on the same.

We listened to the request of one of our readers so that we could talk about The Fifth Element with a certain

apathy, because by the references we had until then Luc Besson's film was a product

"" deceptive "" and quite hackneyed in its approach. In other areas, emphasis is placed on its thematic wealth,

but they are the least, and now, after the viewing, we conclude that it has been one of the most profitable requests, and

we have to do justice to one of the films misunderstood by antonomasia in recent times. Based

on the assumption that we are facing a film straddling the science fiction And the pure and simple action, the

supposed thematic richness maybe would be better defined if we speak of many readings that converge in a

structure of tones articulated to perfection . (Thematic richness refers to isolated concepts, the

structure of tones affects more in the polychrome character of its global texture). One method (among other possible)

of elucidating if we are dealing with a good, mediocre or bad film for artistic purposes, is to check the

diversity of readings produced in the mind of each viewer, always and when the different

interpretations have at their base a verifiable physical content in the eyes of all the spectators. The more

diversity, the higher quality, unless there is some kind of incoherence in that internal structure, and this

incoherence does not depend on whether the issues are compatible or incompatible, but on whether they are valid in face to the

purpose pursued. The fifth element is spoken of as an object of entertainment, film of shots,

persecutions, blows and gossip in the service of Bruce Willis, actor who is here in his sauce m� Ques never.

There is talk of the jocular look that surrounds the story from beginning to end and also speaks of amessage

transcendentabout the current state of civilization. All these readings are as certain as thefluidity

visual and argumentalof the material is arranged and organized according to the aforementioned

thematic characteristics, and the important thing is that Besson achieves an effectiveness at all the proposed levels.

The most obvious result is a happy combination of science fiction, mythology and humor that walks with debauchery

from the first moments in which we see a group of archaeologists. �logos in a temple and the spacecraft that

descends, with the subsequent parade of aliens. He is often criticized for that plémbeo and jocular tone that

predominates in the narrative pulse, but since the first scenes the work reveals his intention to be a

delirious and sardonic look at a g Yanero and its common places. It is not a defect of the film, but an

attribute exhibited with such efficiency that it becomes the authentic spirit of the work, its differential feature of

other similar products and the one that grants it the singularity. From a global perspective, the film is a

representation of a universe with its own identity and uniqueness that ironically combines elements ofuniverses

cinéphilouslike the original trilogy Star wars, Blade Runner, Star Trek or other products whose location is

near the cmic ms or-called "" z number "" therefore beenin many places tics casposo cinema

they serve as a springboard to introduce - with coherence and sense of whole - characters that grate in the

grotesque, as, for example, the one played by Gary Oldman or the histri���nica and irritating participation of the

transvestite color. There are many cinematic guides in a recapitulation that resembles a parody of the genre

that at the same time seems to want to apply a renovation on it. ��� then, as a film of action-

humor, a medical object not lacking in ingenuity whose sarcasm constitutes the main attraction since it configures

a script dotted with di� Pointing tongues, sometimes, even, of bitter irony. In the visual section,stand out

the Moebius designsand an exuberant and exuberant futurism of colors and forms, a scenario in perfect

agreement with the tonalities of the story: myth, irony, humor ���cido and parody unhealthy. Therefore, the

integration of the stage with the story is another of its virtues, of how the plastic resources and thecontent

dramaticform a whole for a g cruce junction. Irreverent and dynamic genres. To the narrate with fluidity and great

rhythm a very simple story (attention also to the use of montage, superb) about a savior of the world and

an anonymous savior who discover, fight and end up falling in love, we can add the success of usingtone

humorousto offer a critical view of human society, the triviality that we face and the

chaos that governs us when the machinery of the universe plays against us. What is called a

ridicule of the human system and its myths is not devoid of certain bitterness, as we see in the scene of the

protagonist woman contemplating photographs of war and death, and the expression of pain in his face, we reach

the end and discover that the sardonic smile and despiporre hide a tear in the future.

" 1

" Essential documentary about the sanitary system of the powerful country of the planet. I am sure that the

president of the government will show him the next time he is told that social security works badly in

Spain.

This Michael Moore that comes out on the poster I suppose is the twin brother we know. Either the Mr.

"" fotoch��� "" has had overtime in the office, I do not know. Look, I like the work of this guy. And look,

I liked the documentary, man. Although I've been hit by things like the fat Americans (I'm

still impressed), that trip to Cuba (which in other times would have burned his compatriots at the stake)

that distills Castro's propaganda, and that distorted vision of the countries that show us. But come on, nothing

serious. The documentary is about the US health system. Start by giving a view of people who

do not have health insurance to move on to what they do have. It gives us a review of the whole system, and compares it with

those of other countries, such as France. Great Britain, Canada or Cuba, exposing a terrible reality in

the powerful country of the world. You can die at the door of the hospital, and they can even take you to die

outside of one of these, as you do not have money. Terrible. I am overwhelmed after these two hours with the increasingly

fierce Moore. Overwhelmed and outraged by the images I've seen. It is true that Michael plays a lot

with the feelings of the viewer, getting into the skin of cases, perhaps extreme, of people with

limiting situations. And what? If you want to make a documentary that stalls people, you have to make what they

see, feel involved, touch the fiber and boil with rage (maybe I've passed, but it was very

Braveheart). As was done here with the traffic campaigns. In the same way. Resuming, essential

documentary about the sanitary system of the powerful country of the planet. I am sure that the president of the

government will show him the next time he is told that social security works badly in Spain. Try some

problems that makes me scream with my breast covered with pride, ���Viva Espa���a (and all yourentities

national, eye) !! Uff, for empathy, the baby 18 months has made me cry like a magdalena.Besitos.PD:

I have to stop writing reviews in the half hour after seeing the movies, that I grow up. Not as much as

Michael Moore, who would look like the Hulk trashing the clothes, hahaha.PD2: The last cake has a comment on

a guy from a website that is worth the documentary s�� I'll see it. In my opinion.

" 1

" ���A movie about the new life of Fidel Castro in Miami? What laziness! It was the first thing I thought, although

sometimes, even the most absurd, interesting conclusions are drawn.

Castro is sick. That's what they say from their government in Havana. The truth is that it has disappeared and

That is the news they have announced to buy time and prepare the transition another president. Starting

from that premise, which may well be true, we come to some approaches, these are very far fromConfessed

reality.my initial reluctance I have to tell you that it was not so much. I endured it and not only that, as

I also, at times, entertained myself, although I did not become an adept at the proposal.

Muchof this rests with the surreal, impossible situations to reproduce if not using a good

actor, squeezing a crazy Guin and gives mettle, because this drama telling the rafter

from m I'm illustrious of them, he has a crumb. Juan Luis Galiardo seems to me one of the greatinterpreters

living, but sometimes he makes me too drunk by confusing person with character. The gaditano enjoys my sympathy

but this is not enough because sometimes I do not see anything else on the screen than to him (despite his good

characterization), so that the vaiv���n of the plots is grateful, that they splash to other personages, like the one

interpreted by the boy, a met���dico actor who already was son in the fiction of Catherine Zeta -Jones and Antonio

Banderas in the second installment of the adventures of El Zorro. From the comic story, from the gui���o to the supposed

actuality, one passes to the cinema with social conscience. The adventure of the new Fidel helps us to know other

Cubas and other Cubans forced to (over) live off the island. It is here where we give free rein to our

interest in the possibility of seeing what the Castro regime has generated outside its demarcations. It is true

that there is a veiled and hispanic veil It alters the reality, but from the irony and the farce also the political

debate can be posed. Credibility is another issue to be discussed that we leave to you. A note

to finish: I had the opportunity to see her at the Málaga Festival, free; this leads me to think

objectively using the rule of 6 euros per entry so, with total security, I would rethink this

review.

" 0

" Polish-Japanese production film, cult and essential for any geek who boasts. It reissues in special edition (Two discs) the AVALON métis. A film by the genius Mamoru Oshii who with his

animated masterpiece "" Ghost in the Shell "" inspired many filmmakers including the Wachowski Brothers in his

Matrix trilogy (In fact there are sequences copied flat by plane from Ghost in the Shell and Larry Wachoski has

declared publicly on several occasions that Mamoru is a pioneer of new styles that inspires him).

Performed by Polaca Malgorzata Foremniak, who wears a look that reminds us of the legendary lieutenant

Kusanage, tells the story of Ash, the best player in a clandestine virtual reality game called

Avalon. In a future society, diminished and apocalyptic, this game becomes practically a drug for

those who wear it. The aesthetics of the film is derived towards animation. Mamoru applies anime scrolls to

wrap us in a haze in which we stop having the perspective of whether it really is a film or an animation

and why not, a videogame. The pace is slow, maybe excessive in some sequences. Avalon was selected at

the 2001 Cannes Film Festival, awarded "Best Film" at the Durban International Film Festival, the London

Sci-Fi Film Festival and Sitges - Catalonian International Film Festival where also won the prize for the

Best Cinematography. In its Special Edition, Avalon is presented in 2 albums in which we can find

extra material such as: " "Quotations by Mamoru Oshii" ", Making off, Special Effects, Documentary about thecinema

director'sand a photo gallery. Polish-Japanese production film, cult and essential for any

self-respecting freak. Mamoru Oshii, is currently immersed in the film of the mysterious The Sky

Crawlers, of which very little is known except that its premiere is planned in Japan for April 28, 2008

(In Spanish). At best, we do not smell it).

" 1

" Good evening, I am Johnny CashFloja the rope on which the film is only supported by the great performances of its

main characters and a music that I personally love. The biopic are fashionable and if they

tell the life of legends of music much more, they sweep at the box office and especially in prizes, the past year

was Ray Charles who I flood our screens with good jazz and we also had our own in Spain with

Camar���n. Now it's up to Cash to make us enjoy the best country. Undoubtedly, the best part of the film

is the protagonist day, Joaquin Phoenix, splendid as Johnny Cash and Reese Witherspoon who brings to his

character, June Carter, a special sweetness (the Oscar is his) . There is a brutal chemistry between the two on the

screen that adds points to the film in front of a clumsy and typical narrative with a perfectlyguide

structuredto move and thrill with the rise to fame and subsequent descent into the hell of drugs and

with the final redemption thanks to the help of his beloved. But the film perfectly fulfills and has a good

dose of entertainment, such as concerts with Elvis Presley, Carl Perkins, Roy Orbinson, Jerry Lee Lewis?

No doubt an entertaining film but insufficient tribute to the troubadour of the losers, withsound

its ownbetween the sad and melancholy sound of country, the rebelliousness of rock and the emotion of folk, an

authentic legend of American popular culture. But it could always be worse. "You dress in black because you did not

have anything else to wear, your music is like that by chance, and the kiss you were going to give me was inadvertently.

From time to time you would have to attribute some "".

" 0

" Delicious piece of real life, portrait with jealousies, quarrels and grudges to the surface Does not disappoint Almod���var with this exercise of cinema in its purest form, a costumbrista, vibrant and concise story,

in which the humor overflows , and that speaks of death. Leave the list high, recovering a tone that

impregnated characteristic titles of its first stage, leaving the self-evident What have I done to

deserve this ?, in particular to the mother who comes to solve pending issues, and to the acid humor of Entre dusk. The

plans of Almod���var, studied in a thousand ���metro, usually live paintings. Rarely a plane

concentrates as much as the first, with all the village women in the cemetery, tidying the graves for

the day of the deceased. The costumes of the protagonist sisters anticipate the colorful andaccent

luminousthat will dominate all the footage, always full of eternal symbols in her filmography (motherhood,

hospitals, neighbor, etc.). ) and a new one, like the table stretcher. It gives us a choir made up of six

strong characters. Through them he draws the women he remembers of his childhood in La Mancha, but

far from proposing a faithful reflection, he assimilates and refuses them, introducing them in a round story, surprising

for his portentous turns. Enti���ndase this note as the opposite of the ravings that made him err in

Bad education. It shows his female characters in all their intensity although somewhat idealized, hence

the superb interpretation. Den from Pen���lope Cruz. Her role is the backbone although she puts a lot of her

part, leaving behind her best work so far, that of Do not move. Aware that the Spanish

marujas have some fringe or pejorative connotation, Almod���var has turned Cruz into an Italian casalinga,

a housewife with character and glamor, a mixture between the racial beauty of Sophia Loren and the athletic bearing of

Silvana Mangano.They accompany her on her trips from town to town - and vice versa - a nearby, and distant at the same

time, Lola Due���as, Chus Lampreave used to the maximum and a correct Yo Yohana Cobo who does not love herself before

so much portent together? Her presence in surreal situations serves as an anchor to the side ���s earthly

Almod���var-. We will get tired of hearing that Blanca Portillo, "" that cinematographic animal "", is the great discovery

of Almod���var for the big screen. The truth is that her contribution to the career of the actress is similar to the one

she made in her day to that of Leonor Watling with Hable con ella (and Alejandro Amen���bar to that of Due� Conas on the grounds of

Sea inside). And it is nothing other than propping up, with great skill, the return to celluloid of an actress whoalready

wasgreat in television and cinema (let's not forget El perro del hortelano and El color de las nubes) and, above all,

enormous in theater. Manchego is reunited with everyday situations but taken to aend

very funny and histrionic. Account for it with one of his muses, with which he made his first six films.

The fruitful and grateful work of Carmen Maura gives a special dimension, leaving an anecdote (or

surreal dream, depending on how you look at it) an interpretation n that in the hands of another actress would have been somewhat

risky.Bajo a first appearance of F���bula, Back is a delicious piece of real life, a portrait with envy,

quarrels between sisters, resentments to the surface, mourning , mobile phones, shoes and rebequitas, many

rebequitas. A guide to traditional Spain, to the neighborhood and to the town where most ofhave grown up

us.

" 1

" Hitchcock takes me where he wants, as he wants and when he wants, a real lesson in how to create a

magnificent horror movie.

There are films that are in themselves and a myth of the cinema, although there are people who insist on taking sequels and

remakes. Psychosis is a myth of cinema with a beginning and ending, masterfully made by Alfred

Hitchcock, although as I said some try to get money for the genius of another showing their

lack of ideas. I had the pleasure of seeing it for the first time this summer and it was surprising, to the films with

too much fame and with a lot of recognition I usually have some reluctance when it comes to watching them and I create

many expectations regarding the film with which I can I ended up disappointed, with Psychosis it did not happen, I was spellbound

looking at the screen throughout the entire length of the film. Hitchcock takes me to where he wants, as he wants and

when he wants, an authentic lesson of how to create a magnificent horror film without having to show anything

explicit just insinuating. A gui�� It's perfect with a soundtrack that perfectly accompanies the film

creating a magnificent climax. It's great from the beginning, with the McGuffin of money theft, with the arrival

at the motel and until the end. With the mythical Norman Bates (magnificently played by Anthony Perkins) and that

mysterious motel with that terrifying house in the background, an argument that has been copied ad nauseam or maybe

it is not that it has been copied if not that Psycho is the perfection of suspense cinema, it has everything. With

mythical scenes such as the shower, which did not surprise me due to the numerous times they have put on

television, a real bitch. I can say little more about this film that has not been said, a reference

in the cinema of psychopaths, an authentic masterpiece of indispensable viewing.

" 1

" After all, American Gangster is a mirror that reflects the turbulent and

distorted vision of the much vaunted American dream.

After the ill-fated Kingdom of Heaven, and the sentimental One Good Year, American Gangster arrives, which for

many is the last chance for a Ridley Scott who has been stumbling for many years. . In between,

a new edition of Blade Runner, which clearly seems the definitive one, at least until a few years

later. It must be said that American Gangster promises that, despite from sounding to something already known

by the viewer. It is not the first time that police corruption in a bigis portrayed on the big screen

city ​​like New York in the 1970s, nor the rise of drugs, nor less so rise and fall of a

gangster. But despite this, Ridley Scott manages to weave an intense and full of emotion thatcaptures

completelythe viewer. The film advances at a good pace, Scott does not recreate himself in the narrative, and the best proof of

it is that he does not become heavy or boring despite his long footage. The British filmmaker offers not only the

portrait of a gangster full of charisma (exceptional Denzel Washington) and the policeman who persecutes him (no

less brilliant Russell Crowe), but shows the At the same time, the convulsions that hit an entire country:

poverty, misery, corruption, the war in Vietnam, a deep disenchantment that arose among the population,

all seasoned by the boom in the sale of drugs. After all, American Gangster is a mirror

that reflects the turbid and distorted vision of the much vaunted American dream. And it is that in the

land of opportunities also misery abounds, and nothing grows better between misery like crime and

corruption.

" 1

" It seems that the director has been halfway between a personal film and a commercial one

without pretensions.

With great enthusiasm, he went to see The Crimes of Oxford, with the illusion of an admirer of Alex de La Iglesia,

one of the most talented directors of this Country; first of all a great cin���filo as they demonstrate it some of the

sequences "" hitchcocknianas "" of its more acclaimed tapes. It is a pity that, in the film that binds us, the orondo

director has been very far from The Day of the Beast or of the Community. And is that in this film fails

almost everything. The casting failed miserably. No one believes the couple "" Frodo "" - Watling. Really the one who fails is

the American actor, with a role that fits him big (and I do not mean the size of Elijah) and that would

squeak by the much more suitable John Hurt. Alex's obsession with shooting on the basis of close-ups fails to

turn the film into one of those "" and I will see it when they give it on television "". The plot fails. It gives the impression that

the director has been halfway between a personal film and a commercial one without pretensions, where

the resolution of some points is precipitate and where alternate scenes placed with shoehorn (some of

the sequences of bed are even absurd) with others interpreted without any conviction on the part of the

actors. Only some shots of his own style - the false sequence shot and the concert scene that

reminds us of The Man Who Knew Too Much (Alfred Hitchcock's The Who Who Knew Too Much, 1956) - and the music, very

similar to what Bernard Herrmann did, save the tape to qualify as mediocre and not poor.

" 0

" Thriller more than political criticism, although in the end the impression is that of having attended andrama

existential, a melodrama of classic dyes , Shakespeareans, Greeks, immortals and universals.

The bad part of the distrust is that it has no restraint: once it has been set in motion, it is impossible to stop its

vertigo, its voracious inquina, its slow death. Something like this happens in this film. The socialist dictatorship of the now

defunct Democratic Republic of Germany lived 40 gray years of mistrust, of microphones hidden in the

outlets and reconverted bureaucrats in sp���as. The Stasi, a makeshift KGB behind the ruins of World

War II, became a relentless surveillance instrument. The number of suicides at that time was very

high: so much so that the administrative hierarchy prohibited the publication of these statistics.Florian Henckel von

Donnersmarck writes without getting too involved: he warns me more about not losing the thread of thriller of the

film than to witness a political criticism. His story, admirable, touching, is the story of every

soldier at some point in the contest: the sentimentality towards the other, the fragility of his doctrinaire and the

awareness of the conflicting nature of his adversary. The vigilante understands the futility of his

vigilance, but the journey from harassment to redemption destroys homes and ruins the future of a

country. I am not an enthusiast of the film: perhaps it has been sold with an excess of fanfare. I understand that

the Oscar to my amanda took the labyrinth of the faun. Being both dramatic films with a political background, the

German raises a higher number of readings and makes a more sober use of the material cinematographic When

Del Toro is baroque and visually triumphalist, Henckel von Donnersmarck needs only a surprisinglyguide

precise, which does not adopt unexpected twists at any moment and treats with such care and elegance such aproblem

huge: the kidnapping of the freedom of a people, the censorship as the only notary of the present, the fear as a

routine to face the unbearable vertigo of decadence. And the Art, Beauty, the word raised to its

most beautiful altar, it plans on the lives of all the characters. The playwright with a socialist conscience, but

disgusted with the barbarism of the regime, the actress with whom he lives, an icon of rebellion, suspected of fomenting with his

self-assured and meddlesome self-confidence the sympathies of the undecided or the ignorant, and (above all) the agent of

the Stasi, the soldier in charge of watching over the lives of others and ending, like a reverseSyndrome

Stockholm, ingratiating with the cause of others, indelibly disarmed of his hatred and manumitted of all forms of

violence. That is, poetized. The end of the film is very beautiful. They understand in detail the issues that the

film is posing. And one of the movies comes out with a huge weight in the conscience and the tranquility that

Art, beauty, Love or whatever we want to call it triumphs over ideas. These counted here, the history of

the GDR, are not excessively different from those lived in our Spain of the postwar period. That also occupied me

in my reflections. And it rained when leaving the cinema.

" 1

" One of the great movies of the year, which plays with us with impunity while we

watch the show, and as Caine says throughout the movie ���cula, "" in the end what we really like

is that they cheat us "", and the best way to do it is to watch this movie.

We just started the year and we already have one of the films in theaters that, at the end of the year, and if my

memory allows me, I ended up taking my top ten best movies. years of the year. The Prestige, here called

disastrously with the name of The Final Trick (The Prestige), is the little game that Christopher Nolanus

givesbefore embarking again on the adventures of the Lord of the Night. For this risky film, Nolan

adapts a novel by Christopher Priest in which the rivalry of two magicians is told, that by vicissitudes of

life, they go from being two friends to face each other so fiercely by the public as for his own life.

Explaining any part of the plot of this film can be very difficult without managing to eviscerate veryparts

importantof the film, making it lose all its charm, as if it really It will be a good

show of magic in which we attend to little ones as the magician plays with us until in the end he leaves us

with his mouth open thinking for ourselves how he could have done that in front of our own

noses . This magician is none other than his director, who, as he explains in the film, presents us with a great trick

of global magic, in which, after having introduced us to the characters, he tells us a story that It

serves as a deception for finally and with a much more elaborate twist than any of these movies thatto us

comefrom Hollywood with the typical little sign of surprising ending and that is let guess already towards the middle of the

film, tell us an ending that mentally reviews the recesses of the film to see how the whole

film was really braided to surprise us. From the first image of the film, with no apparent relation

to the rest until we realize that it is something important there for half of the film, until that end

in which Nolan clearly searches, like that its protagonists, the prestige of having managed to play with

us for about 2 hours and be able to succeed with such a difficult "" trick "". At the beginning the narrative can

be a little messy, since it uses a narrative style that vaguely reminded me of another great work of yours,

Memento, and without reaching the level of it, if you perform constant jumps backwards. Go ahead in time,

which serves to hook more if possible to the viewer, who waits anxiously for another piece of the puzzle to

try to complete the puzzle that makes up the film as a whole. As for the actors in the

film, I do not think I've gotten better with the choice of Christian Bale and Hugh Jackman to play

the two rival magicians. Bale little by little is revealed as an actor to be taken into account, both for its

quality in the latest performances made, as for getting fill the screen and overshadow his

partner, a Hugh Jackman in a state of grace that chains a good film after another, and that time to

time, we find two of the actors with the best projection from here to a not too distant future. As

secondary, Scarlett Johansson, in a role too corseted (in all aspects,has seen the

whoeverfilm will understand me?), And forgive me the easy word game because of her costumes in the film,

but removing a scene in which she appears tipazo (and often tipazo.), her role could have been interpreted

by any other actress, since Like his character in the movie, he's just in the film to

help the two magicians in the realization of that great final trick we're all waiting for. .

Michael Caine as always, huge, very successful his role and his interpretation, something that also happens to an

unrecognizable at first sight David Bowie (his eyes give him away?), Very restrained in his role of scientist Nikola

Tesla, and an important part in the development of the plot, with which the film comes to take in some moments

a turn towards science fiction cinema that can reach dislodge the viewer, not expecting an

incursion in that genre at the root of the story that is telling us. In short, and as I said at the beginning ,

undoubtedly one of the great films of the year, that plays with us with impunity while we

watch the show, and as Caine says throughout the movie ���cula, "" in the end what we really like

is that they cheat us "", and the best way to do it is to watch this movie.

" 1

" Greengrass has managed to create a jewel of cinema from a human tragedy and has given usninety

wonderful and anguishingminutes while being culminated by a quarter of an hour in which it is

impossible to contain the emotion .

It took a lot of courage to address such recent and traumatic events for a country as the

September 11 attacks on the United States. That's why Paul Greengrass deserved applause for carrying

out "" United 93 "". But it is also that he has given us a film of which few are made. If you do not know what

happened on September 11, 2001 in the USA, do not continue reading this article. because it contains certain tell-tale details

. If you already know it, surely I would not need to remind you that United 93 was the plane that day,

while New York suffered the attacks on the Twin Towers, it crashed. �� in Pennsylvania after being kidnapped by

terrorists. It is not necessary to say it but respect for the victims and their families was, obviously,

an indispensable condition for anyone to let them direct this film. �cula. In that sense the gui��� and the

direction of Greengrass are exemplary. But it is also that he has not incurred the stereotypes that I

thought he was going to incur regarding the figure of terrorists, which are here portrayed fairly

objectively. What they did was a brutal crime with no possible excuse and the fact that apparentlypeople

normalcan commit such atrocity is much more terrible than if we portray them as evil,

scarred and unfriendly. In order to make history much more real and believable, the style of the

film deliberately recalls documentary film. It also helps to get into the movie the use of

almost unknown actors, arriving in fact to use authentic flight controllers for some scenes.

Despite this we can not forget that it is a fiction film and its fidelity to the facts should not be

what our opinion about it decided. And considering that we may never know

exactly what happened that day. The film is divided into two distinct parts. In the first one

we witness the gestation of the tragedy: the terrorists starting the trip to the airport, the

preparations of the plane crew, the control tower, the aerial surveillance centers ? In short,

all those who played an active or passive role in the fatigued day. The second part is alreadyfocused

definitelyon what happened inside the flight 93: the hijacking of the aircraft and theconviction

progressiveof the passengers that the only possible way out was to fight against the terrorists. ���Documentary style

? Almost unknown actors? ���Two well differentiated parts? ��� Scenes with authentictraffic controllers

air? Counted so maybe many do not sound very attractive but? the rhythm is so frenetic, so alive, that

there is room for boredom. From the beginning the spectator attends the events. More

? In spite of knowing in advance the outcome of the story, it even has the hope that something happens that

avoids it (sensation - that only the great films can transmit). But If a worddefines

perfectlymy experience watching the film, that word is anguish. It had been a long time since I got into such

a movie and was having such an anguished time inside. Paul Greengrass has managed to create a

jewel of cinema from a human tragedy and has given us wonderful and anguishing ninety minutes

while being culminated by a quarter of an hour in which it is impossible to contain the emotion. Only doubt

about the punctuation of this film is to see how it is treated by the passage of time and of future generations to

whom the narrated tragedy is far away. It will be in a few years when it can be decided with greater

objectivity if "" United 93� ?? it is or not a masterpiece. What I have no doubt is that we are

facing one of the best films of the year.

" 1

" Robert Altman, in Pret a porter, does not do Cinema: he makes a film where Sof���a Loren, Julia Roberts,

Kim Basinger, Marcello Mastroianni, Tim Robbins or Stephen Rea and a celestial cohort come out of mannequins of weight

shine palmito.

Now that El Diablo de Prada is announced at the bus stops, with his homicidal heel, with itsappeal

clean beauty of perfect, I have seen again Pret a porter, the Robert Altman film that is

leaning faraway for the world of fashion portrayed in the movie of Meryl Streep so (forgive the redundancy) fashionable.

I was not dazzled by her day and the review last night remach��� the little querencia that sends my memory to this

film. Very true that Robert Altman is a director of height that has given remarkable films, Mash, Three Women,

The Player, Cookie's Fortune and, above all, Vidas crusades, but here has skated in excess, although

it has been surrounded by the cream of the world of the catwalk and has portrayed vigorously and with a certain excellence of

style its skullduggery and its pettiness, its power and its glory. What Pret a porter does not have is gui���n. It is not seen

anywhere, and that is a huge sin for a movie. It is a huge sin that a simple conversation of

neighbors on a staircase lacks gui���n. The gui���n is the meat that makes the skeleton not fall to the ground.

The gui���n, in the phonetic narrative, is the absolute referent. One can find portentous frames, a

sublime photograph, some interpretations that touch perfection, but if nothing is said, the attention is

lost, and then we do not attend a movie. �cula round but to some more or less well-locked images that

consent that they can, in certain circumstances, be named with the generic name of Cine.Robert Altman, in

Pret a porter, no does (well) Cinema: makes a film where Sof���a Loren, Julia Roberts, Kim Basinger,

Marcello Mastroianni, Tim Robbins or Stephen Rea come out and where a celestial cohort of weight mannequins shine palmito

and rub shoulders with actors of relumbr���n. Under this costly suit, there are huge holes: they are so large that

some overlap others and form larger gaps so that for a lot of footage what we see is a páramo,

a wasteland, a lunar landscape in the that a director with absolute competence and well-deserved prestige

balances accounts that we do not know with the fashion world. In the end, it frivolizes him,him, heels him

ignorestowards the limits of stupidity. Pret a porter is amoral and is acid because something has to be or because the

talent behind it s must be evidenced in some distinctly intellectual trait. The poetry poetry ofLives

Crossed(Short cuts in its original English) is dismembered in Pret to porter in a rhymes of drunkenness that

four friends with certain literary baggage compose to entertain the way of return to house. Everything in

Crossed Lives tasted like fresh air, a very interesting novelty, Pret a porter is boredom. He can not entertain

a film where nothing happens or where very little happens: besides, what happens is relatively interesting.

Altman would have liked the film to flow through the police track that begins the scene in which The

union representative of fashion in Par���sya dies, the character of Mastroianni, in���nito, attends, but he ignores

all the material of the police cinema and enters, almost violently, into the field of comedy abrasive and

bubbly, giving way to a whirlwind of banalities that do not fill the appetite of the kind spectator, unless you

have seen lately little cinema or unless it is a voracious devourer of sophisticated, hollow andartifacts.

forgettableAmerican Syd Field, recognized authority among the authors of script writing manuals

, establishes standards for its writing: each page of a script is equivalent to one minute ofprojection

screen. I do not imagine that Pret a porter had 130 pages in its gui���n. Not much less. There is some dazzling,

that's it: that beginning in which Altman showed us a showcase of incredible brands and tall fashion,

but we're not in Par��� s, nor in Nice. It's Moscow. Robert Altman, old man, complainer, with that look of old bad-

temper that still treasures, talent and ingenuity to fall in love with new generations and deserve the applause

of those who already had him. an in esteem did not hit the key, slipped: retrat��� a world difficult to retractable,

despite the flashes, the flashes are your daily pass.I imagine a Blake Edwards of his good � Time on board of

this assignment. 80 pages of script would be enough, that is, not an hour and a half of movies, but IBlake Edwards

loveand I see it more incisive, much less unorthodox than Altman, concerned too much not to please

many to please very much a few. The loyal ones Those who love the pill. I slept inLives

Cross. And that argument had three hours of pages.

" 0

" The tape, another pot feeder, by Jean-Christophe Grang���, tries to peck from different genres withoutsuccess

any, from the intrigue films, to the serial killers, and even with the western ...

I've been watching this movie for a couple of days, the first day, the schedule did not suit myshifts

work, and the sessions started very early or they finished very late, finally today I have taken a hole in

my busy schedule and I have been able to view it, and my opinion can not be more unfavorable. When I saw the trailer it was

late in recognizing Monica Bellucci, removing her electrifying femininity embedded in typically male clothes,

leaving out that brutal Sex-appleal that she has on screen, and turning her almost into a heroine of action,

pretty silly thing , on the other hand, since the moans that stick during a good part of the footage are closer to

an X actress who e to a heroine of action cinema.The tape, another pot feeder, by Jean-Christophe

Grang���, author among others of "" The rivers of purple color "" (whose first part is masterful and whose second is too

reminiscent of "" The Da Vinci Code "") and "" Pacto de Lobos "" The worst tape of Jean Reno, where he goes there,

tries to peck of different genres without any success, from the cinema of intrigue, passing through serial killers

, and even with the western.With a plot as mysterious as these fast-seller best-seller Theyyou

hookin your reading and disappoint you in your final resolution, however much the Catherine Devenue's

attempt to give an air of mystery to your role. The tape is liosa, with that plot that opens in several directions

and it slammed shut without caring for the least, and that they do not skimp on blood or show usbodies

spectacular, but at last to a fraud, painful and badly built. A Bluff that comes to the screen and

that will go through more grief than glory.

" 0

" Of ragged narration, with a multitude of black holes and incoherencies of gui���n, we try to

strain it by distorting reality and continuously mixing flashbacks with actuality.

Definitely, the Saw saga has come to an end. Not to its end as a franchise, since Lions Gate looks like the

goose that lays the golden eggs with Jigsaw, and while it lasts they will take advantage of the pull that Saw V and Sawhave to make

VI. I say it's over for its gui���n, bill, history and quality. You can not stretch more a saga when it does not

give more than yes. If already with the third part the level dropped considerably, now this fourth there is no where to take

it. First, that incoherent narrative through flashbacks, mixing past and present.,

Mr. Lynn Bousman, with all my respect you are not (nor will it be at this rate) I� ��arritu in Amores Perros or 21 grams,

and not much less Nolan in Memento or Tarantino in Pulp Fiction; then do not try it please, leave that to the real

professionals. Of ragged narration, with a multitude of black holes and incoherencies of

gui���n, he tries to filter us by distorting reality and continuously mixing flashbacks with actuality. To

all this we add the (im) predictable plot turn of the end-typical in the saga-and we have a garbage in

full. Is it that you do not realize that the twist of gui���n was more than exhausted in the first part and if youme

hurryin the second? Well no, it seems that they do not understand it. And to top it off, of the 83 -interminables-minutes that

last by removing final credits, 10 minutes correspond to scenes from previous deliveries,

which reflects the lack of ideas by the team and the need to fill in footage withflashbacks

unnecessarythat the only thing they do is mess up the viewer. For the fans of the casquer���ay and the gore, among whom

I am without a doubt, I only highlight the scene of the autopsy to Jigsaw with great detail and a

unique "" test "". The only thing that made it really interesting (the evidence) has lost its originality and grace.

A pity, undoubtedly the worst in the saga, hand in hand with the 3. Finally, the phrase alive or dead,

you decide ends up getting tired when you hear it 20 times. Renew or die, never better said.

" 0

" A practically perfect film that travels half human conscience to give us a faithful and cruel portrait

of people, be they from China, Japan, America or any other country .

An impeccable sequence of scenes with no apparent connection opens the new film by the charismatic Taiwanese director

Ang Lee. With a title simply perfect and a minimalist atmosphere that bombastic, Desire,

danger is a mixture between the absolute neatness and the perfectionism worthy of the classic cinema of esp��� and a rude

but elegantly hidden poem of murky love between two opposite sides that come together, and not by fate.

After several and varied films without any resemblance, Lee gives us a majestic exercise of suspense to the

Hitchcock and one of the most stifling love relationships seen in recent years, with a flow (that does not

speed) narration that finishes dazzling us with an antol���gico end. This is a tragedy about the limits

of love, of violence as something purely pathetic and of two people who end up defining themselves in

unsuspected limits. The story, which could well be placed at any other time and place, is a meticulous and

slow journey through insecurity and coldness, of two opposing points that collide and can not be

separated. with a simple adi���s. Undoubtedly, some similarities we can find with the previous and also

splendid Brokeback Mountain, like that forbidden and so desired love that nevertheless is dangerous. Yes,

referring only to this topic, it is possible that they are two films that are practically identical, but

Deseo, danger goes further. �� of the human personality and explores something like evil in a shocking way. It is

a film of contained emotions, that does not resort to musical elements extravagantly lachrymoses to

show us hard images. So, it is a sincere film, endowed with perfectionism (its aesthetic is

unbeatable) and that resorts, on a couple of occasions, to the cinema of the aforementioned master of suspense. We are

facing a masterpiece that is closer to classical American cinema than to Asiatic. It is more, if we

changed the language and the country we would be before a film purely to the North American style. And this

is not a bad thing, on the contrary: Ang Lee has had enough courage to develop it in a place

other than the one that is used to shooting and that results in one of the greatest achievements of the year. ��or past.

Although perhaps its disproportionate duration (more than two and a half hours) does not allow it to reach pure perfection,

but that, probably, is asking for a lot. Both Tony Leung and Wei Tang (both protagonists) are

splendid, giving us two of the best performances of the last few years, absolutely believable. and very

human, in spite of my difficulty in understanding its contained form of acting, which does not mean that it is, far from it

, despicable. A film that acts as a spy within a poem of tragic love, which is camouflaged

between the apparent simplicity and minimalism to finally be uncovered and discovered as something

terribly great. Its slow pace allows us to look at a sublime photograph of Rodrigo Prieto and

the musical pieces of the always impeccable Alexandre Desplat, for not forgetting a gui���n that stands out for its

elegance and precision. , although it is so extremely dramatic in its last two scenes (masterful theshot

final). Ang Lee has undressed (pun intended) as never before, leaving a film

virtually perfect that runs half human consciousness to give us a faithful and cruel portrait of

people, be they from China, Japan, America or any other country. Undoubtedly, an incredibly universal film,

deeply dramatic.

" 1

" Being a trite story, with inexpressive actors and badly planned situations, the tape can be

entertaining.

When the film starts, one already has slight suspicions about where the shots can go. By means

of this introduction, banal by the insubstantial, it remains that if patent the tone of what comes to us, a

new example of easy film framed in the genre of adolescent terror . Few dare to

introduce changes when they consider that a formula works: you change the scenario, you substitute one character

for another, but you leave the disturbing atmosphere and the scares, shouts and races because of a psych� ��path with

criminal instincts. Here there is not a gas station in the middle of an inhospitable district or a college, but a

luxurious mansion lost in the mountains; in front of the group of young people with type characters (posh, stretched,

athletes, intellectuals.) a young woman imposes herself with courage and determination - lack is done to sustain the

film - that must save the life of the children he cares for. In short, they are the same patterns, used

up to the point of satiety but, in addition to the producers, they then work out at the box office. Everything has its explanation and the one

that justifies the interest of Hollywood is in the young people who live in stories of suspense accompanied by a good

package of popcorn and The boyfriend or girlfriend was very close. A terror title was also not enough on the

phone, in this case mobile, to announce the death of his protagonists. Missed call, which is called the

referent, plays with the same elements but reserves the surprise card, something that in When acalls

strangerit dilutes as soon as the girl takes the inal��� Mbrico two or three times. By the way, has thebeen mentioned already

repetitive tone? On the other side of the line there is a murderer who will not go to the gallery of serial killers

because his modus operand is nothing special. And even though they think I just gutted the movie, do not

start cursing for free as they will check that Simon West, its juggler-director, makes it clear

from the first sequence. Although we regret, being a trite story, with inexpressive actors andsituations

poorly planned, the tape can be entertaining but only for those who enjoy the exponents

of the B series and titles such as Scream but we warn: We are not facing an incipient Wes Craven but talking about a

title that offers more of the same and more crime if possible since part of the same premises embodied in a

tape of the ���os 70. The producers of the current one must be some of the few who saw her in her day.

Taking advantage of the forgetfulness of our memory, they have worked a guide that, to get away from theplagiarism

shameless, is completed in another way.

" 0

" It is not, at all, a good movie and I do not think that it pretends it either. That yes, it is a comedy certainly

atypical within the denominated "patriotic humor", and that is to be thankful.

���You've never gone through recreational activities and you've seen a handful of people watching (some laughing, some

freaking out, others not knowing very well what's happening) about poor characters dancing on a machine and making faces to

be something like the winners of a dance contest? Well, this here is a matter of, as I said, a

few little people, but there by the country of the rising sun seems to be a real phenomenon that even has

between its expert rows and competitions. "" The dancing machine "" comes to tell us all this. It is curious how Spanishhas

cinemaevolved in the last few years. The almost unanimous tendency of the Academy Academy has

been to put little more than green to the cinema that is made in the United States and to prevail the quality of Spanish

over that without giving reasons to believe them. Well, seeing the latest proposals of Spanish cinema,

even to talk about very patriotic things like "" Alatriste "" or "" Salvador "", you can see a palpable approach towards,

precisely, the American cinema to be able to do box office. Come on, let's criticize so as not to make anything clear

and, in the end, try to imitate the criticized enemy. But ���ojo! What a view "" Alatriste "" has almost nothing to do

with movies like "" Gladiator "", "" The kingdom of heaven "" or "" Troy "", but it is a kind of "" The dog of the

gardener "" with two or three pseudo battles that is half-baked of all kinds of pretensions, both artistic

and spectacle (and the three films that I have named is not that they are precisely moviegoers, but theyeven

aresuperior to the film directed by Diaz Yanes) and, most debatable of all, so that, if they get so involved

with American cinema, they hire American actors to star in their films with a desire to make a

box office ?. Because, in reality, they are the same as them or at least they try and they want their cinema to reach

the masses as well. "" The dancing machine "" is another case of these that I mention, although I doubt that its director

has it sworn. American cinema, is more, is a declared fan of teen comedies that are made in

that country. Therefore, it is not uncommon to see in this film many of the clichés of this type of cinema and, still, a

lot of references cin�� �philes / cin���fagas to mythical physicists of the seventies and eighties that they like so much in this

blog as "" Rocky "", "" Karate Kid "", "" Battle Royale "" or other more dubious ones like "" Flashdance "". All seasoned with a

style close to the Farrelly brothers, with their eternal losers who are not so, those "pringaos" "who

end up doing great things (Santiago Segura is a clear example of this, in a character very close to the one to

interpret ��� Whoddy Harrelson in "" Go pair of idiots "") But, be careful, "" The dancing machine "" is not the typical Spanish

comedy type "" Torrente "" that many they will wait just to see Segura among its protagonists. Nothing of

that. In fact, we are facing a film more bittersweet, which alternates the surrealism more insane (that

giant snake that ends up exploding, the "flashback" that recalls the accident of the dances company of

Segura when he was young) with degrading and sad moments (the successive times in which the villain of the

function, played by Corbacho, throws the toilet full of shit the ring so that look for it Safe or the

solitary coexistence of the latter, with mu���ecos put as a family). It is not a movie of

laughter, but of smiles. It is not crazy humor, but something strange. Probably, for these reasons, the

film will not work too well at the box office (although it is still to be seen), as much as, without being

great, it is far superior to tonter��� as well as the third installment of "" Torrente "" or other comedietas

starring Santiago Segura lately as "" The amazing world of Borja Mari and Pocholo "" or "" Isi Disi "".

It is possible that the proposal is risky in terms of expectations that may arise in a certain sector of the

audience, but it is a risk that seems to be assumed by those responsible and by Segura himself, far from his

typical roles. ���maras is Oscar Aibar, who a few years ago directed the interesting "" Platillos volantes "",

also starring Jordi Vilches (who, let's not deceive ourselves, is the protagonist of the film above

Segura, and this may be another determining factor so that the public does not react in the expected way) and of

a film that went largely unnoticed, entitled "" Atolladero "", that really looks surreal, what

seems to be a constant in its trajectory. The most remarkable of this proposal falls on the magnificent photography

of Mario Montero, who has nothing to envy to movies of greater invoice, making believe that the results

at the technical level of In the Spanish cinema do not have to see many times with the budget spent or the means

available, but with an average budget can do things that resemble the, we return,cinema

American. "" The machine to dance " "It is not, at all, a good movie. I do not think he wants it either. We are,

yes, before a comedy certainly atypical within the so-called "" patriotic humor "", and that is appreciated. A

film that speaks of pathos from an optimistic and even heroic side, in which many of those "" geeks "" of

the arcades or those who put the ears of Captain Spock in each new premiere of the saga "" Star

Treck "" can be seen reflected, although it is not very well defined if it is to laugh at them or to give them a

tribute.

" 0

" Too focused on the smallest, it lacks Axterix's acid humor. The older ones are possibly

bored very much.

I do not like gratuitous violence, much less in films that are supposed to be for children. While watching the

film, I remembered the comics mentally and yes, it is true, they are violent, but it is a very innocent violence that

is more insincere. But when comics go to movies, things change a lot. Already happened with Mortadelo

and Filem���ny has happened with this. To give an example, the scene in which Roman legionary teeth are rainingnot

issomething that I want to be stored in the retina of my little one. The film is about a new visitor who arrives

at the well-known village of the irreducible Gauls. This is the son of a great warrior, so his father

entrusts the villagers, and especially Asterix and Obelix, to make him a man. But the kid does not turn out to

be what he considers a brave man. Wimp and miedica will have to go through a calvary to become a

true Gallic warrior. On the other hand, a tribe of Vikings arrives in Gaul seeking the secret of the flight,

which they believe to be in fear. The truth is that the film, in the eyes of a somewhat infantile adult, is a bit of a pain.

We already know the script from comics, although characters have been added and concepts fromhave been mixed

other stories. The plot is easy to follow, clearly delimiting the good guys and the bad guys. The drawings are

correct and the animation quite passable. But I did not finish to like it, since it is very lacking of the acid humor

of Asterix. Personally I think it is too focused on the smallest. Although for these, much better to

play the old Miyazaki tapes, free of violence and evil. Resuming, to spend anwith the

hoursmallest in the movies. Although the older ones are possibly bored very much.

" 0

" Diablo de Sangre is one of many films that use a theoretical desire for awareness and denunciation

as a mere excuse to offer a multitude of shootings and scenes of action. .

In recent years the cinema seems to have recovered a social conscience that had been lost for quite some

time, and fortunately, more and more films are being made. committed or that take to the great public facts

forgotten or few known. And if there is a region of the earth that human beings have historically been

isolated and forgotten, and to a large extent we continue to do so, it is the black continent, Africa. Everything that has

affected Africa, from the brutalities committed during the European domination to the conflicts provoked

by the lack of prediction of post-colonial distribution, have been left in the background to end up in

oblivion. Edward Zwick rescues from that forgetfulness the civil war that shook Sierra Leone less than a decade ago, and

does so through one of the protagonists of the conflict, the traffic illegal of diamonds. Danny Archer

(Leonardo DiCaprio) is a mercenary and diamond dealer who works for a large multinational. Solomon

Vandy (Djimon Hounsou) is a peaceful fisherman forced to work in the mines of the rebels, where he finds

and it hides a big diamond. With the help of a journalist, Maddy Bowen (Jennifer Connelly), both will start a

flight to recover the precious stone and thus escape from their respective hells. With this approach, the film

starts, a story designed to touch the sensitive fiber of the viewer and try to

sensitize it, worth the redundancy, about the problems plaguing Africa as a plague. However,

Diamante de Sangre is one of many films that use a theoretical desire for awareness and denunciation as a

mere excuse to offer a multitude of shootings and scenes of action. , to which more spectacular. Edward Zwick, whose

skill in the director's chair goes unnoticed, goes on tiptoe through the most thorny matters, without

getting wet and without offering anything new that justifies the payment of the entrance fee. The guide of Charles Leavitt waters

on all four sides, as it is full of situations that border on the absurd. What could not be missing is

the typical and rigorous human-lacrimatic conflict, represented on this occasion by the character of Djimon

Hounsou and his son, whose cl��� Max is one of the most ridiculous scenes in the film. The characters are flat, and although they

have a certain evolution throughout the plot, this is very evident and predictable. Regarding its

protagonists, little can be expected from Leonardo DiCaprio, whose interpretation, although it is still

correct, is somewhat empty and distant. Djimon Hounsou does a good job, but without boasting, while

Jennifer Connelly, in addition to not disheveled no matter what happens, does not know how to sustain convincingly the photo

camera. Blood Diamond is a of those films that use a story that really deserves to be

told in order to transform it into a scene of action behind another. It is a pity that with the available means it

is preferred to make the tape in the purest style of Hollywood, leaving aside the intention of deepening in a

forgotten conflict.

" 0

" Do not let her escape. His ingenuity, his broad sense of the absurd, his narrative nerve, his original mise en

scène and his critical spirit, make of Contestant, apart from a supreme entertainment, the best cin���filo dish

served in the last months. Almost, almost, mandatory vision.

Mart���n Circo Mart���n is a professor of History of Economics who, fortuitously and in acontest

television, has won a whopping 3 million euros in the form of luxurious gifts. Several cars, a

yacht, a plane, a gigantic mansion. From night to morning, he has become a multimillionaire

envied by the rest of the planet but, nevertheless, he has a serious economic problem: he has almost no

cash with which to face the immense debt that has just contracted with the Treasury. Overwhelmed by such an imposition, he will

decide to resort to the bank to request a loan of 100 thousand euros. Without realizing it, it has just gotten into

the mouth of the wolf. This is, in short, the basis on which one of the best movies

of the current scene is based, Contestant, a t��� splendid title in all the senses. Rodrigo Cort���s, his director and

screenwriter, with his first feature film and after several experiences in the world of short films,

proves to be in possession of a truly enviable sense of humor. . His work is clinical, thorough,

hurtful and, above all, fun. Fun and militant. Since Fincher in The Fight Club, nobody had

dared to dynamite the bank in a way as precise as Cort���s. His pace is totally accelerated.

There are almost no breaks. And when there are, they are totally understandable. Use the flash back and voice-

over resources in a mod- ular manner, without distorting or damaging the story you propose. Contestant moves forward and backward

in time, clearly and in nothing messy. On the contrary, his comings and goings with the camera form the true

body of the film and with it, and the collaboration of an insuperable Leonardo Sbaraglia, manages to transfer to the

viewer the state of anguish and despondency that the overwhelmed Martin Martins Circus is suffering. And it is that

Sbaraglia, this time - apart from appearing every day Luis Figo - has found the PAPER (with

capital letters) of his life, that of a character with which it is easy to identify. As

the cinematographic critic ���lex Gorina remarked, after leaving the press pass, "this is a title that will hook you up." A

lot of people, since few are those who can not be seen on the screen: who else, who least, has had

to resort sometime in their life to the bank to apply for a loan or a mortgage "". The idea of ​​Contestant

may seem preposterous, but it is not at all. It may be exaggerated, swollen, but the things that

are plasma are as such, but to the beast, magnified, so that no one will escape the bluntof

cudgellingsuch Rodrigo Cort���s to the world of economics. Taxes, banking interests and the free market, put

in the pillory by an intelligent and Kafkaesque executioner, Professor Edmundo (to whom the ever-effectivegives life

Chete Lera), an anti-economist, with a lot of terrorist, who offers a Unforgettable class, practical and

visual, about the universe of finance. A master class, in the form of an ingenious game of chess that, at the

same time, serves as a tribute to the Monty Python to the very Bergmanian The Seventh Seal. What I say:

wonderful. Do not let it escape. His ingenuity, his broad sense of the absurd, his narrative nerve, his original

mise en scène and his critical spirit, make of Contestant, apart from a supreme entertainment, the bestdish

cin���filoserved in the last months. Almost, almost, of obligatory vision. You warn them: with this film I think to

pass list. And mark their lack of assistance as a very serious sin.

" 1

" It has a good rhythm, although it suffers ups and downs in the middle of the footage, maybe the final morale, makesdoubt

some, it made me think, and I really liked this ending. Very well directed and Written this first episode of Don

Ben, who has earned my respect.

BEN AFFLECK. To say Ben Affleck that is to say, the worst actor, bad films, Golden Leone in Venice for

Hollywoodland, where he played an unsuccessful actor. There are many cases of actors who pass to the other side

of the camera with greater or lesser fortune. Fortunately, and unbelievably, Ben Affleck as director in his first

film, he complies, and he fulfills remarkably. Affeck has good taste when it comes to telling a story,

I am very sure that he has drunk from the great directors of the last times, and that Mystic River liked him a

lot, because he has some coincidences and gui���os to the work of Clint Eastwood. Affleck looks for classicism, in

the narration of a political theme and of burning current affairs, good plans and taking advantage of a fragile guide and

investigating the main characters. It has a great cast, headed, by his brother Casey, at

first his character is cold and unbelievable, as the footage progresses his work is convincing and

we feel empathy towards him. It has been a great year for Casey Affleck, rewarded with a betternomination

secondaryin the ���scar. He is accompanied by the classics Ed Harris and Morgan Freeman, who fill the screen and

solidify the film. In the feminine section are Amy Ryan, also nominated for her role as mother, even if she

is a mother. And Michelle Monaghan, as the protagonist's girlfriend, who plays without more on the screen. The film has

a good rhythm, although it suffers highs and lows in the middle of the film, maybe the final morale, make some doubt,

it made me think, and I liked this ending very much. Strong interpretations, very well directed and written this first episode

of Don Ben, who has earned my respect.

" 1

" It is attractive the cinema? Of internal chat? that Cesc Gay proposes. Narrated from the rest, giving priority to the

flow of conversations with oneself that we did not hear, his Fiction does not bother and that which shows something as sad

as a story about restrained passions.

This alchemist who works with sensitive material, that of emotions and personal relationships, does not like

big cries. Supported by the familiar climate in which he situates the story (fostered by the

real bonds between the actors and himself), Cesc Gay explores a new territory, more relaxed than before:

he leaves the city to take refuge in the rural environment, he goes from choral casting to intimate work. He loads

his backpack with close-ups of actors who tell many things without saying a word, with the exception of

of Chamber, as vigorous and as smart as ever. Complete a trilogy about the problems we face

at each stage of our life. Kr���mpack, In the city and Fiction are very different from each other, but it is curious that they

cover stages: adolescence, thirty and maturity associated with the crisis of 39, a veteran� It comes to us

naked and hopeless. The idea that the film is seen as a fond farewell of an hour and a

half connects with the reflexive gaze of a filmmaker who is doing with his site within thescene

European. With permission of Eduard Fern���ndez? you have to make memory to remember a bad job-, subtlety is

the main protagonist of a story that revolves around the feeling of resignation and responsibility. The

search for inspiration is a flat excuse to give up for a time the life that made you sick. and even there

we can count. It does not matter if the end of the route seems foreseeable, what matters is the trip, the

excursion to the other side of the world with slow pace, almost stopped and nothing artificial. Fern���ndez finds

in Montse Germ���na her ideal partner: she holds her gaze and balances the balance. The other three characters

flutter, limiting themselves to observe without altering nature. Far from appearing pretentious Gay pours into his

pictures of life multiple and grateful musical and cinematographic references, without entering into the metaphysical

title and alter ego character of the director. As noted, we can say that the shooting took place

chronologically, making the work of the actors more credible. A vividness that, like so many other aspects,us

comes toin a subtle way through a simple and precious love story that we all have the right to live.

Because he does not live who does not suffer, even if only a little.

" 1

" Extra���ay and extravagant film of a fantastic genre, somewhat boring in general.Fan���stica genre film, but in absolute fantastic in terms of training and good hobby. Perhaps

what I am going to say is not more than the opinion of an adult referred to a directed film fundamentally to

the children and therefore it should not be held in much consideration, but the truth is that it is one of the

most boring movies that I remember seeing in the � Last times (and I've seen a few already). The thing starts

quite frankly well, with even imagination or at least quite originality. I am referring to thecredit titles

initial, where we are looking at the components of the technical facets without that they are assemblers or

musicians or photographers. . We simply see their names next to animated obejtos that give us to understand in which

apartao they are included, but that it is necessary to be very attentive to perceive it. This way ofis frankly fine. But

showing themwhen the story begins, everything changes to something that I do not know how to qualify. It's a fantastic

movie, but very strange, bizarre, outlandish, so much so that I have not caught the point or the

comma. I have not known where to take it, the truth. It is a whole series of animated scenes (those of the store) that

are shown in a random way, forming an amalgam of situations that are They are immersed in a whole, but

something unintelligible. The dialogues, the characters, the message, the esp���rutu, escape like water between my

fingers. A lot of sensitivity, to my way of seeing quite cheap: that if you do not go (die) please. I know, what

should I do, it's my time, look inside yourself. Anyway, mojigater���aa capped in my opinion. Maybe we all

have to persevere in our dreams, to reach them, maybe we should not lose the illusions of

childhood, maybe ... But what ��� more, the truth is that, as the plot is represented, I do not even caredamn

a, as it proves that I can even say that I fell asleep in a occasion. I guess it was two

minutes alone or so (when they enter Magorium in a hospital) and it was a break for me. No, I did not like

this film, it seemed very good to me. but I have not been interested at any time, looking like a

pete, no matter how well-intentioned I am.

" 0

" I am among those who praise her and those who say that she is nothing of the other world. And, as a

film, I expected more. I do not know, I imagined it differently. But this has nothing to do with the fact that the film

is a high quality product.

When they premiered during the month of October "" Infiltrados "", she followed very closely the opinions of the people about

her. Some praised her, others said that it was nothing special, and others said it was totally bad.

That's why I decided to wait until it came out on DVD to be able to watch it quietly. Everything changed when he took 4

Oscars. Best Editing, Best Adapted Guide, Best Director and Best Film. Then my curiosity for her

grew and grew. Until the v��� (ago, already, more than a month), and now I talk about it. From englobarme in one of the

three groups I would say that I am among those that the they praise and those who say that it is nothing special. And

, as a film, I expected more. I do not know, I imagined it differently. But this has nothing to do with

the fact that the film is a product of great quality. Speaking of its Oscars, the Best Director is more than

deserved. Gui���n Adapted, well I can speak little, since I have not seen the original film. As for the

assembly. Yes, it has a good assembly, but. I've seen them better. And speaking of the Oscar for Best Film. Of course

, no one in their right mind could give it to "" The Queen "" (7/10). "" Babel "" (9/10) was not a big bet at the

Oscars (look what happened to "" BrokeBack Mountain ""). "" Little Miss Sunshine "" (9/10) was too "" ���o���a "" for

some. "" Letters from Iwo-Jima "" (although I have not seen it, it was my favorite) did not win for reasons we do not

know (since everyone says wonders about it). E "" Infiltrados "". I do not know It was a remake, it was very

unlikely that I would win in this category. But there he was, with 4 of the most important Oscars under his belt

including Best Film. Although there are some who say that he should not have won for being a

remake, to me it seems a good choice (but not the best). Let's talk about the movie, like that, in general. In addition to

being plagued by swearwords (I am so repipi), it has some (I repeat, some) actors that do an

enviable job. The one that looks worse is Matt Damon, and I say that not to say that there will be A marionettebetter

without joints was. The most. "" weird "" is DiCaprio (who was nominated for the Golden Globes for this role). It makes a

strange mixture between hard guy, whiner, clown and weeping. The result? A character that is not bad at all in

the film, but that is not done with the public.Harina of another costal are Mark Wahlberg (nominated for the Oscar),

Martin Sheen, Jack Nicholson and Vera Farmiga. first, rightly nominated. Although the truth, would have nominated (and

awarded) to Jack Nicholson for his PAPEL���N (yes, with capital letters), role unjustly forgotten in the

candidacies to the Oscars. Martin Sheen plays a very dignified and charismatic role. But the one that has surprised me most has

been Vera Farmiga, who composes a very difficult character who eats the screen when he shares it withdull

Damon'sor "strange" character. "DiCaprio. Another noteworthy aspect is the Soundtrack, by Howard Shore. But,

unfortunately, because of the painful assembly of sound is drowned at all times. As for the work of Scorsese.

I would say that. own of a genius.

" 1

" Future installments that I hope will have a better script, as the theme of the actors (all simply

passable, being generous) seems untouchable, and a better director than Tim Story who endows more pulse to a saga

that deserves better luck.

My level of emotion prior to the premiere was low. Neither the simpletons nor the trailers had managed to make

me forget the disappointing first part. For all this it is surprising that in the end, in the face of the film

disaster a priori Interesting things like "" Spider-Man 3 "" or "" Pirates of the Caribbean 3 "", the entertainment

"" silly "" of the summer ends up being "" The Fantastic 4 and Silver Surfer "" ( Fantastic Four: Rise of the Silver

Surfer). Not that the film is a wonder, not much less. It is full of bad jokes,situations

wasted, various yo���er���as and, in general, all the shortcomings derived from the writing of a script

designed for children��� and teenagers before adults. But neither can you deny the fact that it is

entertaining and helps to pass the time (hence my qualification of "" foolish entertainment ""). Perhaps the best

with respect to the previous film has to do with the presence of Silver Surfer, an interesting and complex character

that is the best of the film and has been known to endow that air of magic that characterizes him in the

comics. I have to say that, as a follower of these characters, I would like to have enjoyed more of

Galactus but I understand that they reserve that option for future deliveries. Future deliveries that I hope have a

better gui ,N, since the theme of the actors (all simply passable, being generous) seems untouchable, and a

better director than Tim Story that gives more pulse to a saga that deserves better luck.

" 0

" It mixes with great skill the denunciation of the situation in Africa and of how the big pharmaceutical companies

experience their drugs with the Africans, with a plot of suspense.

The True Gardener is a good film, he mixes with great skill the denunciation of the situation in Africa and of

how the great pharmaceutics experience their f���. Rmacos with Africans, with a plot of suspense, which in

principle may seem a bit convoluted, but is very well explained and the viewer is not lost along the

way. In other similar films, the plot is so messy and full of names that in the end nobody finds out about

anything that has happened, however, this film is clearly developed, In spite of being asubject,

complicatedhe plays. During the first 40 minutes he introduces us to the story, a great flashback in which

we are told how the protagonists met and how they came to the situation. �n current, it may seem a

preamble too long, but when the other part of the film starts, all this is forgotten and you realize

that it was necessary that long-term prologue to know perfectly history and not get lost.Fiennes

Ralphperforms well, his character suffers a very clear evolution throughout the film, at the beginning he

is a diplomat and it behaves as such, restrained and unobtrusive, but is advancing According history increasingly

expressed m s emotions. Rachel Weisz is correct but not dazzling.

" 1

" George Clooney enters strong into the world of direction, let's hope he does not stumbleBuff, the hairs like escarpies I still have after having seen the film. I can only say ���Viva Edward

Murrow and the mother who married him! Uf, what a movie. The film is set in the 1950s,

when Senator Josph McCarthy dedicated his life to the famous "witch hunt", or be, to persecute communists

throughout the country. On the CBS network, a presenter of a well-known television program decides that it is okay

with so many abuses by this man and, with the approval of his bosses, he stands up to McCarthy

putting them on the table (abuses). He and his team undertake a unique battle against the senator that is

easily extrapolated to any moment in the history of humanity. And I do not count anymore, that this one has to see it.

Fuck that movie, how exciting. To start is recorded in black and white, which helps

you quickly get into the environment. The first minute is a bit boring (the lyrics) but from there it is

exciting. You spend all the film suffering like a fool for the good of Murrow and his team, so the

atmosphere that creates, of chap���. The photo is good, with very accurate shots. And the devastating argument.

Of course, a lesson of bravery in a time when the brave ones had their heads cut off. To highlight

the good performance of the character who plays Murrow. And bad to the film the truth is that I do not see anything,

that you want me to tell you. Resuming, a film scandal. If he does not win the Oscars, academics

have no idea (I've seen almost all of them). If I had shouted "" Libeeeeertaaaaaaaad "" in the end I die of

���xtais.

" 1

" Winterbotton and Whitecross achieve a film of hard, dry and aggressive denunciation. You leave the cinema thinking that your

problems are less than nothing, and you open your eyes a little in this consumerist and inhumane society.

Great movie-report by Michael Winterbotton and Mat Whitecross. It could be classified as adocumentary

fictional, and I'll explain myself. "" On the way to Guant���namo "" part of a real event, the innocent journey of four friends from

England to Pakistan in September 2001, to attend the wedding of one of them, as they are taken prisoner

first by the Northern Alliance and then by the Americans. This is a fact that happened. The

real people are being interviewed, and in the end. But the recreation of the facts is fiction, there are four

actors performing with staging. And he achieves a film of hard, dry and aggressive denunciation. You leave the cinema

thinking that your problems are less than nothing, and you open your eyes a little in this consumerist and

inhuman society. The film is in the line of the work that most he likes Winterbotton, "" In This World "" (5), but without

his poetry, here he dispenses with it to go straight to the point, to denounce. And I do not like it as much as "" In this

World "", the comparisons are odious. And it's because "" In this World "" seems to me one of the best films of the

last decade, invariably essential. "" Camino a Guant���namo "" fulfills its objective with flying colors, although the

impact is short-term, maybe the draft of "" Saraband "" does not leave me. But it is highly recommended.

" 1

" Winner of the Golden Leyende at the Venice festival that year, it constitutes a show of good cinema, nothing

worthwhile in these times.

Mira Nair, director of the multi-award-winning and exquisite Salaam Bombay! from 1988, he brings us a film that unites

fiction and reality relating the life and history of a punjabi family -Los Velma- through five relationships

that are intertwined without haste, within a typical family of the region with itscustoms and problems

own. Filmed in thirty days with both established and novice actors, it attempts to capture the poor

present of India within a society strongly attached to its roots in the past, both culturally

and in its own right. religion.Infidelity, marriage by arrangement, rape, the father-son relationship and

above all love, are portrayed with credibility and realism, in well-stitched but somewhatstories

pasteurizedin the tone, it is believed in this case to be well regarded by Hollywood and its market so attractive

that everything influences and that is seen, in these parts as well. With striking scenes by the stranger and with all the

typical color of the Indian culture, with an excellent soundtrack that surprises in a dramatic comedy

that could be defined as manners. The most salient are the well-delineated, strong characters, being thepoint

highand the nexus the father of the family, played by Naseeruddin Shah recently named as the bestactor

Indian. The director uses as a separator the melancholy and the disenchantment of the streets of New Delhi (her

hometown) and manages to portray her mixing admiration with a touch of compassion, accompanied by everything an excellent

photo. Small and great film at once, it is no surprise reviewing the filmography of thisdirector

particular. Winner of the Le���n de Oro in the Venice festival that year, it is a show of good cinema,

nothing worthwhile in these times.

" 1

" Where hypocrisy wins the battle of morals. "" Grace is gone "" begins with a pseudo-naked emotional scene from the hand of a group of women whose

husbands are soldiers in the Iraq war. The lightness of his speech (they laugh at the sexual farewell

they gave to his men) and the appearance on the screen of a serious John Cusack, with an emaciated look, point to a

treatment of the film rather than go Unique: we are going to talk about something hard but using the flag of humor., Or that may

seem. The rupture of this supposed ironic discourse comes not so much because of the imminent news of the death

of Stanley's wife (Cusack) and her hurt reaction but with the chords of the music that Clint Eastwood (yes,

the director, the actor, the producer, the already ubiquitous Eastwood) composed especially for Grace is Gone.

Chords, I say, that they twist the melodrama two more times and get to convert it (thanks also todirecting

somedecisions) in a more lachrymic story. is that "" Grace is gone "" is consumed in its

self-pity as it moves forward and takes its characters with it. Stanley is already presented to us from the

beginning from the point of view of the one who points to the unsuccessful: he works in a store without ambition, he suffers from an

important limp (metaphor of the lack of stability). that causes the absence of his wife), does not know how to

talk and hides all his faults (including not being part of the army) under a false sense of

security that borders the despotism. He is a soul lost in chaos while preaching the righteous life thattaught him

the Marines. Undoubtedly, this is how the director (James C. Strouse) sees it and so he wants us to see the spectators through

his angular anamorphic and the bursts of plans in vacant rooms: Stanley is alone and plunged into

the chaos of those who do not know how to deal with a situation. Stanley's dilemma (a Cusack of the least

expressionist but of the most expressive) is none other than to stop being one to become the leader of a clan

he does not know how to address, that is, his daughters. Fleeing from the moment of confrontation in which he has to

tell the children that his mother has died, he decides to start a trip that will help him gain time, gain

confidence and as a means of personal growth (��� what are they but the trips in the cinema?). Throughout this

journey, the melodramatic moments will be appearing (especially between the eldest daughter -Heidi and her father)

and will be lightened by Dawn (the little girl) who will take care of subtracting drama from the whole of the film. A

perfect tandem to prepare the viewer to let go of the tears at the right time: the conversation between

father and daughters. It's right there where Strouse lets himself be defeated for the hypocrisy and can not hide that he is adirector

newcomer. In full conversation between Stanley and his daughters, the director makes the decision to show us their faces

in the foreground to remove the sound in half conversation, no doubt with the intention to give their characters

a moment of intimacy. But is not it hypnotic to show half conversation and leave the spectator with the

faces of the girls crying inconsolably? Would not it have been less pornographic emotionally to retire just

at the beginning and leave the three a place of real intimacy? Strouse's hesitation is more than clear in the

duality of his decision: to stay with his camera in the center of the action but covering the o� ��os of the spectator;

I see but I do not listen. It is at that moment when one wonders where Eastwood's wise advice was at the

time of filming that scene. Maybe Strouse did not see "" Million Dollar baby "" and did not learn from the composer of his

film that the ethics and morals in the cinema start from the point of view it takes the camera. And from that

Eastwood, he knows for a while.

" 0

" A great, small, but not at all simple, and underrated film, which certainly deserves more

applause than it has received (very few).

I do not know why I've always loved road-movies. And it is not that I have seen so many, but

when I see any of them, I feel a sense of brutal isolation. Give me 10 reasons (10 articles or

less, translating the original title, much more suggestive) is not exactly a road-movie like the ones

we're used to seeing, but somehow way, either because the two protagonists (almost absolute) are

in a car for quite a while or because the message of the film is like a car trip. Whatever it may be,

whatever it may seem, Brad Silberling's film achieves what very few people achieve (and very few

try): mixing many themes and doing it excellently in just 75 minutes. On the posterappears

An amazing review: "You're who you know." The film, in one way or another, has been talking about this,

precisely. Two people more isolated from reality (maybe not as much as in the great Lost in

Translation) cross paths and, as the hours of the day pass, they leave knowing m���sym���s until you

get to feel a mutual love. Thus, at first glance, the basic idea of ​​the film may seem too classic,

but I assure you that Silberling transfers his own image with originality and sensitivity.

overflowing, so much so that sometimes it seems that you are with the protagonists living what they are living.

It may seem that as short as the tape is, it is less deep. Well, not ladies, but quite the opposite.

Look, Spider-man 3 lasted about twice as many as 10 reasons, and this, however, contains a dose of

intelligence and morals in abundance. And you have to know how to direct, you have to know how to write. And Brad Silberling,

in this, is a teacher (we forgot his previous works, except for the commitment!). His funny and sad

film has several really prodigious scenes, like when the two protagonists ask each other "" the

ten articles or less "" (those 10 things that they like and those that do not of his life). There, in that wonderful

sequence, you can appreciate the personality of both, their intentions, their fears, their concerns and

learn, in passing, a little about their own lives, about their particularities (even if it's a toaster). The

film is realistic, human at all times, and does not get carried away by the typical gui���os of the

independent American films (here the great one, but a little typical, Little Miss Sunshine, that without a doubt, is,

in general, more good film than Slibering, for reasons already described). There are scenes that turn out to be not only

funny, but also masterfully shot, like Freeman talking to everyone in the

hypermarket or himself insulting the microphone of the first supermarket. Give me 10 reasons it would not be. Give me 10

reasons if they had not interpreted these two aces of interpretation: Morgan Freeman and Paz Vega. What

can you expect? Well the usual: melancholy looks, suggestions that affect you too (I

mean the public), and unforgettable phrases like the last one. And on the other hand, I, at least, did not expect much from her

. And fortunately, I was pleasantly surprised to see that the unbearable girl from The Other Side of

the Bed knows how to act without screaming. The chemistry that is created between them is formidable, totally unusual to

be two actors of very different sizes and ages. I would highlight, above all, the astonishing dialogue of the end,

where both show their most dramatic and romantic facets at the same time. a, but not at all

simple, and undervalued film, which certainly deserves more applause than it has received (very few). The

two protagonists are, without a doubt, superb and the dialogues they maintain should be heard more than

once. And it is that Give me 10 reasons not only surprises but also makes you happy the day.

" 1

" The most complete and mature film by David Fincher. It breaks with its habitual excessive slope and, in spite of

resorting again to the figure of a serial-killer, it distances itself totally from the style used in the brilliant

Seven.

Zodiac is, by far, the most complete and mature film of David Fincher, one of the mostfilmmakers

interesting and politicalof today. A title that breaks with its habitual excessive slope and that, in spite

of resorting again to the figure of a serial-killer, is totally distanced from the style used in the

brilliant Seven. After Zodiac hides another way of facing the genre, where austerity and

meticulousness take a special role. Actually, he has not invented anything new. He has simply sought

other narrative resources that he had never used until now in his cinema. And, for this, takes asmodels

idealthe sobriety retailer with which Alan J. Pakula plasm��� journalistic research on the

Watergate esc���ndalo in All the President's Men and the tone, aesthetic and documentary, with which Richard

Fleischer orchestrated his wonderful The Boston Strangler. Like his referents, Fincher goes to another

veridical case that marked the North American society of the 70's; that of a serial killer that caused

panic and anxiety among the inhabitants of a large area of ​​the Bay of San Francisco. There, right in the

county of Vallejo, an unscrupulous guy, nicknamed Zodiac, started his evil actions in the summer of 1969

and, with his multiple crimes , kept the police and the press in check for many more years. Today, the

murderer's identity is still unknown. Elegant, intelligent and meticulous; in a word, masterly. The

cinematic classicism emerges in each of the scenes Zodiac. There is not a single detail that has

any waste. Everything is controlled to the last millimeter. Bearing in mind that the story

takes place over two long decades, his obligatory and numerous narrative ellipses are an example of theway

perfectionistin which the director has proposed his product. In those temporary jumps (that, sometimes,

include several years of a single stroke), there is never a loose end in the road. Even, at all times and

in a subtle way, the socio-political description of a country in its different stages is present. A

marvel. And, unlike other similar films, instead of focusing mainly on the personality

of the murderer, it investigates the psychological effects that marked the lives of those who, during that long

period, were in the footsteps of the elusive Zodiac. That is why the primary objectivecamera

of Fincher'srests with the figures of David Toschi - the real police inspector who inspired Peter Yates to

create Bullitt - Robert Graysmith and Paul Avery - a young caricaturist and a journalist from The San Francisco

Chronicle, respectively -, the three individuals who were most involved in the criminal prosecution, an

excellent way to demonstrate that, apart from those those who murdered, Zodiac -with its provocations and

encrypted games- also got another type of victims. More than a thriller to use is a film that, twolevels

different, analyzes the effects that cause a great obsession; that which is born in every hunter determined to

get his prey at whatever price, making such an endeavor the sole objective of his life. And I say at two

levels because, apart from the self-destructive portrait of the researchers' personality and theirenvironment

direct, it also investigates - albeit with less depth - in the mind of a murderer willing to kill for the sheer

pleasure of killing. The difference is that Zodiac always achieved its purposes, while its

trackers only knew the impotence of facing a true ghost. It is not surprising that, with

these constants, The Evil Zarov is a title quoted several times throughout the film. And it is that, in

addition to being the preferred film of the murderer (as they say, a cin���filo in all rule), itdefines

perfectlythe established relationship between hunters and their prey.Ms more than 2 hours and 40 minutes of cinema in

its purest state; cinema that is enjoyed very rarely. And, in that calibrated (and not at all heavy)

footage, it has a bit of everything. When it comes to facing intimate moments, Fincher takes his time and

relaxes (somewhat sym- patically) with the coldness and distance with which he manages his protagonists. Face the

tension scenes with a majestic correction; in them, the artificiality employed inshines by its absence

other occasions by the director. At no time are you looking for cheap gimmicks and spectacular effects, not even

when the murders perpetrated by Zodiac are shown on screen, since these are reflected in a veryway,

realisticwith the resulting impact on the viewer is even larger. Everything is perfectly embedded in the

film, starting with its contained interpretations, among which thedeserve special attention.

creations of Jake Gyllenhaal and Robert Downey Jr.the two editorial men of The San Francisco

Chronical who, with that case, radically changed their existence; the cartoonist and the reporter, both

trapped by the same obsession, but affected physically and psychically by different magnitudes. And this without

detracting from the sobriety with which a chameleon Mark Ruffalo gives life to Bullitt himself. Awork

modélicthat, without a doubt, opens wide the doors to the living room. Den from the teachers to a new David

Fincher. A superior and intelligent work, whose maximum responsibility, from now on, can already go with

the great classics of the Seventh Art. Finally, the clear successor of Clint Eastwood already has a name and surname.

Not in vain, Harry the Dirty, in addition to being inspired by one of the constants of Zodiac, is subject in the

film of a deserved tribute. As final data, I will cite you � that the other day I could see The Zodiac, anfilm

American, produced a couple of years ago (not released in Spain) and based on the same story collected

by Fincher. I know that the comparisons are odious but, in this case, inevitable. It is curious to discover how,

with an identical material on the table, the director of The Fight Club manages to break molds thanks to an

insurmountable exercise of style, while the other director, one Alexander Bulkley, does not go Beyond a

simple thriller of the mont full of television connotations.

" 1

" The worst thing about the whole experiment is that after its equator begins to engage in a tedious dynamic and

with little bravery, a bland and unpassionate direction that makes that what could have been a good slasher is

deadly boring.

The work of John Carpenter is being reviewed by the Hollywood machinery withcinematographic results

poor, lazy, mediocre. The hope of seeing a personal version of Rob Zombie that is probably the

most influential film of the American teacher created expectations of witnessing a less curious view

of the myth of Michael Myers The results are not alarmingly catastrophic, but not at all novel or

of any interest. Quite simply, they are mediocre.Planted as an exploration of the evil seen through the

origin of the psychopath in an authentic way, Zombie dedicates a good portion of the film to explain the childhood of

Michael Myers. The deconstruction of what in Carpenter's film worked well in a covert waynot

isas annoying as the purists of the founding work of the modern slasher could expect and, against all

odds. �stico, it becomes the most interesting part of the final product. The first minutes, in whichcalmly

wesee who Michael Myers is and we observe how the disease of pure evil possesses him, until he is no longer the same,

continues to evoke in the spectator a fascination and fear for the psychologist. Paw, although this time it enters more

psychologically and scientifically in what was once an almost mystical evocation. This new and fresh vision of the

origin ends when Michael escapes and the film stops being focused from a point of view closer to

���ly and the plot veers towards his sister Laurie Strode (A gimmick not present in the original Halloween, emerged in the

first sequel to the film). At that time, the film becomes a proper remake of the original,

which could pass perfectly through a sequel more. The entire Halloween night of the original is told here

in a similar way, perhaps with a little plot change here and there. The deaths of the original are reproduced

plane by plane and the same moments that previously created tension, here they do not generate any impression. A second

part that aims to work in a different way to the original thanks to the development of a first act-prequel

that abandons its interesting lines of development in order to reproduce the first film's film in anminimal way

ultra-. Ethics The worst thing is that the particular style of the director barely makesthroughout the second

an appearancehalf and, except for a little more violence and sickly sex, the many resources that he usually uses are not perceived,

except this time a An excessive amount of close-ups. The worst part of the whole experiment is that after its

equator begins to get involved in a tedious and short-sighted dynamics, a bland and unpassionate direction They

make what could have been a good slasher be deadly boring. Tension and horror are

replaced by constant sound beats, in the pure style of low-pitched horror production. It is a pity to see

how a director of undoubted creativity does not risk and limits himself to trying to direct a conventional Slasher. At

least, Zombie does show his love for the original material and his usual cinephilia makes an appearance. There are

many and varied gui���os to the saga and respect for the original material. Rob Zombie's Halloween is in part an

interesting look at John Carpenter's classic but disappoints as the work of the most capable director of The Renegades

of the Devil. Unfortunately, it will not go to the list of Remakes that equals the original work as Dawn of the

dead or that surpass it, as Hills have eyes. I would not even go into the ones that are not bad

like The Texas Chainsaw Massacre. Halloween is an unnecessary Remake, which could have been better if the same idea of

gui���n had been treated by someone more capable, because the big problem that Rob Zombie is dragging is that he

does not know to write.

" 0

" Despite the undeniable trade invested in its realization (for the most outstanding part of the film), the Magic

Flute is destined to a very specific public. Difficult to connect and enjoy with it those

who, like a server, have certain problems with the opera.

First of all, I must admit that I never liked the opera. I've always found a musical genre filled

and overloaded. Maybe that's why, before the adaptation of The Magic Flute by Kenneth

Branagh, I bored in a sovereign way in the cinema. I can assure you that it is not the gui�'s fault Not even the

actors and, much less, the British director's work, since the latter, in particular, is extremely

splendid. His visual ability and the virtuosity with which he conducts the camera are of anquality and technicality

exquisite. The long and meticulous sequence with which the tape opens, for example, is worthy of

being included in any anthology of the Seventh Art that boasts. It is clear that the problem is entirely mine. And it is

that the opera and I are not made for each other. Entirely studded in studios and set between

France and Germany during the First World War, through that invaluable initial sequence plan already

mentioned, Branagh makes a long journey between French trenches, inside and above them; follows the

flight of several birds; he stumbles upon a large squadron; he goes down again to the ground to show the

troops of the enemy and, after several amazing and virguer���as more, he ends that visual walk, inmanner of overture, in

thethe same trench in which he initiated it. . To take off his hat. A marvel for whose realization has had

to make use of digital technology; the only way to be able to orchestrate a plan as captivating as

this one. The rest of your footage -cinematographically speaking- is no longer so spectacular, despite having an

attractive set design. It's taken care of to the smallest detail. He consciously avoids converting his camera into the

main focus of The Magic Flute, giving all the prominence to the music that Mozart

composed in 1971 together to the libretto by Emanuel Schikaneder, and, of course, to the splendid brilliance (according to the

experts in the genre) of the singers chosen for the occasion. Anyway, the most purist operatives

have criticized the decision to have been sung in English instead of opting for the original German. I do not know if

the same thing happened when, in 1975, the renowned and untouchable Ingmar Bergman (uncredited) made an adaptation,

destined for the television screen, of the same work. A love story, musical and musical, thatcombines the

perfectlymost colorful and festive passages with a good number of macabre and dark flashes. A work

that moves away radically from the habitual vision that of the cinema has the Shakespearean director, and in which he

- when situating the action in the middle of a contest b�� �lica- take the opportunity to launch a hopeful song of harmony and

peace, very much in keeping with the current hectic political and world panorama. In spite of the undeniable trade invested in its

realization (for the most outstanding of the film), the Magic Flute is destined to a p Very

specific public. Difficult to connect and enjoy with it those who, like a server, have certain

problems with the opera. I tried. And, in fits and starts, I exceeded more than two hours in

duration. ���Sweat of Branagh's visual enchantment!

" 0

" Spectacular, well filmed, fantastic cinema with realism. Superb Will Smith carrying all the weight

of the film, without bored at any time. A pity that does not keep more of the book, especially when showing

vampires.

For Christmas, nothing better than cinema show. So, I had to go see a movie of popcorn, with one

of the actors with the most hook of the current cinema facing the box office, and that I also recognize that I like it. tico

and I like watching him on screen, Will Smith. After seeing the trailers, Soy Leyenda seemed like a very

promising movie, but it was not going to have anything to do with the book of the same name, like Yo, Robot only

had in with the book, the title itself. And after two hours, he left very happy of the cinema. It had been just what

I expected. I am Legend uses the original story to create a tension film, where I recognize

that at times I become tense and expectant, since all the scenes of terror, or at least, with

some scare, are perfectly designed and shot. I like the version of the script they have built,

based above all on a Will Smith that completely fills the screen, without making us heavy or bored, and

which we follow with attention even worried. At times interested in their struggle, and discovering little by little

how is the New York of the future. In case something was missing, several flashbacks are showing us the first moments of

the infection emerged based on medical experiments that seek to cure the cancer. All the scenes of

those first moments of the plague are absolutely spectacular. But it is that if something has I Am Legend is

spectacular moments, some of them very well shot. This keeps the viewer attentive, since with great

skill, vampires take time to appear, and also do it in a very dosed way, little by little,

keeping us expectant about their appearance, their intelligence or their way of acting. And here we come to the big

problem of the film. I read in an interview with its director, Martin Lawrence, that this first test with

actors with makeup doing vampires, and only then I choose to replace them with digital effects. And that

is the fault. Instead of vampires, here we have aliens with humanoid form, who jump and move in anway

absolutely inhuman, and who spoil all the realistic effect of the film. Not only are they unbelievable, but

visually I do not like anything at all. Even so, the film could be saved, but without telling anything, I

could tell you that the end is a little disappointing, maybe too sweet, with what after a long time

enjoying, you end up having a small low, just before finishing the tape.

" 1

" Being able to have been an explicit and hard film, it is a kind and minimalist vision of a fact that has

positioned itself, due to its own sad tricks, in the referent patriotic of the recent North American History.

The best of the last film of the politician Oliver Stone is that it does not look like an Oliver Stone movie and that

it moves away from any possibility that we can relate it to the pol �mica. There is not the American oven for buns

and the wound of 11-s is still open, and gangrene, in its way, the geopolitical, that nebulous concept

of chess game between rulers where a badly moved piece can cause a cataclysm in my town,

for example. World Trade Center avoids entering into the barbarism of terrorism. It could have been an explicit

and hard film, it is a kind and minimalist vision of a fact that has positioned itself, due to itssad tricks

own, in the patriotic referent. Ethics of the recent North American History (world, would add to me). We do not see

the planes impact on the twin towers: we perceive the rumor of the impact, the deaf and dark sound they

produce. Everything is cradled by a documentary sense that is too much paved with the sweet pamphlet of a Discovery

Channel with a lot of money. Everything sounds soft to us: perhaps we would like a tougher vision, better narrated, more

attached to life. And World Trade Center is a film with a flat invoice that does not engage with the reality of

emotion, even though it films Oliver Stone, that scourge of the Yankee tradition, that traitor to stablishment that is

equally dropped by Cuba to take a cigar with Fidel Castro and make another laudatory pamphlet that

questions the assassination in Elm Street giving a pu���etazo at the table of the orthodox. One could be abstracted from the

iconography already learned (impact of airplanes, bodies falling from the upper floors) and see the World

Trade Center as a film of more catastrophes. The two policemen (McLoughlin and Jimeno) are characters of a

contained drama. They are partially believable. We believe, however, the collapse of a way of life, the

evidence that a new century will be born from those rubble and that we will see the birth. We saw it on

CNN, live, or on the favorite chain of the kind reader, but Oliver Stone now gives us a

twist and sets a show between the unimportant and the sublime of life of a series of people who

struggle, above all, to save their lives. That is why we can abstract ourselves and consider that the film is a fiction

and that there is no reliable correlation of facts that we all know and that all of us, in oneor another

way, Calaron.El excessive footage could have been reduced if they had eliminated the trash of thelife

sentimentalof the police, who do not interest and make us lose the primary meaning of the film. It gives all this the

impression that Oliver Stone has been put in a room to warn him. They told him: "Look, Oliver,

you're a great guy and it's good to make movies that put the staff in bad mood. Take a break.

Tell the country that God exists and that he was there, among the rubble. Let the world know that Americans

are noble people and good people. That there is no hidden truth. That there is not a theory of conspiracy. Oliver,

dude, rest a little. Maybe it even gives us benefits, it's still time "". And Oliver, the man,

reconsiders, obeys the request and releases this tale blandengue, correct, sober, but without that bit of bad

grape that we all ask. In very small accounts, those of us who want the cinema of Oliver Stone, not We will like this

movie. Fans of the filmmaker apart, the film is good, clean as the dawn that closes it. World Trade

Center, in the hands of Stone, with Nicolas Cage of tiny and domesticated hero, smells like redemption, to liturgy. If

Michael Mann had been in the reins, we would have an accelerated, hyperrealistic, extreme version without falling into

the gore and, of course, exempt from any religious point. I wonder what Tarantino would do. It would be very

curious to see where our friend Quentin would turn these towers of faith, where he would hit the kick.

" 0

" A film that has an introduction of almost an hour, a plot of 20 minutes and the end of ten

By God, who has combed like this Pierce Brosman? With that mustache and those whiskers. Not to mention the

clothes. Mother more than cutrez have given this actor who came to play James Bond. With a sign like this,

with things painted in boli, you can not go very far, no.The film is about a hit man who ends

a job in Mexico beforehand and for this reason knows an entrepreneur who is about to close a good business.

For various reasons, he tells her that he works by killing people so that others close deals. And bydesigns

Destiny's, their lives are joined at times during the hour and a half of the film. I think it's the most crappy summary I

've ever made. This has been one of the few times I've started to tell what the movie is about and I'm

left blank. It is very complex to explain it without telling the whole story. And it is that when I had already half an

hour thought "" If I still do not know what goes "". And indeed, we have a film that has an introduction of almost

an hour, a plot of 20 minutes and the end of ten. And that collides. On the other hand, the story is that it does not give

much, because it has no subframes or similar. A very linear story, whose only grace is that they have

cut the tape to keep the interest of the public on a specific moment. On the positive side, the tape

has many funny points, which are given either by absurd situations or by lumpy expressions of the

protagonist. Pierce Brosman does a very good role, largely saving this slightlytape.

mediocreResumiendo, a curiosity that will not go to the annals of the history of cinema, and may be

erased from your mind as soon as you leave the room .

" 0

" Stone achieves a masterpiece of about 45 minutes that loses in intensity as the footage progresses

to recover the tone toward the end.

September 11, 2001. A plane of the company America Airlines and another of United Airlines are kidnapped

and crashed against the World Trade Center. More than 2,000 people died in that al-Qaeda attack

that shocked the world. Only two dozen people were rescued alive from the rubble of the

Twin Towers, which collapsed shortly after the collision. Will Jimeno (Michael Pe���a), agent of the

Airport Authority of the New York Police Department, and Sergeant John McLoughlin (Nicolas Cage)

are two of those victims who managed to leave with life, after 24 hours half-buried, to be able to tell the world

that this fateful day occurred. The director Oliver Stone has been commissioned to bring to the screen the story

of these two men who fought against Death to be able to leave the inferno of debris and flames in which

they were. But not only its history, but also that of those hundreds of men and women who struggled

to find any glimpse of life in the midst of the chaos reigning. Everyone knows at this point that it happened.

Five years ago in the World Trade Center and also lived in a city that collapsed before the

magnitude of events. The novelty of the film is to know how the citizens lived it and, above

all, the security forces, who received only part of the information. They thought it had been an accident.

Those who came to help in the first tower attacked did not know that the same scene had occurred in the

second. The chaos that took place at the scene of the tragedy alternates with continuous images of how theviewed it

family and the rest of the worldbefore television. This part is the most interesting part of the entire film

narrative. Stone films a magnificent beginning of the film that decays when it focuses only on the lives of the

two protagonists. It is not about falling into sentimentality (otherwise foreseeable) but about the way

in which things are narrated and how the flashbacks of their lives are linked with their situation under the rubble. .

It is too shocking and the drama is lost. Although it is fair to recognize that this resource is necessary

to avoid falling into the tedium of the same continued image of delirium, two people half-buried with the desire to

leave it, but little by little they lose hope of achieving it. role of serious man and

not very nice, but fulfilling his duty until the last moment. While Michael Pe���a plays the role

of Chicano fun that the some time has to take the reins of the situation to help out his

sergeant. Both are correct and sober, but the best performance is that of Maggie Gyllenhaal (Allison Jimeno),

the wife of agent Jimeno, which perfectly reflects how it should be. agonies of relatives who did not

receive news of their loved ones. Esthetic quality (which is a lot) and narrative (something less) of the film

apart, the greatest emotion that Stone manages to pull the spectator is the memory. A feeling of deep

sadness emerges when you see the images of people throwing themselves into the void to escape the flames or the

chill that runs down your back as you watch them collapse the first tower. And, inevitably, although

this is not the intention of the director, the memory of the attacks in Madrid appears. The chaos, the fear, the

indignation, the solidarity? Stone achieves a masterpiece of about 45 minutes that loses in intensity

as the footage advances to recover the tone towards the end. Worst of all, for those who are not

Americans that eternal patriotism is even exaggerated, even here. An ex-marine who

travels to ground zero to help in the search for the victims is responsible, of course, for giving life to

that somewhat rancid Americanism that squeaks even in the middle of a tragedy like that. His final phrase on the phone

says it all: "" Go back? No, not yet. Here they are going to need a lot of people to avenge this. " The best, without doubt, the

happy ending for the protagonists, although only in part.

" 1

" A work of an absurd humor, which links it with those of the Spanish Javier Fesser, creator of the

excellent also The Miracle of P. Tinto (1998) and Mortadelo y Filem���n (2002). That is, a Chinese and a Spanish as the most

important references of this genre.

Stephen Chow is today after seven films, the number one man in cinema in China. The popularity made him a

star, but also in his films is the director, the producer, the screenwriter and the total brain behind his

product. As they did also the old glories like Charles Chaplin and Buster Keaton. And to them it is

just -among others-, who pay tribute to Chow with his fresh and dancing comedies. With him he turned the

slapstick, that physical form of humor. A primitive humor and an���rquico, ideal for the pirouettes of kung fu;

a territory that Buster Keaton made great, a creative chain chaos like this beautiful Kung fusion. Eye,

also Chow shows a care of the aesthetics and form -see the photograph of this image-, both in the

frames and in the assembly, which reminds us of apparently, another of his direct influences: Stanley

Kubrick. If not see the initial scene and that endless traveling backwards. In the previous Shaolin Soccer, it

is the beginning with the soccer ball and a shaolin head "" aligned "" like the famous planets, to the sound of

the classical music, which shows. Here is an obvious reference to The Shining. Pure cinefilia. And respect for

the classics. In truth, all this is no surprise. Shaolin soccer (2001) was a delirious comedy and

showed all the imagination that Kung fusion confirms. The surprise is that Chow is overcome, which in

this case makes his last film almost a masterpiece. A work of an absurd humor, which links it

with the Spanish Javier Fesser, creator of the excellent also The miracle of P. Tinto (1998) and Mortadelo y

Filem���n (2002). That is, a Chinese and a Spanish as the most important references of this genre. Ja.The most accurate example

of what Chow's films can be, was given by the critic Roger Ebert of the Chicago Sun Times: "Imagine a

film where Jackie Chan and Buster Keaton meet with Quentin Tarantino and Bugs Bunny "". In fact, thescenes

choreographed fightwere made by the same team from that failed Eastern parody called Kill Bill (and

also from The Matrix). Both, poor imitations of oriental culture. And incidentally and unwittingly, leaves the now

Hollywodense Jackie Chan, a little old and on the verge of retirement. And here you can tell the difference, since any

of the various Kung fights. they overcome without disheveled, the big and numerous Kill Bill. You could only

compare them in skill and imagination, with any of the animated series Dragon Ball! .. Telling the gags -which are

hundreds- would not only be boring but impossible. The gui���n, with entrainable characters and without falling into the dreaded

cursiler���a, is a bit simpler. The struggle of the common people against the mafia, without interline. Pure andfun

intelligent. Even Chow himself remains in the background in all the film despite being the

protagonist. The scene of the persecution -significant of any chapter of the Roadrunner-, the struggle with the

musicians, and the final battle; they are the high points of a film with a sustained, redond���sima rhythm, with

excellent performances of the great majority of older people - some are from Operation Drag���n of Bruce Lee !! -, with

romance, action, humor and no loose spots. Anything else? Buster Keaton from somewhere in the sky, after seeing

Kung Fusion, will be smiling for the first time.

" 1

" A Bogart of terror, the film was conceived at a time when Warner was, if we are allowed to express it,

a "" sausage machine "" .

It seems simple today to disqualify films like El Regreso del Doctor X for its narrative poverty and its

denial when it comes to frightening the public. But we must bear in mind that the film was created

at a time when Warner was, if we are allowed to express it, a "" sausage machine "". Usually the

producers sought to satisfy the public by generating films of social theme, westerns, adventures, the always

effective police and, eventually, some terrifying film. For this they enjoyed a roster of actors under

contract on which they seemed to draw a kind of lottery on whoever plays which character. That seems to

be the only explanation for understanding Humphrey Bogart in a horror film. Warner resorted to an old

success of the house, DOCTOR X (Doctor X-1932) that marked the first alignment between Lionel Atwill and the "screaming" "

Fay Wray. By 1939, with the resurgence of the genre (consolidated from several interestingfeature films

Universal), Warner had no intention of staying out, and that's how we have a " "Regreso" "of this nephew Dr.

X, that although it is not a proper sequel of the 1932 film, pivots in several coinciding points,

namely: - Synthetic blood: Remember that in the film of 1932, a mad scientist used "" synthetic meat "" -

The role of a journalist: Al Lee Tracy of 1932 (too witty and funny) happens to him the Wayne

Morris of film that concerns us, less interested in being funny than in investigating the case - Of course,

the presence of a "" Doctor X "", in this case Bogart, who bears the same surname as the character of Lionel

Atwill (although not related) A theatrical actress (Lya Lys) is "" murdered "" and a reporter (Wayne Morris) gives the

scoop to her newspaper. However, the next day appears alive to deny it. The strange fact

arouses his curiosity and, together with a young doctor friend (Dennis Morgan), he sets out to investigate. The chance

wants one of those involved is the renowned Dr. Flegg (John Beal) whose assistant is the strange and cold

Quesne (Bogart), who is none other than the fearsome Doctor "" X "" , which needs frequent doses of a certain type of

blood. Bogart recently made his appearance at the 22nd minute of the film and it is seen that the director Sherman wanted to endow his

presence with ominous climates that, due to the speed with which it seems to have been filmed, never reaches

achieve. In fact, the final 4 minutes are a prodigy in narrative concisi���on and more that an outcome seems a

summary of the outcome (which of course, takes away the expected suspense). Even so, we can verify its

similarity with the outcome of the subsequent SI MUERO BEFORE AWAKENING (1952), by Carlos H. Christensen.

" 0

" On the terrace of a cafeteria, he draws with his gaze diverse compositions of faces, with profusion of

shadows and reliefs, words lost in incomplete conversations, fragments of reality that constitute

the puzzle of the great search

José Luis Guerin's new film encourages us, once again, to interfere in a search for the

transcendence of cinema and its role as an art or communication instrument. Conn, with subtlety and enormouscoherence

formal, his work supposes for the cin���filo a reason for reflection with the aim of trying to glimpse an

ontology of the cinema, a look sustained in the an� Analysis of the evolution of cinema from its origin until today.

���Cine is the poetry of the image, or the image is the reality of the pr���stine look before all the artifices

with which the aesthetic effort has been burying the supposed original truth ? Are we facing a lyrical work or

is it pure realism and a document of a moment in a corner of life? Minimalism imposes a certain ambiguity,

but in the city of Sylvia it is a film that does not hide any of its features and the answers appear in a

simple act of comprehension. Indeed, it is a film about corners of life, specifically, a city

that darkens and dawns governed by the routines of each day in the different neighborhoods, places and objects of

collective and individual life. The long shots and the traveling along its streets construct an

exploration of the urban landscape subordinated to the spiritual search contained in the story of the young artist

subjected to a feminine epiphany, an object ghostly that acquires the singularity of the palindrome, a labyrinth

of feminine faces that form the polyhedral image of a dream obsession (from theposters

advertisingfeaturing beautiful women to the graffiti that constantly appears on the walls of the

city, J? aime Laure, reference to the love of Petrarch). Thus, the city is not so much a "real" space "

as an artist's enso���ation. And when we talk about the artist, we refer to José Luis Guerin and Xavier

Lafitte, each of whom embodies the subjective gaze of the camera. The city of Sylvia is only an

evanescent image created by the artist, a space of symbols that concentrates the different manifestations of

dreams. Therefore, it is a lyric cinema based on a real scope. The subjective gaze is displayed in two

layers, the one metaphor of the other. The expressiveness of Xavier Laffite's face (emphasized by the blue of

his eyes, an element of beauty introduced in order to attract the attention of the viewer and make him part

of the search) is the best instrument to represent explicitly whatvisual composition

Guerin'ssuggests in the formal-aesthetic sphere. The camera configures the abstract narrative that the central character

translates into immediate sensations. In this way, the appropriate symbiosis between the two looks is achieved in a

relationship of complementarity from which the concept emerges with a clarity that is even to the precision and simplicity

of each plane. One can interpret the material as the representation of a state of being in search of

beauty, or of the past, or of oneself. In the sequence that opens the story, we see Xavier sitting on the bed and

absorbed in an idea. It is the creator becoming aware of his need for an artist, and then he goes out to the

street to find it (every creation implies a search process). On the terrace of a cafeteria, he draws

with his gaze (and here Guerin fuses the two perspectives into one, with which we are before the use ofcamera

subjective) diverse compositions of faces, with profusion of shadows and reliefs, words lost in

incomplete conversations, fragments of reality that constitute the puzzle of the great search. The memory,

the past, the love, the beauty, are as ephemeral and indefinite as the puzzle in the real image subordinated to

a subjective appreciation. The scene in question is worthy of the narrative tension displayed in a

simple but enormously complex set when we transfer it to its abstract meaning, which reaches its

maximum expression. In the image of the supposed Sylvia reflected in the windows of a cafeteria in the

windows of the tram; the evanescence of the memory and the anguish that puts an end to the search. The creator looked for

his art in a woman's face, and this one shows him the polymorphous and elusive character of the same substance that he

intended to make his own. To conclude, it would be a good question to ask ourselves if this impeccable exercise of cinema, which aims to

take us to the original meaning of cinema through an exploration of life, has more strength andvalue

narrativeby the mere fact to be. The perfect use of cinematographic language bycan not be denied

Guerin, but beyond the formal work adjusted to the millimeter in order to articulate the meanings, it

is obvious that the developed idea stumbles on its inherent schematism, and there comes a time when

representation redounds to what has been shown in previous images. In light of this, we raise the question of whether the

dramatic progression of meaning does not get stuck at a certain moment to fall into a static discourse,

without this implying a r���mora to the exposed values ​​with effectiveness.

" 1

" This film is an unsuccessful and pathetic "" attempt "" to do something akin to the great saga of "" Saw "" in the

Cutre-Luxe version.

This film is a failed and pathetic "attempt" to do something similar to the great "Saw" saga in the

Cutre-Luxe version. The director Roland Joff��� (who prepares Singularity for 2008), presents this mess as something

"" Trangresor "" but in fact leaves muchisisisisimo to be desired. The argument has neither feet nor head and

pisco games have nothing, rather they are predictable, easy. The interpretive cast is mostly composed

of actors who are still secondary to their interpretative trajectory. Daniel Gillies will remember him

because he is the marine boyfriend of Chirsten Dunst in Spiderman, this is the most remarkable thing about this guy, whose

performance is forced, not very organic and not at all credible, but let's go the girl, Elisha Cuthbert, fuuuuu, it's

so bad but so bad that almost gives me a spasm in the middle of the movie. Concluding, if you do not want to waste your time and your

money, spend this papuprrimo film. It's amazing how the budget is still being wasted on these

shitty movies, with both a talented young director who would surely take better advantage of it.

" 0

" Although I have just started the year I dare to presume that it will be one of the worst films that await us with

a quality that almost does not reach the mid-afternoon telefilm.

What a movie tease. It is not that it is not sustained or that it does not make sense, it is that what I

Know Who Killed Me is so embarrassing that when they explain it at the end of the tape, it gives others shame. Lindsey

Lohan interprets this time Unana typical American young woman: popular, beautiful, talented and promising who

is abducted. When it appears half dead in a ditch it is believed that it is another person, a stripper

of dark past. The police have to make her remember because she is the only person who has escaped from

captivity and also the only clue to capture the murderer who is already a recidivist in kidnapping and

mutilation. Den other girls in the area.If, well, we have seen other times, to put some saved example with a

certain commercial dignity in the case of The Collector of Lovers but what this pseudo drama offers us

paranormal is more than another derisory thing. Not only is the script embarrassing, its poor performances are

the perfect companion to accompany the fall of its young leading actress who, Surely, I chose the project

under the influence of some psychotropic. Although I have just started the year I dare to presage that it will be one of

the worst films that await us with a quality that almost does not reach the telefilm of mid afternoon.

" 0

" Pornographic film about the hairy asshole and chatter of one Lul���, who feels underutilized.

Since it is pornography more than 20 years old, it is very obsolete, although it is very curious because of the strange

argument. It becomes unpleasant.

Director: Jes���s Franco.Duration: 77 minutes.Studio: 04-14-1986 Madrid: Room X (Francisco de

Rojas). Viewers: 25,137 of human beings (some current releases do not reach this figure ) Reading my Spanish

film book (I hope the author gave me a copy of the free publicity) I found the word "" ojete "",

which awakened my interest. �s. Quickly I had to get a copy, to see this work of art and essay, of the

hyper prolific Jes���s Franco (who not only makes blood films ). Spinning with the subject, to the masculine sector I

recommend to look for the aforementioned word in the Spanish Wikipedia. And m���sa���n if you have seen this movie, it is a

cure for detoxification. The film is about a hairy eyelet, specifically Lul���. So raw. It reflects

the solitude that this orifice has, destined to be only one felt by a woman who does not know the

pleasures that can be provided to her. Underappreciated by his companion, the co���o, the story shows us the

sexual evolution that the aforementioned hole receives, until finally achieving the desired goal. Cachis, I've already

revealed to you the end, heh, je.���A that counted thus the curiosity itches like the eye to a mandril of red ass?

Well, do not be curious, the movie has moments that are disgusting. Is that I have not warned you that theeyelet

hairyof Lul��� speaks. And she speaks with the voice of a girl, or a woman with a flute, with what she even says badly. In addition, the

crazy senseless zooms of Jes���s Franco, shows us planes that no human being should see. Well, maybe

I've passed. And it is that a film director records porn movies, and I try to give them a meaning, it makes

films like these stop, with conversations that are eye-to-eye with me. s fascinantes.Resumiendo, pornographic

film about the hairy and chattering eye of a certain Lul���, who feels underutilized. Since it is

pornography more than 20 years old, it is very obsolete, although it is very curious because of the strange argument. At

times it becomes unpleasant.Besitos.PD: When you have so many years, do not wait for penetrations filmed with

gynecological plans. Better wait for a monologue from an eyelet that speaks with a shrill voice. PD2: The final scene

borders on the gore. It's more, I prefer a thousand decapitated bodies ;-)

" 0

" The story is quite simple, and despite its excessive duration, it does not manage to successfully close all the

subframes that it is creating, as ��� what? Spiderman 3? it's an irregular product, which gets its job, filling the

screens of spectators ...

Sam Raimi returns to place behind the cameras to "" close "" this trilogy starring the man

ara���a. After the previous successes of criticism and public, "" Spiderman 3 "" returns to achieve a triumph exceeded as

far as spectators are concerned, but criticism is another song. Most of them dismiss the film as childish,

excessively long, pantomime and other qualifiers, which lower the list of an interesting trilogy. The

truth is that they are right. "" Spiderman 3 "" is presented to us as a story no���a, in which the character of

Peter Parker / Spiderman is shown in many moments as a caricature, which it does not present anything new, nor does it make the

film more interesting. On this occasion, we find new faces that help increase the

expectations of this third party, such as: Thomas Haden Church, Thoper Grace and Bryce Dallas

Howard. Of these three, the best unemployed is undoubtedly Thomas Haden Church ("" Between drinks ""), who composes a

character like the man of sand, full of humanity within the sobriety and coldness of a convict like the one

he plays. Thoper Grace also shows us two faces, much more differentiated, such as the

photographer Eddie Brock, who will do the competition to Peter in the peri� Doctor, and that of the expected Venom, character that

should have given more game. If in "" The Forest "" Bryce Dallas Howard already demonstrated his talent, here he check that

he has not lost, although his character does not go beyond the typical blonde pretty, silly and rich. Bruce Campbell

returns to make his cameo, in one of the most graceful gags of all the footage. Focusing on the protagonists,

Tobey Maguire has the opportunity to introduce us to a more casual Peter Parker , that borders on the caricature, and

that dares to do everything he had never done before. Kirsten Dunst has a rather bland role, which does not

deserve too many qualifiers, and finally, James Franco more of the same. In short, "" Spiderman 3 "" is

presented as a movie of entertainment, in which the visual effects take all the prominence, and that

in many moments are outstanding (see the man of sand), but in many others they sing to the league. The

story is quite simple, and despite its excessive duration, it does not manage to successfully close all the subframes that

it creates, so "Spiderman 3" is an irregular product that gets its purpose, to fill the screens of

spectators (dissatisfied).

" 0

" Embarrassed and predictable rationale of biblical horror, of apostolic cat���strofes that smell likeblockbuster

giganticon the door of the video store, a sweet treat for demanding palates and attractive

pasa-ratos for those who, deep down, do not ask much, except for a while of amenity. In that aspect, entertaining, the

very public, is.

There is like an archeology of the apocalypse, desire to confine the chaos and the enigmas of public nature in

fictionalized plots, suitable for an immediate commercial consumption. As if the Theology could be reduced to

distraction of Sunday supplement. The collateral effects of the Dan Brown tsunami give frugal mediatic

phenomena that appeal to religious fright, to the remote and revolutionary possibility of subverting the

mythological or metaphysical scaffolding of Christianity and converting it. in a masterful maneuver, in a prolonged deception

during two miraculous millennia. To go to the shelf of novelties of any bookstore to understand the

monstrous scope of this fashion that already seems an epidemic. The harvest joins this anthology of ecumenical nonsense

and confirms the idea that the unpretentious spectator - the one who is suddenly happy - will leave happy and

proud, convinced that his natural supernatural concerns have had a mesi���nico,audiovisual support

mayest���tico, overwhelming and incontestable. Biblical plagues, miracles, antichrists and bastards several of Our

Lord Jesus Christ snatch the formal believer and distract those who only seek distraction. To all the

others, to those who, believe or not, satisfy them a care of the forms and a competent dramatic sustenance the

films like the harvest bring to the fresh air. His eyes will open a little more in the obligatory scenes of

luxury infographic (here there are, no doubt) and will break into yawns when the director occupy thefootage

intermediatewith gilipollescos di ylogos and pseudoscientific justifications. The thin line between faith and

superstition comes from the mastery of using a computer with a powerful graphic card.Fr���vola,

halfway between the biblical thriller and the apocalyptic docudrama, the film dispenses with all literary interest and

casts its possible interest (do not take it away so quickly) in the expertise of the postproduction, will miss falam���s.

This fantasy of loose budget adheres to a potentially harmful genre: the apocalyptic thriller, the

suspense with speculative magic. I fear the worst: I fear that these forays in the Old and New

Testaments, fantastical books, in the literal sense of the term, but indicators, in the last instance, of the

little imaginative courage of the new screenwriters of the cinema, who flee from the risk as if it were a cloud

of locusts and embrace, implicitly, this inexhaustible film and, to the astonishment of the producers, golos��� simple

for the viewer easily impressionable. It's just a matter of waiting a few weeks and seeing how the film is

held on the screen, stealing poster from other less spectacular proposals, but m��� Vitamins of cinema, of

interest, of honesty.

" 0

" There is a moment "" key "" in the story that is already forced, that forces what is already forced,

justifying it in the script with a single phrase of a character with less depth and intelligence than Peter

Griffin.

Cassandra's dream continues with the current "" serious "" London line of Match Point, but it is very far from that.

The direction is correct, but it is losing several kilos of bellows as the film progresses. The

dialogues I liked, but there are some pretty pretentious and plenty of cheap moralina that any

TV movie could contain. In addition, history is nothing special, and it is forcibly. And if we

did not have enough, there comes a "key" moment in the story that forces what is already forced,

justifying it in the script with a single sentence of a character with less depth and intelligence than Peter

Griffin. Not to mention the end (which is so stupid that one gets the feeling that Tito Woody left

escopeteao towards Barcelona without finish the film, leaving it at the mercy of the technical team, who

managed it as it could) and the cast, quite limited, especially the day protagonist Colin Farrell

(absolutely pathetic) and Ewan McGregor, who again shows that, although he has charisma and is handsome, he is a

man with only a couple of interpretative records. Everything I have released would do think to anyone that the

film did not like anything at all. It is not true. I thought it was a movie that could be saved by the minimum, since it

knows how to capture the attention of the viewer during all its footage, and it does not seem fair to suspend it (a 5

pelad���simo). In addition, that creative maturity of Allen of the last years, where everything is more elegant and

sophisticated, dazzles me. But in the end, it turns out to be a rather disappointing film.

" 0

" Far from the use of the biography, he convinces by the 'real' profile that he sketches about the artist Edith Piaf,

whose songs became hymns for different generations.

The problem of approaching a myth is that many of your fans - although this would not be the correct term -

can turn against you. That was the risk run by Olivier Dahan with this portrait of a sacred legend

for our northern neighbors. How can you win over such a difficult audience? penetrate? The answer is very

simple: counting on an actress who transforms by tearing the skin and looking from the inside for the personality

of a character that you have references to bore. Marion Piaf has done it, perd���n, Cotillard,

unrecognizable in his transformation: scratching we find the actress who took justice by her hand in

Long Sunday of courtship and entered into Tim Burton's universe with Big Fish. If a song evokes a state of

mind, a film must do the same thing: provoke emotions and remove dormant feelings. This is what

the person responsible for this audiovisual biography, supported by scars and triumphs, thoughtfully and conscientiously in

order to serve as a vehicle towards a past and recreated time, must have thought. It is for the air freshener decorators, but

also for a cast where Gerard Depardieu and Emmanuelle Seigner stand out. Like when you read a

book and recreate it in your mind, a character of legend comes to life in our head afterwards. Des of having received

innumerable informative impacts. In this way, Life in Pink (the film, not the song) is an

idealization of a star from a compilation of official biographies , cuts in the press, auditions

of his discography and personal perceptions - these take most of the cake. -fundamentalism

Popularand the destructive omens of certain critics can condition the future of this praiseworthy work, a case

similar to that of the recent Lola, the film, with a superb Gala ���vora. After thischauvinist

Iberiancomment? For making parallels between two artists, two myths-, we can only emphasize thatmay seem

their footageexcessive, although compensated by an excellent soundtrack, In part, it diminishes the capacity for impact

that this portrait of La M���me holds since its first frame, with which a passionate andlife begins

passionate.

" 1

" A masterpiece full of shocking sequences (I forgot to mention the explosion of the beginning) and

interpretations that touch or come to perfection. Alfonso, we thank you for giving us such a wonderful gift.

There are times when a story may seem so real to you that it seems that you are living the same moments as the

protagonists. This is the case of Sons of Men, a futuristic film that shows how, in the year 2027

, the first child was born after 18 years. It is clear that it is a masterful film, full of

absolutely impressive shots - the photograph is carried out, nothing more and nothing less than by Emanuel Lubezki ),

brilliant performances and an impeccable script (based on the homonymous novel of PDJames). He was thankful

to Alfonso Cuar���n for giving us this cinematographic gem. The plot is simply

brutal. Not only the base, no, but everything as a whole. The argument of Sons of men is, symbolically, a

journey to hope. And the film is told as a trip, for what makes it, not only more beautiful,

but also interesting. In reality, the life of each one is a journey, and this I think is whatwants tous.

Cuar���ntellIn this case, the journey begins with a follow-up of really disconcerting actors: Clive Owen (the

protagonist of the function, that in addition to showing us that he knows how to walk with sandals, shows his mostfacet

dramatic and human), Julianne Moore (who does not come out too much, but you get completely in his character, thanks

to his great performance), Michael Caine (what to say of this wonderful actor who here plays a

hippie who will be a great help for the protagonist), Chiwetel Ejoifor , Pam Ferris (the ���malvada���director

of Matilda's school) laand the unknown, but brilliant in her role, Clare-Hope Ashitey (��� her second name is

made to prop� ��sito?). With such a cast, it is normal for realism to be even greater, since the actorsus

providewith the best of themselves. The film has many, many sequences. memorable One of

them, more than a sequence is a chapter, is that in which Owen, Ashitey and Ferris infiltrate the

immigrant refugee camp to access the boat that will take them. �� to the Human Project. Another, without a doubt, is that

of the getaway with the car that does not start. It is also necessary to mention such dense dialogues between Owen

and Moore and Caine. And finally, the splendid ending. Absolutely incredible. Still talks about humanity.

It speaks of hope, of pain, of children, of pessimism, of an apocalyptic future, of asociety

terrified, of political forces. This is one of those films that count more or less everything. There are

directors who know how to mix so many subjects at the same time (like Cuar���n), there are others that do not. The Mexican director

manages to create a totally overwhelming human discourse. I would dare to say that along with a few others, he knows how to

show in images the human philosophy. In Sons of Men, each actor interprets not only his role, but also

a symbolism. Look: Owen represents the company; ��� Mood the past; Caine the philosophy; and Ashitey the

hope. One of the best moments, as I have commented before, of the film is that in which Jasper (Caine)

explains to Theo (Owen) the why of the disappearance of the children and the theory that this Human Project exists.

The phrases Jasper says tell it all. In short, a masterpiece full of shocking sequences (I

forgot to mention the explosion of the beginning) and interpretations that touch or come to perfection. Alfonso,

we thank you for giving us such a wonderful gift.

" 1

" It does not stop falling in the common places of the genre, that's it, but it takes time to build a narrative

line that reaches the climax in the fair moment and that at all times is shown as attractive in its

conception.

The continuation of "" 28 days later "", which was known in Argentina as Extermination, was really expected

among the fans of the horror genre. Here Danny Boyle no longer directs but produces it and has invited

Juan Carlos Fresnadillo to use his original creation. This director is known for an excellent

film that I do not remember that was released here, "" Intact "", and the truth is that it was a good choice to

drive behind of the cameras. "" 28 weeks later "" starts then six months after the virus has

devastated Great Britain. The army of the United States declares that the war against infection has been won

and that the reconstruction of the country can begin. The script follows a parallel path between the images that

describe how the problem of the virus was resolved in British soil and the return of a first wave of

refugees to the sectorized London post-epidemic. There is a subject, Don, Robert Carlyle in a solid job,

who in a confusing situation when the movie opens leaves his wife at the mercy of the zombies during the

first outbreak of which we know After his escape, Don will receive his children, who are abroad

and return to District One, which is the safe zone of infection in London in the which is a

character with almost unrestricted access freedom. Well, there is the reunion of a family that was

separated by the terrible events that took place then, although one of its members carries, without being

aware, a terrible secret, we can not anticipate but You will know before entering the room that the

virus has not yet completely disappeared and this time, it is even more dangerous. The script written by the

same Fresnadillo with Rowan Joffe (who comes from American TV and is relatively new to this) is

very well structured. It does not stop falling in the common places of the genre, that's it, but it takes time to

build a narrative line that reaches the climax at the right time and that at all times is shown as

attractive in its conception. There are zombies, marines, deaths, mutilations, blood. All that a fan of the

genre expects. There is also some correct performance of Amanda Walker and Rose Byrne, between intense side,

good photography and a tempo care that makes the film barely feel in the body. "" 28 weeks later "" is

fast, fast and as long as you want to look at the clock and the lights will be on and people leaving the room.

Maybe I was expecting a job. It is complete in terms of the movements of the group of survivors in

London, but I hope the version of the DVD that, like the previous one, will surely have more extras to enjoy. It is

a correct product, but only for lovers of the genre.

" 1

" Through material selected from the nearly 90 hours filmed by Treadwell and interviews with his

relatives, the German filmmaker builds an intimate portrait of the protagonist and uncovers the ancient ghosts that

they rule their life.

The North American Timothy Treadwell, lover and studious amateur of grizzly bears, lived with these

ferocious animals for thirteen summers. Convinced of being the only protector of these beings who, in his eyes,

represented the prefect expression of life, he would not hesitate to camp in his territories and constantly omit

the law that proh�� Acerbe approaching less than 90 meters. Become a celebrity because of his many

visits to schools and his television appearances would win the enmity of researchers and biologists, and would be

seen by many as an alienated obsessed in a risky and incomprehensible altruistic work. The critics

did not break the will of Timothy that in his last five expeditions he would take with him acamera

videoto record his adventures and immortalize his life experience. In October 2003, the worst expectations would

be fulfilled: Timothy and Amie Huguenard, his girlfriend and occasional companion, would be torn apart and devoured by

a large grizzly bear. His death would not surprise almost anyone and even a section of the political right crossed it

out, with chilling cynicism, of "" typical death of a democrat " " Diametrically opposed would be the attitude

of Werner Herzog who, from a respectful perspective, would intuit in the history of the grizzly man adrama

latent, a dimension unknown by the majority. Through material selected from the nearly 90 hours

filmed by Treadwell and interviews with his relatives, the German filmmaker builds an intimate portrait of the

protagonist and uncovers the ancient ghosts that reg�� �an life: handsome teenager and sportsman with afuture

promising, the young Timothy discovered the bad life in college. After flirting with drugs and incubating

incipient alcoholism, he decided to turn his life around and be an actor. However, after being rejected for

a role in the Cheers series, he would fall into a spiral of deep depression and self-destruction. His life being an

endless number of unfulfilled promises, he felt again the need to reinvent himself. It is when you look back in search

of shelter when you remember your personal rosebud, the hobby of teddy bears, which will awaken in you the

inordinate passion for the grizzly bears. Timothy will move away from society and take refuge in thereserves

naturalof Alaska where he will forge an ideal world next to the bears (in his eyes, incarnation of kindness).

Treadwell will be the guardian of this harmonic and simple world, and a non-existent poacher,

representative of the civilization that shied away from him, will be his �� Only enemy. Your tormented spirit will momentarily find

peace in this idealized nature and your camera will try to embalm it. However, this

utopian world will soon break down. Werner Herzog, who has given an important role to

nature, both in his life and in his work, and has spoken of new age sensitivity and esotericism as

diseases of civilization, takes advantage of the material shot by Treadwell to expose his ideas about the

relationship between man and the world. In this way, the kind nature shown in the beautifulportraits

landscapeand the nice planes of the bears that, accompanied by pleasant guitar notes, initiate

the film, will be evident. As a result of a confused human projection when confronted with false shots,

the material that Treadwell had rejected in a montage about his ideal world. The kind look he sees in

the bears and that leads him to speak with them as if they were human beings, will fade away when he meets

the mortal remains of a bear cub that has been devoured by an adult male . The idealized vision of the

protagonist, who will even go so far as to adore the feces of Osuna, will be linked to violence and natural chaos.

The tragic death under the clutches of their beloved bears will corroborate that Timothy's world did not correspond

to the indifferent (catholic, inhuman?) Reality, that the place had He found his measure only existed

in his films. Hand in hand with Herzog, the madman of Timothy Treadwell becomes a kind character capable

of winning the affection of the spectator. Beaten by civilization, his stubborn struggle for a company destined

to failure becomes an emotive reflection of man's combat against existential absurdity, against

emptiness. Werner Herzog transcends the beautiful images of the apprentice documentary maker, converting what at

first seemed like a delirious and meaningless story in a moving speech. Always respectful,

as corroborated by the scene in which he asks to destroy the tape that records the cries of Timothy and Amie

being devoured (material of incalculable value for an unscrupulous documentary maker), Herzog leaves aside the

morbid focus attention on the passionate and warrior nature that characterizes Treadwell twinning with

other characters in the universe of the filmmaker as Fitzcarraldo or Lope de Aguirre. Surpassing the mere curiosity,

the German director makes his own the images of the grizzly man to present, without tapujos, his particular vision

of the world; returning the cinema, in this way, to the place that best suits you: a poetic place between language and

reality from which it is possible to explore the contradictory human nature. PD: "We should be

grateful because the universe out there does not know a smile." "Werner Herzog in theDeclaration

Minnesota

" 1

"Where there could be five films or An interesting television series shows us a sample of

scenes full of holes that may be filled in somehow.

Let us remember once again the first law of William Goldman: films are structure, and that structure is

different and independent of the structure of a novel or a play. That structure must be

above the literal adaptation of a book, what is so much now styled, with the man���a to be faithful to points and

commas and secondary characters and filling actions, or, as it is done against, by adapting

Alacuristeseveral books at the same time (no, I do not explain why the chickenis killed in that way

with the golden eggs). it is the great defect that, as a film, Alatriste has. The structure fails, and,

when the structure fails, the pieces do not marry each other as they should. The narrative remains, thus,

washed away, suggesting too much and counting little: we jump from the highlights of one book to the

next, and leave hanging scenes that are key to understanding the motivations of the characters, the

historical environment. ��rico, court intrigues: it is a walk through the most emotional moments of books, but full

of gaps that, for that reason, reduce the great daily gestures that Alatriste himself or his companions of

wars and misfortunes they are living: the suicide of the Portuguese, the attack on board the ship, the economic sacrifice

of Sebasti���n, the impossibility of freeing the prisoner condemned to death , the accusation of esp���a towards

I���igo. In that look to the novels, we also stay with the desire to know something more of all those

historical characters that appear as filler, making cameos of themselves and cameos of the actors

(too popular) that embody them: the great Javier C���mara playing Conde-Duque de Olivares (an excuse

to admit that I had always seen him in the role of G���ngora , who is more similar), and the no less great

Juanjo Echanove playing a bitter and quarrelsome Quevedo, so overly characterized that almost

seems a caricature of the poet. For that matter, neither Malatesta has the strength that should ��a, nor the episode with the

Duke of Buckingham has then importance in the plot (while the development of that episode is cut).

Anglic is practically superfluous in the film, while she does not transmit any idea of ​​femme fatale and the

performance of Elena Anaya does not put her above any pilinguilla of series of institutes. Ariadna Gil plays

Mar���a de Castro, a role that would have fallen in Ana Bel���n once. but Ariadna is not Ana Bel���n,

I'm afraid. They say that Arturo P���rez-Reverte, happy father of the creature, demanded that the film be filmed in Spanish. ol,

because of what he did not imagine Quevedo or Alatriste himself speaking in another language. Interesting

proposal that, from the outset, closes the doors to the export of the most expensive film of Spanish cinema, as they

have insisted on us for active and passive since they started. ��� to shoot, and perhaps even some nomination to the Oscar

to the great Viggo Mortensen, who embroiders his role (���remending poses of P���rez-Reverte himself?) Although his character does not

dominate the story many times as it should, as sometimes the film becomes too choral and

steals too many minutes of prominence. Mortensen does what he can, and does it well, hiding hisaccent

South American, but unfortunately the same can not be said of the damned direct sound and the ability

declamativa of the actresses, who are not understood half of the time and who recite everything with the same

collegial tone: it is shameful that the beautiful Pilar L���pez de Ayala has just four lines of ���logo and the

four say them badly. Nor is it understood that the inquisitor Bocanegra is intepretado by a woman who is

recognized as Blanca Portillo at all times and whose voice is not camouflaged. The film, then, becomes long because it

is lurching. The great moments (that have them) are very diluted in a narrative that is stretched: it is

an episodic film where the narrative leaps, paradjically, fill it with dead spots . Despite its

cost, the shortcomings are noted: the assault on the ship is already counted on deck, without us seeing the boats on

board; the galleys where, with little conviction, I remaigo is a closed plat que that does not even oscillate and whose ship also

slips away. The historical reconstruction and lighting, impeccable, suffer from the lack of

any general plan to show us from the air the Madrid of the time. Very well choreographed and quite

realistic sword duels, although perhaps there is an excess of deg���ellos throughout the film (follow the

account, because I lost it). : that where there could be five films or an interesting television series,

we are shown a sample of scenes full of holes that maybe filled in, like saying, "Look at

what we know how to do if they let us do it." I am curious to see how the film works in the Spanish box office

and, above all, outside our borders, that it will be the only place where the film can be recovered.pasta

invertedin this project.

" 0

" To see in Original Version Subtitled. Ben Stiller produces and is already on my shelves, between Hot Fuzz and

Blades of Glory.

It should have premiered the same weekend as the Simpsons movie, but the criteria of the Spanish

distributors would surely have been "" direct to dvd "" in another brilliant demonstration. n that not only Spanish

cinema weakens, but also the conditions in which the for���neo is exhibited. The film starring the

unpaired is a kind of update of the immortal The Blues Brothers adapted for the youthful rockers

that inhabit the globe. Perhaps the deepest thing can be the message , the moral, that

personally has come to my soul SPOILER: no matter how great you do, if you do not pick it up on a piece of paper

you will forget it after smoking a hookah. Two losers (one more than another) join forces to

take over the secret of rock: a satna p���a built from a comillo of the same �simo Belceb��� is

responsible for the success of the greatest in the History of Rock. JB and KG will get to work to reach

the Rock Museum, warned of the danger for a great cameo that you should not lose. The start of the movie

includes a musical number that removes the hiccups: Dio, Meat Loaf and a baby JB that was already in Super Nacho. see

in SUBTITLED ORIGINAL VERSION. Ben Stiller produces and is already on my shelves, between Hot Fuzz and Blades of

Glory.

" 1

" The movie that closes the Bourne trilogy tells us what we needed to know about Jason Bourne, resolves

the unknowns on which the trilogy was maintained. A summer movie necessary in times when the action cinema

falls.

The Bourne trilogy arose thanks to the success of the first. There were other books on which to base more movies,

but the idea was to make the first and period. The success of the Doug Liman movie (Mr. and Mrs. Smith) was enormous and this

opened the closing for a trilogy, typical of Holywood. It was decided to change the tone a little and they signed another

director, Paul Greengrass, who had reaped a lot of success with that marvel that was BLODY SUNDAY.change

Successfuleverything must be said, although the first does not detract anything from the trilogy. The Bourne case had

the worst gui���n of all, and it did not sell well for that. The promotion phrase of the movie was "" With a chase

of emotion similar to that of French Connection "", which is not true, neither of you are going to compare. Even so it had a

success of the cop���n. Well, the first part was the most similar to the book on which it was based, which the other two

seem rather little. This is because I read it, not because I read the books, so I can not be

very reliable in that sense. But that does not matter, when a book is dismissed you send a lot of ass up,

necessarily because literature is not very cinematographic, except for Elmore Leonard and Raymond

Chandler I would say, but my opinion matters more poco.EL ULTIMATUM DE BOURNE is a very good movie, with a

rhythm reminiscent of the seventies movies, type PELHAM 1,2,3 or the movies of Don Siegel, but with atouch

more modern, a lot of computer and technological paraphernalia Logic It has a tone very in line with the previous, even

more nervous, Greengrass has moped the move he made in FLIGHT 93, a real movie, and repeated the

formula, m���sc���mara on the shoulder, almost to abuse it. But forgive yourself, because history does not decay. The

trilogy of Bourne is risky, because the three parts are of the same, this note wants to know what it is,

because this is so and such and such. and that's dodgy, because the scriptwriter has to count on people who have not

seen the previous two, and build a script that works by itself, but also puts you in a situation,

and Quick, because if you throw away a lot of time explaining it becomes boring, especially for those who have seen the

other two. I saw the movie with my girlfriend who had not seen the other two, and I understood everything perfectly, it took me a

while to get into the story, but I saw that a beginning was necessary. typical and explanatory, because if

not, I had not understood anything, she did not have certain information about the character that I did because I had

seen the other two movies. Then he got into the movie and enjoyed it until the end. Matt Damon is theactor

idealfor this character, without being the best actor of his generation, if he is a very result, with a lot

of adaptability and that, every time, he does it better, he always improves, contrary to the fact that some people who are good

maintain themselves, he always improves. The end is very good, I did not expect that at all, it is a well-built turn and

very well prepared, because without being the typical final surprise to the beast, it surprises a lot just because of how well

prepared it is. . This indicates to us that there is no need for an apothetical end, if not a well-constructed story and

a well-prepared ending.

" 1

" In short, an unfortunate adaptation of a classic, irregular, simple and with a 100% palomitero use

due to all the pyrotechnics used. Only the decent performance of a credible Will Smith is saved; Except that,

embarrassing.

Third cinematographic adaptation of the science fiction novel by Richard Matheson. Simple and

tight version with a rhythm of the most irregular in terms of narration and action, use of the totally failed flashback

that only seeks the involvement n the viewer without getting it. This time, we changed to Charlton Heston for Will

Smith, we put a dog to him of grief when he dies -as��� we won to the public of easygrip- a

very poor vampires and very badly obtained, and the rest that the marketing team does with the phrases: the

last man alive on earth, or with the most expensive sequence in history. Refried infectious virus (28

days later, Resident Evil, Dawn of the dead.) Where undoubtedly the best thing happens when Will Smith

is alone in a deserted New York. Stunning plans and recreation of an apocalyptic Manhattan

ravaged, where the protagonist has fun of day hunting deer (excellent scene) or going shopping, and

hiding at night. Acceptable - not because of its originality - until the moment when the vampires appear, where

the director goes to opt for the 100% American show in the form of a budget, and forgets everything that has been

exposed so far. Finally, a semisweeping whiff with pincers that abounds everywhere in the15

finalminutes, where we are forced to believe to be saved. Attention to the 30 seconds of the end, the phrase,

the sound of the bells, the church, the doors of salvation opening wide and the whole community

of blesseds that goes out to receive us In short, an unfortunate adaptation of a classic, irregular, simple

and with a 100% palomitero use due to all the pyrotechnics used. Only the decent performance of ais saved

credible Will Smith; Except that, embarrassing.

" 0

" Highly recommended film for all the fans of the murci���lago man, yes, not recommended for minors ...

Hardly doubt is that Christopher Nolan with films like "" Memento " "behind his back and" "Insomnia" "both

masterpieces of current cinema, made the new installment (the 5 th) of the murciélago man a

simple and mediocre film (look at the background of Daredevil, Elektra, The punisher or the worst of all.

CATWOMAN). Nolan composes a good film that delves into the youth of Gotham's hero, a lesscity

gothicthan the one proposed by Burton in the first two Batman (Schumacher's step to refer to me! Hala!),

with an excellent roster of actors, although Bale takes the lead and is "" that leaves "" in the role of

Bruce Wayne / Batman. In two hours of projection gives time to everything, to see the reasons why young

Wayne builds his life on the road to revenge e the death of their parents and their true motivations, and how

goes from being a victim to executioner of all those who break the law in Gotham, his city. Although, of course,is not

everything that glittersGold and yet there is some another negative part, for example the fast assembly of action

scenes, poorly coordinated and poorly focused, there is no detail and in the dark they try to

hide the shortcomings of these, perhaps the only negative note In short, a highly

recommended film for all the fans of the murci���lago man, that yes, not recommended to minors.

" 1

" Finally, for the enjoyment of the simpsoneros, that we are legion, there is film. And fortunately in cinema we are

given the same as in the television series: pure fun cost of ourselves. The fact that the series

has been producing for two decades is no mere chance, as the reader could imagine.

Finally, for the enjoyment of the simpsoneros, that we are legion, there is film. And fortunately in cinema we are given

the same as in the television series: pure fun cost of ourselves. The fact that the series

has been producing for two decades is no mere chance, as the reader could imagine. The classicsman said that

a few can be deceived for a long time, and many for a short time, but many can not be fooled

for a long time. "" The Simpsons "" are, surely, the most influential series in the History of Television, and

their humor ���cido, corrosive, sarcastic, but at the same time tender , human, emotive, has permeated several generations

of viewers; because, in addition, it is a serial that reaches children, adolescents and adults alike. What's more,

I'm of the opinion (not always shared?) That adults will savor more the mad humor of this

family of lower middle class and all the landscape and peasantry that the surrounds. All this is in "" The Simpsons-The

Movie "": criticism of the established powers (with that president Schwarzenegger who is disrespectful nothing more

than the mere statement that he could reach such a high level of office, of course, after seeing George W.

Bush in office, anything is possible: maybe even Schwarzzie does it better?),

Joking about the citizens, both highborn and low bed (heavens, I look like Cecilia?), Distribution of

tow left and right, without anyone being saved. And all with the frenzied rhythm of any of the

stupendous almost 400 chapters so far manufactured by the heated brains of Matt Groening and

company. What was said: a joy.

" 1

" Miss Potter is an over-ripened sugar candy: an unbearable exercise innavel-gazing

emotional. How to put your tongue in a jar of jam. And then put it again ...

I agree with a friend who put me on notice when he knew my intention to see this movie. I used to

say that the painter was sweet as a tongue to a jar of jam. He has a habit that follows

strictly: to get carried away by the elementary impression, the primary one. In this case, he did not likeat all,

advertisingnor (I was, in part, according to him) the title. Then he warned me with

a more effective forcefulness: You are going to see a film ���o���a. That adjective disarmed me, but I disregarded my misgivings

and collided in the viewing of the matter. It would have been better to pay attention to friendship. Friends are a treasure,

as a song says. This is a couple of them. Miss Potter is an over-ripened sugar candy: an

unbearable exercise in emotional navel-gazing. It does not matter that they are there to avoid the collapse two

actors of recent fuste like Ewan McGregor or Renee Zellweger. The cinematographic precipitate is inevitable

because the cake is so overwhelmed with magic, rabbits and noble feelings that it cloys with two or three

minutes of exposure. The Beatrix Potter, the Rowling of the early twentieth century, had to be a charming

lady, with very literary foundations, but the film overwhelms, dislocates, produces the opposite of what

look, let's settle in a comfortable distance. There is never a time to enter completely even though

the actors (the three main ones, McGregor, Zellweger and Emily Watson) are quite good. So

beautiful and well done is everything that scales .

" 0

" More than recommended action tape. Greengrass prints the right rhythm, the plot does not waste time on

unnecessary issues and Damon, in his role, acts as a hero of modern action with sobriety, without excess.not

I dothink he knew either.

The value of this blockbuster is that it does not deceive the viewer and poses a direct intrigue, sheltered in a

series of codes that facilitate the comprehension of the complete series. Bourne is not the hero of thewestern

traditionalambushed in a reality that surpasses him: it is not Shane or William Munny, the vulnerable and sensitive

adult gunmen who still keep the resources of mat���n that they They made fearsome. The plot of the

trilogy leads the story backwards. Bourne does not run away from the past: what he wants is to understand it. The plot is more

complex than usual in these cases, but neither does it require an accelerated course of semiotics or a closet

full of Cahiers du Cinema in the native language. Bourne, a correct Matt Damon, is the James Bond of this 21st century,

the hero of action that oo7 could have been the case that his writers had covered the stories of one

m� It's taken care of invoice. Here there are bad and there are good: the difference with respect to the cinema of similar works

is that this guarantees the fidelity of the spectator (in the style of 24, the exceptional television series

or even Collateral, the ��� last great thriller) thanks to a finest warp of causes and hazards,pieces

well organizedwhose sole purpose is to delay the outcome and entertain, and how, during thejourney

proposedThe detailed biographical reconstruction of the assassin Bourne offers a greedy itinerary: the journey

almost half the world to complete the puzzle. Nothing new, but what fascinates in this installment (and to a lesser

extent in the two previous ones) is the stubborn search for truth, the typical breath that infuses the argument with

heroic connotations and links us with a ambiguous character, of reprehensible past, but sincerely impelled to

find his name, his history, the reasons why he kills and is wanted to be killed. Without respite, the

troop of action scenes more than meets the ration It is a customary of colorful images, technically

perfect, to which the new American cinema accustoms us, in need of a loyal clientele that pays the

entrance and buys, on the way, the alluvium huge amount of merchandising to use. In these times of terrorist warnings

and convoluted cybernetic histories of viruses and imperial Trojans (The jungle 4.0) moves the domestic

closeness of the series, its undisguised melodramatic vocation The Bourne Ultim���tum is a recommendable film

that sees its primacy ballasted in those rankings of the best movies of the year for being inscribed in a g��� A nero

often neglected, which is relied upon to make a box office and ring the box. I have contributed

with pleasure.

" 1

" The particular universe of Anderson can become a delight for the palates already used (or

prepared) to him, but terribly irritating for those who are not (or do not want to be). I

loved it.

Wes Anderson returns with "" The Darjeeling Limited "", an emotional tale about the reunion and the second

opportunities starring Owen Wilson, Adrien Brody, and Jason Schwartzman, and set in the fascinating

landscapes of India. After death from his father, three brothers embark on a peculiar journey with the aim of

reuniting after a too long estrangement. The plan, proposed by the greatest of them (Wilson),

is to embark on the train that gives title to the film and that runs from end to end in India. As

expected, so many years away and the skepticism on the part of the younger brothers before such a bizarre plan give

rise to irritation, tensions and secrecy, causing many disputes including physical.must change a

Thingslot so that the spiritual journey begins to bear fruit. With "" Journey to Darjeeling "" Anderson

once again demonstrates his skills as a director / artist, achieving a succession of spectacular scenes (exquisite

travels that follow the characters on board the train) that merge with an imposing photograph of colorful

design to the sound of a simply perfect soundtrack. In addition, the act The trio protagonist is credible and

delivered, thanks mainly to the work of Wilson and Schwartzman. As if that were not enough, the film opens

with the short film "Hotel Chevalier" "(famous for being one of the most downloaded videos of the last months

due to the nude of Natlie Portman), a beautiful prologue that presents one of the protagonist brothers and that

it contrasts in its gray tonality with the warm Indian landscape that it gives way to. So, Everything seems to indicate that

we are facing an authentic masterpiece, but as with all the director's filmography,

this film does not admit half measures: either you love or hate yourself. Being again the main engine of the proposal, the

particular universe of Anderson can become a delight for palates already accustomed (or prepared)

to it, but terribly irritating for those who are not ( or do not want to be). Conscientiously

dehumanized and apparently distant characters, trivial situations, and sudden encounters between comedy and drama

are just some of the examples that characterize the world in which the director's head seems to nest and which,

in "" Viaje a Darjeeling "" make an appearance in At the moment, it is enough to accept them and play

with them to inevitably surrender to an emotive plot and a beautiful message, full of hilarious jokes

that do not seek laughter but are a constant smile, and also presented s with anformal elegance

impressive. The characters are adorable, and they manage to get quickly with the approval of the spectator. You can

reproach him, that is, a remarkable low of rhythm towards the final stretch of the movie. �cula, in which they begin to

intertwine one conclusion after another leading the viewer to a certain disinterest and distancing. But go,

I loved it.

" 1

" Difficult film, visually unattractive and with a great script that makes up for itRohmer reveals with his arts a heterodox and very personal style of filmmaking where, perhaps the This is not the case

, but the background of their stories is a contribution to the seventh art; especially this

film, the most outstanding in its trajectory. The film begins with the two key elements, the

predestination and the free choice of the person emerged on the basis of an indecipherable conversation of

mathematics between protagonist and secondary plagued by syllogisms. Once put the chips on the board is

only to enjoy the knot of history that is the pinculo of it, where we can witness a

struggle for the firm defense of values; who the enemy Maud, a beautiful woman with great skill, will try to

subvert them in a nocturnal enclosure that the friend of Jean-Louis will prepare. As it was for me "" The Godfather "",

Rohmer's life values ​​are really exemplary. Another noteworthy nuance is that in this story there

are no good or bad, no one is the one to judge the way of acting of the individual; making this a more

realistic film, which also opens up the sea of ​​uncertainty and doubts to which the protagonist and theare subjected,

spectatorsince Take that approach everything becomes more gray. The film is made in a comedy key and would

really be attractive as such if the view does not betray me in a couple of details quite evident, such

as the end, which has a reflective turn (quite brief, by the way) that reveals a background of

latent melodrama, which leaves you a little cold at the end of the film; the other "" but "" are the sets of lighting

which seem to be a little done "" bareback "", that is, if one is used to watching comedies, you will

appreciate that the light tends to play a sweet role to wrap the phylic product of a sugary aura that

this great work really lacks, not to say that it is the antithesis. The latter may sound connotations but

sometimes one factor compensates the other, as is the case. However, it can be deduced that the lighting looks for other

purposes. To conclude and as a recommendation, I will not only say that it is a difficult film, visually

unattractive (not because of the photograph, eye, but because of its lighting) and with a great script that I think iscompensated in

totallyaddition to Jean- Louis Trintignant and above all Fran���oise Fabian who in this film gathers

elegance and intelligence. A work focused on a more purist public on the subject, in summary.

" 1

" Neither the great Bardem, in one of his worst roles, is able to extract mediocrity and anodism from

this film.

Yesterday I was having dinner with the colleagues from work and I arrived, my half courgette was waiting for me.

Not with the roll of kneading bread in the hand, as in the comics of Zipi and Zape, if not to tell me that the

film is a tru���o. That he had seen her with her mother and that she was very bad. Of course, his mother who has a

light reading The Iliad is not a reference too similar to mine, but if my half kiwi says it is

bad, it is that it is. The film I have no idea what is it about? The poster shows Bardem with the face of being

sucking lemons, as well as not much manly. With the male that this man is and the aflaute that they have taken him out. And of

course, if Goya's ghosts go, and Bardem is not Goya, surely the one above (the one with the brush and the palette

of a fine brush painter) will be Goya. The one in the middle I have no idea who it is, that I am very

hurt myself. Well, he says it's Natalie Portman, but I say he does not know what to do. What do you want me to tell you about a

film I've managed not to see? Well no idea, I think my career as a film critic has hit rock

bottom. Many thought that I had already done it, but I bought a shovel to dig deeper, ha ha ha.

Resuming, what my Paraguayan average says that the movie is a tru��� or, so I'm going to apply thefactor

influencesuegril, I'll see what they have given in other blogs to the movie and took an average of stars for

those who do not read the cr�� Ethics is thought to be bad. How tremendous it is to have power to influence the masses

;-)

" 0

" Film about scammers who want to use burying novices to perpetrate a scam.

First episode of Mariano Ozores, who surprises us with a comedy of very nice entanglement andmoments

really hilarious. Highly recommended

Director: Mariano Ozores. Duration: 77 minutes. Year: December 10, 1959. Viewers: 10,484 ofbeings

human. Conversation in the underground mansion of the Chinchan family of the high peaks and the flowery

valleys: Me: We could see the first opera of Mariano Ozores. She: The tits you see with your son. I: Not, that

This is not about tits. She: What does the movie book say? Me: What is a light comedy, insubstantial, but with something

of freshness. She: Puts her to give birth, I do not want to see her. I: The best What I had read about Ozores is

"by-product of inexplicable commercial success" "She: We accept ship as long as it's short. In no less than 40

minutes we had remained rock (three), but with a smile on the mouth. Glory to the almighty, we have seen a

movie of Ozores together. Hallelujah. The film is about a guy (Jose Luis Ozores) who works at a

gas station and his girlfriend wants her to keep the father's business (a funeral home of new creation). With the

help of a veterinarian (Antonio Ozores), they go to their first order, the death of a rich man from the town, very

dear. When they arrive at the house, things do not seem to agree at all. If they do not tell me that it is the first

film as a director of Mariano Ozores, I would think it is a great movie, but that fact He explains why

this man became what he was. And I did not say this, if not my child (the same one who is capable of skinning

a film without disheveled). It is a comedy of these entanglements, with a great Jose Lu���s Ozores (if he had been

born in that country that repeats his acronyms, we would see him as a genius among the classics ) very well seconded by

his brother and a great Fernando Rey. The situations are American comedy, even the setting, making

many times think not watching a Spanish movie. I laughed a lot, despite being a

50-year-old humor, that's nothing. Resuming, movie about some scammers who want to use somenovices

burialto perpetrate a scam . First episode of Mariano Ozores, who surprises us with a comedy of

very nice entanglement and really hilarious moments. Highly recommended to see with affection. Of indispensable

vision by anyone who likes the classic Spanish cinema.Besitos.PD: The data of the ministry and the co��� or

Bernarda appear in the wikipedia as synonyms.

" 1

" Wolf Creek is fiction, but as an experience in horror movies is the most real thing you can find.

I do not know what is more absurd, if I release Wolf Creek two years after its premiere or talk about it when

any good music lover likes it. must have seen already, thanks to new technologies. But just in case

you're lost between the new wave of "" slashers "" that floods the screens and do not know what to decide, the

magnificent tape of the Australian Greg Mclean is the best thing that has been done The

starting point, however, is not surprising at all: Kristy and Liz are two youngtourists

Englishin Australia who, accompanied by Lugare��� or Ben, they travel to Wolf Creek, a huge cr situadoter located in the

middle of that desert that is 90% of the Australian country. What promised to be a plentiful journey between landscapes

worthy of National Geographic becomes a dramatic struggle for survival, with no one who can help

the apprentices of explorers. Because they're alone in the desert, do not they? The great little McLean in Wolf Creek

is to build tremendous tension around the protagonists, using the few (but powerful) means

available to him, namely: some protagonists above the average in terms of charisma and intensity (mention

specialto a touching Cassandra Magrath); the imposing enormity of the Australian desert, which from the

beginning is presented to us as a place as beautiful as it is unlikely to escape from those who want to finish you off;

and above all, the effectiveness and coherence of the script, which plays the trick of realism in a much more solvent than

things like Hostel or derivatives. And by the way, he plays with the "veteran" viewer "subtly changing the roles and

behaviors of protagonists and secondaries. Everything with a slow pace, but that goes deep and makes you

worry, really, for the fate of the experienced hikers. Greg Mclean films with the precision and

patience of an expert, and it is his first feature. Chapeau by ���l.Other of its distinctive points is the mime that has

been placed on the technical invoice and in the setting, both through the image (cortes�� Dela of the unknown Will

Gibson) as of the sound and, especially, a music that perfectly accompanies the changes in the script (by

the most unknown to ��� n Frank Tetaz). The natural scenery accompany, and are perfectly acclimated to

result in that mixture of desolate and wonderful trap for unsuspecting.To put some but the

magnificent ��� Mclean's prima prima, a couple of moments are resolved to the old and foolish style of the

"" mataadolescent "" Americans, which takes something seriously from the proposal; and the tagline of "" based on

real events "", well, I guess it will attract someone else, but I think it is not necessary. Wolf Creek is

fiction, but as an experience in horror movies is the most real thing you can find.

" 1

" Excessive, boring, long, unnecessary exhibitionist exercise with the sole mission of paving, for his

mediocre director, the path to the conquest of Hollywood.

With an apocalyptic trace of vampires and people of bad living and a few producers with fat bundles of

bills in the briefcases and eager to emulate the technological expertise and commercial success of the children of

Hollywood Guardians of the Day is forged, second - it seems - part of another story between the magical and the

embarrassing that a couple of years ago rumbled the dolby surround of the world's cinemas and then he stayed in the

shelves of the videoclubs to the greater glory of the teenage public machine-gunned by strong emotions and scenes

of very high and expensive voltage. There is (threaten) a third party: something like Guardians of the twilight. I did not see the first

attack and I got lost in the second, which comes to tell us about the subject of light and darkness. Nothing that

Bram Stoker did not know, for not going back further. There is almost immediate certainty that the expensive and devastating

visual apparatus will cut - cut is a more useful verb - all narrative interest. In fact, the film is not

seen with interest when we are already sufficiently blinded by the devastating machinery of

special effects: that Ferrari - ��� was a Ferrari? - Climbing at full speed a building that, more than

astonishing us, produces a hilarious effect because (simply) it does not come to mind. A m��� made me think of

those unnecessary nudes that repelled the staff in the very kitsch number of tacky ribbons of

our glorious transition, but do not get away from the subject, which gives for me Lass.The antològic battles between

good and bad have given the cinema glorious pages. If the breath that inflames them of ���pica comes from the

literature, the result is usually, except for the inexperience of the director or budget poverty, worthy, at least.

Nothing disturbs here: everything is seen with a neutral interest. The Moscow inhabited by supernatural creatures, that

contemporary Moscow that could have been an incentive for the western spectator, provokes tedium: everything

is superficial, lacking in any trait memorable. The bad ones are as flat as the good ones, and in that

manique���smo impostado of Russian cinema with ���nfulas yankis the portentous display of software (we are talking about

that since I started this review). ��a) does not bring anything new. The American friend is still the smart friend: Russian

is a flattering guy, who has grown up on the verge of a cinema that programmed too much violence and too much

frivolity around violence. Nor his name I have been able to remember to write this review.Guardians of the

day saturates, that is, saturates like few films of this genre so pleasing for the great majors and for the

public of scarce demands and money to burn in strong experiences. More or less strong. Over time,

this chronicler of his vices is getting older. He notes it with more evidence in these vampire fantasies, in

these videocliper outbursts of formidable invoice but nonexistent interest. It is now when one thinks of the

inscrutable paths of chance: perhaps - I say perhaps - fate has wanted me to lose (it is a saying) two

hours and a little of my time in this half-mess so that I can make up for this night with some jewel of cinema. Inot

doknow: I'm thinking of Nosferatu, by Murnau, who has not been scared (really) watching a movie for a while.

Inform about the result.

" 0

" A good movie with a good dose of humor that you later think about, what did I laugh about, if this is really

sad ?.

From Broken Flowers I had read very good and bad reviews. Well, let's go in parts. No one will be

surprised if I write that Jim Jarmusch makes independent films. Therefore, many who know that already know

what they are facing. Especially those who let themselves be blinded by the labels. For better or worse. To

consider it a mess or a masterpiece. Well, I'm happy to say that I'm in middle ground?

Donon Johnston is a wealthy donjuan at low hours who receives a mysterious anonymous letter in

which they tell him that he is a father for 19 years and that possibly that son is looking for him . He, as

apotic as can be interpreted by a very well-used Bill Murray, decides to move on from the subject until his friend and

neighbor, Winston (Jeffrey Wright) investigates by ���ly and gives him the idea that Go visit the five women who

may have written that letter. Five women with whom he had a relationship in the past. To begin with, the

character of Murray is such a wimp that it pisses you off. It's so useless that you do not know how to react. It seems difficult to see

a donjuan in her wench time. His life is nonsense. A nonsense centered on a sofa in front of an

impressive plasma TV where you watch movies and cartoons. But when his friend Winston

organizes a scheduled trip for him, Don wants to resist? to 20%. In the end he makes the trip. At the end visit

Sharon Stone, Frances Conroy, an almost unrecognizable Jessica Lange and the wonderful Tilda Swinton? and a

fifth that makes colof���n a trip fun but cruel and ,cido, like life itself. The film has its

moments "" BMW "" to the rhythm of the wonderful m�� Music of Mulatu Astakte (as used by Woody Allen in "" The Curse

of Jade Scorpion ""), but it is certainly a very interesting journey, full of sarcasm and characters so

Variopintos, not to say freakis, that the character of Murray seems the most normal of all. Note the

character of Jeffrey Wright, a wonderful secondary that would deserve all the awards and have.

A masterly counterpoint to the character of Murray: he is a generous, hardworking man, he has 5 kids and in histime he

freeplays to investigate on the internet. A good movie with a good dose of humor that you later consider "

What did I laugh about, if this is so sad?" A curious anecdote is, in the final part of the film, in which it

seems that everything will be resolved, there is a cameo of Bill Murray's real son, Homer Murray. The name is a

good joke, ���eh? A film not indicated for those who did not like Hidden (Cach���).

" 1

" Another one of those adaptations of films of the seventies that turns out to be worse than the original one, with more

media but with less ideas.

I have always thought that together with the assassination of Kennedy and the arrival of man on the moon, the third great

mystery of the twentieth century was none other than the fact that Nicolas Cage won an Oscar. And I do not get tired of

saying that we are facing one of the actors with the fewest records that one can imagine. If you

capture a frame of each of your films, you can hardly differentiate your expression, be it

comedy, action, drama or mystery: always the same face. And the worst thing is that when he tries to change the register, it

is even more terrible, because then the only thing he does is strangely deform his eyebrows, wrinkle his forehead and

adopt a histri image. unique that causes embarrassment to others. When I won the devalued Academy statuette

(nowadays it probably influences more money spent on promotion than artistic quality to achieve it)

with Leaving Las Vegas , Mike Figgis, director of the film, must have been so amazed that to this

day, and it's been eleven years, he has not done anything again deserves the penalty. Maybe not to

make Cage too ridiculous, the rest of the actors also do a pretty mediocre job. For a

change, The Wicker Man is another of those film adaptations of the seventies that turns out to be worse than the

original, with more media but with less ideas. In this case with none because it is a copy of the first. In my

opinion it pretends to be an allegory in which it is tried to make see that a world dominated by women would be just

as bad as ours, because the badness does not lie in the sex of people, but it dwells in power, which

corrupts us. The last twenty-five minutes are quite entertaining; the rest so only bearable. You will

say.

" 0

" In any case, this film is a good example to be able to distinguish the narrative from the ambiguous background,

alive and subtle on which it should be sustained. And it does not.

The arrogance of the human being and the inquisitorial intransigence are located in the center of all theframework

historicalthat is shown compressed and polished for a quick consumption in this new film by Milos Forman,

another of the great filmmakers that now is unrecognizable. There may be many hypotheses to

try to elucidate the reason why Goya was chosen as an excuse to film a very trite story about

the inquisition. n Spanish and the consequences of the Napoleonic invasion. In any case, this film is a

good example to be able to distinguish the narrative from the ambiguous background, alive and subtle on which it should

sustain itself. And it does not. , in itself, it could offer more than it has given, and without a doubt the story

flows with quite a sense of the rhythm and the progression of events, almost without giving I breathe in the spectator, he

advances at breakneck speed. There are many things narrated in a hundred minutes, but the content is so

hysterical, thick, abrupt and devoid of a life of its own beyond characters that chatter and go from one place to

another, which ends up deflating and becoming another follet���nm���s to use, plagadito of common places and

dramatic situations embarrassingly exempt from any hint of subtlety. That is to say, this film is such a

flat product, so inert, so obvious, so mechanical, that one can not understand how it is possible that it is

sponsored by a filmmaker like They form and, on top, they allow themselves the luxury of starting their pathetic walk with an

evocative musical band that accompanies the suggestive images of Goya's paintings. It is not that the story

told is "" dense "" or too complicated, it is rather the emptiness generated in the treatment of each of the

thematic elements, the psychological profiles or in the ineffective structure that sought to articulate the

whole: from the individual drama represented in the characters played by Bardem and Natalie Portman

to the collective drama, and Goya as a neutral link and perspective between both. Dislocated and schematic, the

narrative leads to a superfluous and shameful "" sampling "" of a time and facts represented with such

simplicity, both in the text and in the visual, that better It will save time and money for a movie

ticket.

" 0

" Disheveled version of a classics that I do not know: he has the (enormous) desire to make me want to see the old one.

It will be a jewel. This lasts for many minutes, although in the end, weighing pros and cons, we give an

acceptable opinion.

The wicker man stays in that modern flood of remakes billed to the side of some irrefutable classic or

the nostalgia of an icon of the series B. After his viewing, which goes from the intrigue to the disbelief in a few

minutes, I have gotten a huge desire to dig in some well-stocked shelf the original work, English,

of 1973, filmed by Robin Hardin. This second version confirms the idea that, in Sometimes, things have to be left the

same as all the efforts of these people (Nicholas Cage, dull as usual,

included producer) is directed to this curious writer and other friendly readers thedevour it

old movie andto see where Neil Labute, cultural agitator of this luxury telefilm and

former director of really interesting films like Chasing Betty and En compan ��� has failed of men.A police

traumatized by the death of a woman Dre and his daughter on the road without him being able to avoid it suffer a

huge depression that is suddenly released when he receives a letter from an old girlfriend who asks him to

go to a coastal island of the Pacific (Summerslide) to look for his daughter, who later turns out to be both,

who has disappeared. The island is a community that lives under a magical matriarchy, subject to a series of laws

alien to the civilized logic of the police. Pagan rituals and a very precise hierarchy of religious type

confuse the police until the final outcome, which has an interest and that we are not going to gut here.

The bad of The Wicker man is that the end is predictable from the first minutes. I still feel

admiration for those kinds of movies that entangle the plot to the point that one feels imbecile in the end because

they have not seen it before, let's say. Everything is clear here, even if there is an unknown point (a slight point, foreseeable

also for minds that are more acute than mine), which raises the impression In general, some points. Very meritorious (by

art and by evocative of worlds that the film curiously, still looking for them, does not recreate) the location

of exteriors (an island in the Vancouver Bay near the US border) and the photograph of Paul

Sarossy. The role of Ellen Burstyn (the supposed bee queen of the community) is laughable as well. n it is the

final scene in which everything begins again, although we (spectators already put to the day of the intrigues

and the perverse machineries of these amazonas m���sticas) already know where it leads and with what untapped

ways.

" 0

" Amazing debut and a great occasion to reward Bacon with the Oscar, but if you no longer reward a

transsexual, imagine nominating a pedophile.

Some actors have the healthy habit of investing their megasueldos as stars in miniproducciones (from

there, of course) in films that they think more interesting and that will bring them more satisfaction Profesionaln professional.An example

is Kevin Bacon, executive producer of The Woodsman (here The Lector: P), who directs another director, in this

case debutante, with great tact and sensitivity, Nicole Kasell The most thorny argument: a pedophile

tries to reintegrate into society. Of course Bacon could have chosen a role and a somewhat lesstheme

political, but that's why he It adds a point of interest and a lot of discomfort for what the film may contain

. However the good touch of the director, like that of Niki Karo in his Land of men, in this case

does not manage to load the inks but neither redeems the character. That if you know how to create a tension without an

explicit description that will make the viewer fear the worst. Not to mention that Bacon, accompanied by his

wife in real life, Kyra Sedgwick, is the best of the film. All his work is the epicenter of a

well-worn story and some very uncomfortable moments, emotional and even full of anger and anger. They also

have curious Mos Def appearances (the 16-street one) and Benjamin Bratt as a close relative. The film

also portrays how "re-insertion" can be. n "" of a subject like the one in this film, who no longer only tries to be

invisible to the rest of the world by his own guilt and remorse, but so that some peoplehim

leavein peace and do not make him m� Its existence is difficult with constant rumors and gossip. Point aside is to

rebuild a life, especially if you have had family. And, perhaps worst of all, to see if he is capable of

doing something so terrible again to a child or a girl. None of these elements is overlooked in the film,

which can be described as brave. Amazing debut and a great occasion to reward Bacon with the

Oscar, but if they no longer reward a transsexual, imagine naming a pedophile.

" 1

" Possibly the best boxing film in the history of cinema, with a spectacular Robert de Niro in the

role of Jake la Motta. It has unleashed in me a great sense of repulsion, but that is what cinema is about, to make

the senses wake up, in whatever way.

Not long ago I read in a magazine the classification of the best films in history, all in line with the

last installment of Rocky (which incidentally did not appear). the original in the list). In the first position was

Wild Bull, a classic of those that every human being must see, and since I am a human being more and more, in a

fit of expense he bought me. � in the Fnac a pack of Scorsese that my half courgette wants to give back because

no film has liked it. The film tells us the life of the boxer Jake La Motta, from his beginnings to

his retirement and life later. It shows us a violent character, excessively violent, mysterious, stubborn and

stubborn. His boxing is the best, and quickly rises in the rankings until a moment arrives that no

fighter wants to face him, but he does not get the champion belt. because at no time accepts

help from anyone. This is compounded by his increasingly worse relationship with his brother and his wife. I have to admit that

the film did not like me, given that these violent movies, real violence and palpable, they give me a bad

body. Jake's treatment of women makes me twitchy, and the boxing scenes are too explicit. Somebody will

say, and why do you see a boxing movie? Man, because a classic is a classic and I usually like themovies

boxing, but in this there is a question. For the rest, it is an impressive film, with a great De Niro

(who had to put on a lot of kilos during filming to adapt to his character). The atmosphere

is great, and I like the secondary actors, since they are very expressive, a quality that has been lost in

modern cinema. By the way, there is a gui���o (or as the viewer wants to see) with the law of silence, at the

moment you are talking to the mirror as if it were your brother. This is traced to thescene

carof Marlon Brando's movie. Resuming, possibly the best boxinginhistory

moviefilm, with a spectacular Robert de Niro in the role of Jake la Motta . It has unleashed in me a great sense of

repulsion, but that's what cinema is about, to make the senses wake up, whatever it is. I'll stay with

Rocky.Besitos.PD: The key scene of the fight against Janiro It is brutal.

" 1

" The film seems to me a waste of beauty, hardness and good interpretations, which, I would say without blushing, at the

moment is the best thing I've seen in this year 2006. I

started � to read the book almost against the clock, since I did not want to get to the premiere of the movie with my ass in

the air, and I've always liked to leave the cinema and say that hackneyed phrase "" I liked the book "", and

that is that although the novel was painted as the greatest tru queo that could be written in years, it seemed to me �

amazing, almost more entertaining than any fast-food Best-Seller (will not mention any to avoid

susceptibilities and not being crossed out by cultureta gafapastil), and was already reading imagining his transfer to the

screen, to make matters worse in the press pass of "" The Prestige "" I had behind a couple of critics who

praised the virtues of the film that we It brings, so my predisposition could not be better. And so it has been,

the film seems to me a waste of beauty, hardness and good interpretations, that, I will say without blushing, at the

moment it is the best thing that I have seen in this year 2006 with only one month left to close, Tom Tykwer

composes a solid group of actors, where those who more weight could carry in the film (Hoffman and Rickman)

pass as secondary mere and those that we should forget cling tightly to our consciences, Ben

Whishaw makes incre� The character of Grenouille is incredibly believable, marking his moments of

lucidity with the most absolute and dark moments of insanity, and Rachel Hurd-Wood, who already fell in love with me. � being just

a cr ena in the "" Peter Pan "" by PJ Hogan, she re-fills the screen with her incomparable beauty, and that is

Laura's character is the best of the film. Being a habit in me that of reading the criticism to take the

pulse to the "" general feeling "", it has called me deeply the attention that There are those who have torn their

clothes before one of the film's climactic scenes, the one with the orginary presence of Grenouille in Grasse, in

the book, this scene is told in great detail, as much as Patrick S� ��skind is possible with his

words, while the screen goes from being a mere anecdote in the footage, we do not tear our clothes

so soon, for God's sake! (Never better said). A chapter of the book, a part or something really important

that would delve much more into the obsession of Grenouille, and is that this lack of smell is important in the

plot, and here that happens almost on tiptoe, and part of the order of what happens is changed, maybe by the

time of footage? ���Will we thank the DVD to an extended version of the book? In short, when we left the cinema, it

coincided in taste with all those who have enjoyed the novel, and in disgust with those who They have not

lost a half hour a day to taste it, I leave the point of the matter.

" 1

" Gibson is not a filmmaker neither personal nor brilliant, but supported by a gui���ns���lido, with an effectivestructure

and honest, and with a direction between sober and correct, he configures a drama historical in which, forpurposes,

practicalthere are not too many pieces.

In this blunt historical biopic with mesi���nicos airs, Mel Gibson signed the one that probably is its better

film (that is not to say as much taking into account the mediocrity of the rest of its work ) and - like

Kevin Costner with his "" Dancing with Wolves "" - came to recover for the great public the taste of the epic cinema

displayed with all the luxury of means and with an elegy tone. Bastanteaco quite suitable for his story about theliberator

Scottish, although it is true that you can not say that "" Braveheart "" is a complex film. The fact is that, if we

look at the whole of the final result, it is not that complexity was an indispensable requirement

to be the great film that it is. The idea on which the globality of the story is articulated is a heroic profile

that It brings together physical strength with strategy and intelligence in the battle, adding faith in ideals

brought to their maximum consequences, which originates a rebellion perpetrated even by those who at

first were moved by selfish interests and did not hesitate to execute the vilest of betrayals. Thatair

mesi���nicis constituted with the courage of William Wallace in the last instants of his life: the decisive

scream of FREEDOM (including the posture of the crucified one), at that point of the footage and in the context of a

situation in which everything has turned against his possibilities after a long and intense trajectory of

feats, victories and bitter treachery, contains a deep emotional significance, of liberation in thespace

intimateof the hero and of impulse and faith in the great ideals for the beings of his near surroundings. Wallace, with his

enormous and powerful obstinacy, overcoming pain and fear, leaves a seed of hope.is not a

Gibsonfilmmaker neither personal nor brilliant, but supported by a gui���ns���lido, with an effective and honest structure, and with a

direction between sober and correct, it forms a historical drama in which - for practical purposes - there are not enough

pieces. The characters live, react, make mistakes, feel desires for freedom, weaken in their faith,

fall into the weakness of betrayal, repent, reflect, lose or win according to impressions and / or

facts that are derived from each act or word of Wallace. This, because of a perfectly structured script, is

always located in the center from which the whole plot is articulated. A plot that is not complex, but neither is it

mechanical. There is always a margin for reflection between the facts, a certain subtlety indecisions

Wallace'sand those who form their environment, be they friends or enemies. Therefore, without being a round work, the

narrative has life, a human spirit and a certain lyric sense of the epic, which is a consequence not so much

of a good accomplishment. It's like a good script. When you have a good story to tell, if you

add to it the careful structure of the script, almost everything else is done. It is not a round movie: you can detect

a deal too stereotyped at the time of characterizing the profiles of the different groups faced; the

revolutionary slaves are crude, dirty and brave and the English dominators are given a certain

effeminate air, which is somewhat simplistic and vulgar. And in another order of things, Gibson combines his

careful visual style, very praiseworthy in many sequences of battles, with flaky-sausage

telefilme shots: the happy close-ups (or also medium shots) slowed down in scenes of special

importance dramatic This type of slowed-down shots and sequences is the easy resource for the filmmaker who does not

know how to emphasize the dramatic beyond mere sensationalism. Gibson is not Orson Welles and his own narrative makes it clear

when he needs more depth. The fact is that he is telling us a story sustained in

a masterpiece plot: the final cry of freedom, even with its powerful dramatic significance and the

symbolism of the position. in cross, it would have a greater visual expressiveness (and, consequently,value and

cinematographicdepth) if Gibson had placed the camera in a position in which the human profile and

spiritual of an agonizing William Wallace charged a more subtle meaning than what is derived from a simple

game of close-ups and slowed-down sequences. What type of angulation, perspective or position of the camera

would be the right one for that purpose? I do not even care about it, that is a task and a challenge for the visual imagination of

a film director. What I do know is that the mode used by Gibson is inconsequential and not very expressive in its

form, although the background has by itself great dramatic force and with it the viewer cantoo well

intuitthe tragedy of what representado.Al after, cinema is not just what narrated, but, above all,

intelligence, insight and creativity of an artist who plays with his instrument, the camera and its

enormous resources as an open window to a world of representations, in this case, the representation of

someone who put an ideal world before the immediate consequences of reality. And that demands and requires something

more.

" 1

" It's been a while since I laughed at the movies, but I can not consider it as good. It's a movie

of the mont.

I give a high approval to this movie. It's been a long time since I laughed at the movies, and that's not

easy to get from a public fed up with cheap comedies. You know the act of f��� that I had to do

watching this film. I have assumed that everything that smells like Travolta is essential visionado, by

marital prescription, and Wild Hogs. With a pair? wheel? It was not going to be an exception. But this time I have not

suffered so much. On the contrary, at several moments of the film I was about to throw myself to the floor with laughter; and let it

be known that I was not the only one, because the reaction of the rest of the public in the room, including my saint, was

militarily synchronized to each gag and each entanglement of the quartet protagonist who was prepared to

cause that hilarious effect. However, despite the compliments that I justhim, I can not consider it

threwas a good movie. It has undesirable gaps of gui���n, situations badly told and di���logos of bream (which I

attribute in part to the inexplicable lazy dubbing), which break the good vibes that generally

transmits the footage. To begin with, the presentation of the main characters is very clumsy and without spark of

grace, a detail that makes it start with a bad foot. I think what his director, Walt Becker,is to

intendedteach the viewer with a certain humor the boring life of Doug (Tim Allen), Woody (John Travolta),

Bobby (Martin Lawrence) and Dudley (William H. Macy) from whom they want to escape by making a 7-motorcycle

daytrip around the country; And I personally did not take a smile out of me. This unfortunate beginning made me fear a

debacle, because it was foreseen that we were going to swallow another one? Norbit? in potential, or what is the same, a film that

is funny to its director and his team more direct (by rally), and nobody else. But his course changes just

when The journey of our bikers begins. From then on, there are great scenes that make you laugh until

you can not anymore (in which for me the absolute protagonist is the character of Dudley), which reassures (at

times), with other sequences that makes you cry about how bad they are, a question that keeps you on the alert for a

possible drop in entertainment. These ups and downs, which frequently change the rhythm of the mood of the

viewer, place this film on qualifying as king of the movies? of the mont? n ?. Not because it's the most

... of the mound? of all, but because it brings a little head in quality to all of them. It will become effortless

in a very funny television class, of infinite passes, ideal for silly afternoons of pipes and a table

skirt. If I had to rate each one of the four? floats? of the function, from 1 to 10,

these notes would be taken. To Tim Allen, I put a 3. Completely out of place, torp���ny eaten literally by the

interpretation from the rest of the band. Performing Santa Claus so many times has diminished hisfaculties

artistic. John Travolta, a 5 raspao; I've seen him more loose and with better visc in products as

unprofitable as? Look who speaks ?, As amazing as? Pulp Fiction ?, or as indifferent as? Be Cool? . That's it

, we get the creeps of emotion when his legs are going to dance (in one scene his

character Woody teaches Dudley a few steps to conquer a girl, the eternally attractive Marisa Tomei).

Martin Lawrence, I give a 4 high. Take little to walk that hooligan style that has exhibited in its films more

blockbusters (? Of police thief ?, This grandmother is a danger? Or? Two police? ��as rebels?). I have seen it low in

form, and a little fond���n, I do not know if it will be because I was in the gui���n that overweight. And, finally, to William H. Macy,

a 9 Great, the soul of the film; the best scenes have been left to him. Personified awkwardness

interpreted in an absolutely elegant way. Here he has shown me to be an all-of this group,

rounder. OutsideRay Liotta will stand out, with that scowling face he always has. Ideal in his role as a biker

mate with a desire to grind. I do the final review of rigor only I can say one thing: toss up the

view of this film, and if You have to go and see her try to enjoy her to the full, forgiving her the defects that I have

mentioned, because you are going to laugh at mogoll���n.

" 0

" First of the four films on DVD designed for the Futurama series that is a breath ofair

freshto the fans that we were hanging with the suspension of the series. To my modest understanding, great and

essential.

Director: Dwayne Carey-Hill. Duration: More than an hour and a half, like 5 long chapters. Year: November 27,

2007 directly on DVD. In Spain, God will say. After two years without new things of Futurama (as they are responsible for

telling us in the movie) they return with a lot of strength. Instead of doing what The Simpsons did with their

movie (I thought it was not up to many chapters) they decided to hook a few stories

about all the characters and take out a chapter hyperlarge just as great as the best 22 minutes.

Exactly what the fans wanted and wanted. Thanks. The film is about many things, but

basically nudist guys get, through spam techniques, to take control of Planet Express.

But not only that, but that they manage to gain control of Bender through a subtle andcomputer virus

elaborate, in which everyone could bite ( if I piqu��� the day that I left a messenger window "" Bea

says: Hello handsome, you want to see my webcam? "" I almost gave birth to the mouse the emotion, is thatcan chop

anyone). Finally, it also deals with travel in time (the best solved I've ever seen), love,

friendship and many other things. Very complete, yes sir. Well, it goes without saying that I am an unconditional fan of

Futurama and I am very happy with the result. The stories are very well linked, without great losses of

rhythm (perhaps the part of the narwhal is made something rare), and with an interesting argument. Each of the characters

in the series come out, with papers that are less long (pity of Dr. Zoiberg who does not have more interventions).

We have many references to other films, such as the Star Wars saga and some more, guide

the viewer that they are grateful. The humor is the same as always, although I would say that they have run amok and have made

jokes that in the series I do not remember they dared, like why Al Gore lost the elections against Bush

(great , sure that the latter will be very funny). Resumiendo, first of the four films on DVD

designed for the Futurama series that is a breath of fresh air to the fans that we were hanging with

the suspension of the series. To my modest understanding, great and essential. You have to see it. Psychos. PS: Seeing it in

original version brings curious things, like that Bender is really Hispanic and many words he says in

Spanish, like cervesa .PD2: In Spain at the moment it does not have date of exit in DVD, but the American version

has the subtitles in Castilian, with what the investment can be done.

" 1

" But this film will be named as a masterpiece, pure cinema and everything you want because it is? Potita? and

? herposa ?, but it is artificial cinema in its purest form.

I have already seen the vaunted "" masterpiece "" and a promising film by Isabel Coixet. I'm really looking forward to

it because it's one of the promises of Spanish cinema for this year, although it's shot in English and with an

international cast in which it's This is Javier C���mara on the Spanish side. They produce the Almod���var and

MediaPro. As I do not want to give it too much publicity, I will only say that it complies with the typical topics of work that

wants to be deep and dense. Repeat constants: characters with a terrible and secret drama in their past (in this

case adds a totally unfriendly and bitter protagonist), and everything serves for a supposed explosion of

contained emotions that serves of nexus of union between two people alone and wounded in spite of themselves. That sounds like the

typical wise explanation of "" indie ""? This film reflects how to make a perfectdrama

artificial, how to try to get tears and emotions in the most puerile way (although the

Robbins relationship -Polley are the best moments) and alternate the attention in a naive way from a personal drama to adrama

collective. One of the most attractive things in scripts is what the characters tell without expressing it

verbally or at least not openly or directly. But this film will be baptized as a masterpiece, pure cinema

and everything what they want because it is "" potita "" and "" herposa "" and perfectly fulfills all thefilm canons,

indie ""just as it complies with the themes of the action cinema It's one of Van-Damme, but it's artificial cinema in

its purest form. And like everything else, will it have its spectators, followers, followers and admirers? and detractors.

" 0

" Give my congratulations to all the actors. They are great and you have managed to manage them excellently. Dear CC I am writing this letter to you because I feel the need to express my fascination for your Elizabethtown

in a more direct way than with a normal and ordinary criticism. Since I saw the trailer of your movie, I knew it was going

to be a new nostalgic joy. Among your great dreams is to turn a reality that sometimesus

surpassesand is totally strange, alienating and surreal in original situations that, at least to

me, provoke a very pleasant surprise. I was fascinated by the way you Americans have of "" celebrating ""

death. These wakes here are not styled. It must be our religious heritage that prevents us from seeing with affection and

joy having shared moments with someone we loved. Here it's time to cry. Cry and lament But

I've always preferred your style: it's sad to lose someone, so why not focus on

a caring tribute and talk about good experiences with That person (if there are any) But the death of

your story is no more than an excuse. A magnificent excuse to tell us to take advantage of the time we have

to enjoy it with who we want. But not crazy. Not at "" Almost famous "". It could be said that you were talking

about "burning life" to the fullest. It is not the same as Orlando Bloom's drive route (tell him that here he

is quite well and that he can not complain about the projects offered to him), with that wonderful company. ��a. I

forgive you for putting Kirsten on as a stewardess. It's not that I have any problems with them, it's just that at

first I believed her to be a vital philosopher. Also I forgive you some other pueril phrase and declaration

of intentions ���o���a in the mouth of the protagonists. There are quite tacky moments, even disappointing for

someone who knows how to write as well as you. But I do not doubt that you did it on purpose. I do not like it, it's thething.

onlyAlong with Michael Mann I think you are the two current directors who have the best musical sense in their

films. And I do not mean original music, that too, but to make an outstanding selection ofsongs

little knownand make them so yours, that is, so of the film that is not those sequences are conceived without them. Your

film is a mirror. Many of us find ourselves in surreal situations throughout our lives: the same thing

in a funeral you give someone a cigarette and then in the thank you sign invites you to a beer andyou

buysanother box of tobacco . Well your movie is truffled from those situations. And they are fun. Very funny. And

best of all, they help the story and we enjoy it. Give my congratulations to all the actors.

They are great and you have managed to manage them excellently. That is why I am writing this letter to you. I think you are one of the

best current writers and one of the most interesting and original directors of our time. I hope you

do not encounter many problems to make upcoming movies. I do not think Cruise will turn your back onat

youany time. You see that you make good friends. And Tom always seemed like a guy with a good nose to work with

good professionals. Take care of yourself and I hope you surprise us with your next movie. Armrests, YojimboP.D. Someday

I want to do what Orlando does at the end of the movie. And at the end of the road I find what he does.

" 1

" Sometimes the fragile line that unites us between dreams and reality is broken Sometimes the fragile line that unites us between dream And reality breaks. The dream that we pursue, the woman

we love, the house we long for, the music that will devour us when we are sad, everything

becomes a� Enicos in what a second is countable. And so it was the story of Johnny Cash, the revolutionary singer,

who started out as anyone who wants to get something big, for the basic, at the very least, for the low. He worked

in the field, and also came to serve the air forces, until his voice revealed a new icon of

country music and rock'n 'roll. James Mangold brings his story to the movies, the story of Johnny Cash. To a

very beautiful, romantic cinema, comparable to Brokeback Moutain, in certain aspects. There are places and beautiful songs

that will remind us of that other great movie. The image is good and the music, as I say, splendid. At the

beginning the rhythm is accelerated, and it makes us a flashback to his childhood, where we will find what will

later be his most significant features. Your family, that's where we all started. Johnny had a brother, something

older than him, and as his father said, much more skilled in the arts of work, in getting a money

to feed a humble and poor family, like those of before and now and always. The boy was

introverted, for that reason, maybe as we all always do when we let the heart act for us, it will

bring out all the rebellion that never It's exploded. His brother dies, and only the poor and

incapacitated Johnny will be left. And it will grow with the scourge of a father who treated him badly, of a family that seemed not to

want him. Of a loneliness that always accompanies the man there where he goes. But everything changes, everything changes when you

record a first album. He has always loved music. And like every lover of a gift or something that he longs to have

knows, when one so intrinsically carries something, and loves it, and appreciates it there more above any other

knowledge or circumstance, and even later he trains in that art, he ends up being an artist. And that is the summary

of Johnny Cash's story. Irremediably he would tend to take his music to the most unsuspected limits,

and with it, his greatest dream and illusion. And there he would also know love, the love that perhaps never had his wife

"official". She fell in love with June Carter. And music would accompany him to death, just like

love. An artist, of course, and I reflect on what he is, an artist who lived and died in what he loved and for what

he really believed and was still alive. That spark that sometimes we are all exhausted and a poet, a musician,

a real artist never disappears, because in the most unexpected moments enhances your eyes andus

finds. Music, music, and love, that girl who had a hard time getting it, but we know well

that we have loved the reins of love is very difficult escape. And even more of the scourge that then hits us.

But not everything is beautiful, and sweet, and romantic, and good. No. There is always something wrong. Something dark. A bad stage,

a bad day, a bit of bad luck. And Johnny Cash experienced it with the drug, that demon who extolled himself with

his soul because of his unreliable popularity, conceited and deceitful He arrived thanks to his good voice

and his good music, but then serious consequences followed. I ended up very bad, really

bad, like anyone who goes through this. On the tightrope. But as I said, what we really

love and give us strength is what will always take us out of that evil self-absorption that leads us to

pain. In her case, the eternal love of a woman, and the love of music. To those strings of a guitar that would

accompany her until the day when she reconciled that dream we never woke up from. To a fatherly voice that wouldhim

whisper tountil the most brief instants a wicked phrase, some evil words that he would be imprisoned

all his life. The love of a family that could never have had as I would have liked, a brother who

died, a mother who gave birth to one of the most revolutionary music of our past century, to a death

of a lonely and introverted soul that would end up overflowing with rebellion. The rebel of Jhonny Cash, the loner

of Johnny Cash, the always tormented and poet and musician Johnny Cash.

" 1

" Another new fiasco when it comes to taking a videogame to the big screenThe day that I learned, a few years ago, that they were going to shoot a film about the famous saga of video games

"" Silent Hill "" I must confess that something made me extremely alert: being said saga one of my favorites, with

four games each better and with a philosophy that nothing had rather than envy many books or movies, I

had the strange feeling of facing a new fiasco in the futile attempt (until something

fairly decent) to try to take a videogame to the big screen. It happened with the two installments of Resident

Evil, made for the "" actress "" Mila Jovovich, and looking back, with the infumables

"" Street Fighter "", "" Mario Bros "", without of course speaking of those monsters called "" Mortal Kombat "" or "" Alone in

the Dark "". Interestingly, these movies come from games with reputable quality, anyone who knows a little

about the world will know that consolero are renowned titles. But my friend, in movies are, of course,

another song. Perhaps, the only and honorable exception is "Final Fantasy", but of course, what saves this title isis

that itnot based on only one of the 12 games, and I think that there was the right to save at

least the furniture (my body is convulsed knowing that it will adapt too "" Metal Gear Solid ""). Starting

from that basis, from my total and absolute subjectivity when talking about the last film by Christophe Gans (to

which I have something stigmatized, no, I did not like anything at all "" The pact of the wolves ""), I am going to talk about the film

itself. Although, as I mentioned in the previous paragraph, the director did not give me much confidence, it was not the

name of screenwriter Roger Avary, co-creator of one of the most brilliant scripts of the history of the

seventh art: Pulp Fiction, of the always correct (although not brilliant) Sean Bean and of the fantasticwork

musicalcarried out by Akira Yamaoka (that takes the music of the games directly to the screen), thought

"what the hell, let's give a vote of confidence to this". Basically, the film takes as a basis

the argument of the first game, although it mixes concepts from all of them, in which a mother (Rose,

played by Radha Mitchell) goes to Silent Hill , the town that her daughter does not stop to name in dreams, with the

hope of finding answers to certain strange behaviors of her daughter. Once at the entrance to the

village, everything seems to change and Rose's car loses control, leaving our protagonist

unconscious. When she wakes up, her daughter Sharon has disappeared, so she leaves the vehicle and He

walks towards the town, in expectation of what can be found. Silent Hill, on the other hand, is

totally deserted, and a kind of mist covers the entire town without you seeing much around.

From this moment and in general lines, the argument remains interesting, the expectation of what

might happen, and whenhappens, one is amazed at one of the few successes of the film: the good job time

to model the strange creatures that populate the city, so I could say that the first half of the

film seems pretty decent. As of that moment, the argument falls down sharply turning an idea

excellent - that of the first game, which if it had been taken as it was on the screen would have been a ball - it

becomes a hodgepodge of ideas, in the poor attempt to condense the incondensable: 4arguments

totally differentamong themselves in only one. To give you an idea, it's as if we condensed the entiresaga

Star Warsinto a single tape (what would it be like? Nothing good, sure). I strongly recommend that if you want

and can, you give the games a chance, they have nothing to do with the tape and they are small works of

art. Maybe people who do not know anything about the games could be of minor interest to you, but even so I'm afraid

you do not get the approval.

" 0

" Very good science fiction film that has ended up being an indisputable classic. "" Dr. James Xavier self-applied his great and revolutionary invention: a serum capable of producingvision

X-ray. Everything is fine at first, but you need to increase the doses, which will endanger your vision. "Very

good science fiction movie n that has ended up being an indisputable classic. The reason is none other than the

wonderful direction of Roger Corman, a man capable of successfully converting any film on paper.

I was assisted by the extraordinary contribution of Ray Milland, just great. Very good photography and

superb decorated, for a story with multiple readings where morality and ethics are of great

importance. The ambition to go further and achieve more goals, against the power of evil, the fascination with the

forbidden. ���How far should we go to get our purpose? Interesting reflections narrated in

a very entertaining and fascinating way.The end of the film, unforgettable.

" 1

" Film about the daily and sexual problems of a strange group of inhabitants of New York. Inot know

doif it pretends to scandalize, but after 6 or 7 blows it starts to get boring. Scandal based on sex

begins to be heavy. Otherwise, little or nothing.

The world of self-imprisonment is a private preserve of men, for obvious reasons. Who has not ever thought

how good it would be to be able to do oral relief so why do I? Since I saw this movie, I have

lost any interest I might have had. By the way, the actor this, after this shooting, what kind

of roles will you offer? I do not think it comes out in a cameo with teletubbies, no. The film is about some

New Yorkers who are fatally. On the one hand, a sexual therapist who has never had an orgasm, who knows

a dominant mistress who tries to help her. On the other hand, a gay couple who want to give vidilla to their

relationships by getting more people to the rejoicing and gloating. On the other hand, a neighbor spies on you and gives you the

zambomba. And they all end up concentrating on Shortbus, a social club where people are going to becomeuninhibited. You can

sexuallycall me old or short-sighted, but a movie that starts with a guy throwing himself all

over topic in the mouth after self-accused, I do not think it's auteur cinema. The script of the film is

a bit strange, with people with problems that I do not consider too everyday, at least the way to

raise and solve them. The argument really has not brought me almost anything, with the exception of "" knowing "" a

little closer to the world of gay sexuality. But come on, that this has no head or tail. Possibly you

have to read the director's statements before you can focus. Resuming, film about theproblems

daily and sexualof a strange group of New Yorkers. I do not know if it pretends to scandalize, but after

6 or 7 blows it starts to get boring. Scandal based on sex begins to be heavy. Otherwise,

little or nothing.Besitos.

" 0

" So yes, I'll admit that as "" profe "" I liked it a lot, and that it left a good taste in my mouth but ...

(there are always buts in this movie).

She is not an actress of success if she does not have a teaching tape, so Hillary Swank, with her brilliant

career could not be an exception, here she gives life to Erin Gruwell, a teacher who really exists and with

the foundation "" Freedom Writers "" (original title of the film), has managed to get many boys out of the Ghetto

and go to college and become people I have to say, that a serverquickly

hasbeen immersed and at the same time identified with history, and not by the ghetto, but because some years of my

life I have spent giving classes of computer science and accounting to kids of the most diverse, it is more,adda

today's, in my current work I dedicate some days (now that the good weather is here) to impart formative cycles,

so that teaching, in a certain way, runs through my veins. Maybe, this is the main premise that one

needs to identify with the final result, a tape that produced with the baton of MTV (that Inot

doknow if it's good or bad, but there it is), and sheltered 2 years after the racial disturbances that ravaged LA, it

presents us in addition to the double Oscar-winning Hillary Swank, to a casting that, not being varied, finds

some good pearls ( like the ones Swank's character has around his neck), which is worth discovering, in addition

to Imelda Stauton (his next role in the new adventures of Harry Potter was already being forged in this film) and

which is a priori so interpretively chameleonic, that one can hate or worship in a matter of seconds;

on the other hand we have the television Patrick Dempsey (famous for the TV Series "" Anatom���a de Gray "") and that here is

the protagonist's long-suffering husband, in a linear, almost foreseeable role, and that is more than companies

try to put us in the head otherwise, today's ad, the conciliation personal life / working life is

fully ut���pica.A concise tape, t�� Ypica yt���pica (there are 100 films of similar characteristics) that,

protected by the veil of "" based on real events "" manages to move the viewer, and in some moments even, to

excite (OK, I admit, I almost cry in a couple of cuts in the footage); on its negative side, I will admit that I

disagree with that abuse of voice on Off (I am so impressed by this cinematographic resource), some moments,

completely empty and / or stupid, and certain doses of fantasy (it seems in some moments sponsored by

"" Bricoman���a "" by that of "" If you can imagine, it can be done "" Before giving the shelves to this, my opinion n, to

admire an excessive good work in some planes of the film, especially when the character of Swank

begins to read the newspapers, and as one goes seeing the histories and identifying itself little by little with all the

kids (go, that you put in your pocket in a moment). So yes, I'll admit that as "" profe "" I

liked it a lot, and that has left me with a good taste in my mouth, but (there are always buts in this cinema).

"1"

Horrid, made to muddle through, poorly planned, shot worse and does not transmit nor a pice of

emotion.

I admit qu When it was released, it did not catch my attention and I postponed it with a solid "" and to fall "" since

it was not a film that could qualify as Holy of My devotion, today that I have finally seen it, has

seemed horrible to me, made to get out of step, badly planned, worse shot and that does not transmit a touch of

emotion, since everything that happens on the screen does not bother you. It seems that since 11-S (and in Madrid the

subsequent 11-M) firefighters have become the heroes (if not already) of American cinema, so that some

Hollywood listor went through the idea of ​​this film to honor the profession (excellent, on the other

hand) of these characters who are dedicated to saving lives , the pity is that the result is a telefilm worthy

of the televised sobremesa, that is saved of the burning or to be emitted directly in DVD by the presence of

Travolta and Phoenix since they are actors of a certain "" cach��� "". Once I have finished (barely) to watch it,

I am glad I did not do it at the time. God, what a shame!

" 0

" Hannibal: The Origin of Evil is one of many thrillers that Hollywood vomits every year: dark, dark, and

with a truculence that borders on pure and hard gore.

Let's be honest, in today's cinema there is an alarming lack of creativity and originality, either due to the

complete absence of both virtues, or because of the lack of executives who take risks with new andproposals

fresh. And with that said, they've never been curious to know who was the first Hollywood executive who

decided it was a good idea to make a sequel to a big blockbuster, but going back to the past and reviewing the

orchestras. Sources of that history? And who would be the creator and diffuser of the word prequel? What reserve the destination

for two authentic visionaries like these? Even if it's only for the lucubration, maybe they have twoplaces

reservedin the sixth basement of hell next to the serial killers, rapists and lawyers who go

on television, or maybe they have of sharing sufferings with the inventor of methacrylate furniture. After

three films, which are actually four since The Red Dragone was the remake (perd���n, nueva version, that

with so many terms one is confused) of Hunter, is there anything that the public no longer knows about the work and

miracles of Hannibal Lecter? In short, such existential doubts and such moral and philosophical disquisitions

are left to you, dear readers, who are the most appropriate judges. Hannibal: The Origin of Evilus

tells, as his title says, the traumatic childhood and youth of Hannibal Lecter (Gaspard Ulliel), and the

fact that he turned it into a bloodthirsty monster and ruthless. After that excellent film that is La

Joven de la Perla, Peter Webber faces such a challenge without complexes, and signs a more than acceptable

thriller, tenebrous, although he sins excessively. truculence The first thirty minutes are the best of the film,

which ends up falling in the monoton���a because of a somewhat tired rhythm and an excessive duration (demand

producer). Gaspard Ulliel is correct in his interpretation, but whoever looks for him in a worthy successor of

Anthony Hopkins has it raw, with perdón.Hannibal: The Origin of Evil is one of many thrillers that Hollywood

vomits every year: dark, dark, and with a truculence that borders on pure and hard gore. Werecommend

activelyto all those who come to see the tape to do so with empty stomach and digestion,

although there will always be some spectator to whom the peculiar Hannibal Lecter's culinary tastes make him

hungry. In that case, bon apetit.

" 0

" A must-have movie in any self-respecting movie. A delicious work ofmanufacture

perfect, with an outstanding script and full of interesting moments and emotional. To see it one and a thousand times.

Tim Burton is a very peculiar film director, at least for me. He makes very strange movies,

incredible scenes and absurd characters. You may like it or not, but you have to recognize the originality and

quality of their work. And every film that passes, I think it manages to finish the job much better. In addition, his

films do not lose validity with the years, they are totally timeless. It does not matter when they are recorded, they have such

quality that they can be immortal, as shown in Big Fish. The film is about a person whounreal

tells stories that seem. Incredible and impossible stories that everyone dazzles. At

all? Well, everyone except his son who is about to become a father, has had enough of the "" lies "" of his father. It

seems unfair that he had to live wrapped in that farce that his father creates and therefore he hates him. At the

end of the life of the storyteller, they meet again, and this time something has changed. Puff, what about Big Fish?

It has a somewhat slow start, with a multitude of incredible stories that even result in "" lack of

imagination "" of the absurdities that result. But as the story progresses, and it is discovered that not

everything is false, that the protagonist does nothing but adorn reality, that enrich the facts to

make them more attractive, the film get caught in their networks. Get to get that sensitive vein that

we all have, to leave us ready for a very emotional end in which the emotions are unleashed m���sb���sicas. Tim

Burton of course has me caught the measurement. Resumiendo, essential film in anyDeuvedeteca

self-respecting. A delicious work of perfect manufacture, with an outstanding script and full of interesting moments

and emotional. To see it one and a thousand times.

" 1

" If there is something that stands out in the film is its cast, the rest is quite mediocre. Why do all romantic comedies have to be the same? This is the question that thehad to ask

director of The Boyfriend of my Motherbefore shooting it. According to my theory, she, willing to completely change this

custom that all American love stories are very similar, or almost identical, decides to shoot a

movie of the g� ��nero, but innovative, with intelligent gags and quality interpretations. At the moment,

this, for my pleasure, has only been achieved, during these years, the director Nancy Meyers (exemplary director

of the great When you least expect it). Amy Heckerling, the one in the movie in question, is half-hearted. At

first, the chemistry between the protagonists and the gui���n seemed to be well coordinated, and even came to

think (only at the beginning, I repeat) that this It would be an interesting and more than nice romantic comedy to

Love it. Unfortunately, the film submerges itself in the typical topics of the genre and starts to get involved

with loves and desires, deceptions and disappointments that, Obviously, it does not go anywhere. Asprogresses

the film, the script becomes more simple and stupid, although the interpretations never cease to be

bad, on the contrary, in general they are m� Ques that acceptable.From the flower of the evil (2002) that we did not see Michelle

Pfeiffer acting on the big screen. Well, if you want me to tell you the truth, the wait has been worthwhile andnot

hasbeen valid at the same time. Let's see, my mother's boyfriend is a stupid, but the fact that theactress

49-year-oldappears in her is already a point in favor, since not only does she keep her naturalness and funny faces when acting

but it remains, under a surgeon, I suppose, an incredible beauty. The film starts talking about the

subject of liposuction and ends up doing it with something else, and that's where the film clearly shows, without the

contract Pfeiffer, it would not have existed. Yes, Paul Rudd can be as funny and nice as you want, girls,

but it's that she eats it alive. In addition, Tracey Ullman appears as Pfeiffer's "" help in love"" and

affairsis really fun. As you will see, if there is one thing that stands out in the film, it is its cast, the rest is

quite mediocre. I will not go further because you can not. We are facing a simple film, where we can only

highlight the cast that fills it with some really funny dialogues and situations a little less common than

usual. Not recommended for those who detest Michelle Pfeiffer (I hope you are few) and those who hate

romantic comedies.

" 0

" Feast is wild, badass, dirty, violent, fun and black like the balls of a donkey.Well, more wild laughs hit me watching this WILD of the year 2005. John Gulager directed �� the movie after being the

winner of some edition (I think the third) of Project Greenlight, a kind of OT for

"" filmmakers "" The winner makes a movie that produces the types that you see on the poster and They are responsible for

maintaining the reality, but that's what I'm less interested in. Feast is wild, pimp, dirty, violent,

fun and black like a donkey's balls. You can blame your budget B at some point, but

that's only if you're a cretin. Some disgusting and quite horny monsters (come on, fuckers) are going to make

life miserable for a group of unfortunates. The first 20 minutes, at the height of the Vampires of Carpenter. The

photo is chunga and italosetentera and Henry Rollins makes me descojone. Also comes Jason "" Jay "" Mewes. The

presentations of the characters are very horny. I did not miss it.

" 1

" A must-see film, both for fans of the characters of Matt Groening, and those who are not

and a purchase more than secured on DVD.

One of the summer films that I was hoping for the most, and, a priori, one of the ones I was most afraid of, andis

that, I was not entirely convinced that after 400 episodes (which it says soon but that they include 20 years of

series), the film could conserve the freshness, the interest and the humor, that the series has had during so much

time, so one bought � The entrance feared that, under the wrapping of The Simpsons, we would find

something of an inferior quality and. It was not like that, the film from beginning to end is a brilliant reinvention of the series

and a continuation of everything that we have seen for so long in the small screen, manages to maintain not

only the interest from beginning to end, but also there is infinity of gui���os towards the fans more geeks of the series.

And it is that, from the cameos, from Tom Hanks to Arnold Schwarzennegger, through Greenday or Hillary

Clinton, everyone, again, has a place in the film, adding to the secondary characters we alreadyAh

know.! a note, Fox made the rumor, that everything that appeared in the trailer had nothing to

do with the film, sadly it is not like that. On the other hand, I foresee that FOX has seen, in these yellow

characters, a film explode and can (Maybe can) that within a year or even 2 we are again in the

cinema watching the new adventures of Homer, Lisa, Bart , Marge and Maggie.Resumiendo, a must-

see film, both for fans of the characters of Matt Groening, and those who are not and a purchase more than

assured (at least for me) on DVD .

" 1

" A great opportunity to accompany the "" little ones "" from the house to the cinema, with a story that will please both

them and us.

Aardman, experts in animated film in clay and clay, are transferred to the cinema in 3D, for del���ite of

large and small, with this film, owing to others as the excellent "" Curse of the Vegetables "" by Wallace

and Gromit (appearing here in two cameos), and "" Chicken Run- Evasi���n in the farm "", with which it keeps some

parallelism , the truth is that the tape wins integers in original version, especially by the toad with the voice of

Ian Mckellen, since both Rody and Rita (Hugh Jackman and Kate Winslet) give quite the same, maybe the Andy

Serkiss as one of the rats "" cronies. "" It seems incredible that Aardman has been able to capture in 3D all he already

did in plasticine, and that the dolls do not differ at all that before Hacan delight in his

film animation, honestly, chap by ellos.Si therea point with which I stay is with its excellent

soundtrack,c on his images of London in "" ratuna "" version, and with an argument in which things never stop happening

, although perhaps, this unbridled pace sometimes takes its toll on the movie. A great opportunity to

accompany the "" little ones "" from the house to the cinema, with a story that will please them as well as us.

" 1

" Marie Antoinette is a sucker in the up to now impeccable career of Sofia Coppola, who we

hope she will recover from, since she is one of the filmmakers with more future its generation.

There are many people who believe that if you have a good name you can succeed in life, and in a certain way it is

true, since there are surnames that open doors with great ease. However, it can also be a veryburden

heavyif the person in question has talent, and wants to show that they have more things to offer the world than

their name. This has happened to Sofia Coppola, who because she is the daughter of the great Francis Ford Coppola, all her

works are examined with a magnifying glass, and there will be few who try to look for similarities with herfilms

father's. After her remarkable debut with The Virgins Suicides and her Oscar-winning Lost in Translation, she demonstrated

that her talent was innate and won the right to stop people from thinking about her as "" the daughter of "". For her

third feature film, Sofia Coppola takes the life of Marie Antoinette (Kirsten Dunst), the

last queen of France, to justice once more. in the guillotine during the revolution. It is not a current portrait, since it

shows the character from another angle, from inside his palatial and festive world. Trying to humanize and

justify a character historically demonized by their excesses and scandals is really very risky, and

unfortunately the film is noticeably affected. Marie Antoinette is the story of a young capricious,

inconstant, insecure and unconscious, whom the director tries to justify by showing the suffering of his

first years of life in the court of Versailles. It is surprising that her trajectory, Sofia Coppola, makes a story

so rosy and to a certain extent caramelized like this one. Although it sounds opportunistic, it must be admitted that

when portraying a historical figure as important as Mar���a Antonieta, it is necessary to amply show the

reality in which he lived (and not only with a shot of Kirsten Dunst on the balcony of Versailles showing her

loneliness, or another bowing to an angry mob) and its socio-historical context. A point in favor of

the film is the fact that it is shot in the same palaces of Versailles, although it must be admitted that Sofia

Coppola does not possess the visual power that the master Visconti had in such conflicts. The rhythm of the film is

quite slow, and it becomes especially heavy in the sequences in which the dialogues are scarce. Kirsten

Dunst, by her pare, fulfills the role of teen queen who never left the age of the turkey. Marie Antoinette

is a mole in the up to now impeccable career of Sofia Coppola, borr���n that we all hope she will

recover, since she is one of the filmmakers with more future of her generation.

" 0

" Ben Affleck's excellent debut after the cameras.Excellent debut behind the screens of actor Ben Affleck, who has adapted with intelligence and restraint the good

novel by Dennis Lehane.Seg���n was reading he was going liking m���sym���s, having from the beginning the idea of

starring it. But I hooked him and got to the deepest, so he decided to do it himself.And it is

proven that it has been a great success because it manages to transmit perfectly the esp� ��ritu, the essence, of a

story with multiple nooks and crannies where the ethic of a well-executed duty struggles to prevail overinterests

distant, perhaps, surely, clearer and safer, but less just. The characters are not one piece, but

they are simply human beings, with many virtues but also innumerable defects. They have lights and

shadows and both intermingle according to their circumstances. Thus, the protagonist, an atypicalinvestigator

private, has an ethical code of professional conduct that does not he always sees the good way but, sometimes, he follows

the darkest path, he even chooses the crime if he believes he will end the evil. And the other characters, the

same. Affleck's direction is calm but decisive. It helps a lot in the good dialogues and the

attractive and immersive story that was already in the original novel, but convinces by catching, amaze and

move the viewer thanks to a clear narrative where austerity and sobriety technique are at the service

of the argument. There are no artistic formulas, unnecessary movements of the camera or any excess plan. Everything

is very important and the interest not only does not decay at any time but it isdespite its

increasinglong duration (almost two hours, totally necessary), reaching a final part shocking by its dramatic force

and its profound humanity, te���ida of sadness and bitterness. The final shot is open but nothing ambiguous.

We do not know yet if it is heartbreaking or hopeful, but we are very afraid that, in a neighborhood "where the

lambs live among the wolves", as the voice of the protagonist says at the beginning, the future will not be ��Ah

precisely reassuring or illusionante.Excelentes interpretaciones.���! And that the case that is told in

this film and the real Madeleine are like two drops of water, nothing at all. They look like an egg to a

chestnut. In other words,

" 1

" At the end of a strange sensation of coldness, the viewer's body travels. Once I have finished watching the film, I have been browsing the net in search of opinions and it is that , when it is

over one is cold, co���e, who does not know what to say and does not know where to start, it is true that it is very

well shot and that transmits (little, the truth) , that Nicolas Cage is in his usual role and that both

Jared Letto (whom I remember as the Raoul of "" The room of the panic "" Fincher) and Bridget Moynahan from

"" woman vase "" in a paper designed for Monica Bellucci, ah! I forgot Ethan Hawke, but it's so

little that it is normal for one to completely forget about him. With gui���and direction of Andrew Nicoll (the author of the

booklet of "" The Truman Show "" "" S1M0NE "" and "" The terminal "") that the truth is that I like it a lot, the movie is

"" somewhat sosita "".

" 0

" But how do you just Earl digital squirrel girl !? Have we all gone crazy? A careful

and meditated tape disaster.

Years ago a film that was considered child-friendly did not mean that an adult audience could not

enjoy it. Now it seems that he is relieved that he has quality with his target audience less than

ten years old. There is no way for the animation to communicate 100% with all the public, so it seems that they have stopped

even trying. Alvin and the Chipmunks could have been an exception. Yan since many of us have been authentic

followers of Alvin, Simon and Theodore in our early childhood The old series dates from the 50s). That sympathy

that is acquired only after many hours of union with television can not even be compared to the

excitement of a new p���. public child who does not know the drawing of all life (or worse, they have seen the

new versions) and is excited to see the squirrels sing and screaming. The pity is that the

traits that have made us so enjoy have become successful visual effects that have made

rodents are quite mediocre and even boring. The proposal to turn such cute little

characters into an animal-band of I design with songs and choreographies as if they were taken directly from

a video clip of the Backstreet Boys is, without a doubt, an error. But if there is something much worse than all these

blasphemies together is that its main actor is Jason Lee, who had an almost untouched and surreal career

alternating great independent films with food overproductions. But, how do you just Earl

of digital squirrel girl !? Have we all gone crazy? A careful and meditated tape disaster.

" 0

" The development abuses too much of the humor without finishing deciding towards the pure horror or the humorous

being half in both senses.

Double debut of the unknown director JHON KALANGIS, I say double because he debuted in horror movies but with a

lot of comedy and also is the first work that comes to our country. As an actor, however, we already saw him in my

great Greek wedding in his facet in the direction of the comedies JACK I JILL and LOVE IS WORKinadvertently. In both he

continuemet his fetish actress SHAUNA MCDONALD that in this occasion a BILLI ZANE is added at the time lower

but his career removing the success of TITANIC isolated was never too relevant. Start well this series b

typical of ZOMBIES, with lucky GAGS, good GORE effects, which intermingle really hilarious moments.

However it is only a mirage because the development abuses too much of the humor without finishing deciding towards

pure horror or humorous being half in both directions. The makeup can be categorized as

catastrophic, removing credibility from meat eaters. Once again a good idea of ​​departure is

very little thing before the lack of imagination to continue on the same path. A pity.

" 0

" Neither fa nor do neither re nor al or me nor du or have you very clear that here the authenticoccurs

existential uncertainty. ��� Who does not understand me? Is that the film leaves you catatonic, like a larva in an

apple exposed to the March sun on the terrace of my house. I want cinema now to recover. Good.

This considerable disadvantage covers the need we all have to consume poor cinema to distract us

a bit and to raise our eyes, get lost in domestic tribulations or go out to the service to stretcha

our legslittle. If the viewing takes place at home it is the right moment to go out to the terrace or go to the

computer room in case the cousin of Burgos has sent us that e-mail that he has promised us by sms in

where a powerpoint makes you laugh. This telefilm is one of the best that can be seen, but it is not a

telefilm: it is a movie with seriousness and made for the big screen, and that imposes a respect.

Sometimes filmmakers (I think using the term be correctly) and respects passing of clunkers bill or,

as in this case, blemishes, pimples on a clean skin, no s, lines too Straight when what

fascinates us are the shortcuts. The river king is nice, formally correct, with a certain narrative pulse and

its plot flows less am ,s, with meekness, peacefully. There are no scenes-impact. There are no sudden changes

of gui���n. There are no truculencias as in other movies to use. We could name ten films twinned to

this one and that could lead this criticism. Yes: it is a review-wildcard. I grab one and apply it to lots of

tapes without fear of erring. So predictable and neutral is. So empty. And that does not go tosolutions

supernatural(although there is a kind of ghost of ghost) or offers a Cartesian solution to the

intricacies of his suspense. It is not a film that excites and may even make a certain audience find it

attractive. It depends on what you ask when you enter the cinema. If you want to have a good time or have antime

exceptionalor just let the time pass or amplify the time and turn it into El Rato, that is, El Moment

The River King, which I do not know what it is, but I guess something fat. And now I'm going to the terrace to see if I

forget it or I put a post-it so that my memory (faithful and complicit) preserves it from viruses and formatting andcan

I, in the future, remember it with affection, think : What a good time I spent watching The river king. ��� Yes?

" 0

" Animation film with a good gui���ny and very well developed. A few months ago, I passed a movie theater and I was very interested in poster. It was the one of this film

and the curious thing that had that depending on where you look at it, it came out one image or another. And it looked like the house

tried to eat the protagonist. And I said to myself, "This is as soon as it comes out, I have to see it." But as I have fallen

a press pass for handsome, because I've seen before the rest of mortals, heh, heh. The movie is about a

pre-teen lad called DJ Walters who is obsessed with the neighbor from the house opposite, an old man with

bad milk called Nebbercracker. This is feared throughout the neighborhood, since anything that falls on your

plot is requisitioned, including children's tricycles. One day, what disappears is the basketball

of his friend Chowder and when they try to recover him, the old man dies. From this, they realize that the house

has a life of its own, and that it is not friendly at all. With the help of a small ingenious friend, they will have to rid

the world of such an annoying house. By the way, the action takes place on Halloween, that miedito.Finally a film

that I liked, hallelujah. And it has everything. I liked the script, since it is not for nothing ���o���o or

absurd, and has very little moral. It is a fragile action, of a short and high quality film. The kids

are not superheroes or anything like that, and they drop everything without almost eating or drinking it. The animation is very

good, with many details and very natural. And the plot grows until the final apotheosis, which is antològic.

The only issue he has is that it does not seem like a child. It is dark, it has more of a scare, the bad characters

are very bad at the beginning and the end scares (to infantile minds). This is why I think it's more for anaudience going

adolescentforward. Resuming, an animated film with a good gui���ny and very well developed.

" 1

"? Ratatouille? it is a beautiful song to tolerance, to understanding and peaceful and creative coexistence,

with such a superb ending that I have seldom been so sad that a film ends and they light up the

lights of the cinema.

"It is created out of necessity. Because it is a way of understanding life, of living and of expressing oneself. As a cook Inot

dounderstand my work without investigating, without investigating that restless spirit that defines human beings. "" This is what

Quique Dacosta writes, factotum of El Poblet, one of the most famous restaurants of our country. country and, by

extension, of the world. But, if they asked him, his words would surely be subscribed by Gousteau

himself, the famous Parisian chef with the name of submarine commander and gastronomic-revolutionary yearnings.

Of course, they would be subscribed by Remy, the rat protagonist of that masterpiece entitled "" Ratatouille "". And

we wrote well "" rat "" because the protagonist of the last Pixarada not in a pretty little mouse, a nice

Micky Mouse or a tender h���mster. No. The protagonist of this movie is a furry, ugly and repulsive rat. What

proves that Pixar does not walk with nonsense or half-measures, that you have to have veryideas

clearand a confidence in themselves bombproof to take the risky decision. Den turn a

sewer rat into the protagonist of a film.That, let's surrender once and for all to the wonderful

story of "" Ratatouille "" and postr���monos of fennel before a film that is prodigious from its start, in the

old style of the most savage cartoons? that adorable old assassin- to the sequence of theflight

rats'through the channels Underground, pure unleashed adrenaline. And, then, the tenderness. And the message about

radical alterity, about the claim of the other, of what is different. And about the value, the recognition,

the love for the work well done, the love for the artisan, the recovery of childhood, solidarity,

family, teamwork It is incredible everything that counts "" Ratatouille "". And, above all, it is incredible how he

tells it. It is a narrative prodigy. And the ability to transmit emotions. And that Par���s, more real than the

real one. And that kitchen, those stews that you can practically smell. And those secondary ones. And those gui���os. And the

perfect combination of humor, love, friendship, passion, anger, etc. And those rats. Let's not forget those rats that

run, climb, jump and climb. Some rats that, sometimes disgust, sometimes provoke laughter. And the

tenderness. And, above all, respect. Respect for all those beings that being different, are there. By

our side On the next floor. In the bar where we had breakfast. In the streets through which we walk.

"" Ratatouille "" is a beautiful song to tolerance, to understanding and peaceful and creative coexistence, with such

a superb ending that I have seldom been so sorry to end a movie. �cula and the lights

of the cinema are turned on. The question is, simply, when the edition for collectors comes out on DVD?

" 1

" His biggest drama was that, at first, he could not have children; the king had problems in bed. As

I read, frenulum, according to the film, an incomprehensible awkwardness.

I have read that Kubrick had a modern soundtrack composed for his Space Odyssey. Then I thought about it and

chose the one we know, with classical music. What he achieved was a futuristic work with a classical sensation.

Sofia Coppola has done the opposite. Carefully recreate the France of Louis XVI but the music is today. New

Order, Air, The Strokes get closer to the essentials, to what the protagonist felt. Coppola did not want to

talk about a long dead queen, but about a living woman. The Austrian heiress married her with the French dolphin

at 15 years old. His biggest drama was that, at first, he could not have children; the king had

problems in bed. As I read, frenulum, according to the film, an incomprehensible awkwardness. If he does not give an

heir to the French, the role of the protagonist in the court wobbles. His relationship with the mistress of hisin-

father-law, King Louis XV, Madame Du Barry, is one of contempt; the rest of court life is not wonderful either.

The consangu���neos and the ancestry are distributed with sickly thoroughness the honors of serving her in things that

she prefers to do alone. In the absence of a marital life, the young Austrian girl indulges herself in gambling, luxuries, fashion,

wigs, jewelry, and pastry. The tradition speaks of Marie Antoinette as the heartless queen who lives

with her back to the sufferings of her people, Sofia Copola delves into the human being behind the legend. One

understands the person. But a movie is not so easy to fill. The dramas of heroin do not give

much cinema. The tension over whether or not the king will finally consummate his marriage was not enough to fill the film.

I like the end, that farewell, but not at the price of enduring all the time that comes before.

" 0

" Bodrio of terror to the FrenchJoder that bodrio of boarding school. The movie does not start badly and the presentation of the main character, which without a doubt

is the orphanage, an impressive house in the middle of the field, is very precious, full of nuances and with

too much light for a movie. ��cula of this genre. The house is at first sight frightening and the patio that surrounds it does

not fall short either; they had the most important ingredient to make a good horror movie, but they have

missed it. Surprise the good French production and surprise the beauty of the main protagonist, but

not for those. The gui���n is a patra���a, goes through several phases that go of m���sa less and in the end it ends up

boring. It is appreciated that, if they have not resorted to bleeding and several ulcers to give "" more

fear "", a resource that is already well seen but in The House of wax It works. The key scene of the boarding school is

when it arrives from the forklift to the clean room. It is so foreseeable, the resources are so basic that it seems like

a tracing of a thousand films of the genre and at the end the final culmination is more than scary, it makes you laugh. A pity

because the boarding school started very well but in the end it gets long and boring.

" 0

" Deseo, Peligro is a pretentious and bombastic film that, despite its promotion,no

ismore than a vulgar story, lacking in passion. ny emotion.

Ang Lee is a filmmaker who can be considered the antithesis of typecasting, since each of his

films is totally different from the previous one. He is able to make a romantic drama of the time, a film of

action and martial arts, the cinematographic adaptation of a popular comic or the love story of two men

in the deep America. With Desire, Danger, Ang Lee approaches the black cinema par excellence, but the environment of

spies and war is only a framework for the Taiwanese filmmaker Cues tell the story of the passion that arises

between an amateur spy and his supposed victim. From the outset, to Desire, Danger they have plenty, being generous, at

least three quarters of an hour, since their excessive footage is a burden that history never recovers.

The first half of the film, whose only reason for being is to present the characters and show the

environment of a China occupied by the Japanese troops during the Second World War, as a presentation It's

too long. Ang Lee recreates with great parsimony in elements totally alien to the plot,

as each and every one of the games to the mahjong. However, this first part is more convincing and

intense than the second, which theoretically should be the one that most aroused in the viewer, sincein

it isit the bulk of the story. Unfortunately, the emotional core turns out to be a story that

recalls something already seen on many occasions (without going any further, in this same year, to The Black Book), foreseeable

and that does not offer anything new. Well, yes, the highly touted sexual encounters between the main couple

(whose performances are the best of the film), but which are sincerely free since they do not add specific

weight to the development of the trama.Deseseo, Danger is a film that pretends andsin

grandiloquent, and that despite its promotion, is not more than a vulgar story, lacking in passion and emotion

some and totally predictable. And if that were not enough, its duration ends up exasperating anyone.

" 0

" Hot Rod will be in the Top 5 of comedies this year that ends. Infinity of references, rhythm andjokes

antichological. The comedy USA is on a roll. Yuh���!

Hot Rod is a classic. It is again the same story as always (very Sandlerian that of collecting money

making the donkey to save the life of a hated being !!! so to continue pute���ndose in the future) but it

works like never before. It is directed by Akiva Schaffer, tanned in SNL and starring Andy Samberg, a

scientist who little by little made a hole in the show and created this peculiar universe between Napoleon Dynamite and

Ron Burgundy. The movie comes from Lorne Michaels and Will Ferrell, right? and is designed to make

"" burst out of laughter "" (phrase from my video store memoir, which I also rescue.) to the generation Footloose / Karate

Kid based on, as Mr.Toldo would say, pocho humor. And for that he uses a lot of mythical songs from Europe. Several. If

I tell you that Bill Hader (who will be in the longed-for Tropic Thunder) is SUPER and that there is a scene for Will

Arnett to like, you'll probably start drooling. And the title of the post comes from an amazing scene in which

I saw what I did not see in Colega, where is my car? the latter being pending total review.

" 1

" It is not a movie of laughter as Shrek could have been, but a kind comedy withmoments

funny. A chapeau to Pixar for this marvel.

Pixar returns to the attack after the small fiasco that turned out to be Cars (in comparison with the previous

wonders of the house). As in this type of films one usually compares them with previous ones, I will say that

in my place the masterpiece of Pixar is Looking for Nemo. And in this case I must say that they have managed to return to the

level of this film. In every Pixar movie you expect the best of computer animation (it is

still ahead of the others). ���s) and in this it could not be less. Although I already have the impression that they do not give everything

they can of themselves in terms of realism so that it continues to look like a cartoon. Because the scenes that

stand out, like the whirlpools in the sewer, or the rain on the cobblestones of Paris, seem so real?

that at the end they have put a stamp indicating that no real images or "" capture of movement "" have been used. It is

impressive in the three years that have passed since Nemo as the realism of water has increased so much. But

let's leave aside the technical aspects, which have remained brilliant in the Incredibles and Cars. It always gives me a

bad spine when an animation movie is announced by means of the stars that appear as

actors / benders, as if they were not going to offer something else (it is not always so, eye ). And as usual, Pixar

has not done it, despite having great actors in the English version, like Ian Holm, or Peter O? Toole (okay, they're not

stars). The script is a very ingenious piece in which, like Nemo (I know I repeat) animals

interact with humans, but do not talk, but humans treat them as usual, until the

protagonist gets a communication. Remy is a field rat that has a delicate sense of taste and

smell. This makes the garbage that his father and other family (the clan) look for very

unsatisfying. That is why he sometimes sneaks off to the farm kitchen where he can give free rein to his

desires, and there he meets the recipes of France's greatest chef, the great Gusteau. Everything is fine until one

day? I love how the communication between humans and rats is handled. Humans see them as the disgusting

bugs they are, persecute them, seek to kill them? only Remy (who has been drawn blue for that) will get to

enter the world of haute cuisine. It is not a movie of laughter as could be Shrek, but

a friendly comedy with funny moments (a very negative reference to Nemo), in which are the typical jester characters

, the bitter bad guys (Chef Skinner and the critic Ego), and other gender conventions. But I do not think

that in any case the adults are heavy or think that "this I have seen". A chapeau to Pixar for

this marvel.

" 1

" One of the worst movies I've seen in the last few years. Failed product that does not deserve more

comments

The truth is that I approached the cinema without having played any part of the famous video game,

simply because the plot and the aesthetics of the movie They attracted me and I thought I could see anproduction

entertaining(good would be too much to ask) but I was completely wrong. Silent Hill I think one of the worst

movies I've seen in recent years. There are some aspects that are very successful, such as effects and

photography, but even so they do not manage to change my qualification. It becomes heavy, absurd characters, gui���n (���?) Confusing

that requires a great explanation after having made it a character, creatures that do not

come too much to story (I guess in the video game itself), a parallel of worlds, situations thatyou

leftcold completely. And I say all this because it's funny that having Christophe Gans (crying freeman, the

pact of the wolves), Roger Avary (The rules of the game, Killing Zoe, writer of Pulp Fiction) and Dan Laustsen

(Mimic, The pact of the wolves ) as director, scriptwriter and director of photography respectively,has been created.

such a bad productThere are some aspects as I said that they are saved from burning, and among them we find

their cast: Radha Mitchell (Melinda and Melinda) and Sean Bean (Boromir in The Lord of the Rings) show

that they are very interesting actors and that they give themselves, as they have been able to recreate the experiences of such

tormented parents. In short, a failed product that does not deserve more comments.

" 0

" I fell in love with the direct and raw way of being filmed this movie is one of those that not only impresses with

images but also impacts with a dialogue

With this film I've enjoyed how long ago I did not. For some time I did not go to a movie theater and

I wanted to see something entertaining that I could get away from the real world if only for a while. I went

to see this movie even knowing that some of my colleagues did not like it at all.

Immediately, I fell in love, the direct and crude way of being filmed this film is one of those that not only

impresses with images but also impacts with a formidablely realistic dialogue ( at least before the

first turning point) that made me the accomplice of all his Machiavellian and vengeful plot. The story is

about "" boy meets girl "" (via internet) are left to take an ice cream and spend a nice time together. The

problem is that "" boy "" is a photographer of 32 years and "" girl "" is a girl of 15. At first the

viewer presupposes what will happen when "" boy "" decides to take his "" girl "" home to make a

photographic session. But how could such a foreseeable guide be made with the Sitges prize? very easy,

because this story is not about this stick, here the "" girl "" innocent turns out to be a vengeful soul who waited to

be at the photographer's house to make him suffer in unsuspected ways to find out if this has any

relationship with a case of pedophilia that has been in the area recently. In my view it is a very

original film both in approach and in front of the public to which It is as imbecile as

most American movies of these last times. It is very radical in its approach, a fact that reinforces

the mystery that surrounds the young protagonist in a cloak that prevents us from perceiving whether she is a justice or a

psychopath without scruples. In this film there are no good acts, only some less evil than others.

" 1

" Beautiful, funny, cruel, sincere ... everything is almost perfect in this tragic story. Justify

enough because it has been a failure in your country of origin.

The man of the time with Grizzly Man, The Squid and the Whale and The Hills Have Eyes is part of my

2006 selection. The photography is spectacular, as well as the use of the Scope and the City of Chicago, a character

m���s.Cage is spectacular and Mr. Caine and his timbre of voice are the most comforting of this year (attention

when they hear the song in the car) Justify enough because it has been a failure in his country of origin; is

one of the films of the year. Beautiful, funny, cruel, sincere. Everything is almost perfect in this tragic story

of a man trying to recover his dignity in this (evil) world in which we live. It seems incredible that it is

directed by the same as "" The ring "" "" The Mexican "" or "" Pirates of the Caribbean "". The dysfunctional family seen in

movies that most resembles the family father . The best film by Verbinski (probably his masterpiece),

which walks with ease through the fine wire that separates Happiness from Los Tenenbaum. Antological (and very Kaufmanian)

the trip in search of salsa t���rtara and very interesting the theory of fast food. Impressive recital of the entire

cast. Another outstanding. A 9.

" 1

" Your guide will delight lovers of action cinema, since it presents all the ingredients

to not leave anyone indifferent, and scenes as varied and already cl It's impossible to

forget what we have before our eyes.

Taking advantage of its output on DVD, I took the opportunity to revisit it, it is curious that when you contemplate a film for the

second time, you can stop at scenes that you have previously missed and even deepen in others that, in

a way another, they did not have the relevance that I thought before. I still think that Eva Green, with her interpretation of

Vesper Lynn, does not manage to give her any entity as a Bond girl, being light years from any of those who

were previously partenaire of the most famous 007 agent in the world of celluloid. Daniel Craigh with his bond is

the archetype of the character we now know, giving a different dimension to the classical 007, this Bond is hard,

uncool and more enamored than those of yesteryear. On the other hand, his guide will delight fans of action

cinema, since that presents all the ingredients to not leave anyone indifferent, and scenes as

varied and already classic 007 saga that it is impossible to forget what we have before our eyes. Curious,

on the other hand, the scene of the game of Poker, where his planning and excellent shooting manages to

keep us in tension. In something so extremely trivial, as is a game of chance. Honestly, a movie that

deserves a more view.

" 1

" A Bond as cool as always but much less sophisticated revives the series of his ashes. I declare myself a fan of the James Bond films. I recognize it. It brings back memories of my discovery of cinema

by Sean Connery in "From Russia with Love" and that makes him more tolerant than the rest with the

ravings that the series was suffering. However, I think I'm pretty fair if I say that this is the best

Bond in years and the rest of the opinions that can be found in the network of networks as well. The arrival of

Casino Royale at cinemas has not been accompanied by the advertising noise that was coming before the premiere of the

previous films starring Pierce Brosnan. This, coupled with the presentation of Daniel Craig as the

new Bond, blond with blue eyes, augured the final blow of the series. However, both the new

protagonist and the new air that has taken the Bond universe have served as a revulsive and we can talk about

the best delivery of the saga for a long time. Daniel Craig embodies a first-time agent, but with the

hardness required by the position. It's still as cool as Bond has to be but with much less

sophistication. He finished the Martini agitated but not removed and the flirting po���tico with the Bond girls. Both the

dialogue and the character, who bleeds much more than usual to be James Bond, are credible. That does not

mean that the film itself is credible, because one of the premises of the series is that what you see has to

be incredible. What happens is that there are differences between this is incredible but it gives me so much and this is

incredible. ���Just that does not arrive! Casino Royale has a few scenes of those that make you grab the

arms of the chair and that means that the character has arrived and that you are living through their

eyes. to an amazing Daniel Craig, we have Eva Green (Solasadores de Bertolucci) as a Bond girl,

which on this occasion is more than a pair of tits with legs. Mads Mkkelsen turns out to be

very convincing, especially in the scenes of the poker game. Otherwise, the rest of clichés that one

can expect from a Bond movie are here: a heart attack, persecutions, explosions, cities, twists

in the plot ,. It is not that the script is a prodigy, but it fulfills the expectations and does not become long, something that

happened in the previous deliveries. I miss the appearance of R, but it is one of the ballasts that have been left

behind to lighten a package was becoming very heavy. In short, the good of Pierce Brosnan seems

a grandfather if we compare it with Craig's Bond, much harder and less sophisticated. The bet of the people in

charge of Casino Royale has been to lower to the superagente one of the altars and to give him a beating of reality, and the

result can not be more promising.

" 1

" Alatriste is the tangible demonstration that in this country we can already dedicate ourselves to doing something else, Inot

doknow, socks for example.

It is the Spanish film of the year, as in 2005 it was 'Torrente 3'. I'm talking about the box office, naturally. And if

we talk about its quality as a film, it is little better than Santiago Segura's cachondeo, and no, it's not good.

I would like it already. The supposed crisis of the Spanish cinema will be saved two tru���os that there is no where to catch them.

Because more readers, 'Alatriste' is the tangible demonstration that in this country we can already dedicate ourselves to

doing something else, I do not know, sock for example . This film is not only a clear exponent of the null quality of

our cinema. It is an invitation that any spectator with two fingers of front does not come back to step on a movie

theater to see a patriotic product. It is also an invitation for all those who

work in this film industry in our country to think about changing their jobs and not losing more time.

doing the fool. What am I being too hard? What is going! What happens is that if the film were American,

then I would give birth without more point, and what is better, I would care a bit. But as it is ours (and that

of ours goes with second ones) I can not remain silent without more and to limit myself to realize a critique of the film without

entering in certain considerations that I think important. So much time complaining that in our country we did not

dare to make a superproduction the American with many means and such and such, with all the History that

we have and bla BLA bla. and when it turns out that there is the possibility of doing it (a good possibility,

I would say) and apart they put us on a plate to an actor of the stature of Viggo Mortensen and about 22 million euros,

m��� It's a minimally acceptable literary base, I ask, "How is it possible that suchhas been done

shit?" I will not talk about your argument. You take the books that Arturo P���rez-Reverte has dedicated to the

character and you will see that he has taken something from everyone to tell the story that is told in the

film. A hugely confusing story that never progresses and what is worse: it is not interesting at any

time. What does Alatriste do? What do the rest of the characters do? What unites them? These and many other questions

can be answered but only half-heartedly, since it is never perfectly defined or explained what

each character does and its function in the film. Many come out, or rather because they are played by

well-known actors and so the public can say: "Look, it's Pilar L���pez de Ayala" (daughter m�� �a, who recommended

you to get in here?) That little definition affects not only the characters but the story. Theplot

centralis quite diluted, either by the overwhelming artistic direction, by the excess of characters or by

secondary plots that radically obstruct the narrative, as for example love affairs between some

of the characters. Apart from wasting time, they are not well displayed. We would also have to say that the film

is lost in historical data referring to famous paintings, which do not give a, becausenot even

damnthe fact isachieved. of wanting to transmit the sensation that we are facing something big right at the

moment of being realized. That excess of information ends up tiring us, it's like if the responsible ones thought

that we were not going to give account of the exact time in which the movie is developed. ��cula. But it is good to see, if they alreadyat the

tell usbeginning of the year, and they repeat us every two times: "" one year later "", "" ten years after ���s "" and so on.A

Agust���n D���az Yanes is not that the film is too big for him, it is huge. He can not

infer the correct rhythm, it is more, sometimes he gives the feeling that there is no rhythm; holding the entire film is

truly soporific and ends up unsettling. For not having there are no rhythm lows, which is already saying. And

when the time comes to be spectacular, the director shows that he can not shoot a singlescene

battle or sword fight. Everything is confused and is very hurriedly displayed. The film also can not

boast of having many spectacular scenes, which is still a mistake, because when it focuses on its

characters is total chaos. If at least he had something more action, and had not stopped so much in

uselessness, we would be talking about another film without any doubt. But it is not so. In the work of actors there is something

for everyone. Evidently who takes the cake is Viggo Mortensen, to whom we only have to

reproach him for a really strange way of speaking and that would hurt his interpretation a bit. However, he makeshis own

the characterand walks through the entire film filling the screen, perhaps too much, because of what there is no

doubt is that the film is a whole vehicle for his lucimiento, let everyone know that this actor has come

to work with us and let's focus it a lot, lest it be the only time he approaches us here. The

rest of the cast is really hard to live up to. On the good side we have Javier

C���mara, an actor who earns a lot with the years; Blanca Portillo, that if she does not take the Goya for it, she will do it for

'Volver'; Juan Echanove as an excellent Quevedo; Ariadna Gil, not because it's okay, but because I let this

actress forgive everything and it's always a joy to see her on screen. And how not, Eduard Fern���ndez, magnificentactor

off-roadwho embroiders what they throw him out. On the side of the bad guys we have Eduardo Noriega, who at any moment

seems to be going to tell us that we drink Schweppes; Elena Anaya, who is never believable; and above all Unax Ugalde,

who by now I already qualify as one of the worst actors in Universal History. His character,

vital in history, does not have the smallest entity in the hands of Ugalde, does not exist. The actor who only knows how to

put a face, his, is truly pathetic and finishes rounding out the general disaster. Good

actors must be added what is spent in design of production, that ah��� the film is perfect. Every cent of your

budget is reflected on the screen, something is something. But evidently it does not arrive, since the rest are not

more than a lot of characters coming out right and left and reciting phrases that at times are

ridiculous. A very bad that once more highlights and uncovered the enormousdeficiencies

artisticof our cinema, which we would have to be defending tooth and nail (never better said), but

with films how is this impossible? Let's see how long it takes to laugh at us when the film is

exported. In these moments the sensation is of absolute mosque, tomorrow it will be sadness, because once again I repeat

that the occasion to do something great was unique and they have wasted it. And by the way, it does not seem thatis going to be

a seriesdone on the character, which would be logical. Of course, they have run out of money producing ���sta,

there is no continuation.

" 0

" At times it seems Basic Instinct and at times any movie of Demi Moore, but it does not stop working despite

the (contrived) police plot and because the surprise factor is null ... It

had many I want to see this movie. Kevin Costner has been very big and his version of Robin Hood seems to me

excellent, like his Eliot Ness or his Garrison in JFK. His castmates here are Willam Hurt, who seems

that since Una History of violence always plays the same role and Demi Moore. What happens is that here

the roles of the three could be reversed and nothing would happen, no matter who is the cop, the bad guy or "the other". In

Mr. Brooks Costner is a schizophrenic addicted to murder, but that's not a spoiler because the first

ninety seconds of film make it clear. At times it seems Basic Instinct and at times any movie of Demi Moore,

but it does not finish working in spite of the (contrived) police plot and because the surprise factor is null.

Impeccably, is the classic movie Forties couples to come tomovies in droves and "" hallucinate "" withwhat

Kevin Costnermakes them like another movie like gust them for that p Public: American beauty. I do not know if it will

please the marriage you put your son Kevin Costner of Jesus. It was going to be approved by the hair, but there is an

ultra-late shooting that makes her lose the little credibility that she had.

" 0

" The bad thing about being accompanied to the movies is that you do not always choose what you want to see. So this time I

had to endure two hours (on top of these bad films last always two hours) of commercial success and

mediocre.

The bad thing about being accompanied to the movies is that you do not always choose what you want to see. So this time I had

to endure two hours (on top of these bad movies last two hours) of commercial success and mediocre. I

think they want to impose a fee by law. ��nima of European cinema in theaters. The distributors argue

against it that it would ruin them, because roughly the European cinema does not give more than seven percent of the

profits. Hollywood, on the other hand, expressly makes the type of films that the kids demand and therefore gives a

lot of money. This is an obvious reality, and the consequence is that supposedly all of us who lovecinema

quality, especially moviegoers like me, should be happy. I am a very atypical spectator, I think .

When I decide, I know what I'm going to see, and nobody scares me. I get it first by snooping on the

story, and so I see movies whose subject interests me. I do not usually choose films for their actors or their archetypes.

I would do it with Gary Cooper, but he is dead (as everyone knows, Gary Cooper is in heaven). Second, I

control a little of the directors who are good and those who are of the montón, it is very simple, the bad ones do

not stay in my head for more that they market me. In third and last place, when I doubt I can pull the

criticism, always with a little care because critics are also human and, as such, have their

tastes, In addition to their patterns in many cases. With this simple methodology, I have freed, for example, Torrente

and its sequels, films that copy the reason of the American success. . And I've also enjoyedGladiator

Ridley Scott'sor Scorsese's Gungs of New York, which prove that Hollywood can do good works if you want, the

problem is that you usually do not want to (you just have to make a hamburger slop that everything the world

eats). I believe in the free competition of ideas, that's why I think this measure is wrong. I do not want obstacles, even if they seem to

make sense, a job well done can add up little by little and reverse the situation, only theis needed

intelligence of the spectator. And of course, if the powerful want consumerists and not freethinkers, then they will give the

public what they want. It's more, I think that the public does not have to give what they want or what they expect, but what

you want to give them. Only then do the cells of thought move a little.

" 0

" A strange sensation keeps you stuck to the chair when the credits are lost and it seems thatfaint

with them the magic that minutes before has made you feelis extinguished. completely hypnotized.

After the wedding it is painful, emotional, deep, hard ... a masterpiece.

Very often one leaves the cinema thinking that something has changed out there. Or inside, better said. A

strange sensation keeps you stuck to the chair when the credits are lost and it seems that with them

the magic that minutes before has made you feel completely hypnotized is gradually extinguished. After the

wedding it is painful, emotional, deep, hard. a masterpiece. Nominated for the Oscars in the category of best

non-English speaking film, director Susanne Bier's film (Brothers, I Love You Forever.) tells the

story of Jacob, a lonely wolf who devotes his life to helping the children of Bombay, India. The economic difficulties

the orphanage goes through where he works make him be forced to travel to his native country,

Denmark, to negotiate the donation proposal that an important businessman is ��� willing to do.

Soon you will see that Jorgen, the altruist in question, imposes strange conditions that will gradually make sense and force

him to make the most decisions. important of his life. After the wedding is mainly a story

of reunions: between people, between people and those places they belonged to, between past and

future. What we thought we had left behind sometimes reappears with unsuspected force. Each secret

revealed opens a new world, a new range of possibilities. And, always, when opening a doorone closes

another. Jacob advances, and we with him, through his past to approach a crossroads that leaves him

no good option, but not bad either. Less is more. This touching drama (its detractors say it's a melodrama)

supports its solid gui���n in intelligent di���logos, which endow action Den a lively pace and an ever

growing interest. I remember one of the first replies given by the protagonist when he arrived in Denmark, tired and

skeptical. His companion, son-in-law of the wealthy Jorgen, comments: "" He came out of nowhere and now has a great

fortune. Although it is not noticed "", to which Jacob responds "" that came out of nowhere? "". Irony, sarcasm and

subtext are always present. But if something stands out beyond the argument and the subject, it is because of the

superb interpretations of all its protagonists. Mads Mikkelsenare particularly brilliant

(Jacob) and Rolf Lassgard (Jorgen). No doubt much of the success of the work falls on them, as they participate in

making the toughest scenes of the feature film credible and emotional. In short, we find, in my opinion, before

a of the best movies of 2006. I'm afraid that I'll go unnoticed at the Spanish box office, but this

is the kind of stories worth watching movies for. If you ask for something more than pure andentertainment

hard, empty and meaningless, go and see it without hesitation. I personally respond to complaints, if any.

" 1

" Crènica of a budding apocalypse. Impeccable model of nihilistic cinema, Children of men raises more

questions than solutions.

Impeccable model of nihilistic cinema, Children of men raises more questions than solutions. I have already

written a few times that this is the nature of art. It produces restlessness, creates discomfort, induces

pessimism and, nevertheless, is a song to human life, a beautiful song, scarcely religious, although what

happens may make us suspect that the moralistic or mythological side will triumph in Some time: none of

this happens. Intelligent hybrid of several genres (political cinema, science fiction, conventional thriller),

Children of men is an absolute flash of light, a dark and apocalyptic light Optical for what it narrates (a

pregnant woman led by a former activist to salvation given that 18 years ago that

no woman is pregnant) .Cuando���n, which is a Todotereno able to give life to Harry Potter, make road movies

of teen sex (And your mam��� tambi���n) and stir our guts with this tale of illegality and

corruption, death and beauty, at the same time, itthe target of entertainment without abandoning its

hitsclosest record of metaphysical intentions, namely: a world destined for its dissolution, a world without God or government

that lives its last heaven and its last rattles of tenderness. Maniquea in its final resolution,devoid

completelyof any wisp of humor (or the crazy character of Caine manages to put a smile on us, although he

proposes it with enthusiasm), the film documents the horror of war, portrays verismo the profound absurdity

of the condition Humanan human (Malraux dixit) and how love, that son begotten by the woman of color in a

concentration camp, in the warm light of an insensitive flexus, ends ( how to say the opposite) triumphing.

" 1

" Huerga defines with splendor and dose of great cinema the attack against the freedom of a historical stage.

A whole lesson on how to make quality Spanish cinema.

I am 26 years old, I was born in 1980 and my knowledge about the Spanish Civil War and Franco's dictatorship are

reduced to the fine brushstrokes that my parents have been facilitating in stages of historical concern. Africa, seasoned

with a terrifying tale that my late grandfather told me one summer in Malaga, his participation in thearmy

Francoistagainst the "reds" as he called them during those three years. you. He told me everything that lived in

the front of Andalucia, everything, I even had access to a diary that he wrote. 40 years were needed for that stubborn

individual, vileness in its purest state , leave power, less time we have needed to forget what

many lived and what many do not know. There is a certain phobia on the part of the national cinema to recover the

historical memory of a dark age that belongs to us, that we must not forget, and I do not know the reasons, but it

is at least discouraging, that the new generations born under the protection of the freedom that ��

democracy, successively forget the events that led a few to fight for their freedom, against

the oppression of a totalitarian and fascist state, which now all reject and that almost all

supported at the time. Beginning with those politicians who served the Franco regime and who are currentlybehind

hidinga political party and considering themselves the most democrats in the state (we all know that Manuel Fraga was

minister of Frank). Regardless of the fact that it would be wonderful if those who defended 4 decades of terror,

asked for forgiveness, it would be essential that our comatose Spanish cinema be left behind of banana imitations of-

North American byproducts, and that they dedicate themselves to making films of quality, in which there was room for the

recovery through the cinematic language of those dark events that brought the human condition

to its most despicable baseness. Just so that young people who have to build the future,not

let'sforget what happened in Spain, events close in time, because after all .. 25 a��� os, they are not

so many. And that is precisely what Salvador de Manuel Huerga does, to bring us back to the last throes

of the dictatorship, in which a young anarchist was condemned to death by a state that he wanted to demonstrate, after

the murder of Carrero Blanco at the hands of ETA, which they still had power and after a judicial process

full of shadows. We could argue about whether Puig Antich was a terrorist or a liberator, but this controversy

was perfectly clarified in V de Vendetta, a thesis that I fully support, because under certain Circumstances

in which, the right of the individual of SER, is not fulfilled, the struggle must be carried out to ensure that aton.

no time are the most universal rights of this society troddenWithout the mediatic effect of names like

Almod� ��var or Perez Reverte, Huerga defines with splendor and dose of great cinema the attack against the freedom of

a historical stage that I repeat, we should never forget. Filmed in a high definition format (something like what

Michael Mann does), it has a surprisingly fast pace and does not decay even in thescenes

most seemingly inconsequential. The sequences are supported by a truly antisocial BSO, with themes by

Lluis Llach, Leonard Cohen or that sensational Knockin? on heaven? s door by Bob Dylan. Rhythm accelerated, accurate and

without defocusing at any time the action that we attend, being at all times perfectly located on

the screen and without getting lost in impossible barbles that do not contribute anything to the staging. Surprisingly

the film has two distinct parts, all that huge flashback that economically details the

beginnings of Puig Antich in the revolutionary movement, and the segment from which ETA kills Carrero

Blanco and the young anarchist he is aware that he will be executed. And I say surprisingly, because the fine line

that separates both segments is so splendidly diluted, that at all times we have an amazing sense

of continuity, with its consequent difficulty in elucidating at what point the first section of the film. Great

success on the part of the director, who supports with a dirty and cold image, the recreation of a completelyworld

differentfrom the one we know, and that brings not only closeness, but also an evident effect of realism thatrarely

we haveseen in these lares.The actors are to feed separately, except for Leonor Watling (who is

still more than correct) whose profile is not completely defined, even the secondary ones like Celso Bugallo

or Ingrid Rubio scratch great height, but above them there are two names, Daniel Br���hl and Leonardo

Sbaraglia, who can already prepare their speeches, because the Goya does not take it from him or God. In the case of the German

actor, to say that his interpretation is sublime, is to remain short, at all times restrained, represses (and

perceives) the feelings that emerge in him, with a strong point. at the time of execution, where your

an overwhelming interpretative lesson is to get up and not stop applauding, because it delights with one of the

most emotive and somber moments of the entire film (and capable of leaving the audience in a sea of

tears ). In the case of the Argentine. I have no words, the few scenes that she shares with Br���hl are antol���gicas

and brilliant, we perceive the evolution of the character, and each time the camera focuses on the moments more

dramatic, it causes a knot in the throat, of 10, especially when attending the execution of Salvador (Inot

dodeprive any of the film, do you?), which rises in the 120 minutes of footage as one of the mostscenes

shockingof recent Spanish cinema, loaded with a drama that forces one to withdraw his gaze from the screen, and

which is embarrassingly pathetic. Really, the last 30 minutes of the film would be outstanding in its

entirety, quality films and echo with the soul, even so, it is not necessary to deny that perhaps it is unnecessarily

lengthened. After so much I praise the film, it would be necessary to highlight the one that I consider the black aspect of the

film, the ambiguity with which the authorities of the state are treated (in spite of certain fragments of

humanity in certain characters). In the movie the bad guys are bad, and except in specific cases, at

no time do we perceive a minimum of humanity, it is generalize too much in my humble opinion. It is true

that I do not know to what extent the film is true to the facts, to what extent is the history adulterated,

nor is it something that is very relevant when we attend a whole lesson of c� How to make quality Spanish cinema.

" 1

" Why do we have to suffer this type of film every week? A very recent revision of a Shakespearean classics, translated into a teen comedy, (from ""Labyrinth

Poisoned"" or "" 10 Reasons to Hate You "") the most famous dramatist in the universe has been proving how his works

became romantic comedies for the adolescent public. Taking advantage of the World Cup in Germany, this is

about football, where a girl, played by the unknown Amanda Bynes is posing as her

brother, it is true that in the room where I saw the film I had ��am���s femininas that "" feminos "" and these last ones we

watched with enough boredom, since we did not understand the jokes, nor is it necessary that we did, since the

tape, the more predictable and bland better than better. Anyway, one more, that neither change your life, nor change the

genre nor wait m��s Des of what there is, by the way ��� why every week we have to suffer this type of

film on the poster?

" 0

" Hitchcock's excellent film, one of his last works in Great Britain, before embarking on the

road to Hollywood.

"" One morning, a prestigious actress appears dead on the beach. The woman has been killed with the belt of

a man's jacket. A young man, from above the cliff, sees the body and descends to see how it is. He runs

in search of the police and two women see him running away from the body. Although he explains everything to the

police, he is labeled murder, so he flee to discover the real murderer. Help him, not without

reluctance, the daughter of the Chief of Police, who little by little will fall in love with the young man. "" Excellent film by

Hitchcock, one of his �� Last works in Great Britain, before embarking on the road to Hollywood. It is very

good, by intelligently mixing humor with intrigue. The main couple has a lot of chemistry and both,

���ly she, are delicious and delicious. She has a lot of good humor, especially because of the continuous dialogues

between the two j��s. Young, who throw puyitas full of iron���ae ingenio.Por their part, the intrigue, great asset

in most of the tapes of the English magician, is well worn, with the last minutes in the pub where the

murderer plays the drummer with his face painted black but with his contiuos tics in his eyes, made by whatMoments

you can recognize him.like the car being swallowed For the land in the old mine, the young man's escape from

the police or the girl's dinner with his younger brothers are pure Hitchcock cinema. A superb

film, with a title that could lead to deceit.

" 1

" Once more, between the tease and the sensation of seeing something unique. I hate the filmmaker Lynch because he

tries too hard not to tell me anything and irritate me. I admire the artist Lynch because he is able to have methree hours

react forto his work.

Background: 'The Elephant Man', 'Blue Velvet', 'Twin Peaks' and 'Wild Heart' I loved, 'Mulholland

Drive' me indign���. A couple of years later, I reconciled with his cinema thanks to an overdose: 'Eraserhead' and

'Lost Highway' in one go. I like David Lynch, but I do not share his relationship with the viewer.

I enter the projection of 'Inland Empire' willing, once again, to be challenged and defeated. What I thought I was going to

tell: Nikki Grace is an actress in decline who gets an important role in a film with Devon,

a young actor with a reputation as a womanizer. Just at the beginning of the rehearsals, they discover that they have embarked on the remake

of a cursed movie, especially for its protagonists. Nikki begins a search for her own identity through

a menacing labyrinth of thunder. What she finally told me: schizophrenic filmmakers,sitcoms

rabbit, theater of whores and a circus Internet and full of Poles compete for the favor of theaudience

21st century. Oblivious to the struggle, Lynch discovers all of us in his "" inner empire "" which gives the film its name

. Either that, or nothing, which for the case is the same. David Lynch proves, once again, to be thefilmmaker

"mainstream"who most defies intelligence ( and the patience) of the spectator. Three hours of continuous

chaos, a spiral of climaxes that are happening, one after another, from about the 20 minute

film. Until that moment, Lynch develops the ���narraci���n? that only serves to give a synopsis and some

tranquility to the investors of turn. After, and supported by his new toy, digital video, the Missoula

returns to his subjects, his obsessions, again and again, striving more than ever in annihilate allnarrative

possible. Exempt from the need to "" tell something "", Inland Empire? is able to fascinate with the strength of a

superb Laura Dern, with the proximity that video gives to this new nightmare, with the overwhelming power

of the masterful use of sound and music. It's Lynch in its most free and least cinematic state since, perhaps,

"Eraserhead?" And that's where, precisely, the viewer can find his or her particular way outterror

atmosphericof? Inland Empire ?: Lynch, in the background, does not want to tell anything, just to evoke sensations,

moods. Have you on the edge of the seat. Perhaps he has never wanted to tell much (unless he is paid for

it). That is, he is very aware of his almost mythical dimension, and he is capable of laughing at himself, at his

complete filmography and at the spectator, cr� Ethics included. If you survive your almost insufferable hermeticism,

'Inland Empire' is very entertaining, and even fun. In short, Lynch demands all your attention, your

intelligence and your patience for? have a hard time Then, the lights come on, and you find yourself next to

someone who is familiar to you, and you ask yourself what you have lived (silently, no one

knows you have not understood anything), and since what you have lived can not be measured in numbers, stars, or

anything like that, you decide to shut up and do not say anything until you get home and look online for the

interpretations of others to what you You have lived. At least, you are not alone in your bewilderment. Once more,

between the teasing and the sensation of seeing something unique. I hate the filmmaker Lynch because he tries too hard

not to tell me anything and irritate me. I admire the artist Lynch because he is capable of having me react for three hours

to his work, to chills or clean laughter. A 2 for the film, an 8 for the work. I do not know if I explain: go

see it and think.

" 0

" With this Phantom Biker, Johnson makes it clear that, however much he likes superheroes, that does not

mean he knows how to make good movies about them.

That the director Mark Steven Johnson likes to make superhero movies has been proven, started with

Daredevil in the direction, in a film that was no wonder but that it was saved from burning thanks

to a few details. With his Electra script he was not so lucky and Rob Bowman perpetrated a real mess

of film. Now, with this Ghost Biker, Johnson, who writes and directs, makes it clear that, however much he

likes superheroes, that does not mean he knows how to make good movies about them. We parted from a gui Plan

plagued by topics with the typical story of the superhero, how he gets his powers, thelove story

impossible, the protagonist's trauma, learning his skills, fighting with the bad guys , etc. Ok that is what

there is and you can not ask much more, but at least if it can be done well and provide details,

conversations and motivations that make the plot fluid, coherent and distinct, which in this case there are, there are

more, ridiculous and meaningless scenes, other bullies and some embarrassing phrases. Then we have

a Nicolas Cage who is like an actor of grief and who gets a pathetic act doing sometimesand

hickchick ridiculous others. We continue with one of the points that should have been the strength of the film and that does not

just convince, that special effects. The flaming skull should have been more terrifying,

more filthy and darker, let's be more scary in the end and look more real, although we must admit that theeffect

fireis achieved. Then we have a little developed and less spectacular action scenes saving

only some scene of the motorcyclist on his motorcycle. One pity has been wasted in a film with so little

substance a character that could have given a lot of play with a different approach, we can only hope that they do

not give Jonhson the opportunity to shoot a sequel, that this man is dedicated to something else and stop

tormenting us with superhero movies. you're not tall

" 0

" The Zone is what happens to many current films, has an initial attractive approach, but

unfortunately has not been able to develop properly.

Since the attacks of September 11, contemporary society lives to a greater or lesser extent, depending

on the governments of each country, immersed in an authentic culture of fear being paranoia for the security

its maximum exponent. And when a society moves almost solely out of fear, injustice is aggravated and

acts of an unthinkable atrocity can be committed in a theoretically developed andsociety. With

advancedLa Zona, the Mexican filmmaker Rodrigo Pl��� makes a metaphor about how fear of the

unknown, fear of insecurity, can turn ordinary citizens into monsters. That is the

intention of the film, but oh friend, one thing is the intentions, which can be extraordinary, and another

thing very different is knowing how to translate them properly. There are some statements from the script that from the first

moment there is no one who creates them, besides a series of typical and very trite situations, to which above they are not

even given a good development The characters are credible for the extraordinary work of the actors,

among which stands out an immense Daniel Gim���nez Cacho and a disturbing and terrifying Carlos Bardem. It should also

be noted that La Zona is well rounded, at times it enjoys great intensity, while in others

the rhythm drops noticeably. The end is seen coming from far and not surprising at all. The Zone is what happens

to many current films, has an initial attractive approach, but unfortunately has not been able to

develop properly. It is most likely a story too ambitious for adirector

new.

" 0

" It is a product more than decent and entertaining and surprising for its achieved tension and abundant blood and

black humor.

Dawn of the dead is a product more than decent and entertaining and that surprised many of us by its achieved

tension and abundant blood and black humor. And of course, if the parodies of this type of film arrive, many of us

believe that it has to be in the form of Scary movie (by the way, that they do notstopas long as there are

seem toforever)films to be parodied. However, the English always get an ace out of the sleeve. They catch a success like

that of the zombies, they adapt it and add much more black but elaborate humor. Much English humor well written

and scripted. And the result is Shaun of the dead, title with much more game than the "" espa���olizado "" Zombies

party.Shaun is a thirtieth with a boring life and mon ���tona. Live with a childhood friend who only plays

the console, has a girlfriend who demands more commitment, an adorable mother and an obnoxious stepfather. But on a

certain day, people start doing weird things. It seems that they are all sick, their eyes turn

white and they walk clumsily. Until Shaun and his friend realize that they are surrounded by zombies spendodd

a half hour pretty normal with thesmile and witty flash. From "" the girl in the

garden "", the apostate protagonist becomes someone determined, a hero who wants to rescue his mother, save

his girlfriend and take them to all to a safe site up? Until we do not know what. Without leaving aside the gore aspect of

the zombie films (there are some other sequence quite explicit and disgusting), this movie is

great for the black humor that it gives off. If Starship Troopers was another work of great sarcasm (confused

with a fascistoid tone) in which we could see prototypical and handsome young men in the flesh of filthycanines.

bugand bloodthirsty, this movie is fun to see so close and vague characters tuckedah���roes

in half-haired. The gui���n is a great comedy that exploits to the maximum the topics of the zombies; that yes, it takes them

to its most sarcastic end without losing respect for the genre it deals with. In fact there is some othermoment

dramatic(too much dramatic but insurmountable) that makes the rhythm fall a lot. But this day of the apocalypse

ends the viewing with a smile and a final sketch that leaves you with the idea that some parodies can

become good comedies.

" 1

" Invisibles, a documentary of truth, portrays, with the support of five magnificent directors and a producer

list���simo, the current injustice with a realism rarely seen and without any spectacular scene.

Neither stories of love and corruption, nor Hollywood productions with a touch of denunciation, nor

international films that border on injustice in some countries. Invisibles, a documentary of truth,

portrays, with the support of five magnificent directors and a producer list���simo, the current injustice with a

realism rarely seen and without any spectacular scene or anything like that. It's not that he's criticizing

the other films, on the contrary, I think they're all very good, but seeing this documentary makes you

want to compare them. In short, that both Isabel Coixet, Wim Wenders, Fernando Le���n de Aranoa, Mariano

Barroso and Javier Corcuera explain, in one way or another, the injustice that is being committed around the world with

poor people. All of them, produced exceptionally by my admired Javier Bardem, tell in a

crude, realistic and respectful way several of the lives that are in our world and that for some reasons

we ignore them. To these people, the documentary calls it "invisible", and from there its very apt title. This is a

clear tribute to all of them, a film shot with intelligence and well informed, and above all, very well

made. I could not keep one of the shorts, because they all have their special things. Coixetus

showsa reality that exists in Barcelona and many other cities and also the health problems that

exist in other countries; Wenders manages to catch the viewer with his interviews so incredibly hard; Aranoa takes

us into the world of children in Uganda in an exceptional way; Barroso leans towards the subject of the

pharmaceutical companies (in a way not similar to the Meirelles film) and makes us aware in

an intelligent way; and finally, Corcuera makes the longest short film, perhaps, analyzing deeply the

problems that exist in Colombia about the displaced because of guerrillas that happen there. Fiveshorts

great, not unbalanced, despite being longer than others, and above all, made with conscience, something

that today is difficult to find. Although it may be a bit weak in the most global sense, since they

are all so different, it may seem like an excessively risky or personal result. In short

, we would have a solid documentary, well narrated and above all, varied.

" 1

" Movie action totally drowned out by stereotypes, a flat guide like a folio, lacking in

inspiration when solving situations or proposing something that equals or exceed what was seen in its

precedents.

Initially, the approach of this third adventure pointed wisely towards the development of the themes that

best define the idiosyncrasy of this rebellious warrior, always directed towards the defense of the values ​​that

humanize us beyond the force gross. Rambo seems to have found his place in the spirituality of the

East, earns his living by taking advantage of his physical qualities in the fight to the body and silences the restlessness of his

mind with the landscape and the spiritual symbolism of Thailand. Up there travels Colonel Truman (Richard

Crenna), who finds a Rambo who definitely denies his warrior past. Truman is amotive

two-edged: the element that still links Rambo to the past and the only friend to cling to.

Precisely, the hero returns to his old ways without any other reason than friendship. Rambo III, however,

is a slight variation when placing the character in the battle between rival sides, since here -

unlike his two precedents, which predominates the loneliness of h� Contraroe against the world - fraternize with

one of them. But, attending to that archetype of the savage hostile to civilization, it ends up being logical that

Rambo sympathizes with the Afghan tribes, since they correspond perfectly with that archetype on whichis

Rambo's profilebuilt, and also here the mujahideen play the role of the oppressed who must be saved

from the Russian demon, as it could not be otherwise. (And because of all this, how bad this film has aged,

and the hilarity that all this produces in a post 11-S.je world). For the rest, Action map totally

drowned by stereotypes, a flat guide like a folio, lacking in inspiration when solving

situations or proposing something that equals or surpasses what has been seen in its precedents. It contains some moment of

effusiveness of the hero less dignified, and some sections filmed with success, like the assault on thefortress

Afghan. He forgets his attractive approach and ends in a joke of loose pieces, like a crude

imitation of the great moments of the trilogy.

" 0

" Lynch builds his dream universe in a non-capricious way, but he's very playful, maybe too much, and

often gives the impression of being an impulse improvised creation intuitive, which will not always be right to

give a coherent meaning to the viewer.

In order to tackle the value of the cinema in its multiple manifestations, we must bear in mind that it offers

very different types and styles, degrees, spheres, for trying to define it with precision, in which the type or level

of demands present a huge variety. This pedantic way of starting the commentary is an attempt to

be as fair as possible when it comes to rating a film as "" Mulholland drive "", because, in one direction,

another, it is very easy to fall into the simplism and the precipitate conclusion. There are, then, different spheres: there is a

cinema made to entertain, a cinema to narrate in the conventional way, a symbolic cinema. lico, metaphorical cinemacinema

, social criticismor exhibition of theses and / or ideas of anthropological content, etc, etc, etc, etc.A David

Lynch likes it Do a little of everything, mix and stir in such a way that it is not digestible for all

stomachs. But in this notebook, tastes and aesthetics are not valued or judged, but raw art,

to understand each other, although to our regret the same art is subject to industry rules. First of all,

"" Mulholland drive "" is intuitive cinema, which refers to and affects the intuitive capacity of the viewer. It is a type of

cinema in which the one who looks at the screen has an active role in the construction of the meaning, causes and

effects of the narrated story, thanks to the fact that its creator leaves a margin of indefinici���ny Ambiguity for the

viewer to imagine the rest. This is achieved through the use of deliberate loose ends and with asense

narrativebased on the symbolic, and the symbol is always a representation of something other than the same

symbol. All this implies that, in many cases, the viewer is required more than what can be covered, because

not everyone has the same intuitive sensibility or the same cultural formation. But, I insist,criticism

filmdoes not consist in judging tastes and sensibilities, but in analyzing and testing Lynch's ability

to construct a symbolic framework vertebrate in a specific narrative, with the consequent artistic value.

And very parrot must be before filmmakers like Lynch, who love to go smart. The critic, here,

must be devilishly astute. First of all, we discard the topics and the errors. There isbelief

a widespreadthat says Lynch is an "incomprehensible", "" complex "", "" hermetic "",

"" unclassifiable "" filmmaker, adding to the repertoire expressions of the type of "" or he himself knows what his films are "",

"" does not pretend to tell a story, but improvises without rhyme or reason "" and things for the style. But all this is a

mistake and, with regard to the film that concerns us, when one says that it is complicated or complex or that not

even its creator understands it, the only thing that is demonstrating is that he has not understood it and, above all,

he has not been able to enter the ambiguous game in which there is only one weapon with which to be able to succeed:

creative intuition, in parallel with the creative process of his Author. In an attempt to synthesize the idea, I will say

that Lynch is very simple and concrete in the story he tells us, but very twisted in the way of

approaching it, extending it, extending it beyond what it is. righ now. Substitute "" twisted "" for creative,

intuitive, poetic, symbolic, psychoanalytic or artistic. Lynch tells us a very concrete and simple story

in its most evident and visible aspects, but he flees from the conventional narrative structure to give free

rein to his creativity and ability to suggest things without saying them explicitly. And in art it is not

essential that the poet understand each of his poems. Therefore, to say that the film is not good because

its author does not understand this or that aspect demonstrates the narrowness of the mind and the flat encephalogram that some

have hung on the brain. Both "" Mulholland drive "" and "" Blue velvet "" tell a very simple andstory

simple. It is the way of narrating -through the use of symbols and a staging that refers to the on mundorico world-

which gives them a strange singularity that breaks the schemes of many spectators. Let's see. The story:

"" Mulholland drive "" tells the story of a young aspiring actress who is involved in a dark plot

about a girl from the dark past and a gang of gangsters involved in the industry of the cinema. From

a fairly simple premise, Lynch composes a story that encompasses a history of léssic love, an ugly andlook

sarcastictowards the top executives and promoters of the Hollywood industry and a hidden subplot that it is

held in the presence of esoteric elements: a mysterious blue key that opens a blue box, abeing

scary-lookinghidden in a filthy corner, an elderly couple and the enigmatic one " "cowboy"". At amoment

certain- after the visit to the theater where we contemplated the performance of "" la llorona "" - the "" cowboy "" (

symbolic character that, apparently, knows and supports all the enigmas of the plot) enters the room

where Diana's body is and tells her that "it's time to wake up". Awakening of the dream. Diane is the

counterpart of Betty and Betty is the dream that compensates for the frustration of a bitter reality that will lead

Diane to suicide. It is necessary to pay attention to that the roles and the dramatic place of the personages suffer antranslation

inversefrom the moment in which Diane is awakened by the cowboy. I will not extendbecause it is noteither

myselfnecessary(and the attentive spectator will be able to verify it with ease) but as an example see as the director

of cinema that in Betty's world was a victim of disloyalty and humiliation, in the world of Diane (I repeat,

Betty's counterpart) - that same person is the one who is Swiping the girlfriend to her. Camila captures all the

attention, success and fame while in Betty's world (under the name of Rita) this was abeing and a

disorientedvictim of a conspiracy. Enn in favor of another Camila. That is, there is a central character, which is

Betty / Diane (Naomi Watts), on which two universes of opposite facts and meanings are built, buteach

complementother, since the universe that happens before Diane's awakening is, dig Let's face it, a

"" revenge "" to everything that is shown to us from that point in the footage onwards. As we see, what Lynch does

is narrate with an inverse structure, making the easy difficult. If the film started with the death of Diane

after hiring the services of a mat paran to take revenge on her beloved Camila, it would be much easier to intuit than what is

narrated below. It is a reflection of frustrated dreams and hopes. But if Diane dies at the end, who really

dreams? And that's the key, and it's also a constant of David Lynch's cinema. Everything we see in

the film is part of a dream with two different levels. A circular dream that extends according to the information

provided in the visual representation, plus the intuition of the spectator who enters a labyrinthine game , either

to get lost in the enigma or to try to give a more logical form to those apparentlyaspects

unrelated. Where does the movie really start and end? Is Betty a dream of Diane or is Diane anightmare

Betty? The blue key and box symbolize the door between the two levels or worlds. Thelooking being

frightening-seems to hold the magic that makes translating possible. The cowboy is the cold and distant gaze of the little

god he directs and is aware of everything that is happening. As in the dream world, "" Mulholland drive ""

is an intentional chaos that does not need a logic to justify itself as a physical creation. Therefore

, it is not worth saying that it is a failed film because it has too many loose ends andaspects.Recapitulating

unexplained: history of léssic love, plot of suspense with mafiosi and people of cinema as an excuse

to develop a an ���cid view of Hollywood high society and elements of a symbolic nature that

structure the whole towards an on tratamientorico treatment, in such a way that everything is subjected to that fascination Porn by the

disturbing and "vaporous" character of dreams. Now, that mixture, ���is packing ?. Is it easy to mix

real facts and subjected to the logic of the waking state with on elementosric elements in the way that it does?

For example, the death of Diane (one of the last and most disturbing sequences of the film): the

"real" fact "is suicide with a firearm, which appears together to a symbolic-symbolic element; thecouple

elderlyIf we pay attention to the laws implicit in the very nature of the film, it is limited because in the

first scenes that same couple of elders already played a symbolic role, although in a reverse direction.

There is a coherent continuum, in which each piece plays its role. With these examples, I note how Lynch

constructs his dream universe in a non-capricious way, but he is very playful, maybe too much and often It gives the

impression of being an improvised creation with intuitive impulses, which will not always be able to give a

coherent meaning to the spectator. But it is the same spectator who must do the rest of the work, it is

what the film demands, which elevates it to the category of work of art if we consider its exclusive nature

arising from a singular mind. creativity. His character as a work of art lies, in short, in the infinity

of its meaning, since it extends to the infinite intuition of the spectator. The complicated of

"" Mulholland drive "" is not the story that counts, but the structure and the elements used to tell it,

which leads to an explosive mixture, although not as excessive as it seems (without ceasing to be so), and from that prism

more industrial than merely artistic (that is, the prism subject to rules and conventions according to a

commercial and also aesthetic model), "" Mulholland drive "" presents some problems that prevent it from being a

perfect movie. Some of its problems have their origin in the original conception of the product, thought

to be a television series and spread over many chapters, which explains why there are things

that do not fit or part of the footage on which it would have been better to put scissors. As for the characters, as

we have said, a good part of them have a symbolic function (the two elders, the man hidden in the

rinc���n, the cowboy) and all the remaining weight falls on the two female profiles, both managed quite

fluently and sometimes star in scenes loaded with a penetrating sensuality. In the formal, and ending,

the film it triumphs to an exalted degree. From the use of color, the luxurious interiors in contrast to the

roughness of an old motel room, the interior of a theater, the light that accompaniesexciting world as

Betty'sopposed to the darker tones of Diane's world, everything is calculated to

produce the optimal visual representation in each one of the states or oneroic levels. In other passages,is

an air atmosphereachieved by small circular oscillations in the travellings and sequence planes

that indicate a face, a street or the interiors of a room. ,N, creating that dream sensation that encompasses

all the content and style of this unique masterpiece that may not appeal to everyone, but what

is out of the question. n is its originality and the fact of being the expression of a unique filmmaker.

" 1

" To touch the Sky is a film that will enchant the melodrama lovers, but that the rest of the public will

provoke a rise of glucose due to the indigesto cake that they must digest .

The Argentine cinema has lived a few golden years of great splendor, but little by little it has been entering decline,

and for that reason the immense majority of titles that arrive in our country. s are already co-productions with Spain. In some,

the contribution of Spanish producers is minimal, but more and more productions are mostly

Spanish. A clear example of this is Touch the Sky , the new film by Marcos Carnevale after the great

success that he seduced with Elsa and Fred. The film narrates in a dramatic comedy tone the relationships between a group of

friends living in Madrid and Buenos Aires who share a common tradition, launching December 31 at the

same time wishes for the new year tied to a balloon. The term comedy drama is quite

disconcerting, and the truth is that it serves to cover a small void arisen from a new type of

movie. Queculas that move between horse comedy and drama. The truth is that Touching the Sky is seen with a

half smile from start to finish, and on numerous occasions the film will achieve the moving viewer. But it

is also true that the film has plenty of sweetening and sugar that make it an authenticcake

sentimentalnot suitable for diabetics. Some of the stories in the script are unbelievable, and sometimes it

seems as if Marcos Carnevale was more concerned with psychoanalyzing the characters than with their own

plot development. The flimsy gui���ns���lo remains standing thanks to the excellent interpretive work,

highlighting Facundo Arana and Montse Germ���n, and an incommensurable Chete Lera, claiming once more as one

of the great actors of this country. Touching the Sky is a film that will delight melodrama lovers,

but that will provoke the rest of the audience. a rise in glucose due to the indigestible cake they must digest.

The sacrifice is worth it to see the work of Chete Lera.

" 0

" Any of us could be the protagonist of this story. Or is there someone who does not "" cover ""

nothing?

Prawns with garlic, croquettes, anchovies in vinegar, squid, calamari a la romana, tortilla de patatas,

spicy banderillas. There are tapas of all types: more acidic, more salty, sweeter. The

Tapas movie menu contains all the ingredients and flavors to achieve the category of five forks. After winning

at the Mal���ga Spanish Film Festival, where she won the Best Film, the Audience Award and

the Best Actress Award, The success of this tragicomedy seems assured. On the other side of the stove, the chefs Jos���

Corbacho and Juan Cruz have prepared their first prime on a slow fire, since they have taken more than four years in

shaping his master dish. A bittersweet ration in which the stories of ordinary people who

live in a neighborhood of the city and who lets glimpse their fears, their hopes and their disappointments are mixed. The directors and

screenwriters Corbacho and Juan Cruz take the tapas viewer through a neighborhood in the city of Hospitalet, taking a

walk through the lives of five everyday characters that are familiar to us. They are very different characters

but with something in common: everyone has a secret to hide, something to cover. All cover their miseries under

a false appearance of honesty. Hence the double meaning of the title of the film. On the one hand, the film

talks about the daily tapas of eating with which everyone has grown, while on the other hand it highlights the

secrets or insecurities that people cover daily. The character to whom Mar���a Galiana gives life ("" Solas "") is one

of the most surprising in terms of unspeakable secrets, especially due to the bonus he gets

by dealing with the j��� venes to those who sell drugs without anyone suspecting it. In a society like ours

where the most important thing is not to be but to look, hypocrisy and lying is the order of the day. There is

nothing more than a walk around any bar and take a few caps to check that the insubstantialcontact

socialis nourished by gossip about neighbors or superficial comments about the future of the country.

Conversations in which this kind of banal communication serves, perhaps in addition, to cover up or mask the

existence of oneself. For the movie, characters that we could find in any neighborhood of

any city. Surely, we all know the typical owner of the bar on the corner of the neighborhood as Lolo (���ngel

of Andr���s), whose wife leaves him because he puts his business before his relationship. And that, at first, he is not capable

of swallowing his pride and going to look for it. Around the story of Lolo and Mao, his new kitchen assistant recently

arrived from China, he turns some of the funniest and most satirical scenes of the movie. �cula. Perhaps we will alsopaths

have crossedwith a couple of unconscious teenagers who only live to get involved and take shelter in

drugs to escape from their daily lives. Raquel, on the other hand, is a womanwho takes

in her mid-fortiesrefuge in the solitude of cyberspace with no hope of finding a real lover until one day a young manher

givesback the life she thought was lost. A brilliant Elvira M���nguez who does not need words to express

the bitterness and disenchantment that transpires his character. The unbounded love story of the old woman who only

lives to satisfy her sick husband gives the film a touch of tenderness. And it is that although the

film acquires the tone of a light comedy, in the cracks of the narrative,slips

an air of sadnessimperceptibly, freezing the smile to turn it into a painful grimace. And is that

life, as the movie poster says, is like the peppers of the padr? N, sometimes itches. and sometimes not. In the style

of other Spanish directors such as Fernando Le���n de Aranoa (Neighborhood, Mondays in the sun) or Ic���ar Bolla���n (Flowers from

another world, I give you my eyes), but with a dose of humor, Corbacho and Cruz portray the reality of Spanish society

in a fairly faithful and without stridency. In times special effects andblockbusters it

Hollywoodis difficult for a film of realistic dyes to survive on the billboards. Nonetheless, the

film gathers the precise ingredients so that the public stays hooked to the seat during the 93 minutes

that the tape lasts. Perhaps its short duration prevents the viewer dig a little deeper into the stories,

that tastes better a dish that can leave you hungry for more. And is that when the lights of the room are lit,

the viewer continues to digest the story, in which anyone can see reflected his own life, his

illusions and disappointments. Because in the film appear universal themes such as loneliness, death, love,

sex, friendship or hope. Cotidianidades with which the characters of this film coexist and with

which we face every day. Because any of us could be the protagonist of this story. Or

is there someone who does not "" cover "" nothing?

" 1

" A varied film made with taste and sensitivity (or bad taste, in the case of the genius, in everything

else, except here, Christopher Doyle) and with superb interpretations.

Beautiful, charming, sad, moving? And what can you expect from all these directors? Well a

varied film made with taste and sensitivity (or bad taste, in the case of the great, in everything else,

except here, Christopher Doyle) and with some superb interpretations. Highlight names, both directors and

actors, as Coen, Binnoche, Coixet, Payne, Portman, Nolte, Rowlands, Suwa, Gazzara, Coixet, Salles, Tykwer,

Schmitz (maybe his short is the best along with Depardieau and Payne's), Castellito, Chomet (mputos mimos!),

Sandino Moreno, etc. Although their respective shorts have fascinated me, there are others that have disappointed me a, such

bitas those of Alfonso Cuar���n, who, despite being a simple short, has his grace, does not just take the trick, and

Olivier Assayas, who could have explained much more with the story of Maggie Gylenhaal. These two that I have

named are not that they are bad, but that they simply have not called me specially. But there is, in

"" Paris, je t? Aime "", the worst short film I've seen in my life: Christopher Doyle, with anBarbet Schroeder

incredibly patheticand a sorry story . For the rest, there are stories that do not say neither fu nor fa, but

that do not bother (on the contrary, enrich the film in an intelligent way), such as those of LaGravanese (with Fanny

Ardant and Bob Hoskins), Gus Van Sant (to me, personally, it seemed to me, his short, quite heavy, although

many people in the cinema loved it), Wes Creaven (another politician, but without a doubt, with someinterpretations

formidable, both of Mortimer , Sewell and Paye (Alexander) - like Oscar Wilde! -), Bruno Podalyd���s (the first and

kind short film), Vicenzo Natali (original, yes, but lacks solidity, lacks spark Coen) and Gurinder Chadha

(yes, it's nice, but a pel���nt���pico). In conjunct, the film presents a formidable montage (without the names

of the directors before each short begins!) and a structure ordered by neighborhoods of the most original. The

music is beautiful (���attentive to the song of the end!). Well, as you will see, to criticize this film it is

necessary to appoint interpreters and directors, because otherwise, we will be left with little. I recommend it to all

those who want to see something new, original, intelligent, varied, irregular (although very little), beautiful and

sad. The small masterpieces are those of Joel and Ethan Coen, Tom Twyker, Alexander Payne, Gerard D���pardieau

and Oliver Schmitz. The good and more than kind shorts belong to Isabel Coixet, Walter Salles and Daniela

Thomas, Sylvain Chomet and Nobuhiro Suwa. The shorts that complement the film are Gurinder Chadha, Wes

Craven, Alfonso Cuar���n, Gus Van Sant, Richard LaGravense, Bruno Podalyd���s and Vincenzo Natali. The short films that

definitely remain: Porte de Choisy (by the unforgivable Christopher Doyle) and Quartier des enfants rouges (by

Olivier Assayas). By the way, do not miss the ending where several of the shorts intersect and with the song

The m hisme histoire in the background. What great you all are!

" 1

" One of the best anti-political films from The M chaquetatalica JacketThe latest film by Sam Mendes (winner of the Oscar for Best Director by American Beauty) Do not disappoint,

Jarhead is at the same level as his previous jobs. In this, his new work, stands out above all in the way

of telling it, is completely away from all the previous we have seen in some movie blic. Mendes returns

to show the more human side of the characters as he did in "" Road to perdition "" and makes itdone

masterfullyin "" Jarhead "", which is not a movie. The Bible itself, at least not the concept that I have of

film, is a drama about a naive soldier who innocently enters the army and who Every day that

passes, he regrets having done it. Leave behind your whole life, family, friends, girlfriend, work? something that due to

his experience in the war will cost him to recover. It is inevitable to think of "" The Metallic Jacket "" by Stanley

Kubrick when one sees the beginning of the film. The style of the film is very reminiscent of thefilm genres

European(see Stalingrad, Enemy at the Gates?) Where the importance of the relations between the

soldiers that to the own blic conflict. Highlighting, once again in a Mendes film, the impeccableaspect

technical, the picture is again great, with those perfect images of the desert. The direction of Mendes

is perfect again, the camera is where it should be, it is not gimmicky nor is it looking for shocking scenes like

Saving Private Ryan, maybe even the story told by Mendes, about the soldiers and the war is more

shocking than any scene of Saving Private Ryan. The BSO again magnifies, perfectly accompanies

the film, at first when I heard some songs before watching the film, I did not identify it with a

film b ���lica, but then in the film they fit perfectly and make Jarhead a round film. The

performances, all the casting is phenomenal but I have to highlight the main one, Jake Gyllenhaal (Donnie Darko),

who performs a deep and complex, almost perfect performance that perfectly reflects hisat all times

feelings. Jamie Foxx plays Sergeant Major Sikes, a noncommissioned officer who feels comfortable being what he is,

a professional soldier. And also a great convincing performance like that of Peter Sarsgaard. Undoubtedly,

Jarhead is one of the best anti-war films that have been filmed since "" The M���talica jacket "" and that

we can identify his anti-war message with works of the caliber of "" No news on the front "" or "" Paths of

glory "". A film that demonstrates the stupidity of war, how wars have evolved, where we now

fight "" at a distance "" where you do not see the enemy's face and where soldiers are trained as killing machines

and in the end his only shots are to the air fruit of his frustration. Soldiers who liveexperiences

unforgettable, leave behind their whole lives and then there is no possible return, they will always continue to be a head of cattle

whatever they do. This is seen especially in one of the final scenes when a Vietnam veteran

gets on the bus when they get home, receiving them as they did not receive him and how they see what they are going

to become. with the passage of years. Your life will always be linked to those moments lived with your companions

in the trenches with some companions who become brothers, "" blood brothers "". ���Welcome to the suck!

" 1

" Apparently the Pang brothers have decided to go the easy way and emulate each and every one of the old

tricks of Asian terror in the hope of taking a scare easy to the viewer Western

Earlier this year The Messengers (2007) caught some attention when it came to the entry into the West of

Danny and Oxide Pang, the Hong Kong twins who have climbed the fashion wagon of the Asian horror with

films like the (for me) nefasta The Eye (2002) or the (again, for me) much more interesting Anomal�� �a

(2003). His arrival in Hollywood was marked by a certain hype as he wondered several things they could do with such

cinematographic machinery at their disposal. The result, however, is not the most desired; Although the

film does not become so disastrous as to make its viewing a torture, it is probably the greatest

number of commonplaces of Eastern terror never brought to the screen. Made almost as if awere followed

formulato the letter, the English language and the American rural setting is the only thing that the direction of

their homologous come of the Far East. Part of the error was coming from far back. In a very shabby publicity campaign

, the supposed thematic center of The Messengers was highlighted, according to which the children have

the ability to contact much more. Easy to the spirits that roam the world of the living. This

phenomenon is not at all the center of the film, which focuses more on the experiences of a teenager

who, after moving with her parents to a sunflower farm in the middle from North Dakota in search of a new

life, begins to perceive the presence of some ghosts in his new home that, apart from making life

impossible, seem to take it little by little to the resolution of a secret that comes from the past . If it sounds familiar it is

because this same plot has been reproduced to the satiety practically without any change. In the forms

should be the new thing, but apparently the Pang brothers have decided to go for the easy way and emulateand

eachevery one of the old tricks of the Asian terror in the hope of starting a scare easy to thespectator

western, mainly in what refers to the skin ghosts white that move in staccato. The

twins have even resorted to self-citation to include, at a certain moment in the footage, a scene

exactly like that which gave more fear in The Eye, without any change, and that would have worked if itnot

hadbeen used five years before. The cheap scares do not help much, to tell the truth, and theturn

finalthat takes the plot is seen to come to leagues.It is a pity that the start in Hollywood of these directors has

resulted in a film so empty and as expendable as this. Its null originality and the reluctance of its

plot betray it as little more than the showcase vehicle for adolescent actors, in this case Kristen

Stewart, whom I always remember as the daughter andr���gina of Jodie Foster in La habitaci���n del p���nico (2002).

Any other consideration becomes incomprehensible. The Messengers is not a remake of any oriental tape,

but it could very well be.

" 0

" Film film kinki about a band of women in the 80s in Spain. Infinitely worse to his

male version, it is seen, if only to be able to boast of having seen such a tape.

The cinema of the decade of the 80s in Spain was a real melting pot of styles and themes. From the films

of social denunciation, like "" The crime of Cuenca "" of the ill-fated Pilar Mir��� (by the way, that pathetic I am

his son), to the ones of the despelote that already you all know Making a gap between them, emerged what

we could define as cinema kinki, which are stories of the suburbs of the great Spanish cities.

Counting as the maximum exponent the "" Stray dogs "", this director wanted to make a tribute (called

arrimo my sardine to the ember of others) and removed this "" street dogs "" that has cost me a horror to find the

poster given that it has the name of a porn movie (maybe I should see one of these). The film deals with three

girls (they seem older than role they play) that come together to form a street gang and so flee

the street, with their drugs, beatings and prostitution. Things are going pretty well, until they start

thinking about higher levels, which does not cause them if not serious problems. Go ahead that it is worth watching the

film to see the sample of young breasts that come out, which are from when the silicone was put on the joints

of the windows. What a level breast, my mother. The argument is not that it is wonderful, but it is not all

bad. The actors are a bit lazy, with some corrupt policemen who laugh t��� de Torrente, although we have some

very good actor in small roles. The dialogues are great, very outdated, but great. Of those who

want to go through hard and in reality are pure poetry. My half-hearted clown was listening to the movie and from time

to time he would see me ask "" Did he say ...? " Buen���simos.Resumiendo, film film kinki about a band

of women in the 80s in Spain. Infinitely worse to his male version, is allowed to see, if only to

be able to boast of having seen such a tape. A classic video club of the late

80's. Besitos.PD: "" There are people who do things with their heads. Other than with the heart. I do not do anything about it, I

do it because my brother asks for it. Yes, yes, the co ,o, what happens? "" PD2: By the way, they perform the sexual act with

underwear, what things.

" 0

" One more among many romantic comedies that repeat again and again sentimental arguments. I have never been excessively devoted to those American romantic comedies in which they are dedicated to trying to

reconcile the ���grima with laughter and feeling, but since they all start they know that in the end,

after an endless number of vicissitudes, you tell them right, the protagonists will end up together, with few

exceptions .Although I must admit that I have always found it curious that many of the great

successes of contemporary cinema come from this repetitive genre, extremely simple and somewhat (or a lot)

cloying .Among Women it can not fit exactly in it, since it is one of those films in which the

story as a whole has little importance and the weight of the script falls on the particularities and interactions

between the different characters. Something similar to the style of Woody Allen, but saving the distances between ���ly and

Jon Kasdan (scriptwriter and director), that even being a more than acceptable and contrasted author, does not reach the

levels of brilliance and dynamism in the Dialogues exhibited by the New Yorker. The film narrates the adventures of a

young man who pretends to be a writer and who, after a traumatic break with his girlfriend, moves to live at hishouse

grandmother's, where the relationship with the neighbor family soon causes a great impact on the life of the protagonist. The

truth is that the film is not a big deal, it does not stand out at all, since the interpretations are rather vulgar

, and they show a Meg Ryan overcome by the role and an Adam Brody excessively lame ��geno;

Disappointing, by R���cana and short, the appearance of Elena Anaya. The soundtrack, which saves many productions

of this type, does not measure up either. In general, and except for small flashes, mediocrity is thenote

prevailing.

" 0

" Apocalypto is the magnificent and deranged proof that Mel Gibson is about to become a

character that likes Werner Herzog.

If I were the woman or one of Mel Gibson's children, I would not sleep at night at all. This guy

has for some time crossed an internal line that probably will not be appreciated in the day as well as

in the movies he directs. Because if the cinema is the psychological mirror of a director, 'The Passion of Christ'

hints at the fundamentalism of a fanatic, and 'Apocalypto' gives us back the image of a wild hallucinated

dominated by his primary instincts. And they are still asking him to be politically correct. "Apocalypto" narrates the

initiatory journey of Claw of Jaguar, a young hunter who lives in a small village at an indeterminate time

of the pre-Columbian period. The mighty Mayan warriors burst into his life, destroying everything in his path and

capturing him as a slave. Claw Jaguar must face a thousand dangers and his own fear to earn the

right to return to his forest. And with a premise in principle so flimsy and so frazzled, what Mel Gibson achievesourselves

is immersefully, as seldom It has been done before, in a frenzied struggle for survival. The

word that best defines the spirit of the film is furious, and does not disguise it, on the contrary. The alibi of the

primitivism of the time allows Gibson to bring out the worst of himself as a person, probably, but far

beyond that, the best of himself as a filmmaker: Gibson turns what he could It would have been another 'TheJungle

Emerald' or 'In Search of Fire' (estimable but too well intentioned) in a violent story that

seems told by a cham���na the light of fire in a cave In addition, the narrative virtues are

multiplied by the nervous digital photography of Dean Semler (not coincidentally responsible for 'Mad

Max 2' and 'Mad Max 3') and the the overwhelming montage of Kevin Stitt and John Wright, while the much criticized

anachronisms are minimized by Tom Sanders' incredible production design. All theaspects

technicalborder on a very high level, more taking into account that 'Apocalypto' was shot in natural settings

in Mexico, with the difficulties that entails. The big doubt I had about the film was the

interpretations. Gibson decided at the end by amateur actors who responded to the type that eachneeded

one, and we have to congratulate him for it. It is perfectly defined by Max Renn in his successful analysis in Videodrome,

"" [.] Actors so real that they seem to be fused in their characters [.] ". To make matters worse, is not limited to

outlining a confrontation "" good vs. wild " bad savages "", but you can even find nuances on

both sides, always within the limits of what is, a film of action.failures

possible, the historical inaccuracy, which may be offensive to the defenders of the most stale academicism, and

the simplicity of the plot, which is in turn one of its great strengths: when a jaguar and a Dozen

headhunters chase you through the jungle, there is little room for philosophical delicacies. Beyond the

interpretations that may be (and those that always invent), ' Apocalypto 'is the magnificent and

deranged proof that Mel Gibson is about to become a character that likes Werner

Herzog. A 9.

" 1

" I liked (and entertained) enough, but with certain reluctance that in the USA should begin to accept

to exorcise their ghosts ...

For some time, whenever I have seen the poster, or the trailers of the tape, thanks to my other page

("" Cin���filo's Orifice "") I have been interested, and at the same time intrigued about this film, which, unlike

"" Lions for Lambs "" I do not get excited, this one, I liked it a lot, saving, what I already said at the

time, that in the USA they are not able to accept that Iraq it is becoming for them in the 2nd Vietnam, and that,

unfortunately and however much they love it, they can not go through the world of "saviors for freedom" "(and maxime

less when this is done at a stroke of shot). Having said that, I admit that not only the tape I liked, but

also the 110 min. It lasts approx. I have been flying, both for the gui���n, well built and quite

immersive, as well as the performances of Jamie Foxx, Chris Cooper, Jennifer Garner, Jason Bateman and Jeremy

Piven, by the way, to the �ora Garner (or Mrs. Affleck) has a funny moment in the film,

where she can not avoid the "" dread "" she feels when listening to a nearby explosion (very successful not to double his

scream.), priceless that moment. The hand of Michael Mann, it is quite noticeable, since in some moments the

film seems to be indebted to the cinema of this, besides Peter Berg is seen an excellent good to do on screen, and makes

every moment, removing what I have said and some point excessively "" lagrimgenous "", so in his facet

as director, we face a future great director of g ���nero (we'll see how he does it in his next

films), adding to Danny Elf's excellent score man (How could it be otherwise), taking advantage of

those Arabic touches, gives the packaging to the film necessary for it to be completely digested by the

viewer. In short, and I saved the distances; I liked (and entertained) enough, but with

certain reluctance that in the USA should begin to accept to exorcise their ghosts.

" 1

" Dur���sima film essential to see if you want to know pieces of the contemporary history of Spain.

I notice that there are scenes of people injecting themselves into the vein that can be violent from the raw and

natural that they seem.

What poster is more expressive, at the same time sinister. The film deals with the life of two kids in the vicinity

of the majority of age in Bilbao. These, one son of a civil guard and the other of an abertxale deputy,

get into the heroin a bad day, and they need to steal and traffic to continue with their addiction. harder,

mother. From my point of view, what stands out in the whole film is the raw way of dealing with two very

topical issues in the early 80's in Spain. On the one hand, the heroine that asol��� to that generation, making

disappear entire gangs of friends. On the other hand, the problem of the independence of the Basque Country, whichthat time

atreached its highest level of violence. The development can be a bit heavy, especially

because the younger actors are not too good (I was surprised by how bad theacted

youngster Enrique San Francisco). But the global vision of the film, seen more as a documentary than as a

film in itself, more than compensates for this problem. Resumiendo, durantima film essential to see if you

want to know pieces of the contemporary history of Spain. I warn that there are scenes of people injecting themselves

into the vein that can be violent from the raw and natural that they seem.InspectableBesitos.PD: The

scene of the baby's pacifier puts the hairs as escarpias.PD2: The end I gust��� a lot, pastellos, but

what I did, it's not going to be all pain and suffering, a little bit of compassion with the spectator.: From the

PS3movie The Lord of the Rings supposes that Urko's name will have fallen into oblivion, will not it? I had to make

a joke, that this has been sadder than the day that Chanquete died.

" 1

" Not only the technical level is exemplary, at the level of gui���n the film works, you care about its characters,

its feelings, in addition the director knows how to give rhythm to the action, even, get some other

startle in the seat.

Monster House is a return, rather, a regression in childhood, in those eighties that for many

mean our innocence. At that time the cinema premiered products aimed at children, but that

could be seen and enjoyed by adults. Among all the producers that arose at that time

was Amblin, sponsored by Steven Spielberg. From her came the children's cinema classics like Los

Goonies, ET, El Secreto de la Pir���mide, the trilogy of Regreso al Futuro and ���Qui���n enga��� ��� Roger Rabbitt ?,

among others. I grew up with those films and I have a fond memory of all of them that, in addition, have stood the

test of time in an excellent way. That's why the premiere of Monster House is a joy, because it recovers the

spirit of that cinema. Set in the 80's (although without saying it at any time) narrates the terror thathas

a childthe house located in front of you. A house inhabited by a hateful man named Nebencracker and that

seems to have a life of its own. The film, produced by Spielberg and Zemeckis, portrays as usual in these

productions some events that take place in the suburbs of a city, a neighborhood of single-family houses

where children can campaign at ease. In addition, she introduces us to two children, who do not stand out for being the most

popular at school and with affective problems (the father refuses to say I Love Your Child, even though the

mother he asks for it insistently when they go on vacation, or parents are always absent from the other boy

nicknamed Croqueta), a common factor in Steven Spielberg's films and productions. These two children would be joined by the

know-it-all and repellent girl, who ends up being the only one who believes in her story and who also marks theawakening

sexualof the children. children, who are already close to entering puberty. We also have the child "" pasota "" with a

boyfriend "" fumeta "", who, of course, does not believe in the warnings of children about the house and a couple of

policemen who thwart the attempts of the protagonists to discover the secret of the house. And then, there's the

house. A house alive, terrifying, with clear references in Poltergeist or Night of fear. At the level of

history, of characters, the film is, as I said, nothing against the tide, returning us the

characteristics of the beloved children's cinema of the eighties. ��cula could be framed as an animation film,

although it has a radical difference with respect to Pixar or Dreamworks productions: having been made

with the technique "" Motion Capture "" . This technique allows the actors to be recorded making the movements of their

animated characters, so that the movements, corporal expressions, dialogues are directly extracted

from the work of the actors interpret the characters. This technique was used for the first time in the

film Polar Express, although fortunately it has evolved a lot since then. In this the faces of the

characters, the eyes, transmit emotions and despite their caricature design can come to seem

real beings, something that never happened with the film played by Tom Hanks. Another radical difference in this

technique is that it allows directors with little or no experience in the field of animation, to shoot a

film in this style and it shows. Digital technology makes the camera not a difficult thing to move

but simply a point of view, which can move anywhere without hindrance and in this

movie. they apply it. A camera always in motion gives personality to the film. Influenced by Spielberg

and Zemeckis clearly, the novice Gil Kenan, presents some plans in which the camera moves, rotates, has

freedom of movement around actions and characters, achieving extraordinary moments like the scene

in which the house returns to the life. In this way, he manages to get away from the traditional animation cinema that tends to

imitate the difficulty of moving a camera in a real scene, with a multitude of fixed shots or with gràa, without

taking him out advantage of being in a non-physical environment. But not only the technical level is exemplary, at the

level of gui���n the film works, you care about its characters, its feelings, in addition the director knows how to endow

from rhythm to action, even, it gets some other startle in the seat. In addition, perhaps to close the

cycle, the legend that surrounds the house ends up being very Burtonian and beautifully sad. On the musical level

the film is also very successful with a score written by Douglas Pipes, a composer for me

unknown, who performs a fun approach to music. ��sica of terror of the series B. In summary, a

highly recommended film, nothing pretentious or ambitious, far from the technical virtuosity of Cars, although, as a

whole, rather better resolved. A great surprise that is located above all the animated

films that I have seen this year and that, in addition, get eager to see the new project of

Zemeckis shot with the same system and inspired by the legend of Beowulf.

" 1

" The great achievement of? Alien? it is the superb conjunction between human characters and physical surroundings, between the

penetrating sense of horror and the unusual and the aesthetics of the graphic design. graphic

Even in the late seventies, the idea of ​​which part - this absolute masterpiece of the

science-fiction genre is very unoriginal: suspense and terror story about "" bug that pursues and eat

humans. " The novelty occurred with a new location of the monster: the spatial abyss and within the framework of thevision

futuristicof space travel. It is not enough to transport an old idea to a new space and time.is to

Thatsay, the film by Ridley Scott could be quite mediocre and, on paper, little or nothing would

show. But the great achievement of "" Alien "" is the superb combination. between human characters and physical environment,

between the penetrating sense of horror and the unusual and the aesthetics of graphic design. Conjunctions at the

service of an overwhelming story because of its sense of suspense, but also because of its metaphysical power, reaching

an overwhelming operatic texture of the claustrophobic in the abysses of outer space . In fact, the

true protagonist of the film is not the human profiles, but the physical and symbolic wrapping that

cradles them: the gigantic Nostromo ship. The design of the great commercial ship alludes to an enormous mechanical monster that

wanders in the interstellar void, or a great castle or gothic fortress that imprisons its inhabitants. The struggle

between the human and the mechanical is present in its various strata. See the beginning of the film: the dark emptiness

of the cosmos gives way to the mechanical spawn. Next, Scott's camera recreates itself in the visualization

- through slow and contemplative travellings - of the passages, cables, gossip, depths and computer artifacts

that signify the robotic soul. ship's policy. In this way, the environment is configured as the authentic

protagonist of the visual representation. Then a door opens and we are led to the room in which the

human inhabitants are about to end their hibernation in the heart of the fortress: it is not by chance that the

brain informs that governs the ship and directs the human entourage carries the name of "" Mother "". From that

point, we get to know the human life inside the ship with a simple andcharacter drawing

effectiveand, above all, diverse and rich in perspectives: from the cold introversi�� �n de Kane, the sarcasm and the irony

of Bred and his pupil, the extreme and Machiavellian scientism of Ash, the anguish of Lange or the honestauthority

but doubtfulof Dallas, all that human group contributes an excellent chemistry of decisions and ways to

face the danger. In other words, a great human content is added to the physical package, attending to the

needs of an argument that does not require excessively complex characters, but they must be

significant in the confrontation with the situation. n and the psychological context. And it accomplishes it. Beyond the

human, the design of the alien and each of the interiors, overflowing with an aesthetic on horseback of the

g Ethical and psychodic, abrupt and ghostly, they form a dreamlike atmosphere that accentuates at all times the

sense of horror experienced by human characters. The claustrophobic emulsion caused by the suffocating

architecture of the ship and the subtle presence of the alien is reinforced in different settings in which Scott

takes great care to place the human profiles in a closed space of doors, passages, gases, sounds, and

ghostly silhouettes insinuated in each corner of the visual field (see the sequence of Dallas in the search of the

bug through the t�� Ventilation panels: a simple frame of the profile of Dallas violently trimmed and

suppressed by the closing of one of the hatches, a simple resource of great expressive force used in the

context, which reinforces the stabbing claustrophobic dimension of the story or the great success of not showing

the whole body of the Alien, accentuating its physical ambiguity on a par with its presence subtly drawn

in the reliefs of doors, walls, ceilings or walls) Very i Intelligently, the silhouette and physical texture

of the alien resembles and merges with the tubes that run through walls and passages, making theenvironment

humanform a unit with the mechanical environment of the ship and the biol Logic of the alien. It is this perfect and

stimulating conjunction of elements that gives it its great uniqueness. In the metaphysical, the physical dimension

of the ship, the computer "" Mother "" ( its "psychic" correlate "), Ash and the alien are the mechanical parts of cold attenuated

rationality that face the more accentuated humanity of Ripley and his . The story gains a deep

and profoundly dramatic background when we discover that the real characters of the collusion are not

human but machines: the death of Ash, so gesticulating , with those violently truncated cables, theblood

whitegushing out and the grotesque cybernetic noises, transmits with a great sense of light the

chilling discovery of the inhuman that was hidden under the appearance of responsible rationality. In the

words of Ash himself, the alien is the biological entity par excellence, for its destructive action without

remorse and "without moral fantasies" that could repress them. That is to say, the perfect machine that frightens and

persecutes those who are already prisoners of the ship Nostromo. Therefore, its enormous metaphorical power leads us to a

consideration as important as his excellent performance level of gui���n, structure, tonality andsense

aestheticboth in the narrative sphere and in the plastic one; "" Alien "", apart from a horror story, is also

an allegory about the dehumanization in the technological era, about the human being lost in an immensity

c The seismic findings in the form of travel and technological creations, but helpless against the machinery of

power and the unconsciousness of many. In a certain sense, the loneliness and anguish of Ripley running through the

interior of the ���as of the Nostromo ship, through the passageways saturated with technology,vapors and fumes

industrial, shrill and threatening sounds, in a ghostly environment in which you do not know the danger that

hides turning the corner in each fork, his solitude reflects the solitude of modern man, more human

than ever but increasingly imprisoned by the mechanical. And what better environment than the empty abysses of space

to situate this modern nightmare.

" 1

" Anyway, I could not forget the cameo of the great Nacho Vidal ... A simple tape that is watched and forgotten

with the same speed.

Starting the tape with some credit titles that remind slightly of "" Catch me if you can "" of Spielberg,

we find this vehicle of lucimiento (with a joke argument), to Santi Mill���n, Fernando Tejero

and Jose Luis Garcia S���nchez (to the latter I have seen him in "" Closer "" with Bel���n Rueda), a soundtrack,

plagued of Spanish music, in addition to Mastretta, with its characteristic sound. As a counterpoint, or curiosity, to

say that Fernando Tejero wore contact lenses throughout the filming opaque that prevented the vision, as well as

the character Santi Mill���n seems a mute too forced for my taste, and is that I know a couple of-

deafmute who do not mark as much as Mill� On the other hand, the character of Jose Luis Garc���a S���nchez reminds me of

my father, who wore an orthopedic leg for a good part of his life. of his life, his jokes are those that I have

heard in the film. In short, I could not forget the cameo of the great Nacho Vidal. A simple tape that is watched and

forgotten with the same speed.

" 0

" Completely overrated and the worst of Hitchcock. A story too stupid to take

seriously

Criticized by the critics, and considered one of the best films in the history of cinema, to me it seems

completely overrated and the worst of Hitchcock . A story too stupid to take seriously

and a development of characters completely sloppy, with touches of fantastic cinema stuck with shoehorn. Another

motorcycle that they try to sell us. Hitchcock seems to have trouble creating characters that the viewer

identifies with. In fact it is the common denominator of his weakest films (Topaz, Catch a Ladr���n, The Shadow

of a Doubt?). Although it also appears in some of the best ones, like for example Rebecca: They are

technically great films, with very elaborated plots, but plagued by cold and flat characters, that do not they connect

with the viewer and are not very credible. In "" V���rtigo "" "", I care very little, what happens to James

Stewart, if he is afraid of heights, or if he has fallen in love with a spirit. Is that sincerely I have not been given

information to identify with ���ly and I see him wander with a worried face throughout the film, without

the minimum inter� Pors for what happens to him and without believing his character for a moment. Another ofrecurring features

Hitchcock'sis to show two readings of his characters, making the darkest facet of his personality,

hidden for the others. The characters, many times the real engine of their actions. Sometimesare achieved

great successes, but in Vigo it is very difficult to realize the intentions of the director and the

interpretation of the strange behavior of the protagonist is absolutely taken by the hair. If you do not read

the famous book of conversations with Truffaut, surely you do not realize that what the masterreally wanted to

directordo was a study of necrophilia. Surprising, but it does not contribute anything at the time of

enjoying the film, and as in the matter of the previous paragraph; it produces only indifference. I also believe that he

says little about the quality of his work, that he is unable to clearly and understandably show his prpposes, and

expose them in a cryptic way so that only fans can decipher them.If we add, a soporifera plot,

unfit for the English teacher, which is to discover with friend James if Kim Novak is dead, crazy, or

asshole, we have a very poor. There are some special effects tricks very advanced for their

time and a pretty good soundtrack. The rest is boring and very pretentious.

" 0

" The final message of Babel, is a call to compression. The importance of paying attention to what

others have to tell us. A highly recommended film and a fantastic farewell for 2006.

Alejandro Gonz���lez I������rritu (Mexico 1963) after unquestionable successes as "" Amores Perros " "o" "21 Grams" ",us

bringsa fíbulosa and unpredictable, Babel. The name of the film is derived from the Hebrew verb bal���l, "" confuse "". And

precisely about the confusion, about the words and how important it is to listen to them, is what

this magnificent film is about. Alejandro returns to surprise us and to fall in love with his genuine personal stamp. This

man does not roll, this man makes authentic visual verse with the camera, although the result of this tape

as well as also those previously mentioned, would not have been possible without the Narrative logic of Guillermo

Arriaga (Mexico 1958) scriptwriter of the 3 titles. To have chosen Babel as a name, is a colossal success, for

those who do not know the story, La Torre de Babel prented ���a being a ziggurat type construction,

reaching heaven, is mentioned in the Bible in chapter 11 of Genesis. According to the account, the God Yahweh

descended to see the city and the tower that the men were raising and said: "Here we are all forming a

only people and all speak the same language, this being the principle of their companies. Nothing will prevent them from

carrying out everything they set out to do. Well, let's go down and there we confuse their language so that they

do not understand each other���.Something similar is what happens in this film, people withhistories

parallelthat are united in a point whose effect Butterfly influences like a domin��� in all of them.actors

Outstandingnot only in their interpretation but in their characterization, Brad Pit with those wrinkles offather or

fatiguedhusband or the aut� ��ntica Adriana Barraza (Amores Perros) as a girl. The truth is that you can not put

any but (although Gael Garc���a, is interpreted as same). I like this director, because he is faithful to the actors

who have helped him get the triumph. He lifts them up again and this time accompanied by stellar names

like Brad Pitt and Cate Blanchet (beautiful). Maybe someone will rate the film's rhythm as slow,

but it's not like that, you have to think that this story with a faster pace would be run over. As a novelty,

Alejandro discovers a new muse for Hollywood "" Rinko Kikuchi (Japan) 1981) "" which we have seen

previously in "" 69 "", the rest of his filmography is of Japanese origin, but he has enough films under his

belt and he announces that to give a lot to talk about in the Hollywood universe. For the clueless, it is the

actress who plays the Japanese deaf-mute teenager. The final message of Babel is a call to

compression. The importance of paying attention to what others have to tell us. To make a better world

thanks to words, our words and the words of others in perfect harmony. A highlyfilm

recommendableand a fantastic farewell for 2006.

" 1

" It remains in one of These exercises called "author's" "that will delight thegafapastas

unconditionaland will twist in his chair and repeatedly refugee the viewer who wants to give an

opportunity to another type of cinema.

Those of us who had the opportunity to see the film on the day of the premiere at the CGAI (La Coru���a), presented by its

director and accompanied by a "press conference" "" As a presentation of Cahiers du Cinema in Spanish, we could

see several things. Although the director says that "there are no movie critics left in the

mainstream media", I understand that I can be, here and now, one of those who may be paying attention or taking in some

regard. Iron���as aside (and in my other blog), the film is a real bore. What the director

considers "simple" is simply simple. His previous film, "" En construcción "", with an enviable

collection of nearly 700,000 euros, was a documentary that was fictionalized. This last film tries to be

upside down. However, it does not get natural. His reality is cardboard, are actors who can not interpret,

who could not or wanted to shoot naturally. The figurants that try to be a fictional city are

horribly directed, reason why the city seems rather taken by geeks and people who circulate with an

astonishing regularity and above all, disturbing. But in spite of the boredom of an hour and a half, I have to praise the

good taste of the director for having chosen an actress like Pilar. Although its presence in the "" argument "" is

totally accidental and therefore brief, it is the only one that can respond to the intention of the director so that

the viewer finds the beauty that the protagonist is supposed to be looking for However, and in favor of those postures

so "" reflective "" of which the authors of this type of films presume, the beauty of Pilar is obvious. And many

of us enjoyed it on screen. But one could say that even that whole culture ofis a contribution

idealized beauty that many criticize on posters with "" unreal women "". " It would have appreciated an effort by the

director to have achieved an anonymous actress (perhaps the waitress?), With a particular beauty and having

portrayed his attractiveness so that the protagonist (very handsome too, what a coincidence) and we, the

spectators, were surprised by reality. What happened to the time of the wonderful "" Brief

encounter "", in which we believed the relationship of the characters and were, for being banal, physically very

corrientuchos? in any case, although the joke that moves this film look like the portrait of a stalker, you

stay in one of those exercises called "" copyright "" that will make the delights of the unconditional gafapasta and

will twist in his chair and rebufar several times to the viewer who wants to give an opportunity to another type of

cinema. And not only did I twist myself, for the record. I had more people next door. I do not recommend this movie even for

those who want to see a great actress like Pilar on screen again. Wait for the dvd or some pass at theCinemas

Dor���.

" 0

" It is necessary to advocate from time to time for the cinema "" made in Spain "" and this film, without a doubt, is a very good

proposal

Some weeks ago, one of the usual columnists of the free DNA newspaper said, to see a Spanish

film movie is to laugh with our humor and enjoy our miseries, hence perhaps the last

film by David Trueba has served to feel identified with this proposal, since starting from

several points in common of a server with the story raised on the screen, one already has on the tape an

opinion quite contrary to what I could read about the same.Samuel and Eva have been together for 8 years (just likebetter

a server and theirhalf), they think of a life together (idem), and although they have not stopped being

cr�� They have to face independently the problems that until now they did not even know (idem),

she more settled, firmer, with his feet on the ground, (idem) and he was a fucking mess, a dreamer who thinks that

everything can be fixed tomorrow and that Going things from when he was more than a tender adolescent, he must

now face a destiny that is almost upon him (idem), if we are united by an authoritarian mother we would almost

have the story of my life taken to the big screen, but, you can always resort to the opinions

expressed in Filmaffinity (excellent web to which I owe an apology) and assess whether you deserve or not come to

see it. Once I have Given "" the sheet "" step to comment a bit on the film, David Trueba composed a comedy

(with certain drops of drama), based on his own experience and starring Pilar L���pez De Ayala and

Alejo Sauras, the latter is pigeon-holed in his television role of "" son of the fiti "" and it is complicated to

separate him from that image, in turn Pil Ar L���pez de Ayala begins to be with permission of many others, one of the

most beautiful (and popular) faces of Spanish cinema, his appearances on the tape are full of moments

�� Unique, and being even the most "" full "" of the film, his interventions leave the best of the film

Trueba.La film is full of cameos, and from the of Neus Asensi, passing through many of Trueba's friends

(including the bitch of his brother Fernando), the "" buenrollo "" in the accomplishment of the same; Menci���n apart would

need the splendid Concha Velasco, who looks as beautiful and glamorous as before. (In addition, he celebrates the

same day as me). Finally, we have to advocate from time to time for the cinema "" made in Spain "" and this film, without a doubt, is

a very good proposal.

" 1

" Sadomasochism, Sex, Dementia, Religious Fervor and if they hurry me some concealed zoophilia in a work

shot with the entrances of some interpreters and director delivered in one of the most beautiful andfollies

inspiringthat reflects m�� Multiple readings

A play called EQUUS by the writer PETER SHAFFER wreaked havoc in the 70s, a good scandal thanks to a

story full of madness where the most expressive topics were taken as difficult as passion. ,N,fervor

religious, sexual incomprehension is not exempt from violence. Surprising is that a director who at that time

enjoyed the compliment of the entire world critic with successes of the SERPICO caliber, a relentless world orafternoon

dogswas involved in such a risky project. A legend of HOLLYWOOD was added to the project in the

face of the great RICHARD BURTON protagonist of celluloid masterpieces. The night of the iguana, thetechnique

sacredor Cleopatra gave him immortality accompanied by a young and unknown actor PETER FIRTH who did not

have a career too fortunate despite the talent deployed in TESS or JOSEPH ANDREWS finishing In the

television and in very secondary roles. On the screen, we see a hesitant start with a

staging similar to TELEFILME, a narrative that is not entirely fluid, which may lead one to think about the

viewer that perhaps is a failed attempt to hook the original spirit of the text. Suddenly everything

begins to change, the tone rises quickly, the two main interpreters are battling in an antològic duel, the

story takes an unusual force in each plane reaching a final part that it leaves you totally knocked out. EQUUS

is a confrontation of two beings adrift, a life that in the eyes of others is ordered but the

PSIQUIATRA suffers a routine that devours him from within in a world that he did not dare Retar to challenge, discover the

passion in his patient patient that in spite of his madness to know how to aspire the force of a life that took him to the

anguish by some parents about protectors and a mother who poisoned his mind of religious facts that the

young man confuses in his relationship with horses. A cheap film that without paraphernalia faces twoworlds

differentbut at the same time they collide in a freedom that the two characters long for without achieving.Sadomasochism,

Sex, Dementia , Religious Fervor and if they hurry me something and concealed zoophilia in a work shot with the entrances

of some interpreters and director delivered in one of the most beautiful and inspiring follies that reflects multipleWithout

readings.a doubt a risk that the current cinema is not allowed and that is why these works are nowadays almost

unrepeatable in a world that turns its back on true art in favor of mediocrity that is easily digestible in

favor of dollars.

" 1

" Exceptional, that is the qualification that would have to give this piece of goldsmith, which works

perfectly from the beginning of austere style and customs, to a final po� Ethical without, however, not being

devastating.

The choice of this film by the newcomer in the long Juan Antonio Bayona (oforigin

Barcelona) is very appropriate to inaugurate the new edition of the Sitges Festival, a clear declaration Den principles about the

quality that promises a contest, which a priori is presented as the best, but the best, as far as

film proposals are concerned. And once again, and I never tire of repeating myself, a new hit full on

the target of the good taste of the film, again the debut of a Spanish director in the g�� Fantastic ,nero, and again

an exceptional movie. After attending the screening of a jewel like this, one finds answers

about the spectacle that this new Spanish horror film had created, so well received in Cannes and with

large-scale distribution in Usa for upcoming dates. The story places us in the shoes of Laura (Bel���n Rueda),

a 37-year-old woman who returns to live the orphanage where he was raised, in this case to convert it into, in addition

to his home, a residence for handicapped children. After a beginning where we see that she was adopted by

some family, she moved us without preambles to the moment that Laura is living in the

old orphanage with her husband and his son Sim���n, which we will discover shortly after he was also adopted,

and who is ill, which forces him to take his medication every day. As the film progresses, and in a veryway

subtle, we discover how Sim���n talks to his parents about imaginary friends, which is not

the least worry. for his parents, considering him more a typical attitude of a lonely child

than anything else. But everything changes from the moment in which Laura and Sim���n visit an old cave near the

beach, where the child tells his mother that he has met a new invisible friend. This causes several

confrontations between mother and son, something that is completely twisted at the moment in which Sim���n disappears

for months, without knowing his parents what remedy to put to that situation, but feeling that he is not ��� as far as it

may seem. Exceptional, that is the qualification that should be given to this piece of goldsmith, which works

perfectly from the beginning of austere style and customs , to a poetic end without, however, not being

devastating. The story is developed with an impeccable narrative rhythm, all narrated withtension

increasing, including a couple of scares that cause one to rise out of the chair like a spring, and a capacity

for the description simply impeccable.Bayona creates a visual style that makes media economics a

virtue, since there is always a feeling of hopelessness in the characters on the screen and that is why to

place them in those gray and austere environments, where the contrast with the great spaces, like that brilliant

scene of the beach and the cave, creates a constant feeling of oppression. It has aaspect

very ornate visualor even a beauty of the images that stands out above the story (something that

happened partially in some other first film of national filmmakers). That is to say, the virtue of Bayonne, if we are

guided by his first film (we will see how it evolves in the future), is to penetrate the interior of his

characters through drama and terror, not both a particularly brilliant staging, but rather

a great storyteller. Many layers have the film, as the special connection that is established by

nature between a mother and her children , although in this case it is adopted, and how difficult it is to see on the screen

shown as effectively as in this film, or references to children's stories from the

perspective of an adult, such as his constant allusions to Peter Pan, where that ending is especially

significant. The constant threat of madness permeates the images of the film, where even the end of the

film could give a lot to talk about if we are seeing something real lived by the characters or is a vision Insane

, with a suggestive ending that could not rule out in my opinion the second option. On the actors, say

that all are shown especially highlighted, with a consideration �n special for Bel���n Rueda, who embroiders her

role as a mother traumatized by the loss of her son, or by Sim���n himself, who gives his child character

certain nuances that are not usually saint and sign of the genre precisely. They work both at a

strictly physical acting level and in scenes of internal torment, impeccable. Some of the scenes in the film are

of a synthesis capacity in themselves of the insultingly brilliant horror genre. and terrifying, like the

scene where a mysterious hooded child, who after we know who it is, slowly approaches

Laura emitting animal sounds that are terrifying, shown with a tension and an ability to

shoot scenes of this amazing kind in a debutante. Or one of the best of the whole film, where almost at the

end she remembers the game she enjoyed being a child in the orphanage, and what appears behind her makes

anyone's hair stand on end. Simply brilliant. Perhaps the only one that could be put to such a brilliant

debut, consists of the film's own argument, which reminds us of films already treated many

times before and that remains the virtue of originality (we could remember as recent "" The

boarding school "", although with much worse results of final finishing), since the well-known argument of a threat

from the past that manifests itself in the present in a cursed place, the which always tends to be an isolated house, an

orphanage or a hospital, is constantly present in the cinema (I will not name a certain film based on

the novel by Henry James because it is already very repetitive). In short, a brilliant film, a

demonstration that we are facing a director with a bright future in the field credited tocinema

fantastic, with a special capacity in storytelling and with a very direct style and without concein the form of

sionestypical, where despite the "" but "" commented in the previous paragraph shines to offer us one of the best

horror films in a long time.

" 1

" A perfectly harmonized millimeter guide in which you do not have too much left or nothing is missing. Atoy

fun actionthat goes beyond the genre to tell us a story full of sensitivity, irony, a good

dose of bad milk, tributes and quotes. ���ffixes, and reformulation of clichés.

An airplane lands, a lone passenger who listens sarcastically to the advice of the traveler who accompanied him from the

next seat. Under the jacket he hides a revolver. He is a policeman. At the airport a driver withis waiting for him

his name written on a sign. We know that his name is John McClane, he has traveled to Los Angeles, and

California is his first iron���a. He is an ordinary man, and seems to guess that he has not reached theplace. The

righttwilight reigns over the city of Los Angeles while the driver does not stop with his questions.

McClane is taciturn with strangers, "keep driving"? But the driver insists, and so we

find out that he has a wife and children, and that he has come to join his family on this Christmas night. In previous

sequences, we see Holly Gennaro inside a huge building, talking on the phone with her

daughter, this question by dad but Holly does not know if they can see him tonight . The camera describes a shortshot

sequenceup to one of the photographs. There's Holly and her husband, the new arrival on a plane. Outside in the

great room, Mr. Takagui encourages his guests, a party in style on Christmas Eve. Through

the windows the reddish light of the twilight enters. Holly pushes the photograph with anger, and resentment

appears in the story. McClane gets out of the car, a contrapicado manifests the grandeur of the Nakatomibuilding

Plaza, and its latent threat. Threat in the form of family discussion, or a vehicle that stealthily approaches

from somewhere in the city. Regardless of the features of action movies, a plot

that occurs in the approach of the narrative (not necessarily in the knot or in the outcome) is a

commendable dose of dramatic force. Die Hard begins as a family drama starring a citizen on

foot � "Lost" in a place alien to his real interests (he prefers New York, but his wife is

in Los Angeles), which will have to face old conjugal quarrels. Suddenly, he is involved in a

desperate struggle against a group of armed men who assault the building and take his wife - and the rest of

those present at the party - as a hostage. Films such as "Rambo", "Acorralado", and

similar products, so frequent in the eighties, already at the beginning, showed the preponderance in

the story of the action. Vion violent, personified in the clich��� mus ?? musculitos?? � turn, whether it was

Sylvester Stallone or Arnold Schwarzenegger. Jungle glass, on the contrary, proposes to develop

violent action based on a current human being and a situation (the conjugal crisis, voluntary migration)

framed in other g��� cinematic genres, specifically, melodrama. Violent action is the revulsive that

restores the hero regarding his conjugal problems and his role as a police officer. In short, it allows you to

use the action genre to tell a meaningful and solid story in your dramatic budgets

while rephrasing the idea of ​​the "hard guy"? �, and elevates it to the category of art.John McTiernan directs

with efficiency and passion based on a written guide to detail and a seamless editing work, in

which each dialogue, each scene and chain of sequences, each new element introduced in the development

of the adventure will serve as a fundamental piece until a conclusion in which all the roles converge. Let's not

forget that Jungla de cristal drinks from the cinema of cat���strofes, and narrates a collective drama in which the

human group is divided into two blocks; those who live the experience from inside the building (McClane,

terrorists), and those who live it from abroad (police, citizens, press). In this way, the story

offers two perspectives, a notable contribution to its narrative dynamism and the creation of antagonists, which

also leads to an ironic game between those two human groups. Note the bias in the information of theregarding

police agentsthe reality of the circumstances experienced by McClane and the hostages, which

contributes to elevating that look of claustrophobic drama: the dissociation Between what happened inside the

Nakatomi building and the outside world emphasizes the loneliness of the hero, and turns the terrorists into the

real puppeteers (for example, the scene of McClane in the roof firing in the air to save the

hostages, the crumbs on board the helicopter think it's killing the hostages, or maybe it

was a depressed broker? This goes to extremes when the two FBI agents appear with

the anti-terrorist handbook in their hand. Each of his actions is an advance for the assailants; Hans

Grubber sentences: "Do you ask for a miracle and I give you to the FBI"? The reading that is made on the outside of

what happened inside the building, serves, from the purely argumentative, to justify the development

of the operation of Grubber and his. For the purposes of cinematographic texture, it creates an ironic tone, a

ridicule of the security forces that self-obey the role of citizen protectors. The whole

scheme and structure are designed with the aim of extolling the figure of the anonymous hero, a simple

policeman who coincidentally is at the epicenter of the action. ���n, the existence of which some even

deny.The writers, in their excellent writing work, did not forget to introduce a link to unite the

two dissociated worlds, and appears the character played by Reginald Veljohnson (agent Powell). Within the

global catastrophe, the film offers a substory in that description of the friendship that arises between Powell and

McClane via auditory communication. A description and development not devoid of sensitivity, since it

establishes a spiritual connection and an empathy between the two characters: Powell confesses the tragedy of his

past, and McClane confesses his weakness in his role of spouse and as a human being who is in a situation

that exceeds it. Opposed to the lack of communication, the cynicism and inhumanity prevailing between the

two worlds represented in the rest of the group, agent Powell and McClane are a cry of hope and

fraternity in the midst of chaos. And, in the final scene, we verified the success of circumscribing - until then

- the relationship of friendship to auditory communication. The look of appreciation and complicity between them in their first

face-to-face encounter puts the final finishing touch, and any spectator who has apprehended the sensitive

significance of the relationship described above, will not be able to � avoid the lump in the throat, especially

when Powell is released from the trauma pret���rito to kill Karl (Alexander Godunov) to save the life of McClane

and his wife. Attention to the underline that the soundtrack of Michael Kamen makes at that moment of action, and the

expression on the face of Veljohnson.ESTO IS CINEMA, SE���ORES. CANON for a good action film imposes the

presence of a bad guy with charisma, and there we have the unforgettable Hans Grubber. If the drawing (characterization) of the

character is already attractive (cynicism, lack of scruples, sense of humor, tongue-in-cheek language and

references to the classics) the charisma of an actor as portentous as Alan Rickman does the rest. His antithesis,

John McClane, a vulnerable human being who faces tragedy with iron��� and sense of humor,expressions

testosteronethat relax the tension of the story to draw a smile in any moment ("Hey, do

not fuck with me, dear, do you think I'm ordering a pizza?"), or better yet, "nine million

terrorists in the world and it occurs to me to kill one who has the foot of a woman�? �). McClane's great handicap,

as a fictional character, is his ability to provoke empathy and connect with the viewer, due to his

own intrinsic characteristics. The viewer lives and suffers the adventure from McClane's point of view,

hence the absorbing quality of the story. The architecture of the Nakatomi building induces the sensation of

claustrophobia from the visual-physical stratum , complementary to the claustrophobic character, from astratum

purely psychological, contributed by the aforementioned dissociation between interior and exterior of the building. T���neles,

rooms, corridors, ventilation ducts and elevators, constitute the appropriate scenario for the

physicality of a violent action that always moves in the human and veros���mil terrain. At times, the

fire and smoke that surround McClane evokes the aesthetic of Ridley Scott in Alien, or the testosterone action

of Cameron in Aliens. Who doubts, in addition, that part of the thematic and plot idea of ​​the film is

inspired by "Cornered" ??, ?? Tibur? ���n�? � and � ?? Alien� ??. Grubber's death deserves

Mention aside, McClane's gesture after the decisive shot - blowing to the mouth of his revolver - evoking

John Wayne (which Grubber himself had alluded to) , moment in which the hero acquires an almost supernatural outline,

sublimation of his anonymous condition to pass to the sphere of the cinematographic myth, but from his base human,

not from the pre-established cliche. The fall of Grubber, the simple thief who posed as a terrorist,

induces the last bias. Someone, down there, says: "I hope he's not a hostage?" "Already with McClane outside

the building, and under a pounding rain of bills that evokes the prolongation." In the farce, theprofiles

representativeof each of the dissociated worlds converge to settle accounts. Aside from the emotional encounter

with the agent Powell, it is necessary to mention the punch that Holly Gennaro gives to the repugnantreporter

televisionwho had mediated the catastrophe, thus concluding the thematic content that ironizes with the

different social forces that intervene in the situation. In the end, only counts McClane, the new hero who

synthesizes John Wayne and Rambo with a touch of simple - not simple - humanity, and for whom the

experience lived inside the Nakatomi building has been a reason for reconciliation. ���n conjugal (the kiss in the

back seat of the car). An ending that converges with the beginning. THAT is to tell a story. And it is NOT a matter of

tastes, but of knowing the basics of the narrative. There are no other words. A harmonized millimeter guide to

perfection in which nothing is left or nothing is missing. A fun toy action that goes beyond the genre

to tell a story full of sensitivity, irony,good dose of bad milk, tributes and quotes

cin ���ffixes, and reformulation of clichés. A reformulation that has not yet found a model that

transcends it. Surprised that a genre as corseted as the action film based on the figure of the "hard guy

"? � can offer as much as the masterpiece of John McTiernan offers. We are facing an authenticmiracle

cinematographic, especially thanks to a guide that articulates a variety of themes and structures without this

variety hindering the fluidity necessary in this type of film. . The current filmmakers (and especially the

screenwriters) should take note. Crystal Jungle is CANON, it is the rule and the model to overcome. Any product of

action that, at least, does not approach the quality of work (written work, especially), inventiveness and

characterization of characters exposed in crystal Jungle, will be �, at least, a mediocre product. Good

work and dedication in previous works has not been done to fall into self-congratulatory anecdote or

oblivion, but to be revered and try to transcend (overcome) their achievements. Those are the rules for a cinema

of quality action, although some insist on denying it.

" 1

" Without a doubt, Ladrones is one of the best visually better films I've seen in my life. A

good choice to be impressed by the Spanish cinema.

Undoubtedly, Ladrones is one of the best visually better films I've ever seen. Every

scene has a special meaning that is not spoken with words, but rather everything that is conveyed is transmitted

through Des of the looks and the gestures of the characters, and above all of their music, whichexplains

perfectlyeverything that is happening. It is a dramatic story in which Juan Jos��� Ballesta plays a

young man who has managed to survive through robberies since he was very small and wants to rebuild his life after leaving

the juvenile center. A challenge that fails to achieve because the society still judges him for the acts of

his past and finds again that desire to live, when he discovers that a girl tries to steal a disk in a

store and helps him so that Do not get caught. From there, a beautiful relationship develops in which you will

explain how is the art of stealing and you really realize how easy we neglect our things, so

far in which they rob you, that then you return to put precautions until you forget and they return to you to

steal. Little loop. The interpretations of both Ballesta and Mar���a Valverde are extraordinary, it seems

lie listening to Ballesta talk in interviews that seems like a child, then when you see him

play characters so dif��� your soul falls to the ground and you see him become a man. And above allnot

you canlose the magnetism of the two with their eyes. Simply amazing. A good option to

be impressed by Spanish cinema.

" 1

" The Host is presented to us as a wish and I can not, at least in the West, and that has as its

cause to have made us believe that we were going to enjoy with another type of film. I can only recommend the selection of

another of the many proposals on the billboards.

Deceived So I could define myself once I started watching this movie. It is not the first nor will it be the last time

it happens to me. We are already a little tired of being sold a product that is not the one we will

see. The Host is selling it as the new great monster movie, following in the footsteps of Tibur��� and Alien.

In addition "" Variety "" qualifies us as the best monster movie in history. I do not know if the friends of

that magazine are horny, but their marketing campaign and the trailer are getting people to

see this Korean movie. Bong Joon-Ho's work , is a waste that at least here in the West, we (or

me) is quite laughable. There are some parts that are saved and that are quite well, as the beginning and

presentation ���n the creature creating chaos on the banks of the river and park, but after that sequence, the

rest of the film is presented as an absurd comedy, with child characters and almost removed of

context, that do not achieve anything more than the stupefied spectator wondering why he has chosen that film

to spend two hours of his life. Within the vicissitudes of the protagonists and the mechanisms of the film,

we can find criticisms of governments, their manipulation mechanisms, their experiments, etc. Trying to

show that is fine, but not in this movie, or failing that way, since it does not achieve its purpose and

the only thing it gets is to do even more. Pesadas heavy to "" The Host "" In short, "" The Host "" is presented to us as a

want and I can not, at least in the West, and that has as its cause to have us believe that ��� We were going to

enjoy with another type of film. After this, I can only recommend the selection of another of the many

proposals that are on the billboards.

" 0

" The film, turns more before the puteo to which Robin Williams submits to the protagonists, and if any of the

readers have gone through the process of organizing a wedding you will feel identified ...

Among my friends and acquaintances it is normal to always end up talking about movies, and that is that, since everyone

knows my children and their faces towards what they call 7th art, someone always comes to me. I take films,

many (the great majority) take note of them and I postponed them in a section called (next viewings),

others, there are some, I leave in a corner of oblivion and I thank for the recommendation and little more, this

tape, which, a priori had to be of the second, in the end and by mediation of my wife (you know who's boss

at home.) I ended up watching her, surprisingly she ended up falling asleep and I, surprisingly ( mbi���n) I

just saw her without stirring in the sofa or say it was a sovereign idiocy, and that is, to believe that in this

type of cinema, on many occasions I am the one who, or either go to sleep, or with 10 min. of footage is enoughme

forto have an unequal opinion of the work, or I just take the cable out of the XBOX that connects it to

the PC monitor and I hear it in the background while I play some videogame. the film, turns more to the puteo

to which Robin Williams submits to the protagonists, and if any of the readers have gone through the process of

organizing a wedding you will feel identified, though, On the other hand, the film falls into a thousand and one

situations seen before. Mandy Moore as always, one notch more in his revolver, Robin Williams

sympathetic, histrionic and brutally funny, in addition to the little one who accompanied him a, another one of the bombs of the

movie. At no time I say that the film is a masterpiece, but it is not bad and at least it entertains and

identifies the "husbands consorts" that we suffer this type of cinema.

" 0

" King KongThe director's effort to make this film become his masterpiece has cost him little,

health, money and his wife..xD. And the great Peter put so much effort into the project that he lost some 25

kilos in a short time, exceeded the initial budget by 200 million dollars and that of his wife are

gossip. In other words, we have a movie taken care of to the smallest detail, withvisual effects

really impressive, a good enough picture and adequate performances. And this king kong

2005 is very different from the original 1933 in terms of characters and plot. Some scenes are

traced back to the original respecting the previous work and throwing a bit on the ground that terrible remake of 1973

with Jesica lange in the role of the diva. That's why I think we should thank the director ��� shown a

film faithful to that of 1933 that although the argument is not very complicated this new version has tried to

deepen in that relationship between the woman and the beast. To highlight the great work of Naomi Wats for

transmitting the affection that comes to feel for the ape and the performance of Carl Denham in the role of Jack Black.

But I think that above the performances are all special effects, a display of technique and

engineering that leaves more than one mouth open. To begin that introduction to New York from the 20s it

is simply splendid, and later the skull island, with the Indians, the abrupt jungle, the enormous

creatures and the mighty Kong. A gorilla very well recreated, both in modeling and movements (Thanks to Andi

Serkis). But although as in all this film sins of several things. The most serious is its duration, because certain

scenes from my point of view could have been saved, since there are scenes like those of the ship that are left over and

do more Heavy waiting to see the ape. The duration is a burden that Peter has not been able to calibrate well and

that unfortunately will cost him dear. And another negative point is the soundtrack. In this respect Peter has

neglected it more than in the Lord of the Rings. It is not that it is bad, only that a soundtrack was expected at the

height of the ESDLA. I even think that the game has a better soundtrack. And by the way the official game of the

film is highly recommended, you can see the hand of the director and that is appreciated because it is quite faithful to the

film. In summary, I strongly recommend that you watch this movie. ���cula to the cinema, because watching it on thescreen

TVis a crime. That does not throw back your 3 hours of footage, in the end it will leave a good taste in your mouth.

" 1

" Great animated film with ecological message included and with impressive musical numbers.

Undoubtedly, we are facing the best animated film of the year.

After seeing Al Gore defending the environment, one remains somewhat uneasy to know what is happening

exactly in our world. At least I was left with this feeling of restlessness, so I was just

as "amazed" in the face of these devastations that humans provoke with Happy Feet, although in a way �s

animated (sorry for this double sense so little fun, but is that I do not go anything else). George

Miller, director of several films, failed (for me, at least), such as The Oil of Life or Babe, apiglet

brave, invites us to this wonderful animated film. Conn with a moral message that is more than clear. This

time they are not pigs but penguins appear, although other animals also come from that glacial area such as

the Antarctic. It could be said that Happy Feet is a mixture of the story of the ugly duckling and the film Liberad

a Willy, because it shows very interesting topics such as the rejection of a different being and the ecology. to.

The film, summarizing, tells the story of a penguin who is born different, without knowing how to sing, and who

later is rejected for this same problem. During the trip in search of something better, you will find other penguins

that will let you know that it is better than you think and that it is worthwhile to continue and leave band to everyone who

does not accept it as it is. The protagonist, instead of having the ability to sing, has the ability to dance, something

that is not well seen in the world of penguins. So after the rejection and the trip will return in

search of his beloved Glory and in search of his happiness. From here it's when things start to get complicated

and everything changes until we reach a limit where the protagonists will see the way humans are (for

them, aliens). �genas). In addition, the film has several tremendously entertaining musical numbers, some of

which give you goose bumps. The dances, most of them with claqu���, have anrhythm

exquisiteand are not made (most of them) heavy. For me the best of them is the end, although the

playback (whoever has seen it and will understand me) is also unbeatable. So Happy Feet could also be called

"" ecological musical "". But on the other hand, the film The animation of the film is also incredible,

so it's still going Feel more pleasant watching it (attention to the sequence where the ice is breaking

and the pieces are chasing the penguins). Although the script, that has to be said, is also no

wonder, since in the middle of the film it presents a more or less important fall that stops the incredible rhythm

that I was there then. Although then it recovers in an extraordinary way, with a magnificent dance together

(of all the penguins). So if we highlighted something, it will be to its incredible animation and not the script itself. In

short, Happy Feet is a great animated film with an ecological message included and with

impressive musical numbers. Undoubtedly, we are facing the best animated film of the year.

" 1

" I try to be benevolent and look for the positive aspects of "The cold hour" ?? However, I do not

find any, except, in any case, the commendable intention of making cinema of genre in Spain.

The only thing that made me afraid of this movie, which opens on Friday the 14th, is to think what I will receive

after my negative criticism, with how well Elio has been talked about Quiroga in this blog. For that reason I try to be

ben���vola and look for the positive aspects of � ?? The cold hour? ?? However, I do not find any,

except, in any case, the commendable intention of making cinema of genre in Spain. A more suitable approach

for a short film that for a long show us how a few people live after a chemical war. The

protagonist, Jes���s, an eight-year-old boy, introduces us to all his exile companions while recording with a

video camera. moments of his confinement. The death of a chicken indicates that it is going to take place at night,

a cold hour, in which they will have to lock themselves in their rooms so that "the invisible" do not

attack them . When we have almost half a film, the need arises to go to a store to collect food

and medicines. And there for the first time there is a threat: "the strangers"? They are beings that

function as a chemical weapon because they are infected and can infect someone who is healthy just by touching them. Much

later, strangers will have to be eliminated because the protagonists will discover that they are gettingclose

tooto the place they inhabit. It seems that they have summed up the argument with a bad idea, making it sound

ridiculous on purpose. But it's not like that. During most of the footage nothing happens. It is not that we

are in a conflict derived from the situation of forced survival, which could be good,

but that conflict does not exist. Because strangers can only attack them if refugees break

certain rules because hiding from the invisible is so easy, there is nothing to fear until themoment

final. And all we see are sequences about the daily lives of these survivors. Time could

be stopped and one could even build a film without turning in which we were surrounded by a panic atmosphere

or the anguish of an imminent end of the world. However, it is not the case and none of the scenes gives

the least fear. The order in which the sequences are mounted could be altered and give the same, which

means that there is nothing that leads to the following and that everything happens because , as for example, the

sudden changes in the psychology of the characters. Everything is subject with threads in "The cold hour".

It is one thing not to justify the sources of fear, which is accepted nowadays in many films, especially if they

are Asian. Another very different is to include numerous di enlogos in which they try to explain these origins,

but to pass through them as stepping on eggs so as not to take the risk of messing up if something is deepened. In addition to

that, the tricks for dosing the information and not communicating everything to the spectator at once, but little by little,

are too shameless. Such a superficial approach, at the same time, is believed to be profound and, as a sign of

pretentiousness, it puts the characters in the Bible: Pedro, Pablo, Lucas, Mar���a, Magdalena, Jes���s , Judas,

Saulo, etc ... Along with the flimsy script, the worst aspects of the film are the interpretations. It would not fit

to name the actors and actresses one by one who do it badly because, taking away the children and the adolescent,

they appear very even, which one worse than the other. Silke, Pablo Scola, Julio Perill���n, Pepo Oliva, Omar

Mu���oz, Jorge Casalduero, Nadia de Santiago, Marco Gonz���lez, Carola Manzanares� ?? are some of their

names. Esthetics is perhaps the most visible of all. It is likely that readers, if they are very fond of

terror, appreciate something in the film, due to the lights and shadows of their photograph. But Quiroga not only fails in

gui���ny and in the direction of actors. As a filmmaker we can not overlook some things either. The few action

scenes that are there are shot with a surprising lack of rhythm and brio. The author is more attentive

to transitions with which to show off than to narrate, among other things because there is nothing to narrate. With the

steady-cam it tries to give packaging to what does not have it, but these camera movements, apart from being clumsy,not

dofit fluidly with the formal genre decisions, more It is

true that the budget of the film may have been low, but that is not

enough to obtain better results in the facets, such as the gui� And the acting work, which I mentioned.

Other technical aspects are also somewhat poor. Although the film is Spanish and has been shot withsound

direct, there are always fragments that need to be folded because the voices have not been taken with the right conditions

. Well, the folded parts are out of sync. There are Z series movies that are very bad and

that is precisely why they can be enjoyed to laugh. Sometimes I confessed that I have

seen more than one of Uwe Boll with that intention. But � ?? The cold time ?? En ?? In that link you can

see trailers and more information ?? it does not even bring these minutes of morbid rejoicing. It is long

despite not being and bored even the prompter. If it were something better, I would talk about how unoriginal its

starting point is, about the amount of similar films como ?? as ??? The thing ?? from Carpenter� ?? that

exist But I hope this was the only bad thing about Elio Quiroga's second film after � ?? Fotos? ??

" 0

" A bad movie, enormously disappointing especially in its realization. He goes on explanations,

forget characters and does not even offer a minimally worthy show.

It is true that Tony Scott has not yet flown as high as his brother Ridley, but I have always defended him

as a more than interesting director. Someone with personality to direct good action tapes.

Regrettably, he made me have a terrible time with things like "Day of Thunder?" Top Gun? or? Fantastic ?, but I

've had a great time with tapes like? Amor a Quemarropa ?,? The Last Boy Scout? or? Spy Game ?, and films like

? Public Enemy ?,? The Craving? and? The Fire of Vengeance? They are worthy entertainments. Lately I was very disappointed

with that visual delirium entitled Domino ?, and when I saw the trailer of? D���j��� Vu? I thought Scott was backBecause

to his good times.if there's one thing to note about Tony Scott's latest film, it's that his

trailer is perfect, a masterpiece of montage using the very cleverly argument of the film in the

construction of the trailer itself. I never got tired of seeing it and of course I wanted to see the movie,

well, as practically all the trailers, but this one in particular stands out above average. So

, last Friday, happy and happy, I went to the premiere of? D���j��� Vu ?, and after two long hours of

footage I came out with a face of perplexity that still lasts me. And this movie seems confirmation that

Mr. Tony Scott is lost, and there is nothing to foresee that someone will ever find the film again. path. Talk about the

argument of? D���j��� Vu? would be to cite a huge amount of plot incongruities, which as indicated

in the comments of the post about the film made by my partner Beatriz, we should not take into account,

something with which I agree to a certain extent. But come on, we could say that the film is about a

crazy terrorist who wants to fly a ferry and a policeman who travels through time tries to stop him, at the same

time falls in love with a woman who dies in said attack. Because I know, because the screenwriter has given it to

him, he has read somewhere that the great love stories are timeless and he has taken it to the

letter. Everything that the film raises has been seen a thousand and one times in other films of thematic id ,ntica, that is,

time travel. However, this would not be any defect if all the narrated was shown with a

minimum of credibility and seriousness, something that does not happen at any time. It is as if the scriptwriters of the

event, Billy Marsilii and Terry Rossio, did not believe in the material they have in hand, and what is worse, that

Mr. Tony Scott did not know how to put this material on stage. The film is hurried, with an irregular rhythm

and not taking any time to reflect on certain points of the story, something that would have come

very well. Maybe this is so because in this way many spectators will not realize the enormous flaws

that the ridiculous gui���n has, so in my opinion, the film is a bit of a fool to the public. There are two

moments in the film in which you can see the errors in a scandalous way. First, the scene in

which the character of Denzel Washington explain absolutely everything about the possibilities of time

travel and if you can change the past or not. This scene seems like a comedy because it is so ridiculous

, and it is also too long, rejoicing in its own defect. The other moment is quite long,

since we can say that it is from certain intervention of the main character, the film goes downhill

at great speed and ends up crashing Without remedy. It goes by explanations, forget characters and not

even offer a minimally dignified show. Regarding the actors say that Denzel Washington is as

always, that is, protesting everything. Jim Caviezel seems to change a bit of registration, although personally he does

not convince me like that terrorist mix of psychokiller and Rambo. And who, of course, is truly

disastrous is the main actress, Paula Patton, with a character not at all drawn despite the hours and hours

spent observing her. This in my opinion is to miss out on any of the possibilities of history.

Something that also happens in a certainly original chase scene, although only the idea, since the

visualization on the part of Scott is of the weakest destroying what could have been one of the

most spectacular and surprising persecutions of all that have been done. In short, a bad movie, enormously

disappointing especially in its realization .N That's it, I insist that the trailer is a jewel. And by the way, it's

titled? D���j��� Vu? How could it have been titled? Jamón sandwich with Chorizo? or? Persecution in Time? or

anything else, and that is that they do not even talk about d���j��� vu, that has noses.

" 0

" The worst movie I've seen from Pepito Piscinas or Jenaro the one from the 14. Cut and candied for the exclusive use of young people -vinds of paranormal emotions and clueless adults,

Mosc�� � zero does not convince anyone. It is an aberrant exercise of degradation of the cinema as art, a shabby show of

aspirations because Val Kilmer, Vincet Gallo and some other divo already in closing give in to participate. Tells the

story of an anthropologist lost in the hell of the Muscovite subsoil. And hell was the movie theater,

dear readers: the pain in the chair, the sensation that time, that jewel so Precious, it slipped, and

the enormous desire that the 90 minutes conclude precipitadamente or that the designer has a rise of self-love

and, lacking to its deontological principles, unplug the m� Machine and go out into the hall and honestly

return the euros to the spectators. Then thank you. And he does not write any more because from time to time he wants to

write twenty lines instead of the usual semantic scattering that I like so much and to which

my natural cinephilia inevitably flows. A lot is this. Little deserves. Nothing. Silence. I should not have

written this review. I should not have swallowed such embarrassing footage. Fact is. Notice given.

" 0

" What I dislike about an Incomoda Verdad, which is based exclusively on a strong name and acampaign

marketingso well perpetrated.

���Documentary or Video of Political Propaganda? This is the idea that I had in mind during the viewing of the

entire tape. It is not that I am an incrimula or my cousin has told me that the climate change is as false as

the P Ratrez Mouse but it is that in reality the scientific data and the format An Incredible Truth gives

enough to think about its doctrinal and scientific foundations. Al Gore records one of his many

lectures on Climate Change and this will be ��� the thickness of the content on the ecological problems of

our planet, the rest is adorned with a handful of images of his political career, his family and his childhood .

Many graphics, diagrams and photos showing what almost everyone knows, less and less ice at the poles, more

and more desastresevitable natural disasters, CO2 emissions to the environment and temperature rises in all the

globe All very correct, very orchestrated and very well staged by an Al Gore with aShowman point

pricelessbut the dilemma is in elucidating whether it is a good or a bad documentary and I think that from thepoint of view

scientific�fico there are better and more successful but that will not arrive weeks Earth, a documentary macro that took

several years to record has achieved the images that Al Gore s He bothered to generate by computer (like the

bear swimming adrift in the middle of the ocean) a colossal job that nobody will enjoy because we have been

blinded by seeing the work of the almost American president It is unquestionable that a politician of his stature knows how to

speak, that it is easy to buy the product he is selling because he is known, committed and comes out on the

big screen. ���If you have even been given an Oscar! But from the documentary point of view I lack things, I

lack sources, scientists, first-person experiences, something that is not a dogma of faith to finish

believing this unquestionable truth and so well sold. That's what disgusts me about An Uncommon Truth, which is

based exclusively on a strong name and a marketing campaign so well perpetrated.

" 0

" Dodgeball is recommended on DVD for a Sunday afternoon. Just to see fast today and forget tomorrow.

Dodgeball ("" Balls in play "" in Argentina and only on DVD) has each and every one of the condiments of the

current American comedy: entertaining and light, entrainable characters and too many stereotypes? And

even generally ill-defined? performances and in short: round and empty. Here is also the

eternal fight between good and bad in a parody more, that ultimately does not come to conform to anyone. Angui���n

almost non-existentthat is pure pretext for the cataract of jokes and funny situations (only of a few times) plus

the brief cameos of Hank Azaria, William Shatner, David Hasselhoff and Chuck Norris that bring only a little more

grace. Everything else is a good direction of Thurber because it becomes almost invisible, the surprise with the hard

Vince Vaughn in an unusual role in his career and a sustained and even rhythm, that everything together sounds

too much little by the expectation and the cast. But the big problem of Dodgeball is the notorious blunder of Ben

Stiller, in charge of the first great overacting of his career, as out of tune, where he stood out as

one of the best comedians of the moment. A character machietta quite boring and pulling heavy.

Dodgeball is recommended on DVD for a Sunday afternoon. Just to see fast today and forget tomorrow.

" 0

" And here comes the trap of Gibson, like all good trickery: if you do not have the imagination and thetalent

creativeto squeeze New Testament history in a genuine way, the best option (N (the easiest)

to be able to become interesting and look good, is to resort to the morbid and emotional manipulation of the

viewer.

There are movies that look like good movies and are actually bad or not as good as they pretend. I remember

when I saw this film for the first time I thought it was a very bad movie, absolutely embarrassing. Now,

after a thorough review, I can say that it is not as bad as it seemed, and that it is a perfect example of how

easy it can be to cheat and manipulate to the viewer It is indisputable that "" The Passion of Christ "" has

several points in favor: a superb and enchanting staging, good photography, good sense of rhythm and

some moments endowed with inspiration ���n dramatic, without excessive cursiler���as. It is memorable thatcamera

subjectiveplaced on the altar and the eyes of the god who sheds his first sword for the death of hisson

incarnate(excellent sample of lyricism) or the chilling death of the traitor Judas, whose feet we see the

rotten cadaver of an ass, preceded by a series of disturbing visions that give the film an

air of dreamlike nightmare. Some critics appeal to this kind of gimmicky trickery to let loose that Don

Mel Gibson offers "a personal vision" of the New Testament text. Go retro, Satan���s���We start out there.

The film we are dealing with is - and pretends to be - a visual representation of the exact and fundamental content

written in the new testament referring to the last hours of the life of one of the myths m� Transcendent of

the history of religions: Jesus Christ. Therefore, the material of which part is well known by

all and the central character has a role and characteristics that have been assumed by each individual

inserted in Western culture, whether believer or atheist. Based on this, and taking into account that cinema is not

only visual representation but forms of content and point of view of the camera, I note that this

film It is absolutely flat, empty, not very brave. Because let's look at what Gibson does: at no time does it

represent the tragedy of Christ by offering his personal point of view, simply placing the c� ��mara in a way

that shows us the typical picture of Jesus of Nazareth releasing his practices, or of the group of priests of the

Sanhedrin showing the bad temper and the bad slob that they have, or the supermalos that are the Romans or the

well-meaning final gesture of Pilate and that we have already seen throughout the history of cinema on repeated

occasions. Therefore, the cinematographic visual language of Gibson is absolutely conventional and does not exploit

even a minimum part of the enormous amount of suggestions that can inspire a character like

Jes���s, from different points of view: as an archetype of spirituality or heroism, as a model of rebellion,

etc. There is not a single shot or frame that tells us anything special and that proves that behind the camera there is a

creative, brave and even brilliant filmmaker, according to some unsuspecting people. In cinema, the personal recreation of the

represented history is done using the point of view of the camera, among other things. Mel Gibson does not go beyond

being a mere illustrator of the sacred text. So, where is the little thing? And here comestrap

Gibson's, like all good trickery: if you do not have the imagination and creative talent as to express the

New Testament history in a genuine way, the best option (the easiest) to be able to become interesting

and look good, is to resort to morbo and emotional manipulation of the viewer: you do a parallel montage

showing the face of a guy talking about universal love and brotherhood to see how that same character is

v�� The victim of an atrocious violence, shown openly, suffering in a torn flesh and

scandalous spurts of blood splashing into the camera. To decorate the thing a bit more, we resort to

the subjective camera again while poor Jesse loses his strength and balance when he can not hold the cross. For

the spectator to feel the pain of Christ and put on your flesh. Let's be honest; what Gibson did is a

"heavy" version of the martyrdom of Christ, a morbid spectacle, recreated with a great sense of effect, but

here the intellectual or artistic values they shine by their absence. And, in a certain way, it is a lamentable

emotional manipulation of the spectator, using one of the religious figures that moresignifications

spiritualand irrational passions generates in our society. "" The passion of Christ "" is a gimmicky film,

no more. Artically speaking is a vague and vacuous work, Gibson has gone to the easy. This is aa gridded

clamorously pretentious film, the fruit ofmind like that of Mel Gibson, a filmmaker against whom I

have nothing, but everyone is known for the vulgarity and vulgarity of its different declarations. or public acts

. Here he tries to offer a work of art with religious and humanistic motives, but, honestly, he is not

gifted for these areas. Putting on a Satanist with a black hood and holding a baby with the face of a

man who watches over the agony of Christ is not offering a personal vision (valga say that howling

cry-endsatanicafter the death of Jess agonay on the cross is more tacky than I've seen in movies, ridiculous

to to retch), but to resort to disturbing elements copied from other authors (or from the richeschatology

Catholic) that made them their own, such as Ingmar Bergman. It is the difference between theappropriation

legitimate and genuineof elements and tricks that others have used and the impersonal and clumsy hodgepodge in which

Gibson falls. Gibson's use of certain water elements is not genuine, but stinks of

pretentiousness, something very difficult to demonstrate objectively, but at least that is who this is for writes. Inot

doquestion or deny the ability of Gibson to stimulate the sensibility of some viewers, but

come on, no point of comparison with Bergman or David Lynch. In sum, and taking into account the subjectivity and the

different sensibilities, dir ��� that is not a bad movie, it is an interesting - striking ar���fagas -

representation of the passion and death of Christ, ideal to put it in religion class Not for Catholics

wanting to affirm their faith by accompanying it with good doses of morbid. But this is not a good film, because it

pretends much more than it is.

" 0

" Film that with successes and errors, has the status of classical work, influence of a whole generation of

filmmakers and cin���filos. From various points of view such as aesthetics, morality -even because of its ominous history of

prohibitions-, all of a personal and innovative style.

"" The Mechanical Orange is my favorite movie right now. I had certain prejudices against it but after

seeing it, I realized that it is the only one that exists about the true meaning of the modern world. "" Luis

Bu���uelFilm that with successes and mistakes, has the classic work status, influence of a whole generation of

filmmakers and cin���filos. From various points of view such as aesthetics, morality -even because of its ominous history of

prohibitions-, all of a personal and innovative style. Unbeatable adaptation of the book by Anthony

Burgess, who narrates part of his personal experience of being unemployed and being a victim of violence due to the

fact - little known - of being his own wife victim of A rape by three soldiers during the

war. This film also has all the characteristics of the filmmaker, his defects and his virtues.

Grandiloquent and pretentious, sagacious, on���rica, full of signs. Vital and strong. In the debit can be mentioned

as his film that worsened, because he composes the film with all futuristic icons (commissioned to the

best designers of the moment) that will languish. Cona with the passage of time becoming a brand of the

seventies itself. It is the film that marked its mark of dividing them into two antagonistic halves, like a trip

round of his characters with the baggage of sharesacquisitions made by the road and its disastrous

consequences. Showing us violence without violence, almost in an artistic way (if we look at it today it would be laughable

the prohibitions of the time) taking a step more earthly than the odysseys of the man who showed us only three

years before in the film 2001.Acierto in the election of an unknown protagonist (Andrew MacDowell), only known

by the sweet Love Store, after using Kubrick in almost all his films - less the first ones and 2001 - to

consecrated actors like Sterling Hayden, Kirk Douglas, Peter Sellers (twice) and James Manson. The

beginning A powerful beginning, almost intimidating. One of the best of Kubrick and any film. Thelook

cold and murderousof Alex (preannouncing his incipient madness) that by means of a slow traveling becomes the

Milkibar with his druggos / friends, that stalks us and is configured, in those beginnings that he preferred to engage to the

viewer and keep him attentive to what will come. According to an excellent appreciation of the Spanish critics Felici

and Marco, this look of Alex is a continuation of the look of the last plane of his film predecessor, the

star child of 2001. The hope and optimism of that scene clashes with the violence of this, returning to the

present the typical pessimism of almost all the films of Kubrick. Big scenes are many. Thesetting

staticin which they fight with a rival gang in a theatrical setting, offers an ode to violence inplan

ballet. The shots in the "" execution "" on the edge of the pool by Alex reaffirming his

leadership to the sound of the classical music that dominates the entire film. The mortal dance with mrs. Cat in his room

sex (with a giant phallus and a bust of Beethoven on each side as weapons) cause both the death of her

and the fall / death of Alex himself. The onlicic passages of the Bible in the imagination of the protagonist

(simil video clip), are all shot with the delicacy of a sandpaper passed by acid; scenes

worthy of a true lover of cinema and music, as already demonstrated in the use of the latter in

metaphysics 2001. Problems Filled during the winter of 1970/1971 , one of the first inconveniences that washim

posed towas to adapt the nadsat (Russian suffix for "" adolescent "") that the author had invented as slang for the

gang members, inspired by his studies of the Russian language . Kubrick solves it by faithfully transcribing word for

word of the invention, with the absolute comprehension and acceptance of the spectators. Another obstacle was the

threats towards the director and his family, blaming him for the violence in the English streets due to the furor of the film

and its images. Kubrick decided shortly after the cancellation was shown in Great Britain. Despite all

the reruns made an incredible profitability of the film -cost��� two and collect forty- strengthening the

independence of the director and assuring him absolute control of all his later work. In spite of all this, the

text has a final chapter that redeems Alex - older, married and happy - of all his actions, reintegrating himself

back into the society that rejected him and gave him, a more hopeful, catholic and banal epilogue. Kubrick

dismisses it as inadequate for the subject matter of his film and the book itself (which will actually be edited without that

last chapter in the US). More what graphic is the appointment of a technical member of the film staff, whichexemplifies

clearlythe director's thought and the very end of the film: "" Kubrick with 2001, Space Odyssey itus

showswhat we could have had, and with La Naranja Mec���nica, it shows us what we are going to obtain in

reality. "" "" Man must be able to decide on good and evil, even if opt for evil. To deny him that choice

is to turn him into something that does not become human. in a mechanical orange "" Stanley Kubrick

" 1

" Side-by-side bump, Sunshine, however, contains details of high-end cinema with a

superb technical invoice. Where is the fault? In the scant interest of what counts, in not believing his

proposal, in the scramble of topics.

The typical of galactic heroes is never to return. Its aura of legend is forged in the

stars, which is the most conducive environment for enso���aci���n and collective mythification. The

science-fiction film covers the void left by the western or the cinema of medievalist inspiration. The props are

manifestly different, but the patron, the archetypes and the narrative structure are, in essence, identical.

Sunshine is a perfect sci-fi show; not so much as entertainment. Danny Boyle, his

enthusiastic manager, sin of naive, is carried away by the paraphernalia of the apocalyptic game and forgets to payattention

moreto some promising characters, but who end up lost in the vertigo of his company. Sunshine

promises them in its start: the ship conjured to deposit in a dying sun a nuclear charge that revives it.

Inveros���mil, far from my emotional experience and, apparently, not confirmed by science, the matter is

ruined halfway and the astronauts are perishing like flies in a glass of sidereal vinegar. The

tpicos accumulate without possible fracture. Unlucky bad luck with galactic predestination and technological

turmoil (homicidal lights, computers that wash their hands like Pontius Pilate) becomes gibberish

out of my reach. One is satisfied with having enjoyed 2001, a space odyssey or the completeseries

Alien. I'm not, obviously, a fan of the genre, but there are measurable inducements, spaces where you know how to

move and how to enjoy. Not here: Sunshine despises the commercial thread of similar format tapes

like Armageddon and installs itself with an almost insufferable self-satisfaction in a type of cinema supposedly more

serious, less satisfied with the avatars of the production. n Hollywood And in that willful exercise quasi

new age shipwrecks. is abysmed in tedious planes of interstellar space or whatever it is called. Theconflict

survivalaroused in the ship (save them, save the earth, maybe the cheerleader is missing) is solved

more than discreetly, without dramatic fanfare. Everything is left to embrace a thick boredom, scarcely

benefited by the very correct staging of the director and the restrained acting work of a cast to

which they could have given more literary carnality. The technical quality, in these times, does not move. We are already

saturated with colored lights and Russian mountains at the doors of the house.

" 0

" The definition of the initial word of the title is a good synthesis of the film. A long journey in an

exercise that is more in keeping with the mind of a philosopher than with that of a common viewer.

"" After having seen her again and again, I realized that this is the first time I feel that an artist is

"" very "" above me. "" Woody AllenOdisea (t� Title of a homonymous poem): Long journey in which theabound

adverse and favorable adventures to the traveler(Salvat encyclopedic dictionary). The definition of theword

initialof the title is a good synthesis of the film. A long journey says (and we also add metaphysical, lyrical

and megalomaniac in equal parts) in a more appropriate exercise for the mind of a film. �sofo, that for a common

viewer. Loaded with symbolisms and interpretations that escape and rediscover in repeated visions

of the film, it is untouchable, ambiguous and fascinating. Will this film be the masterpiece of a director obsessed

with it? Is it worthy of a visionary or a pretentious and boring film like few? Wanting to embrace and develop

the primitive beginnings of man, extraterrestrial life together with future technology and development and

evolution sounds at least, excessive for any mortal. Talking about Stanley Kubrick, it does not sound so

outlandish. To comment 2001 is done with certain fear: the one of not being able to include it in its totality. With as many

edges and varied interpretations as each one of them, it is created to see. Without fear of making mistakes, it is one of the

best movies of its genre and an inescapable reference of the creative universe of this talented director. Re���ne

each and every one of his obsessions and successes, as well as his own defects.Adem���s changed the path of

science fiction to always, being until that moment a minor genre - almost of class B - and despised.

Number put in any survey is made among the best movies in history. The dawn of

man This before and after we point out, it is due both to its content and to its shape. The prologue with

perfectly transvestite apes resembles the primitive steps and changes of human evolution towards

man. For that reason, almost human postures and movements are necessary. This was achieved by the actors

-mimos- standing out "" Moonwatcher "" (Daniel Ritcher) for being the leader, and the protagonist of the mythical scene of the

bone thrown into the air, which A terrible and beautiful ellipsis becomes the Discovery ship.

The alignment of the stars always foreseeing an important event; the spaceships to the sound of the Blue Danube

by Johann Strauss simulating a sexual dance for its forms (according to Kubrick "" a mechanical ballet ""); can be

both crazy, as a feature of genius. Scenes of a beauty and emotional depth rarely seen

in a film until today. The flat monolith of black granite - symbol of the superiorintelligence

extraterrestrial? ���o de Dios? - is the only nexus that Kubrick allows himself to give us in the whole film. The rest, it is

developed by our own imagination (Whoever wants some clue or meanings of more, will have to read

Clarke's book that abounds in them). � habl��� Kubrick The ending containing a new pure and original being (called

the star child) is hopeful and a positivism inídito in his films. All point out at this point, the

similarities between the content of this film and the book of the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche called As���

habl��� Zarathustra. Everything begins to be related to the main musical leiv motiv of 2001, called

precisely the same, composed by Richard Strauss at the end of the 19th century based on the reading of the same book.

Then everything points to the Nietzschean theory of the "superman" and the return of the new man, a being without the

limitations of the human race (the star child?) The protagonism is divided into several characters, perhaps to magnify

the figure of the director, the only true "star" of the film. The recognizable secondary ones are the already

named Moonwatcher, Dr. Floyd (William Sylvester who talks in a scene with his supposed daughter (Vivian

Kubrick), the astronaut Poole (Gary Lockwood), and the character with the highest screen exposure during thepart

final: the astronaut Bowman (Keir Dullea). The real star and protagonist of 2001 - and the one that lasts the longest in

our memory - we know that it is cold, cynical and aesthetic super computer HAL 9000. Of anpersonality

overwhelmingand that was born primarily in female version, changing to avoid the sexual connotations

that would distract for other seg� The director, a cruel, intelligent and almost human machine with the neutral,

serious and mechanical voice of the Canadian Douglas Rain (voiceover of NASA projects). but it could be the

too extensive and psychedelic "" trip "" end of Bowman by hole n egro -���8 minutes! -, which leads him to his

own evolution, a passage as bright for its color as tiring, as if Kubrick wanted to show us for the

first time his mastery for achieve special effects, in���ditos that s���, so far.HistoryConvengamos

being nine years younger than the first Star Wars (1977), and with its archaic procedure (frame by

frame moving the models 4 millimeters at a time) does not show too much inferior in the field, and not to mention, of

the artistic distance (see quote from Lucas at the end). A vision that becomes confused despite the enjoyment and

difficult access to the plot due to the absence (we said before deliberately) of a conventional and linear structure of

gui���n. Kubrick said in his few interviews that 2001 is a "non-verbal" experience "and that each one has to

make his own interpretation of the seen; paying attention to only loose signs, with a vague coherence such as

the now famous black monolith. The dialogues occupy only 40 of the 141 minutes of duration, almost with an end of

dispersion. It became so famous that in 1972 the great Tarkovski created Solaris, commissioned as aresponse

Sovietto the success of 2001, denied outright by the director himself. In short, the long-awaited masterpiece (which

���la���orara so much according to his sayings during the filming of Barry Lyndon), I think he had already made it at the end

of the d� ��each of the sixties contramano of his time and is called: 2001, Space Odyssey. "" The cinema moves to a

level closer to painting and music than to the written word . That's why films offer the

possibility to explain concepts and abstractions without the traditional reliance on words. "" Stanley

Kubrick "" I'm quite happy that they did not compare it so much with 2001 (to Star Wars). At the technical level they

can be compared, but I believe that 2001 is much higher. They had ten times more money and time, and

obviously it went better. "" George Lucas, Rolling Stone, August 25, 1977

" 1

" One more film about the dangers of tourism, and that, based on the infamous Hostel, it seems (and I say

well, it only seems) to pose a minimal social criticism to American tourism.

The production notes say that Turistas is the first American production shot entirely in

Brazil. And I say that, given the result, they could have saved the trip, because not even the (scarce)

landscapes portrayed compensate for the experience. Alex (Josh Duhamel), his sister Bea (Olivia Wilde) are

vacation in Brazil with her friend Amy (Beau Garrett). On a bus trip, they suffer an accident and eventually

meet the Australian Pru (Melissa George), who travels alone, and the Londoners Finn (Desmond Askew) and

Liam (Max Brown). While waiting for the next bus, they decide to go to a nearby cove paradise, where Kiko

(Agles Steib) will host them, and after a night party, they discover that they have been stolen and are

lost without clothes and without money in a strange country. Nor is it a matter of going into much greater depth in

the plot, but suffice to say that it ends up falling in all the topics of this type of films, with the exception

that in this nobody says that of "" separ���monos "". That yes, with all the well-connected characters can not be

exploited the uncomfortable feeling of helplessness of an isolated character in a hostile territory. The worst thing of all is

the slowness with which it develops everything: the first hour goes by showing us bikinis and caipirinhas of the most

varied. And this would not have to be bad when used to create a future climax, or to ask

the viewer what awaits the protagonists, but no, do not be fooled. ��en, that is not so. There is no cl���max and there is no

mystery about the fate of the characters, because between dance and bath they are responsible for gutting it all. The interpreters'

greatest ability is to look good in the bathroom. �adores, that's why the director, John Stockwell,

was also responsible for jewels such as Lethal Immersion and On the Edge of the Waves. In short, one more film

about the dangers of tourism, and that, based on the infamous Hostel, it seems (and I say well, it only seems) to

pose a minimal social criticism to American tourism. Although I suppose that, between water, alcohol and

other fluids, it will be sufficiently dissolved.

" 0

" A correct narrative that addresses issues of a humanitarian nature, but the approach remains in aidea,

"wild"well-intentioned but without capacity for reformulation or dissection. n of the underlying problems.

In front of films like this one, so thought for the purpose of giving moral, humanitarian or ethical lessons,

we must not lose sight of the discursive nature of a narrative not focused on its effectiveness and full accomplishment

, but is subordinated to the same discourse. In other words, the representation is divided into two

strata; the visual stratum and that of the word. With which we have that the representation is more a

spoken representation than imagined (image), and this produces a bias in the final result. A film before

which we perceive that its content and development could be equally understood with or without image, could never

be a great film, because it is more oral discourse that expresses the image (one should never get away from

the essence of cinema). The voice-over speaks more than the image itself, and this is also a consequence of the

poor visual capacity of the director Jim Hanon, without good is certain (and in this point we are faced with the

great handicap of the film) that in some key moments it shows a great precision: the scene of the deaths at the

hands of some Indians who at first did not seem hostile, but who then derive in brutal violence, or the

image whose function is the intersection center of the dramatic meaning: the one in which we see

Mincayani contemplating the photograph of the son of man that he has just given rte, whose helpless silhouette

we see in the background of the plane. That same photograph will play a fundamental role in the future, a key moment of

reconciliation and forgiveness. The truth is that all the elements are well organized in order to tell a

story as the bosses send, at a structural level you can not blame him for anything, the problem is the tricky narrative

and typical of the Mannerist narrative, at all times you want to control the thoughts of the spectator,

and that is something that should never be done when it is a reflective story, despite the fact that its intentions are

good. It is a film about violence and resentment, and about c��� The return to the origin (to the wound that

started the spiral of violence), and the recognition of the mutually inflicted violations, leads us to

forgiveness and empathy. What happens is that the whole discourse and thematic background is a typical in itself.

Rather, the film itself is flat like a folio, discursive and pamphleteering (religious morality

included), too often it is carried away by the precious and sentimental tone, both in the recreation n the

beautiful Amazonian landscape as in the drawing of the loving relationship between father and son (how many times have weseen

alreadythe hypermegatical farewell between a character who goes on board a vehicle - a plane, in this case

- and another character who runs while shouting "" I love you "", "" returns "" or things like that?). a

correct narrative that addresses issues of a humanitarian nature, but the approach remains an idea "" comod���n "",

well-intentioned but without capacity for reformulation or dissection of the underlying problems.

" 0

" The gui���n is very weak and falls into the trap of its structure that wants to be enigmatic and surprising and

becomes obvious and boring.

I'm very lazy Spanish cinema. I do not lose faith in him because as soon as a film appears that

is worth seeing and it's a big surprise, but in general I do not like it, that's why I choose Spanish

films. ��olas to see in movies with dropper. I was curious to see this movie, I had read good things about

it and I thought, well let's give it a try. Unfortunately I made a bad choice. Thenight

sunfloweris a rural thriller, maybe that would be its correct definition, although the word thriller is

very big. The film, narrated in a non-linear way, presents the same story narrated from the points of

view of the different characters that intervene in it. A priori, an approach if not original, at

least different, but that ends up being the most serious problem of the film. The film tells the visit to a village

of a group of speleologists (led by Carmelo G���mez) to investigate a recently discovered cave and

try to find cave paintings that can make the economy ���a of the village increase

considerably. Upon leaving the cave, a fact occurs that will mark their lives. The film starts well,

although with a horrible picture, the narrative has some tension until the traumatic event occurs, towards

the middle of the footage, and from there �� the film dies, agonizes, slowly. The characters that had

been protagonists until then disappear to give way to two others, both civil guard, who end up

being the protagonists of the story in the last section. A clear mistake, because it really is more important what

does not tell the story of the first protagonists. In addition to having all the tension and, practically,

solving the story in the middle of the footage, the rest is not interesting, it's more boring and makes you look at the clock.

his look at rural Spain, at the disappearance of the villages, the film hits and is stimulating, but

as a thriller it fails. The gui���n is very weak and falls into the trap of its structure that wants to be enigmatic and

surprising and becomes obvious and boring. The actors, with the exception of Carmelo G���mez and Celso Bugallo, do not give

much of themselves, the truth is, they are not credible, although they are not the worst of the film. The direction shows an

alarming lack of pace, very noticeable in its final section. The picture is frightening, full of noise, without

contrast. The repetitive music and without strength because the director only uses it when nobody speaks, he does not know

what to do with it.Resumiendo, an error. Although more a disappointment because the film in its initial stretch

points to something better than it ends up being in the end. A new failure of the Spanish cinema, to see if Alatriste

improves the panorama.

" 0

" Of popcorn and sof���. I recommend her. Batman is called that because he was afraid of the murcia and decides to face his fears. What a game

this gives! Imagine if you were afraid of sem���foros, chickens, cockroaches or strawberry calipo.

What little imagination did the creators of this character have (but what a good commercial vision, given that

CalipoMan would not have had such a pull, for sure). The film deals, as his name indicates, from the beginnings of

Batman. When he was a boy, his father was a rich altruist (science fiction begins) who gives his all for his

city. One day, it rewards him killing ���lya his wife, so Batman decides to travel the world in aplan

righteous. In a jail near where Moses gave the three voices, he is led by a man who wants to

put him in a kind of sect that is dedicated to cleaning the world of criminals. After adriestarle, spend mogoll���n

things that I do not tell. In this film spend so many things, it is worth how long it is. It

has nothing to do with the previous ones, we do not have a bad guy more foolish than a sweet potato, for example. The bad guys are

bad and rightly so, but really bad, nothing silly. The argument engages quickly and the story is

sympathetic. The secondary actors are good and they give very well the hit. And the special effects are not too

exaggerated and very correct. The final is what I thought was the most foolish and absurd, but it can happen because the

set is very good. Resuming, popcorn and sof���. I recommend: Do not you nothing if you had been

it.Besis.PDafraid of the cocks of water (if I do not say I burst and full of all the ulcers) .PD2: Pollaman, je, je.PD3: That

d�� �am���s silly, really ;-)

" 1

" Excellent Spanish comedy of the late nineties, The Miracle of P. Tinto has the best faces I

saw in a long time in the cinema, and in addition excellent performances.

Excellent Spanish comedy of the late nineties, Miracle of P. Tinto has 1. A simple humor, another

more violent, visual, surprising, and a third more lacerating, that includes a social criticism for

nothing na���f, although without reaching the cynicism.2. An enviable production and, above all, anaesthetic care

absolute, where art and photography desulminate for their beauty, prolixity and surprise in the context of a comedy

of this cala���a (I mean, comedy comedy, of those who make laughs, and not dramatic comedy orcomedy

romantic, with which smiles are outlined) .3. The best faces that I saw in a long time in the cinema, and also

excellent performances. In other words, a casting motherfucker. In short, a film more, much more than

recommended.

" 1

" It starts off in a promising way, introducing us to the characters with speed and simplicity, although from

the middle of the tape it starts to deflate.

There are films whose formal packaging shouts to the viewer so overwhelmingly how good and deep they

are, that it is easy to be fooled by them and conclude that, in effect, they are great movies. culas. ""Games

Secret"" (Little Children), the new work of Todd Field after "" In the room "", it seems to me one of those

movies. It tells the film, the story of a group of people whose lives intersect in the parks, pools and

streets of their small community. A bored mother (Kate Winslet) befriends a father (Patrick Wilson) who

stays at home while his wife (Jennifer Connelly) is out working. On the other hand, Larry (Noah

Emmerich), begins to worry about the presence in the neighborhood of a ped���filo (James Earle Haley) just

out of jail. One of the elements used by the film to be dressed in "" depth "" is the continuous

comparison with "" Madame Bovary "". It is not necessary to comment on the enormous differences between the society of the nineteenth

century and the current one, still not as big as I would like, and that completely invalidate the system. The author of the

script, in fact, is aware of these differences and invents a regrettable argument to "" justify "" the

infidelity of the character of Kate Winslet. Do you think that otherwise it would not be justifiable? Was it necessary?

If the work pretends to be a criticism of society, why does it offer the character such a simple excuse? In

fact, the film exudes a reactionary whiff that cries out to heaven. I am in favor of not judging a film because of

its ideology and I will not do it but I want to draw attention to the fact that, if Ithat detail, it

paid attention tois because the film I do not get hooked. To give a radical example I will say that when I see "" The triumph of the

will "" of Leni Riefenstahl I forget Nazism, moved by the beauty of the images. But I do not want you to

think that there is nothing good in the movie or that it has horrified me because it is not like that. It starts off in away

promising, introducing us to the characters with speed and simplicity, although from the middle of the tape it

starts to deflate. It is also true that the actors are very well, although I think thehas been exaggerated.

quality of the performance of Kate Winslet (great actress who is at her level but without great fanfare) and

the one of Jennifer Connelly who, for example, in the dinner scene,(pardon the cacophony) gives a

lesson in howlook at the cine.Mencin James Earle Haley he deserves composing a disturbed able to

l Pity and fear in equal parts and starring in some of the best scenes. Among them will remain in my

memory a great tribute to "" Tibur���n "" that is very intelligently embedded in the story. If you have

seen the movie, you may guess what scene I am referring to. As I say, the story gradually goes flat

until it reaches a really strange ending in the that the characters make stupid decisions with the sole

purpose of reaching the point desired by the director and the screenwriter. I could understand it and it would almost make sense,

if it were a ruthless criticism of American society, but that this criticism is not, to me, visible in

any way. At the moment. Sometimes we intuit it and I think that, as we wish to see it, we almost see it but we can not

do it without filling the gaps with elements of our invention. I do not think that is the correct way to

face a film. I can not stop commenting on the painful translation of the title of the film in Spain.

"" Secret games "" is clearly designed to attract audiences to theaters with the hope of encountering

an erotic thriller or something similar. In fact, some friends who asked me about the film ran

terrified as soon as I told them it was a drama. The original title, "" Little Children "", gives much more sense

to everything that happens. Because that's what all the characters are for scriptwriter and director: young children

unable to be clear about what they want, to fight for it, to take responsibility, to mature, to treat their

mental illness, etc? A pity that the intended message does not finish reaching the viewer or that they

intend to use it for gui���n tricks that border on ridicule. "" Secret games "" stays that way " � halfway through

the great film that could be but without falling into mediocrity either. Its critical repercussionme

seems to, in any case, excessive and temporary. Assessment moonfleet.es: 5 out of 10

" 0

" Reduce the soul of Beowulf to a medley of visual plagiarism in which the filmmaker does not exist, but the

production and the prefabricated idea.

In a translation from the literary language to the cinema, and more specifically in a genre motivated by

laws of entertainment that in our days derive from a model that seeks to recover the typical sense of

the legendary adventure, of the sword and witchcraft, the aspect of greater relevance is the style created - or to be created

- with which the written legend can have an expression �� Significant .lmica.So because the original text does

not have enough attributes, either because the adaptation lacks ease and imaginative impetus, the truth is

that Robert Zemeckis Beowulf shows a warm and impersonal texture, a pure technological device of doubtful

utility. For what do we want to digitize the human characters if this technique does not overcome - nor does it equal

- the expressiveness of the real actor? If the characters - already from the same conceptual base - are condemned to

be predetermined clichés in all their acts and words, to use them as a technological excuse is to trivialize the

product from the surface to the potential profund.A dramatic effects, the first fifty minutes

contain the elements of interest and the thickness of the typical intensity, while the final section is reduced to

a digital circus starring the drag�� And the Twilight King, towards a logical conclusion and subtly

embodied in the last game of plane-contraplane. This shows that we are facing a correct film of

entertainment, but that it does not take advantage of its own framework to raise the dramatic intensity essential in

this type of cinema, the end as an apotheosis of mythical characters. Great work, that's it, in photography and artistic

design, making an environment of legend in which we can glimpse a superfluous brushstroke (often with

details poorly explained) about the error , the lie, and the curse that persecutes the royal lineage, withthe underlying

sexual promiscuity astheme, and the struggle against the myth that imprisons Beowulf's mind. It is a pity

that Zemeckis' visualization is reduced to a pure industry production, with landscapes, planes,and

pitchesprogressions from the trilogy of rings Peter Jackson, 300, or the galactic hexagony of George

Lucas. That is to say, to reduce the soul of Beowulf to a medley of visual plagiarism in which the filmmaker does not exist,

but the production and the prefabricated idea.

" 0

" With an agglomeration of characters and events that never catch our attention, only

its sober special effects stand out and the hope that future deliveries offer here. That this

first part only insinuates.

Based on the novels by Philip Pullman, directed by Chris Weitz, and starring the young Dakota Blue

Richards along with a long cast of supporting characters played by Nicole Kidman, Daniel Craig, Sam

Elliot, Eva Green, Tom Courtenay, Simon McBurney, Jim Carter, Ben Walker or Clare Higgins among others, this

bridge at the beginning of December arrives at our billboards The golden compass, a film that initiates a new

fantastic saga in the line from The Crónicas of Narnia, The Six Signs of Light or the Everlasting Harry Potter. The

film, the first installment of a trilogy, situates us in a world parallel to the ours, in which humans

possess a kind of alter ego known as a daemon, represented in an animal form. Lyra, the protagonist of

this story, will embark on an unprecedented adventure to save two missing friends and

unmask the Magisterium, an entity that seeks to avoid everything that the world knows the existence of the-

socalled Powder, an aura that , through the daemons, allows humans to travel through different

parallel worlds.Triste start of fantastic saga supposes The golden compass.Obviando already the similarities that the

adaptation of Luces de norte has with the increasingly prolific franchises carried out by

children who flood our billboards in the last few years ���os, the film by Chris Weitz runs slowly

despite the constant agglomeration of events and the saturation of secondary characters that appear and

disappear throughout his footage. In this way, although the film hits ad opting for a relativelyapproach

more maturethan other fantastic titles, this is no more than a succession of events, but foreseeable,

yes � well-known, that almost never gets our attention: the story is monotonous, and

only the impressive as well as sober digital effects make it not let's take our eyes off the screen

too often, in a world with echoes of Victorian London already seen in the young wizard

Potter's franchise, albeit something more suburban, as if it were a fantasy novel On the other

hand, it can be said that the approach that The golden compass offers us 'in the long run' is much more

attractive than the immediate product, with a host of parallel worlds just mentioned in this first

installment and the interesting duality between humans and their daemons, the they represent the virtues and

weaknesses of their owners and maintain a vital bond with them. Special mention deserves the criticism that

presumably The golden compass realizes to the Catholic Church, concealed under the figure of the Magisterium, because

the film (the book, no idea) s just allows usinterpret the message, and if it were not for the

repercussion that this news has had on certain media, I rather doubt anyone really have in

terms of interpretive cuenta.En section refers, we find a Dakota Blue Richards solvent

but somewhat detestable at times, a completely laughable Nicole Kidman, a Daniel Craig anecdotal

but compliant, a sympathetic Sam Elliot and a pretty sad Eva Green not for its interpretation, but

rather for the role that it has had to exercise. In short, I could barely highlight from La br���jula gilt some

fantastic sets �sticos already some tremendously veros���miles and simp���t icos daemon, in addition to a fight betweenbears

polarquite successful. I give a 5 out of 10.

" 0

" I have the impression that it is a great movie. I went to the cinema to see something "" known "". When he left the

cinema, he had just seen something "" new "".

Today 5 years ago of the terrible events to which this film alludes. Especially in North America,

much has been discussed about the convenience or not of it. However, given the reception that the

United States has had, it seems obvious that it has come at a good time, both as a cinematographic work and

as a reminder of those who died in that sad, disconcerting and unforgettable date. . United 93

is a film whose outcome we know. Therefore, the game of the director with the spectator does not fit to see if

the end succeeds. Thus, only two possibilities fit. The first, that it is a kind of docudrama: a

notarial account of dramatic events that have taken place. The second, something similar to what I understand as the "essence"

of cinema: telling a story through predominantly visual elements. When the lights ofare extinguished

the room, almost without preamble, we are in the room of a hotel where some Muslims pray. They are

young. Their faces show tension. Obviously, the viewer, like them, knows the reason for the tension.

But the world, the cosmic world, still does not know it. It is night. After dawn, the young people are heading towards

the Newark airport. On the route, on a wall, you see a great title: "" GOD BLESS AMERICA "". "The others"

also pray. In my opinion, the whole film revolves around a great contrast between the before and the after,

between the before the flight 93 and the after, when, traveled the track, there is no turning back. The

first scenes show men and women who go their own way. In the background, routines, comments without major

importance, the inner world of each one and what he has to show to others. There are no heroes; There are neither

good nor bad. Neither are abstractions or caricatures; just ordinary people. Everything changes, but in the

horizon of the foreseeable. Much of what happened on the plane that made this flight is unknown. It is known

that at 09:24 on the morning of September 11, 2001, the commander of Flight 93 of United Airlines requested

confirmation of a warning message that had to received. It is also known that two minutes later, the

hijackers burst into the cabin and took control of the plane, probably killing the pilots and

a stewardess. It is known that, at 10:03, after the passengers broke the cabin door, the plane,

a Boeing 757-222 crashed into a Pennsylvania field, dying all its occupants. Greengrass, based on

various sources, including the official report and the testimonies of relatives, follows the course of the report,

devoting most of the screen time to the period between the takeoff and the terrible ones. moments

immediately before the fall of the plane. Yes, until the moment of takeoff, the rhythm has been

enough to maintain attention: jumping from one person to another, as a way of presenting thosebeings

anonymous, with their concerns , interests, illusions, more or less minor, because of the habitual thing, pointing out already

masterfully the character of some of them, the takeoff marks the great transformation. Obviously, those we

see on the screen still do not know anything, but Greengrass and we are and, consequently, impose anchange

obviousof pace. It's as if the takeoff run of the Boeing 757 symbolically indicated that acceleration,

until it became thrilling. The spectator expects something "" to happen "" that he already knows, but the director maintains the

tension of the spectator, inviting him to participate in the events, leaving him to ignore what he knows for

enter the action, so that it transforms the question by the "" what "" by the question by the "" when "".

That new rhythm will not stop until the end of the film. The camera, which quickly jumps from one person to

another, fragments of natural dialogues, interspersed, that overlap each other, make the narration take on

a verisimilitude of reportage, without losing, however, its quality of "" film "". But United 93 not only

presents what happened on the plane; It also shows the bewilderment, the panic and the chaos that seized all

those responsible for air traffic that morning, a symbol -as it seems to me - of the bewilderment, the panic and the

chaos that took over the "" first world "". The director may have thought it would be too much to lock ourselves in the

plane's cabin during the 35 minutes between the hijacking of the aircraft and its end. Well, because it would

be difficult to maintain the narrative tension in such a minimal environment or perhaps because he wanted to give us a

general overview of what happened that day. ��a, employs a narrative strategy that has always played in the cinema:

the story of "" United 93 "" is the story of all those involved, through continuous and increasingly

rapid cuts , who come and go from the airport, traffic control, to the command post of the

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the command of the Aerospace Defense Command of

North America (NORAD), where the people who are there (like all that first world) try to understand

what is happening. While the camera jumps from one place to another, there are some faces that stand out: Ben Sliney,

the director of operations who led the FAA command center on September 11, 2001, one of the

nine people from the FAA and the US Armed Forces who interpret themselves in the

film; Major James Fox, from the northeast sector of NORAD, who asks again and again where the

president and vice president are, highlighting the lack of leadership that became apparent that day . There are,

of course, images of the two planes that crashed into the two towers of the World Trade Center, but,

in my opinion, I think they are marginal notes that could have been dispensed. In short, I have the

impression that it is a great movie. As I said at the beginning, I went to the cinema to see something "" known "".

When he left the cinema, he had just seen something "" new "", to a certain extent, a sample of cinematographer:being

the narrated factsimportant and maintaining a true fidelity to the real events, I did not have the

impression of seeing a documentary, but a work constructed in such a way that the spectator enters into the function, coexists

with those who intervene in it, constantly keeps the attention and Enter into the atmosphere of

tension that surrounds the entire work. United 93 lasts 115 minutes and has been written and directed by Paul Greengrass.

Barry Ackroyd is, in my opinion, an excellent director of photography. The music, at all times adjusted to the

action, was carried out by John Powell. Tim Bevan, Eric Fellner, Lloyd Levin and the director himself have been the

producers. A curiosity of the translation: In a scene corresponding to the command center of NORAD (they are

preparing for a fictional tactical exercise), an officer refers to the fact that "Russian bears" are going to enter through

Alaska "" Obviously, it refers to the Russian bombers Tupolev TU-95, whose name in NATO code is Bear.viewer:

Recommended It's easy, anyone who likes movies.

" 1

" And if we all let go of that evil being that supposedly cohabit with us? Think about it well.

We are reunited with a new film that explores that evil inner side, which is supposed to have

all human beings. If in The Strange In Me, I explored the ability of a person to cause harm,

to take revenge for the loss of a loved one, on this occasion the motivation It's very different, since Mr. Brooks

acts by killing other people for an addiction. Although I rather believe that it is a mere excuse, to flee from his

boring and lonely life and become someone who can control his own destiny and that of others. The

interpretations of both Kevin Costner, who I think makes one of the best roles of his career, because it shows

perfectly as if he wants to resist killing, he can not avoid doing it again and that is

evident in his eyes and in his gestures, like that of William Hurt, who makes an alter ego perfectly and

knows how to play with the feelings and emotions of Mr. Brooks as if he managed a game of chess.

It impresses you is that you come to understand for a moment the motivations that lead to that person doing that

kind of thing, and therefore it is also important the character who is excited to contemplate and perform a crime

with him, because in a certain way you are also pricked by curiosity, by that anxiety that We have to know

everything. The only downside is that some scenes become excessively long and the story becomes heavy, but it

's a momentary thing. It's not that I've forgotten that I also Demi Moore is there, but it's because theduo has taken her out

protagonistso much on the screen that I did not even need her to show up.

" 1

" A mediocre blockbuster that for me, has received too many good reviews for what it really is: an

adventure movie with hardly any personality (coming from such a director director) that seeks

entertainment and little more

I'm not a fan of superheroes, but I have to admit that both Spider-Man and Superman are the ones

that attract me the most, maybe because they have more feelings than the others. Today I will talk to you about the second, the one I

used to watch on TV series (and something I liked most about him was how it was changed in the cabin). In 1978,

Richard Donner first blew a man on the big screen with Superm���n, based on the comics of

Joe Shuster and Jerry Siegel. The result was quite good, and I think thanks, apart from the originality, to

the actors: Christopher Reeve, Gene Hackman, Marlon Brando and Glenn Ford. Now, in 2006, we do not have this

"" redistricting "", but I do know Bryan Singer (director of the magnificent habitual Suspects, although it does not reach this

or the sole of the shoes), that does not get the same emotion, since the other one was a great innovation, but

it gives it a personal touch, and it shows. But Superman Returns, that's what this new version is called, it also

has its flaws, and I think it's imperative to comment: it presents a lot of t��� peaks of Northfilms

American, like the rescue of Lois and his son on the yacht or many di quelogos that you seem to know by

heart. These aspects lower the quality of the film, especially because it becomes less credible.

But I must also highlight some virtues that are not typical of this type of productions, such as

the way his Lex Luthor plan tells, several movements of the camera innovators and the spectacular

main credit titles. In f ,n, that as you can see, the film is quite irregular. I will not get much

longer, since half of what I would explain to you would already know (as the argument, for example, that is long, but

known). What I have to emphasize are the special effects, which as usual in this type of

film, are spectacular, both in the rescue scene of the plane, and in the final outcome. It should also be

mentioned that the scenes of action are very scarce, although they are brilliantly filmed and of

long duration; music, where the theme that John Williams composed for the first film

stands out; and finally, the good, but somewhat contained performance of Kevin Spacey playing the villain and

enemy of Superm���n, Lex Luthor. The rest of the performances are, really, very unbelievable, especially that of

Brandon Routh as Superman. A mediocre blockbuster that for me, has received too many good reviews for what

it really is: a movie. An adventure story with hardly any personality (coming from such a director) that

seeks entertainment and little else.

" 0

" Infamous spawn created by and for impenitent porreros. I guess that for what it's funny you have to be very

smoked, although I have to admit that there were a couple of moments that made me laugh. There are also women in

leather who dance sensual dances.

The brain of a film viewer must be reset from time to time, just like computers. We

get used to a level of quality, that everything seems bad. That is why there are people who, moved byhuman

kindness towards their fellowbeings, record these things for the good of Humanity. Thus, those of us who see it, reinitiate

our critical vision and appreciate more than we usually see. I was already with "" As smoke goes "" and I have

happened again with this. The film is about a flat shared by four colorful characters, three of them

joined by marijuana. With the money given by the only non-smoker, one of the inhabitants of the apartment buys a

second-hand water pipe (called Bong), which according to High Times magazine is cursed and its previous owner

died. Obscured by the beauty of said pipe, they place it in the lounge after smoking it. The following day,

after a delirious erotic festive sequence, one of the companions appears dead on the sof���.My half courgette

drowned in the t��� the beginning, just when we saw marijuana plants coming out. Well, more specifically

when I recognized that it belonged to Mr. Chong (the one in As Smoke Goes). Well, the film does not even reach the quality

to be called like that. The gui���n is tremendous, showing us how a killer bong wants to dominate the world by

releasing its fumes. All this allows us at the end a patriotic talk that parodies great titles that Inot

canmix in the criticism of this monster. The actors, evidently, are more bad thanmeat

dog. Special mention must be made to the special effects, which takes us to the oldermovies

B-series, where imagination replaces everything. , infamous spawn created by and forporreros

impenitent. I guess that for what it's funny you have to be very smoked, although I have to admit that there were a

couple of moments that made me laugh. There are also women in leather who dance sensual dances.

" 0

" Correct thriller to the clock that keeps the attention of the viewer mainly due to the relative

difficulty of finding out who is really behind the whole shed against the protagonist. Would it be released

in theaters if Pacino was not there?

Dr. Jack Gramm (Al Pacino) is a university professor who also works as a forensic psychiatrist for the

FBI. A few hours before the execution of an imprisoned prisoner is carried out thanks to his work, Gramm

receives a call threatening him that he only has eighty-eight minutes to live. So, in a little more than an

hour and twenty, he will have to find out who wants him dead, and try to save his life. There are not a few who

say that in In recent years, to look for good American cinema in stores, you have to go to the "" television

series "" section, where you can find products from alt��� level like "" Lost "", "" Alias ​​"", or "" 24 "". Precisely

the one starring Kiefer Sutherland is the one that has left the most impression on screen (large or small), as its

innovative montage and revolutionary screenplays begin to be imitated more and more frequently. . And "" 88

Minutes "" is a clear example of this. In fact, numerous are the similarities (almost plagiarism) between the film,

directed by Jon Avnet, and the series métis. Obviously, the first one is the option of telling the

story in real time (or almost) with some element that constantly reminds us of the minutes passed.

What on television were black screens with a thunderous digital clock counting the seconds, this

time they are phone calls remembering the time of life that is left to the protagonist. This resource serves

to influence a feeling of overwhelm throughout the film, and it is true that it does, but much

less does it in the same way that it happened in "" 24 "" (and is that maybe one thing is to maintain that frenetic pace

during the forty minutes of a chapter, and another to do it in a feature film). More cheeky a��� n is

the character of Pacino, a Jack Bauer somewhat older in years, but with the same characteristics, from his

interrelationship with the rest of the characters (Dr. Gramm spends almost the entire film attached to the mobile, just like

here), how to solve their problems, the distrust that sometimes generates his character, and even his

tone of voice.In reality, all this is not negative, because without elements like these the film would be lost without

remission, becoming a forgettable thriller so anod Not as stimulating. Because there is nothing more to

highlight from it. The script is quite conservative and is dedicated to move through clich���sm���s manidos of the genre.

It is a correct story to find out who is the bad guy, but nothing more. We appreciate the large number of dialogues

contained in the film (although they cause more than one beat of the rhythm, they differentiate it from the restproducts

of today's). �a), especially the last one that Pacino has with one of his students, in which he leaves anquestion

openof very difficult answer, but apart from this there is absolutely nothing more remarkable Nor can the

proceedings be overly praised, because they all seem apathetic and listless, doing monotonous work except for

some time Pacino (the phone talk - like no- with the condemned to death).highlights

Negativelythe presence of Leelee Sobieski, whose character does not change his facial expression, either while in

class or being attacked. But in reality, the real problem of "" 88 Minutes "" lies in the direction n. A

director with something more mordant (Michael Mann, for example) might have been able to build a much

more stimulating work, but Jon Avnet signs a completely impersonal film, without a single shot that can be

remembered five minutes after finishing the viewing, and with a dangerous scent of tv-movie present from the

first minute. An authentic waste. In short, "" 88 Minutes "" is a correct timethriller

trialthat keeps the attention of the viewer mainly due to the relative difficulty of finding out who is there. �

really behind all the shed against the protagonist. However, the raising ofcan not be avoided

certain questions. Would this movie exist if "" 24 "" does not exist? Was this small-translation of a genre

screennecessary? And the most important one would be premiered in cinemas without Al Pacino's presence?

" 0

" With brutal highs and lows, with a viral subframe that no one can understand and an end that

is pure delirium ...

After a decidedly spectacular start "" The Host "" soon reveals his Achilles' figure : It's 100% Korean. And

this explains why in his country of origin he has raised more than sixty million dollars and in Spain, France or the

United States he barely manages to stay in the top 10 m�� It's a couple of weeks. The Western public, among

which I logically include myself, is not yet ready for Asian cinema. Yes. The japan movies are cool. The

Korean women too. And the Chinese, of course. They have disturbing images, they are original, they attract attention. But we will

never be able to be completely filled, to be convinced. These guys really are very disturbed. It

comes to mind "" Old Boy "", "" The Curse "", "" Hero "", "" Audition "", "" Kung-Fu-Sion "", "" Battle Royale "" What's

wrong with these people? Is there something in the water they drink that makes them tarumbas? Is there another bacterium in the sushi

that they did not tell us about? All the named ones are tremendously novel films that revolutionize, in one

way or another, the thriller, the terror, the martial arts, the suspense, the comedy, the action. but with which we will

never connect because, unfortunately, we do not have our eyes torn. "" The Host "" hasscenes

magnificent, transgressive humor, characters that you adopt and visually is the ca���a. But the Japs are the

Japs and can not settle for doing, simply and plainly, a movie of monsters. They have to

mix terror and humor, politics and gore, Spielberg and Lynch. and, of course, that's how it works out. With a

brutal ups and downs rhythm, with a viral subframe that nobody ends up understanding and an end that is pure

delirium. What are we going to do? These guys are like that. They prefer to complicate their existence to sign masterpieces.

In spite of everything, and since the Gafapastas are almost legi���n, "" The Host "" will become a collector's item

as soon as it appears on DVD. I would never say it is a good movie (God forbid) but I dare say

that it is an entertaining rarity that will not leave anyone indifferent. How many American orfilms would

nationalkill for a review like that!

" 0

" A cold and empty film, whose soul emerges from time to time and where the form prevails over acontent

scattered and soulless. No doubt? The black dahlia ?, version of Palma, will disconcert both its (many)

detractors and (few) defenders.

Brian De Palma's obsession for the stairs, and the scenes starring Mia Kirshner, in themselves

a small film inserted in another larger one. This, plus some cin���fila reference, and a couple ofsequences

magnificently plannedis the only thing that has interested me about the new film by the director of "Los

untouchable "". A nostalgic-cin���fila operation to revive the classic spirit of the black cinema of the 40 that,

as the fans, adapts the famous novel that James Ellroy inspired in the rugged case of the

murder of a young aspiring actress, Betty Short (Mia Kirshner), nicknamed "" the black dahlia "" by a

journalist. The convoluted plot, and all this is one of the characteristics of the black cinema, links with other

subplots, replete with sex and crime, until we get rid of the dedectivesque development of the argument and

force us to focus our attention on the description of environments m���ss���rdidos and the ambiguity of his

characters. A material, at first sight, suitable for De Palma, who seems to take very seriously this

"" throw us "", because it manages to a few minutes of projection stop being interested in what happens on

screen. does your miscasting contribute powerfully? ("" errors of distribution "") in which De Palma, apart from

his pompous camera movements, is also an (involuntary) specialist. Remember that adaptation of "The

Bonfire of the Vanities" with Tom Hanks, Bruce Willis and Melanie Griffith, where no actor seemed appropriate

to the character. Here the same thing happens. On the other hand, the style of De Palma is manifested in all its splendor in the

celebrated sequence shot that links the discovery of the body of "the black dahlia" with a shooting. And also

in a tense sequence with the two male protagonists on spiral staircases (in the style of "" The

Untouchables ""). Also surprising is that (grotesque) sequence shot in an objective camera (like if the camera

were the eyes of the spectator himself) entering the Linscott mansion and introducing us to his eccentric

tenants. Remember that one of the few films, and the one most remembered, made entirely in ""camera

subjective"" was "" The lady of the lake "" (Lady in the lake, Robert Montgomery, 1946). And that fixation of de Palma by

the stairs? These appear in abundance. In one of the first scenes he makes his three protagonists, Kay

Lake (Scarlett Johansson), Bucky (Josh Hartnett) and Lee Blanchard (Aaron Eekhart) meet the p���e for the first time.

of a white stairway. Here they are a framework of aesthetic encounter and transition. Well then we will see that Bucky and

Blanchard, former boxers of completely opposite characters, "" fire "" and "" ice "", will become inseparable friends,

ascend to police inspectors, and with Kay, Blanchard's wife, and a? femme fatale? in

"light" version, it will be possible to form an almost idyllic triangle. The stairs, whether with "" V���rtigo "" guides or The "

Battleship Potemkin", have become for De Palma an ideal space to create suspense and reproduce

fears, such as the aforementioned tension sequence with Bucky and Blanchard on the spiral staircase. It is

used to visualize the barriers between the characters. Like the scene where Bucky looks at Kay

while undressing in his room, upstairs, (an "object" forbidden as the wife of his best

friend). But the set is pure artifice. A cold and empty film, whose soul emerges from time to time and where

the form prevails over a dispersed and soulless content. Without a doubt "" The black dahlia "", version of Palma, will

disconcert both its (many) detractors and (few) defenders.

" 0

" Good interpretation, magic direction, very good special effects, a beautiful story to tell,

a double dimension finish and the aut��� personal brand of Guillermo del Toro.

I have to say, that "" The labyrinth of the faun "", has reminded me a lot of "" The backbone of the devil "" In addition to

working with children again, del Toro repeats that sensation Van vague two-dimensional end, that is to say an end that

according to the dimension that you choose to interpret it will seem like an atrociously cruel ending or an ending never

better said, fairy tale. This is what happened to me when I saw my backbone and again I repeat sensations

with El laberinto del Fauno. It is a very Guillermo movie, with its personal stamp, not having the pressure n of

large producers as it could happen in Blade II and Hellboy (whose second part is being made at the

moment, premiere scheduled for 2008), has been fully released to fall into that magical world that

leads within and that he possesses it when he rolls with freedom. Del Toro is possessed by his work and reveals a world that is

perhaps imaginary, maybe not, that rocks with a cruel reality of a bitter time in

Franco's Spain. .The time comes to speak of the fragile Ophelia (Ivana Vaquero), which looks a fluff on thelip

upperthat seems to me moustachioed according to plans (consider the light, the spotlights? that increase or

decrease the visibility of the fluff) and that I have to shout from the rooftops that distracted me

continuously and took me out of context. Because of this fluff, I had continual heartburn. The question

then is: why does a director like Guillermo del Toro miss the fact that there are some

plans in which the girl wears a mustache? Please forgive me Ivana she is a fantastic actress, but

this is unforgivable, a director who cares so much about her aesthetics, I'm not worth the excuse that it was to give her

realism, because, a "That age with a mustache is absolutely horrible, they could have put a little

Andean (dye for hair on the upper lip) and have at least" "disguised" ", the mustache would have been just

as realistic, but more beautiful to be blond hair instead of ���negrooooo! Sergi L���pez? sublime, as always. I

was amused by the cameo of Federico Lupi, sitting on his throne although there is very little sequence time for such a

big actor. I do not have anything bad to criticize about the film in general, the existential void thatyou

leaves, due to the end of the double dimension. Good interpretation, m Management direction, very good special effects,

a beautiful story to tell, a double-dimension finish and the authentic personal brand of Guillermo del

Toro, director who It grows with each tape that runs and for me one of the best currently in the fantastic

genre. Round movie.

" 1

" Entertaining film of the season, which is original in the approach and also in the resolution.

Let's see how we say this without being stoned, but I reminded myself, saving the abyss, to Perpetual Chain. Ay,

ay, ay, do not throw stones at me, they really look alike, and if you do not see her and tell me if she does not remember you. By the

way, that great movie Cadena Perpetura, if you have not seen her, go to the video club urgently for

her. The film is about a couple of kids, she a duchess and the son of carpenter, who want to live an

impossible friendship in the Austria of the late nineteenth. After the years, they meet again, he became

the best illusion magician in the world and she in the future woman of the heir to the Empire. And betweentricks

incredible, police investigations, palace intrigues, unresolved crimes and clandestine

amories the narration runs. Well, I liked the film a lot. My half-courier said about fifteen times that it

seemed slow, and I had some reason, but I did not care. Mr. Norton's performance is fine, but it's not

the best. The tricks if they are creepy and the atmosphere also seems very successful. The argument is

not bad, with several stories intertwined, not of great depth, but we go to the movies to have fun andourselves

entertain, not to burn neurons. And the ending seemed wonderful to me, that I needed something like that, without

violence, magical and beautiful. Resuming, entertaining film of the time, which is original in the approach and

still in the resolution. It is appreciated that the special effects are just and necessary, without fanfare.

" 1

" Sponsored by Fernando Trueba, the young Navarrese director has surprised everyone with a daring film.

A film of remarkable, entertaining, fresh, interesting.

Excellent debut of F���lix Viscarret in full-length film. Sponsored by Fernando Trueba, the youngdirector

Navarresehas surprised everyone with a daring film, Bajo las estrellas, based on the novel "El trumpetista

del Utop���a" by Fernando Aramburu. As Trueba said in the preview: the best thing about Viscarret is that he has

his own style, something that many never manage to achieve. I agree, and in Malaga they should think alike:

better film, director, actor, protagonist and novel guide. The story is relatively simple: Benito, a

second-rate trumpeter, unsuccessful, drunk and disoriented, he returns to Estella, his hometown, to

attend the funeral of his father. There he recovers part of the lost time with his brother Lalo,bonach���ne

innocent, and decides that it is worth prolonging the visit to free him from the woman he is going to marry: Nines

(once a reveler and too much precocious for everything). However, upon meeting his daughter Ainara (rebellious and

introverted) an unexpected friendship is born and new paths are opened. It is difficult to decide between comedy with

dramatic overtones or drama with chemical overtones. In any case, the laughter is guaranteed, even the laughter, but it

also has a very emotional point, a very human background, with lost characters, mistreated, unhappy,

unsuccessful. Life does not smile too much and if they ever had dreams, they have forgotten them. However,

the others will find enough motivation to move forward. And one, in the middle of the film, can be

concentrated, thinking about those things, about how cruel life can sometimes be, about injustices, etc. and

suddenly listening to some stupidity in the mouth of Benito (Alberto San Juan) and not being able to avoid doubled up laughing. No doubt

the acidity of this character, who calls sow his young friend, and who has no qualms about giving a little

march to the funeral of his father, is one of the strengths of the film. They are, in fact, all the characters,

interpreted in an excellent way. They also highlight the photograph of Álvaro Guti���rrez and the music of Mikel

Salas (both elements successful, careful, always accompanying the tone of the story but without taking the

role). In short, a film of remarkable, entertaining, fresh, interesting, to which, to put some

snag, maybe there is some footage.

" 1

" The film is very well directed, that is undeniable, but, despite the good things that I have told,did

Inot like it.

Well, yesterday night I was in the pass for academics of "" The way of the English "". This is my verdict. This

is undoubtedly one of the criticisms that has cost me the most work, I do not know if this will be significant. This

film is based on the famous novel by Antonio Soler, awarded with the Nadal of 2004 and which Antonio

Banderas as director, adapts for the cinema in a quite peculiar. I thought it was remarkable how

Antonio chose to tell us this story that in my opinion is quite vulgar. In this case I stay more with

the c quemo than with the qu���.This story that a principle (for what I said about the way of telling

things), it may seem like an aut�� Pajantica mental straw, narrates with the deep voice of Fran Perea (Congratulations Fran)

the crossroads of teenage lives that are at a point on the road of life in which they decide to

move away from the destiny that they had fixed, for to flee from its sad reality and achieve its dreams, the

path of the English, shown as allegory in the materialization of a street in Malaga. Excess of sex, which

I came to be even grotesque in some scenes. An ode of the Andalusian, with the rescue of the best

actors that this land has given, like Juan Diego, native of Bormujos (Seville). To emphasize the direction of

actors, which I thought was very good, Antonio's involvement at this point and the beautiful photo is noticeable on

many occasions. As a lover of burned planes, I have to admit that I was fascinated by one of thesequences

finalwith Victoria Abril (great by the way) and Alberto Amarilla FACE to FACE. From Alberto I want to say that

I liked his interpretation, the expressiveness of his eyes, this is an actor that communicates, that reaches you,

although you have to improve some techniques. Undoubtedly the worst part of this cast is Mar���a Ruiz, who is excessively bigger

in the camera, for the paper (bags, crow's feet and lines of expression included) this actress whom

we have previously seen in "" The amazing world of Borjamari and Pocholo "", does not quite convince me, his performance

is mediocre and l���neal? crass mistake its presence in this film, eye does not mean that it is bad actress,

simply that they are not suitable neither their profile nor their interpretation. Absolutely all the actors in this

cast, I seem older for the role they play, all, except someone like the grandfather, The body

(great Mar���a Nieto) and some more, in particular I refer to the adolescents, we continue to insult the

viewer by putting 28-year-old actors to play the role of a 19-year-old boy, lamentable, unbelievable andnightmare

totalwho wanted to flee with fear from the room. liked this raid of Banderas as a director because,

the film is very well directed, that is undeniable, but, despite the good things that I have told, I did not

like it. To those who do not like auteur films that do not go to see it, because this is undoubtedly antape

author's. Soundtrack, curious and evocative.

" 0

" Extremely entertaining, with well-delineated characters and situations of the most hilarious. Anentertainment

assured, destined more than children.

Barry B. Benson is a bee concerned about her future. The idea of ​​creating honey day after day for the rest of

his life without any rest terrifies him, so he decides to take risks and leave the interior of his hive to

know the outside world before being forced to face the inevitable. In his particular journey, he manages to

stay safe and sound thanks to Vanessa, a human who saves him from a terrible death by crushing. Barry

is suddenly attracted to her, and would do anything to thank him for the gesture, but for that he would have to

break the first law of the hive: it is strictly forbidden to speak with humans. Difficult task is asked

for the new Dreamworks proposal. After seven years of exploitation of the flagship of the production company, it

is already beginning to show notable signs of exhaustion. Therefore, Simon J. Smith and Steve Hickner, directors

of "" Bee Movie "", must show that there is more to life than the brazen green ogre. For that, that's it, they had

an important ace up their sleeve, as is Jerry Seinfeld in the tasks of screenwriter and doubler. Although the

final result still does not come too close to the level of Pixar productions, the truth is that they have

far exceeded the goal, creating a film (and a character) that has nothing to envy the

trilogy. ��a of "" Shrek "". The main difference between bee and ogre is that the creators of "" Bee Movie "" are not

limited to offer us a succession of gags based on laughing at other movies. Here they build a script

around the characters and the situation in which they engage, and the jokes are intertwined in the dialogues and

actions of the same, resulting very little forced. So much so that even the (few) jokes that

refer to the viewer's references work perfectly. Although much of the success of these may

reside in that focus on characters or programs less obvious than you might fear (there is not a single

guide to the scenes with stop-motion of "" Matrix "", I dare say that for the first time in the history of

Dreamworks). Take as an example the characterization that makes an actor as unusual as Ray Liotta. But what

makes "" Bee Movie "" a different movie is what counts. Because what starts as another successor of

"" Monstruos, SA "", that is, two colleagues working in a world parallel to that of humans, with a single

company in which all the bees work (it includes scenes that are too similar even visually, such as the

arrival at work by car on the part of the two main characters), gradually distancing themselves and

acquiring their own personality, creating a real mountain There are very unforeseeable events that

end up with aerial accidents starting from a grain of sand, such as the exit of the bee from its

hive (the truth is that its beginning can also be remember a lot to "" Looking for Nemo "", now that I think about it).

In addition, the whole central part of "" Bee Movie "" belongs to the legal genre, something in total opposition to the

children's cinema that will manage to entertain something more to the adult public, already tired of these films being

limited to parodying scenes from other movies. And as I mentioned earlier, Barry is charismatic,

dynamic and very well defined. He is a bit stereotyped, but at no time comes to bother

thanks to his mordant comments, brushstrokes that his actor infuses and that make the bee is

truly hilarious. Everything would seem to indicate that we are talking about the definitive animated film, or the

Dreamworks victory over Pixar. Unfortunately, it's not like that. Because where "" Bee Movie "" does not innovate or an apex

is in its background. Despite the originality of the situations (bees talking to men, judges and courts,

honey companies with clear references -this time- to the human hives of "" Matrix "", Ray Liotta and Sting.),

the film follows a path as predictable as its final sweetening, which makes it lose many integers on

numerous occasions. Thus, to the minimum that the bee does not take out any comment of its own, or that

there is no other twist of argument, the rhythm gets stuck, and the Film becomes somewhat honeyed because

it focuses too much on a script that is not always up to scratch. Even so, it is a highly

entertaining film, with well-delineated characters (and well-folded) and situations of the most hilarious. An

assured entertainment, destined to be bigger than children (who will get bored when they do not have too many scenes of

visual spectacular action), and a very nice invoice. This should be the correct way forward for the

production company, which nevertheless continues to resort to its golden egg hen and has already announced the

fourth part of "" Shrek "". 7.5 / 10

" 1

" A really violent story A Violent Story, 2005, is truly VIOLENT. Never better put a title. Please, do not

think to go with your nephews under 10 years old because they would be left for psychiatric therapy forfive years

at least. Death and sex explicit and in close up. But apart from vioLENTA it is SLOW. So slow that in many

parts it is suffocating. That is to say, the film causes stress, because between that nothing happens or thethings

cruellesthappen from one moment to another. I went to see it with too many expectations, because it was promoted as one of

the best premieres of the year, strong candidate for the Golden Globe, etc. But nothing to see. The performances of the

majority of the cast are innocent and unprofessional. Very bad casting. The performance of the protagonist,

Viggo Mortensen (The Lord of the Rings, 2001-2003) is good, as are those of the actors Ed

Harris (Las Horas, 2002) and William Hurt (Artificial Intelligence, 2001). But the rest of the cast?

"0"

What really surprised at the narration of different stories, drawn perpendicular, is the

vision that swoops on the enigmatic main character and Mankiewicz's refusal to address

expl Quite infidelity.

"" Dear Debby, Lora Mae and Rita .. "" Following the advice of Louis Mayer, Joseph L. Mankiewicz "" I walked a lot

before I started walking "". Which means that, before directing, he did important production works

for the Metro, and established himself as one of the best writers of the 30s, cultivating all the genders and

highlighting as a dialogist. The prestigious "" crawling "" earned him the recognition of the Hollywood of the time,

getting an Oscar nomination as a producer of George Cukor's Philadelphia Stories and another for

the gui���n of Skippy in 1931. His first film after the cameras, The Castle of Dragonwyck, arrives in 1946

to sicken the ironic, delicate, elegant and subtle Erns Lubitsch; starting with her a meteoric and successful

career that makes her the essential filmmaker who never conceived a good film without the support of

a solid story. Said in his own words: "The difference between real life and movies is that a

script has to make sense. Life is not "". Sense, irony, mordacity, good humor and charm come together in this

delicious comedy of 1949, with which he gets his first two Oscars (direction and adapted guide) ). Then,

there would be mythical titles in the history of cinema, such as Eva al Desnudo (won two other statuettes), La Desdesa

Descalza or La Huella, su � Last footage.In Letter to Three Wives, adaptation of a story by John Klempner,

contemporary authors, -empted to incorporate voice-overs in their films- , you will find a

master lesson on how to apply them. As is clear from this excellent reference, this, basically, is limited to

the introduction of scenes, channeling the argument and defining the backstory of the characters. At no

time does the omnipresent narrative compete with the images or diminish their protagonism. He knows how to intervene and,

above all, when not to do so. Your mission is to complete, never interrupt or fail. Without a doubt, the

balance that did not reach the acclaimed Todd Field to spoil the adaptation of Secret Games.of the

Anothergreat attractions of this film lies in the successful use of flashback, which it is resorted to by the

demands that come from the gui���n itself. According to the novel, Addie Rose does not attend the annual charity snack,

failing her three best friends. Failing that, he sends them a farewell letter, in which, in addition,

he tells them that he has escaped with the husband of one of them! The three protagonists recall theirlives

conjugalin order to find out the terrible truth: with what? Another extraordinarylesson

cinematographicthat justifies the election of a certain technique for needs derived from the production,

not for the mere whim of doing it; attitude very like the current directors. On the other hand, the establishment

of actors exceeds the most optimistic expectations. Linda Darnell's expressions are memorable; the

apparent frivolity of Jeanne Crain, plausible; and the interpretation of Ann Sothern, incarnating the prototypical

American worker of the late forties, unbeatable. Meanwhile, the male response is not to be

expected, being represented by the restrained and accurate work of Jeffrey Lynn, the magnificent debut of

Paul Douglas and the inestimable eschatical presence of the unspeakably good Kirk. The masterful touch is rounded off

with some frames that force the cinema to love (the looks that the three wives direct to thebooth

phonewhen the ship moves away), with improbable situations destined to provoke the laughter of the

most demanding spectator (the dinner starred by the outrageous radiophonic sponsors), with scenes

endowed with a moving dramatic charge (the desperate monologue that shows the transformation �n by Debby), an

impressive black and white photograph that diffuses the smoke of cigarettes, a

meticulous and artistic direction and the exquisite dialogues, impossible to unthinkable in any a recent film.,

Althoughperhaps, what really surprises in the narration of the different stories, drawn in perpendicular, is the

vision that is thrown on the enigmatic character principal and Mankiewicz's refusal toaddress

explicitlyinfidelity. Some aspects as significant as easy to explain. It is only necessary to think

that Addie is not more than the touch of attention required by sleeping loves, the illusion that preventsneglect

sentimental. Something that, ignoring the warning that we will hear at the beginning, of course it has a lot to do

with me ... or with you.

" 1

" Another worthy but failed comedy of the many that come to us each year. That yes, I think that to see a

failed comedy is better to see one made in Spain than one made in the USA, if only to support our

industry.

Despite being one of the most difficult to tackle since it is rarely done well, comedy is still one

of the most common cinematic genres in our cinemas. Once the proposal comes to us from Spain and

is signed by Roberto Santiago (�? � Happy men? ??, El ?? The longest penalty in the world? ??)

on a wink written by himself along with Juan Vicente Pozuelo and Curro Royo. Unfortunately, this time

too, the result is not satisfactory. The premise of "The suicide club"?

more interesting, although the little one can be attributed to Robert Louis Stevenson, author of the "set of

homonymous stories"? � from which the writers extract the central idea : a group of people toworthless

commit suicidedecidedfound a club in which jugarn each week quin is he who kills another member and quin

and It's the one that dies. One of the problems is that the film does not finish exploiting the chemical possibilities of

that premise, focusing more on doing that kind of jokes �? ? TV comedy style?? �, which

unfortunately are so fashionable in our cinema. In fact, it does not end up being defined openly as a

comedy � ?? of those of troncharse�? � and, sometimes, it opts for a darker tone that does not even set at

all.The result produces a clear mismatch between the dramatic and chemical moments that, moreover, are neither as

dramatic nor as dramatic as would be desired. The actors try to save the function but they barely get it.

Fernando Tejero, possibly capable of bigger companies, needs an urgent change of registration because I see him

pigeon-holed forever in the same paper while Luc���a Jim���nez becomes, again, a morbidlywoman

attractivewhich, in his case, does not have excessive m���rito.In definite another worthy but failed comedy of the

many that arrive to us each year. That yes, I think that to see a failed comedy is better to see one made in

Spain than one made in the USA, if only to support our industry.

" 0

" Brick is one of the most original, daring and fresh products of the past year, everything that

Palma did not give us with its Black Dahlia, Rian Johnson gave it to us in Brick, a dark, intelligent,

convoluted film, hypnotic extra���ae.

I would not lie if I said that one of the biggest problems, if not the biggest, of theHollywood industry

currentis the scarcity of original and daring ideas. The most interesting products reach us mostly

through the small screen, television is becoming a constant source of ideas for the world

of cinema. Every year there are a couple or three of high quality series. One of the most interesting series of

the last few years is Ver���nica Mars, which I have already been told to write about. A series that

managed to move the spirit that enjoyed the first seasons of Buffy Vampire Slayer,

adding touches of the best film noir, what has come to be called the teen -not to go. And there is, in part, the

success of Ver���nica Mars in knowing how to conjugate so brilliantly, two worlds, in appearance totally different

as they are the classical film noir and movies. Letters and series about teenagers, adding the serial factor that

television has, and being able to offer each week a piece of that mystery. In this year that we have already left

behind, it has brought us many disappointments, but also some surprises, films of which a priori

little or nothing was expected, or of which we even ignored its existence, one of those pleasing, most gratifying

surprises is "" Brick "", the film of the rookie and promising filmmaker Rian Johnson, the m��� It's close that we can

find Ver���nica Mars in the movies, but unlike this one, "" Brick "" moves away much more from the teen and approaches

the film noir, something that at first can remove realism, but that makes "" Brick "" a more

complete and sometimes fun product with a touch of humor really achieved. In "" Brick "" we find all

the topics about black cinema and each of its characters, the tormented detective, the femme fatale, the

confident companion, the "" mafioso "", the mat ���n? but this time it's about simple teenagers. Brick not

only demystifies the genre in terms of its characters, but also in its locations, here there are no

dark alleys of big cities like Chicago or Los Angeles, here �� We are in a small town

in Southern California, and the action places us in long high school corridors, large open spaces,fields

soccer, long roads , etc? The atmosphere sometimes reminds us of the Coen cinema and David Lynch's cinema

(for example the house of The Pin) and it is similar to the sordidness of "TP: Fuego Camina Conmigo" and in

general to the visual elegance of David Lynch and his cinema. Brick is one of the most original, daring

and fresh products of the past year, everything that Palma did not give us with its Black Dahlia, Riangave it to us

Johnsonin Brick, a dark film, intelligent, convoluted, hypnotic extra���ae. A film shot with an

immense sense of elegance and the narrative pulse, with great scenes like the protagonist's fight with thethe

leader offootball team or the pursuit through the corridors of the institute . Two small samples of the

virtues of Brick and what a future Rian Johnson can offer us.

" 1

" The director of In the arms of a mature woman turns Flora Mart���nez into one of her tourist guides:

join the city's underworld and see what does not appear in the city. the travel guides.

If there is a cinema-by-color classification, this film would have a grayish, intense blueand

tonebrown tones very close to black. Chromatic curiosities aside, Tuya is always a sample of black cinema

whose patterns have been reviewed by an interesting filmmaker for daring, a priori.Correct thriller with

social conscience and successful is the portrait of this other Barcelona, ​​far from the neighborhoods se���oriales, the

tourist centers and sheltered from the modernist air and the winding modernilla. The scenario where two

marginalized people live (played by Mart���nez and Rub���n Ochandiano) serves as a meeting point for beings who

remain in dangerous balance, always with the threat of falling into emptiness. profiled the performers, it

was necessary to define the plot (s) and it is here where this tape weakens, that it suffers the excesses of a somewhatrhythm

decompensatedand the idea of ​​puzzle in the montage. Even so, this new vision of the 'otheris very interesting

side', portrayed by means of an accurate setting, an outstanding musical support and a correct photograph. ��a

of the teacher Jos��� Luis Alcaine. Where is also confirmed Lombardero is in the direction of actors: Nancho Novo

takes two of two in a very short time, because we do not forget Pudor.It is one of these unfortunate beings that

they swarm through these islands dominated by traffickers, prostitutes, small-time mobsters but capable of doing a

lot of damage and delinquents with dreams. We do not have the need to distinguish between good and bad: everyone has a

reason to be there and do what they do. Without influencing his criteria and despite these pieces

of no-life being seen, Manuel Lombardero could have ground the tooth with more force. But maybe,

not too much blood.

" 0

" Fear, despair, tedium, curiosity, exhaustion, intensity, frustration, fascination, despair, you will

leave the cinema spinning around what you have seen or tried to forget.

Fear, despair, boredom, curiosity, exhaustion, intensity, frustration, fascination, despair,

all these sensations and more you can have during the three hours that lasts the new torment and / or

genius perpetrated by David Lynch. To begin with, do not pay attention to the official synopses that you can find out

there, they have little to do with what you are going to see. The film begins with a girl watching

television and crying, a scene that will reappear throughout the footage and is one of the keys to

unraveling this complex film. The following scene is another good example of the cinema to whichhas accustomed us

Lynch, the visit of the new neighbor in which a dialogue is achieved that little by little is growing in tension and

absurdity, what he promised. to be an innocent visitor ends up becoming something really strange, perverse and

terrifying. From here and during the first hour of the film everything seems to be more coherent and

meaningful, but the entrance through a mysterious door with an extra�� Nombreo name marked in chalk in an alley

will make the protagonist find the evil (already prophesied in the scene with the neighbor) and it is here where it goes

back, where everything begins to become confused and where the nothing seems to make sense. And it is that in Inland Empire all

it is a turn back, everything is cyclical, it mixes yesterday, today and tomorrow without us knowing very well

which one is which, like the real life of the actress and her fictional character in the filming of a movie that

is a remake of a cursed film that never saw the light. Lynch plays with love and sex, and again mixeslife

realand fiction between the idyll of the actress and the actor, both married in real life and in fiction and whose

acts will have There are serious consequences, as we are already warned. The succession of scenes, in principle without meaning,

seem to have a certain coherence in small details, each scene is referenced in another and everything seems to be a

confused dream. ���o, or nightmare, in which things are mixed and we are told the same thing over and over again but with a

different scenario, in different times but with a certain similarity. There are patterns that are repeated during the

footage, and when everything seems to come to an end, we are taken back to the principles of the film and

dislodged one more time. Again the references to the cinema within the cinema, the reality and the fiction fused

in the mind of a Hollywood star that arrives at the end of the journey of the really emaciated film, a

Laura Dern in an interpretation There are a thousand details to decipher in Inland Empire, to number them all here would be

impossible, but I have already given some, the rest will have to find them and collect all the pieces for

try to give some sense to the film, if you really get to find it, surely you have to see the

film twenty times and even then the doubts will remain, maybe It's just Lynch who has the solution in his head, maybe he does not even

know it, in any case you'll come out of the cinema turning over what you've seen or tried forget it

" 1

" A strange story, too forced, told as such. The result, in addition to predictable and

disappointing, is boring.

I think that there are few directors capable of having such a short and at the same time irregular trajectory as M.

Night Shyamalan. It is hard to believe that the infumable "" Signals "", with Mel Gibson taking the opportunity to give

lessons in morality while escaping the aliens, is the work of the same director that "" The sixth sense "",

one of the best suspense films of recent years. Therefore, the premiere of "" The young woman of the water "" was quite

an unknown. Would it be great? Would it be acceptable? Would it be bad? I found it disappointing. Very

disappointing I have read several reviews that praise her. Normally, they claim a kind of right to create

worlds full of fantasy in the cinema. All that is great. Personally, I like the idea of ​​asking what would

happen if magic entered the world of everyday life. Just as I already did in "" El"", where heus

Protegidoshowedthe emergence of a typical superhero of c���mic -with a characteristic uniform and a supervillain included-

in an environment family, Shyamalan does not situate the protagonists of "" The young woman of the water "" in an enchanted forest,

but of the pool of blocks of buildings. The characters of the story have their correspondence inpeople

ordinaryand the environment is familiar, as if what happens could happen, in reality, to

anyone. The problem of the film is not this approach, but the way to solve it. Unlike

"" The sixth sense "", where the viewer was discovering the secrets little by little, the narrative rhythm of "" The

young woman of the water "" is excessively precipitate. It does not allow you to immerse yourself in the story to the rhythm of the protagonist,

but suddenly everything has happened. She is already there, we all know who she is and what is happening and nobody has

had time or surprise. We just have to wait for the end, which comes after a couple of veryturns

simple and predictable- nothing to do with, for example, "" The forest "" (to quote an example that is not " "The sixth

sense" ") -. The characters, on the other hand, are excessively flat. How can a group of

apparently so different people react exactly the same to an unbelievable situation? Shyamalan knows it. I

do not Finally, the "" explanation "", which appears in the form of a story from the neighbor, is too forced. A

strange story, told as such. And that's it. The result, in addition to predictable and disappointing,

is boring. What could have been a beautiful film about the fantasy that could enter at any

moment in our day is something to forget . Some people say that Disney must be suffering

for having let M. Night Shyamalan escape. I rather believe that he is breathing in relief.

" 0

" Ultraviolet is Ultramala, it's been a while since I saw anything like that. We have it all: pathetic phrases,insults

subliminalto the spectator, pathetic interpretations, incongruities in the story, the list is very long.

Well, excuse my dear readers but these days since the premiere have been very busy and I have not had

time to write, but here I am again. Let's talk about ultraviolet that for those who do not

know is the last mess, I say. film by Mila Jovochich (The 5th Element). What surprised me most about the film

is the subject matter, I think we're all in the frame, nobody he imagined that the thing was aboutvampires

victimized. Ultraviolet is Ultramala, it has been a long time since I saw anything like that (from the avengers of UMA THURMAN)

and that is that Mila loves us, fascinates us, is very good, she is wonderful, she has overcome herself as an actress, yes, yes and yes,

we know, but fuck, me, this humble servant wants to know, why all her films have the seal

"" Bodrio Danger " " on the cover page. This girl could be more interpretive, but of course she is

insultingly beautiful and as she now takes vulgarity, she is only offered shit scripts. Milita will end up like

Charlize Ther��� n, having to produce their own movie (Monster) so that they respect her as an actress and have an option

to the Oscar that she actually took (very well deserved). In Ultraviolet, we have it all. Ethics,insults

subliminalto the viewer, pathetic interpretations (of course, with that gui���n), inconsistencies in the

story, the list is very long. If I have to admit that the production of And the special effects in both the action

scenes and the melee are phenomenal, that's it. But. My God, the script is

terrible, it's horrible, I have no words, be careful if you go to see her, you will not suffer aaneurism

cerebralwith such masterful phrases as " "I come from a world that maybe you can not understand" "what a horror!

XDGenial the soundtrack of The Cramberrys.

" 0

" After twenty films trying to sneak up on the tremebunda trola not that Daniel Craig is James Bond but

that he is a rookie, brutote, passionate and makes mistakes, is something that does not believe Judy Dench nor thethemselves

writers.

Since George Lazenby said (in English) that of "" Wow, this did not happen to the other guy "", the followers of

the cinematographic adventures of the best-known secret agent in the world we have developed the particular theory

that the saga of 007 is not telling us the adventures of a single agent, but of many, and that both the acronym

double zero and the brand name James Bond are a cover to cover up the identity, the past and even the

personality of the new spy that occupies the niche. Yes, yes, there are things that do not fit (usual behavior

Felix Leiter'sin his different incarnations, for example, the different faces of Moneypenny, the widowhood of

Bond Lazenby who inherited �� the Bond Moore), but I would say that those things squeak less than the wonder cocoa

that the producers have, which are not clear, and which they now intend with this new

delivery , Casino Royale, show us a James Bond. I start! One agrees that, since the cat is

theirs, they can fuck it as they wish, but after twenty films (twenty-three, if we count the Casino Royale

television, the original Casino Royale pardicide, and the return to the fold of Connery with Never Say Never, do not tell

the cameo that made the character from the hand of Connery himself in The Rock) try to sneak the trola tremebunda

not that Daniel Craig is James Bond (that yes, it takes a while to believe it) but that he is a rookie,

brutote, passionate and makes mistakes, is something that Judy Dench does not believe or the own writers. How much

easier it would be to accept that there have been other previous 007, which we have known (us and M) in the past, and

that now this blond strengthened Even though he seems to have recently been discharged with disgrace from the British SAS, he has been

handpicked after Brosnan to fill the post. The half-conversations between M and Craig suggest it,

Judy Dench herself (who advanced the saga by playing a female M for the first time and who went crazy against

Brosnan), says Here is a line of dialogue that seems to guide the comment I already made to former Remington

Steele in his first career: "You are a remnant of the Cold War. ���a "", he told her then, while now,

before the brutalities of here, the blonde with the blue eyes (who, above all, goes through the entire movie), says "" Cu��� I

miss the Cold War "". But no, they have not dared. Nothing is more cagueta than the owner of a franchise.

And that there are elements in the film that indicate that the idea could be in the minds of the scriptwriters, the

director (who already reinterpreted the series with Goldeneye eleven years ago) and the author of the soundtrack:

the theme of Bond, which does not sound up to the credit titles, is avoided all the time; the final scene, the only one in the

whole film in which Craig says "" My name is Bond, James Bond "" is hollow because all the time he has called it that

way, when It had been simpler than just calling 007 until that moment to assume the

personality of the British agent. For the rest, the film tries to escape from the usual Bond scheme but does not

succeed: when it approaches the usual Bond (that is, the action scenes), it always remembers something that has been

done before; the damn maneuver of moving the camera makes you not see a fuck in the scenes of

fights; and when he tries to make a movie of posh spies in decadent environments (that is, the long hour that

the card game lasts) ends up being dull and boring. It is not enough to want to innovate: you have to know where and

why you innovate, and after twenty degrees of franchise it seems to me an unsuccessful effort, a want and

I can not, a ask for pears to the elm. The bad guys are second-class; the plot, silly, foreseeable and confusing: let's

recognize that Casino Royale, the novel, is not very cinematic in its conception (also in C���mic it's a bit

heavy), and It saves the scene of torture and rescue in extremis. rescue that differs from the

book, much more direct, wild and auguring things to come (an incision to remember that Bond is marked in

the hand as "" Sp���a "" and the MI-6 he has to remove a piece of skin from his temple to cover the mark, a detail that

Fleming remembers in all his stories). Craig is not a bad actor. But it's not Bond. Or it is not

"" our "" Bond. It can not be the Bond that the producers pretend that it is going to be later (mainly because the

story develops "" now "", in a post-9/11 world). It is not soft. It is too lethal, too abrupt, without the

characteristic sense of humor of at least four of its predecessors (Connery, Lazenby, Moore and Brosnan, Inot

doremember if Dalton made jocular comments or was too preoccupied posing) . More rough than a spider, to

understand us. It is clear that when writing the script they did not have in mind Brosnan, nor Ewan McGregor, butJason

Transporter'sStatham (the scene of the fight in the truck reminds to the scene of the Transporter truck, which in

turn was a "" tribute "" almost flat by plane and stunt by stunt to In Search of the Lost Ark). By the way, a

silly little scene at the airport: with the one that is falling in the world, you think you are going to present a

prototype of an airplane. at night? Almost as foolish is the chase jumping manuman��� through half Africa

(���a way of recognizing that now Bond has in Spider-Man and superheroes his worst enemy in the

box -office?). And how much does this man run in the whole movie. Eva Green is bland, enormously bland. Agirl

Bondwhose history does not interest and is not passionate: it is incredible that such a maromo goes from being the brute of

history to releasing the crazed ones that she releases in the last and longest ones. just minutes of the movie. Judy Dench

is fine in her role as little mother (���enchufadora?) Of 007, although it is necessary to hit her ears to the

translation and the dubbing: She does not have l��� Gica that M utee to Bond; That gives the relationship between them both

unnecessary and contrary to the tension that exists between them. The deduction of Bond's past from Eva Green,

by the way, contradicts the less official biography of the character, so that once again we can point to

a desire not consummate to tell us that this Bond, in fact, is a new Bond that follows the trail of other

Bond that are no longer. And all this roll of telling us a novice Bond to, oh, be amazed because there are

spy organizations that the MI-6 does not control (Smersh in the original idea). The same is encouraged and finally

end up doing a remake of Doctor No. O de Vive and let die, which is the next novel. Because without ideas it

seems that they have remained of all.

" 0

" The recourse to a product easy to reach a globalized market has structured this project made in Spain

since before its idealization. For this it is easy to use the innocent and needy look of afilmmaker

novice, although well prepared.

After the viewing of The Orphanage one can not but congratulate those in charge of promoting the film,

for the invaluable work they have done -no enviable with which the US majors whip us

every week at the box office- to present us with a quality product and supposed entertainment assured to the

genre public of cinema and popcorn and, in particular, to the ���vido cin���fago of the genres of terror or of thriller

with ghost included. However, the orphanage offers us (if anything) an estimable technical invoice and - that's it - a

Bel���n Rueda that confirms its expressive force and dramatic potential in every plane where it fits his beautiful face, at

the same time that torn by not know what internal duels. It's nice to see her, and only for those close-ups in which

the camera captures her face deserves to spoil the time. Otherwise, the orphanage does not give much more, and it promised a

lot. In the first place is the matter of the haunted homage to the genders, so of the taste of thecinema

Anglo-Saxonthat such succulent figures tend to give to the collection. And that homage has nothing

to reactualizaci���no cin���fila anecdote with interests that if they do not enrich the whole, at least serve as

a complicit look to the teachers of the that are nourished No, they are an orchestrated Mecca with the only intention of

liking. What worked, why not repeat it nuanced details of fill, scenarios, some other character

retouched. The rest is a generous promotion, a gui���o to the guilt of the native spectator

for not going to see national cinema and the finish is topped with the icing on a nomination of which all theuniverse

knowncan speak (and the nihil obstat of Guillermo del Toro himself). The stew is ready to be

presented and tasted at the price of an entrance fee. In the second place is the difficult balance that requires

mixing - without falling into the results of a frankeinstein tragic���mico- a genre so enthroned in theimaginary

popular cin���filoas is the terror with an emotional tone that dislodges without distorting thepaths

transitedof the genre that circumscribe it in the typical of the easy effect, the noisy score, thegore

bloodthirstyor the recurrent situations that surround characters-type so easily enumerated by all

fans (psychopaths, fearless adolescents) but with desire to march, sinister building, the night as abackground

pictorial, .The orphanage prefers to take as narrative referents and exclusively physical delicatessens of the

genre closest to literature Fantastic and terror decimon�� nica, including recurrent echo Henry

James and Turn ofScrew (so dear to all filmmaker trained in the old school), and alsoworks

honored cinematogrficas publicand cr ���tica that ensure the effectiveness of the scene and in turn serve as a

guide to the seasoned viewer and the contumacious critic. The orphanage, moves closer to the supernatural drama

than to the ghostly thriller to use. It seeks more to underline the emotions of its characters under the veil of fear than to

frighten without more (although those doors slammed, that child stuck in a sack ,.). See other cases: Frigile, They, The

boarding school, And the intention is worthy, but. Bayona (who previously directed videoclips to OBK or Camela) pretends with her

primoglito to endow it with an entity and talent without distilling the mixture in consistent barrels. One intuits, as already

said at the beginning, that in the end the recourse to a product of easy exit to a globalized market, without

concessions to a demanding author, has vertebrated this project made in Spain from before of its idealization.

For this it is easy to use the innocent and needy look of a novice filmmaker, although well

prepared. What one expects is that experiments like this one, imported from Mother USA, are lucrative for

those who take them to and, in passing, move the Spanish audiovisual market towards a renegade public. But,

please, is it too much to ask for a juicy and consistent script? The orphanage starts well, serene, unhurried,

dosing information, creating atmosphere, but over time becomes the doubt of being or not being a successor of

Poltergeist, a copy of the others (v. Ela The sixth sense), The backbone of the devil, The nameless, The

abandoned. And in the end it comes out of the mess by decanting by the already traveled path of its

referents, but without its own entity. Things to imitate the older brothers.

" 0

" Movie of adolescent action that will please the older ones. It can be seen perfectly, by mixing large

doses of action with interesting dialogues in a very short space of time. Highly recommended to

take the cool afternoon in this incipient state.

This summer is strong in terms of blockbuster films, those of popcorn and flat encephalograms. Itnot

isusual that we find so much offer, that really makes you doubt what to see. And above all, it is not

usual for a film with a protagonist adolescent, focused on a wide spectrum of viewers, to

be entertaining and fun like this. The film is about a 14-year-old adolescent ��os (some more I

dare say) that has a guy that he considers boring. Soon it is discovered that it is soso tio is aagent

secretof MI6, and at his death, the young Alex has to take charge of a mission. Apparently, his

uncle had taught him various spy disciplines. Specifically, the task is to know what hides

behind the new personal supercomputer that will go to the market. Amazing film, pardiez. You know that

when you do not expect anything, you always look with better eyes. We can say that we are facing a

new James Bond with acne and hormones to fertilize a haren. A lot of vibrant action, fun inventions and

characters that hook. The characterization of the characters deserves a separate mention, given that they are

clearly focused on an adolescent audience, but somewhat demanding. The bad guys are diabolical and

perverse, but very silly (in addition to superfees). The good ones are prototypical, with an MI6 boss who gives a

lot of laughter. Resuming, movie of adolescent action that will please the older ones. It can be seen perfectly,

by mixing large doses of action with interesting dialogues in a very short space of time. Highly

recommended to take the cool afternoon in this incipient state.

" 1

" Although historically it does not accurately reproduce customs, weapons, or even the most important, it has

many accurate data from historians, such as the times of battle or even phrases of the

combatants. Pure entertainment.

It is said that Xerxes I, the Persian emperor, when encountering the Spartans, supposed that they would leave when they saw the

magnitude of their army. Four days passed and Xerxes, impatiently, sent an emissary demanding that the Greeks

surrender their weapons immediately so as not to be annihilated. Le���nidas I, king of Sparta, answered: ���Come to

look for them yourself���. This is how the battle began. I have seen the last adaptation of the famous Battle of the

Therm���pilas, which faithfully follows the style of the homicidal c���mic. by Frank Miller, who participated in the production of

the film. No doubt there will be detractors and followers. I am one of those who enjoyed from beginning to end, with anmovie

entertainingwhere there are.Although historically does not reproduce with veracity customs, weapons, not even the

most important, the n��� number of combatants (the 300 Spartans would have to add another 6000 Greek allies)

has many accurate data from historians, such as the times of the battle or even phrases

of the combatants, according to I've been able to read. Actually many weaknesses can be attributed to the production:

abuse of slowed-down scenes, very flat story with absolute mastery of the (video game)about the

aestheticcharacters (s� The Spartan king and queen have a certain personality), there will even be many who lose

interest in the blood spatter and skewering in "" the battle of the pinchos "" as said a friend.

Still, it's pure entertainment. I liked the use of descriptions, as if it were a book

accompanied by images. Also the narrative with voice over, which also brings interesting things. It has

humor (derived from the chuler���a of the Spartans, or the surrealist character drag-queen Persian King). And it has

many remarkable phrases for lovers of the battle harangues type Braveheart or Gladiator: ������Espartanos !!

���Prepare the breakfast and feed yourself well, because tonight you will dine in hell! The man is not a being of

peace. He has to try to get it, but not at the expense of his own dignity.

" 1

" Bobby is a magnificent film, with hardly any major flaws, with an absolutely brilliant choral cast and

a direction and a script that deserve a very large squeeze. Keep going, Emilio!

As you may have seen, I go from cinema to cinema. Tomorrow, surely, I will go to see secret Games and SundayDiamond

Blood. And yesterday, it happened to Bobby, directed by Emilio Est���vez. First of all, to say that we are in front of a

magnificent film, with more than good intentions and a cast, which undoubtedly deserves to be called an

outstanding one. To talk about politics, we Ladies and gentlemen, it is very, very difficult. Or rather: portraying

American politics on a movie screen is incredibly complicated. You can express your opinion

by absolute patriotism (here, like Mel Gibson's Braveheart) or show your moreside

democrat, like , in this case, Emilio Est���vez. I, personally and evidently, I prefer the ideals of the

second, and therefore, I enjoyed (especially in its final part) with Bobby, the film more mature (and famous) of

this, since very recently, great director.Although one, too, can portray his political thoughts focusing

, solely, on events, or alternatively, adding to the political plot. �tica a series of stories

intertwined with a message, moderately political, each. And Est���vez's film, to top it off, uses

two aspects with their respective importances: the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy and the lives of each one of the

people who were in the hotel where he died. �� And this, the truth is that it only improves the quality

of the film. In addition, leaving the traditional structure of a film about a political event aside, he

begins by narrating everything that happened the day before, and, concluding, the murder, giving way to a(inspeech

totally wonderfuloff) Kennedy. So we have a script, written by Est���vez, totally incredible,

written to measure, almost perfect. Perhaps the only failure that would find him would be that slight drop in rhythm in the

middle of the footage or the bias that is given to the stories, although perhaps It is right to count more

than others, because they are of greater importance and more profitable. Every good cinematographic guide deserves a good

deal. And here is probably the best deal of the year. To say that each one of the interpreters that appear

in Bobby is sublime, although I, would highlight especially to some: Anthony Hopkins, showing, for the last

time, his great interpretative skills and, here, playing the role of a veteran butler of the hotel, which has

lived many important moments in history; Sharon Stone, leaving the crosses of legs andsequels

absurd, getting into one of the most worked roles of gui���ny and offering us an unbeatable performance;

William H. Macy, playing a not very common role in his filmography, because he plays the owner of the

hotel, with a lover in the middle; Christian Slater, oddly enough, is splendid. Although his role is

not pleasant, the interpretation he offers is incredible; Laurence Fishburne, in one of his best

roles, giving life to a chef with a personality and moral that surpass normal. Probably the

character that I liked the most; Freddy Rodr���guez, also, in his best performance, full of sensitivity and,

at the same time, security; Lindsay Lohan, definitely, in the best role she has done to date. Your role is

charming, brave, risky, full of passion, etc; Helen Hunt, as a couple of Martin Sheen. Both are

splendid, although their roles are not too deep (and this, is precisely whatwants to

the directorachieve); and all the others, who, like I said, are also splendid, like Demi Moore

(although you did not believe it either), Emilio Est himself ��� vez, Elijah Wood, Brian Geraghty and Shia LaBeouf (those who

take a joint more), Nick Cannon, Heather Graham or Jacob Vargas (the Mexican who fights with Fishburne in the

kitchen). part of the impressive gui��� and the outstanding cast, Bobby presents some technical aspects equally

unbeatable. From the perfectionist photography, carried out by Michael Barrett, to the incredible montage,

made with precision and rhythmic sense. It also highlights the music of Mark Isham, although I prefer the song

Never gonna break my faith (nominated for the Golden Globe). In short, we could say that Bobby is afilm

magnificent, with hardly any major flaws, with an absolutely brilliant choral cast and a direction and a

script that deserve a very big smash. Keep going, Emilio!

" 1

" Until the hour of footage does not appear nor one and when they decide to go into action we see four children with

makeup that seems made in chalk, slow rhythm where except for the final part looks like a dramatic telefilm .

Film that was planned to be orchestrated by the author of the Texas massacre TOOBE HOOPER that after no

agreement is replaced by CARDONE author of vampires in the desert or death in 8 MM 2. A cast composed by

Chloe Moretz that will appear in the nine version of THE EYE and LORI HEURING dresses in the pleasant summer of

seduction. The work of the interpreters is the best thing in this disaster, with such a title unequivocal

as ZOMBIES because it is expected to see many of them precisely. Until the time of footage does not appear or one and

when they decide to go into action we see four children with makeup that seems made in chalk, slow rhythm where

except for the final part seems a dramatic telefilme.El little budget is noted in all thesections

technical, add to the mediocre makeup, kindergarten photography, music that does not hit at any time

in a direction No Mr. Cardone horrible.Poco can be saved from this mess.

"0"

can not miss this round history where muchsimas appreciate the virtues that led to the

categra of genius Alfred Hitchcock prolific british

Although v��� many years ago, I went back to review and enjoy one of Alfredmasterpieces

Hitchcock's, although I promise to start commenting little by little on the genius, not all of his filmography. (A (I directed 53

movies) but I have more than 30 titles that I have, helped by the magnificent book that I gave me. A friend

(thank you!) about the British filmmaker. It is difficult for me to talk about this film without commenting or supporting myself in

some of its scenes, so if not the they have seen, I recommend that they see it (it is an authentic wonder, of

intrigue and narrative perfection, with a multitude of memorable plans), and then read what comes

next ���n.Although Hitchcock was known as the master of suspense, so is the narrative technique. In

this film there is not a single shot, which is executed and filmed with brilliance and perfect calculation. The beginningalready

ispromising. A long travelling focusing on the shoes of the two protagonists, (describing already with more

details of the imaginable ones to them) that meet and stumble in a train (after this stumbleus

showstheir faces) After this meeting, Hitchcock already draws our attention with the histrionic tie of the

character of Bruno in a poetic interpretation (thus he qualified it Truffaut in his famous book interview with the

filmmaker) by Robert Walker, designed by Hitch himself. More memorable scenes. The murder of the woman

of the character Guy Haines (in a loose interpretation of my way of seeing the actor Farley Granger, who

practically repeats the character of La Soga) seen through the reflection of the fallen glasses of the assassinated one. Or how

the director makes us look almost the only way possible in Bruno in the middle of a crowd of people

watching a tennis match: everyone goes spinning the head from right to left minus ���lO how Brunostrangles

virtuallythe character played by the director's daughter: Patricia Hitchcock (see photo with

the father), in a prominent secondary role, not necessary for the story, but that contributes a lot, like the

other daughter with glasses of senator Morton. In this film we see once again Hitchcock poses the

questions that the viewer would ask himself before a certain situation, and then he gives an answer, more or

less convincing, but one that leaves you satisfied. An example: when Guy's fiancée begins to sense that something

is happening she asks him how he convinced Bruno to kill his wife. After clarifying Guy that it was not

so, that Bruno is an unbalanced that is making him blackmail, she asks the question that the

viewer may have had in mind: why not went to the police, or why have you not trusted her

from the beginning? Answer offered by Guy: Why, so that they think like you thought at first?

What was involved in the crime? Another feature of the director. The game with the viewer. There is a

certain moment when Guy calls Bruno and tells him that he has changed his mind and that he wants to put an end to

all this, assassinating as Bruno wants his father. Then go to the house of Bruno's father.

Hitchcock does not give a single clue as to whether he has really decided on this and has taken this option, thus playing with the

public. Finally it reassures us to see that he only wanted to warn the father of the grave danger that runs with his

unbalanced son. Another admirable virtue: the coherence of the vision of the camera. If Hitchcock poses a

scene with two characters talking and one of them is sitting and the other standing, the usual shot -

in the dialogue of the two, he does it with a flat shot (from above) and with another contrapicado (from below). These

contrapicado planes are of special taste in the director, since he uses them even to focus from below to his

characters when they go down a ladder for example. Again indicating Truffaut's book, he said that

Alfred was filming the scenes of murders as if they were scenes of love, and vice versa. Perhaps it is something exaggerated,

but in this case he clearly prefers the bad guy in the film, treated with benevolence and exquisiteness, as when he

burns the balloon of an annoying child in the amusement park. It makes us identify with Bruno in this

ugly actionMost memorable scenes: the recovery of the lighter dropped into a sewer by Bruno. How can you

create suspense in such action? Well he gets it. Or the magnificent final sequence of the runaway t���o

vivo, with that fight between the hulls of the same horses (great). Apparently, I recognized that I played

with the guy who should crawl under it to stop it. He said if he had raised his head. I would not have

forgiven him. To criticize something, it can be ridiculous that he is radiating the tennis match

for all the public that is present (including players) with comments like this or that is

playing good or bad, or is risking. anyway. I had to put some clout not? That who has not seen it,not

canmiss this round story where many of the virtues that led to the category ofappreciated

genius arethe British prolific Alfred Hitchcock.

" 1

" Totally crazy, unbridled and surreal comedy full of crappy special effects and blood at heart and

with delusional characters.

This film is another song and here what we have is a pure and hard comedy and of the most out of date. A young man

returns to his hometown in Australia after suffering a childhood trauma and now feel anpanic

excessive and irrationalto the sheep. He travels to sell his share of the farm to his brother, who has taken

over the family business after the death of his father. The brother tries to develop a new species of sheep

through genetic experiments, but something ends up going wrong and an epidemic that turns the peaceful sheep

into violent killers is taking over the town. Totally crazy, unbridled and surreal comedy full of

crappy special effects and blood at random and with delusional characters, attention to herbs that

aims to solve everything based on naturopathic remedies. A small beat of rhythm is inevitable in the second

half of the film, before the final savage, but it is an understandable and salvageable failure. Personally I have enjoyed

much more and I have had more fun with this film than with the previous one. To have a nice time and

laugh.

" 1

" We breathe the good vibes and the desire to have fun in all the footage. One of the most outstanding producers and of course politically incorrect of the amateur scene with

titles as prominent as the Needles of the devil or Real zombie to revolve among so many others. These Ibizan people

show their great sense of humor in a film that parodies with great brilliance the oldadventures

karateand the famous tournaments, with a sense of rhythm that does not decay in any way. At the moment, even theeffects

technicalare really well achieved for the budget they handle, good vibes are breathed and the desire to

have fun throughout the footage. A wave of laughter from start to finish that makes me admire them a little bit more, in the

line of karate to death in Torremolinos but superior.

" 1

" The film rocks you between comedy and drama in a delicious way, without a doubt an experience that younot

willregret say what some people say. You pay attention to the irony ...

Giovani Veronesi with 32 scripts behind him, 10 films directed and 5 interpreted, arrives with the

continuation of the Italian famous "" Manuale de Amore "", film of little impact in Spain (I think this

is the weather), but very famous in Italy and the rest of Europe. It should be noted that this Italian film

exceeds in all aspects its predecessor (Manuale d���amore). The actors (including Elsa, who I think have done

the best role of his fateful career) are huge, the script is fresh, fast, fun and the movie has some

spectacular plans, like for example those of Mnica Belucci right at the end, without words I stayed to

see it. Fantastic makeup (useful, invisible, natural), soundtrack and I insist a great

script. I highly recommend seeing it in original version, it can be a little heavy at the beginning but when the

ear gets used is much better, since you can appreciate all the vizmica that already has thetonality

Italian. By the way, Elsa Pataki, successfully surpasses this subject with a great accent. The great Belucci,

who is a panther of the camera is as always spectacular, but as I say the complete cast is ���

beautifully directed. The film rocks you between comedy and drama in a delicious way, without a doubt an

experience that you will not regret say what some people say. You pay attention to the irony.

" 1

" A fascinating soundtrack, and characters who manage to convey just a lot ofwithout words

emotion and feelings, make Eleven a film of great pleasure, that under no concept

classify a in the musical genre.

After winning the Audience Award at the last edition of the Sundance Film Festival, the Irish film Once

has become one of the most unexpected phenomena. Less than this year, getting very good reviews both from

the public and from the specialized press. Directed by John Carney and interpreted by Glen Hansard,

Mark���ta Irglov� ��, Hugh Walsh, Gerry Hendrick, Alastair Foley, Geoff Minogue and Bill Hodnett, the film tells the

story of a singer and songwriter who plays his songs through the streets of Dubl���n, when he is not ��

working in his father's store. During the day, to earn some extra money, he interprets familiar topics

for the passers-by, but at night, he plays his own songs in which he talks about how he left ��� his girlfriend. Her

talent does not go unnoticed to a Czech immigrantthe piano and sells flowers on the street, so

who lovesboth will end up working on a model, while the possibility of starting a new life together is planned

over their heads. that Eleven is one of those movies that leaves you with a very good taste after

seeing it, despite its bittersweet quality: of long duration (eighty minutes, I think) , the film is

of a manifest simplicity, m���sa���n if we take into account that a good part of its footage passes through

different musical interpretations. Eleven, as I said, is terribly simple at the same time quite obvious and

somewhat sweetened in some ways, but it works. It's just like this: there are no complex plots, notwists

plot, no apparent comedy or drama but, in contrast, it offers us a wide range offeelings and

terribly humansensations. And that is probably the formula that makes Once a film, I do not know if it's

memorable, but it's round: we find two worldly characters, gray and melancholy but not

without hope, like the city of Dubl itself. ���n, linked to a past that is embodied through the

music they compose. And, by joining through it, both characters seem to find the reason, the excuse they

needed so much to leave behind their burdens and start a new life, together or separately. What Elevenus

offersis a terrible affinity, a sometimes hurtful worldliness, like that perennial feeling that surrounds

the two protagonists and that makes them wonder with their eyes ��� and yes?, As probably any of

us will have ��� occurred on more than one occasion. And precisely that possibility, that hope, makes its

protagonists can restart their lives with the assurance that, despite all the blows thatcan give them

lifefrom now on, they will always harbor the memory of That person, and that memory willthem

makeget up again and move on. From the delicious introductory scene, to the impossible but

fun sequence in the bank in search of a loan, Eleven is a song of hope in every rule,

next as in few occasions we have the opportunity to witness on a screen, and without falling into the topics

of drama or comedy to use. A fascinating soundtrack, and somecharacters manage to transmit awithout

Once thelot of emotions and feelings,words, they make Eleven a very pleasing film, which under

no circumstances would classify in the musical genre, and that will undoubtedly be a refere For all those of

spirit eminently melancholy. Very recommendable, and a pleasant surprise. I give it a 7'5 out of 10.

" 1

" As a science fiction movie It is correct, entertained at times, but it soon becomes what it is: a

reflective metaphor, sometimes poetic.

Cuar���ne I������rritu share in their two recent works that bitter (���mejicana?), Penetrating and reflective look,

on the contemporary world and its contradictions, thus as a perspective without concessions about pain and

loneliness. In Children of Men this panorama is drawn through a futuristic and apocalyptic London,

plunged in terror and despair, whose State relegates in a sombre apartheid ( that reminds Auschwitz) of

its immigrants, and leads its citizens to suicide or laziness (like that of the character himself interpreted

with sobriety by the almost always great Clive Owen). But -as in Babel- will be precisely from the the belly

of those immigrants where the last hope will be woven for an opulent, technified, but stilted andsociety

nihilistic, condemned to disappear. The political pretension of Cuar���n is explicit. Even so his speech - and that of

his friend Irritu - does not close there. Both investigate the psychological drama of his characters, extracting from him

a perfect metaphor about our civilization, but at the same time a personal reflection that shoots directly at the

spectator, discomfort and forcing him to think. The whole script functions as a metaphor whose intention is not to

warn about what could happen to our civilization. �n, but rather deforms the reality in whichalready

we areinstalled so that each viewer makes his own map of the world and its paradoxes. The immigrant is

taken in Children of men as the archetype of the Other, which the opulent world fears but needs as a

cheap labor force and an increase in its birth statistics. Europe no longer wants to have children, or has them at a

meager pace with respect to the number of retirees who swell the Imserso. But the infertility that the film talks

about is more extendable to the climax that according to Cuar���n you can breathe in a tired first world, although it is

surrounded by amenities. It is illuminating the scene in which thousands of dozens of citizens discover with

affliction - in front of their extra-flat televisions - the news of the death of the youngest of their fellow citizens.

Acceptance of death and the need for hope can only come from countries endowed with a biographical

sketch of pain and poverty. A self-satisfied society does not accept death and intends to cheat by living the

dream of the eternal happy present. Now in Y tu mam��� tambi���n? And in his first work, S�� Do it with your partner, or as

assistant director in Gaby: a true story - we see the concern of this director to

unmask the cuts with which we flee from death and pain. And he does it without contemplating, but

always leaving room for the hope of being reborn of feeling mortal and touched by misery. In Children of

Men, Theo receives a timely visit from Julian, with whom he had a son, who died shortly after a

fever. Julian prompts Theo to go on a journey of redemption through which he will save his gloomy existence

because of the memory of his dead son. Like the character of Richard (Brad Pitt) or Chieko (Rinko Kikuchi),

in his desperate search for love - in Babel, Theo discovers that this pain only heals with help of the other. In

fact, before Julian appeared, Theo only had friends locked in their ivory towers,

bearable by music and drugs (Michael Caine) or for the enjoyment of beautiful (Danny Huston). Julian

(Julianne Moore) brings him back to reality, like the Morpheus of the Matrix. You will even have to pass for an

immigrant more, discovering the treatment they receive and the conditions in which they live. In turn, Proyecto Humano

is adapted as a subtle metaphors of that space ut���pico (away from the city, on the high seas, without aport

fixed) where differences are highlighted only as a means to protect fundamental rights and not to

segregate, exclude or exploit, and where all are treated only as they are, humans. Hope can not come

either from terrorism that claims to defend the rights of minorities against the totalitarianism of an oppressor state.

That is why the unborn child has no more room than in that ship that has no more owner than the one who wants it, outside

the city, that London, s A symbol of progress and democracy. Children of men enjoy themselves more by letting

you suggest more than what is shown (which is not little). As a science fiction film it is correct, entertaining at

times, but it soon becomes what it is: a reflective metaphor, sometimes poetic (like that final scene in

the building shot, with soldiers petrified at the sound of the baby's cry). To emphasize the mise en

scène, the setting of an unrecognizable London, the trepidantes sequence planes, actors more than

good. But it is not a film that satisfies the stomache of the good lover of action cinema, it is not even a

science-fiction movie to use, although This genre easily ends up bordering thediscourse.

ethical and politicalAmong the most remarkable moments, the visit to that empty school, almost demolished. You can read

in the work of PD James on which this film is based: "We have separated from us, as parents in mourning,

all the painful memories of our loss. The games for the children have been removed from the

squares. They burned all the toys, except the dolls that some women not quite use as child

substitutes. The schools were closed for a long time until they were closed or

converted into adult education facilities. Only on the cassettes and discs are the

voices of the children heard. For some it is unbearable , but for most people they function like a

drug. ""

" 1

" The Last King of Scotland is a much needed film, which serves to remind us of the atrocities of the

past, and It helps to raise awareness of the atrocities that are still being committed in Africa.

In the last few years, the cinema has increasingly sought out pure andentertainment, empty andfilms

simplesimplecapable of despairing any cinephile. that prides itself to be it. But at the same time thathappens

this phenomenon, another completely opposite is produced, and it is the increase of films of social and historical denunciation,

most of them of European production. , such as The Plunging, Sophie Scholl, or now, The Last King ofKevinmaker

Scotland.MacDonald, reputed documentary, is responsible for bringing to the screen one of the

bloodiest dictators of the last Fourth of the twentieth century: ugand���s Idi Am���n Dada, responsible for an

ethnic cleansing that caused more than 300,000 deaths. The story centers on a young doctor, Nicholas Garrigan

(James McAvoy), who arrives in Uganda to have fun and help the population. After an accident, Dr.

Garrigan will meet Idi Am���n Dada (Forest Whitaker), and will soon be immersed in his particular universe.

Macdonald faces such a challenge with great aplomb, and proves to be up to the story that counts and

denounces. The Scottish director leaves aside the rumor mill that has surrounded Am���n, offering aportrait

bold and uncompromisingof a cruel, vengeful, unstable tyrant and excuse Downtown There will be those who take their hands to

the head due to the fact that the film humanizes the genocide, but that no one is led to equavocs: humanizing a

historical character is far from justifying his acts, but reminds us all that the responsible

for such barbarism was a human being. The strong gui���n of Peter Morgan and Jeremy Brock is an excellent starting

point for a film of great intensity, with some magnificent scenes, as the first appearance n

Forest Whitaker on screen. And it's time to stand up and applaud an act like Whitaker, who

performs a memorable and outstanding performance, which will undoubtedly go down in the annals of film history.

His work is so impressive that it completely eclipses the rest of the actors, although some like James

McAvoy also perform very well. The Last King of Scotland is a very necessary film, It

serves to remind us of the atrocities of the past, and helps us to become aware of the atrocities that are still being

committed in Africa. And leaving aside its background, it is essential only to see the extraordinary work of

Forest Whitaker, hitherto unknown by the great public, but one of the best actors of the currentpanorama

cinematographic.

" 1

" It is in the last third where we can see how far the influence of this unknown movie came, being

the most obvious Matrix and part of the Kill Bill universe.

Burn the males because we are in front of a forbidden film. I really wanted to see Thriller: A cruel

picture for several reasons. What if Tarantino was inspired by her for his Kill Bill, what if I do not know how many years

hidden in a drawer. the fact is that the movie does not disappoint, rather the opposite: despite being

another film of revenge 70's in the line of I spit on your serious you have to point a series of gruesome details to raise

to the Olympus to this Swedish film before any other North American (though always funny) movie like the

"" porn touch "" or the modicum gui���n, something that the rest of them lacked revenge.Thriller is the story of

Madeleine, a girl who, being a girl fifteen years ago, was raped by an old vagabond causing her a

perpetual trauma and the definitive p�� The loss of speech. One day does not arrive in time to the bus and a crappy guy, a

Swedish Malcolm McDowell then picks it up. And he kidnaps her. And it makes her addicted to heroin. And

prostitutes. Then we started freaking out. When the girl is with one of her forced clients, the plans

leave no room for imagination: first first and detail shots of "" the action "" make the movie an instant

musician of the trash semi porno.Madeleine wants to get up, of course, and while she goes to bed with clients of the most

dreary she is saving for weapons, fighting classes, shooting and driving. Revenge will be slow,

but it will be rehostia.It is in the last third where we can see how far the influence of this

unknown movie, being the most obvious Matrix and part of the Kill Bill universe. Now what matters is

revenge of a fucking time, and if there is revenge in the final part, now we find the Peckinpah part

of the movie: superslowmotion for each and every shot of the Pirate. pure delirium. A last act of

street justice so brutal that one can not help but remember Until his time came, probably the best

revenge in history. If you have not seen this "" swept "" you are taking.

" 1

" An experience that is enjoyed from beginning to end, a descent into the infernos of the interior that whips the

moral and entertains a gray afternoon.

"" Hard Candy "", the long debut of David Slade was a masterpiece but it is halfway through

a last half hour in which there are too many detours without a specific direction , wasting one of

the best starts of the last years. Jeff Kohlver is a thirty-two-year-old photographer who has

been fooling around the net for a while with a fourteen-year-old girl, Hayley Stark. The day of his appointment begins a nightmare of

physical and psychological torture that will end in tragedy. To continue with only two actors for more than

ninety minutes is a very complicated task that Slade solves in a masterful way with tworecitals

unforgettableby Patrick Wilson and Ellen Page. The camera, almost always in close-ups, shows thething

rightand the photograph of Jo Willems is thick and he sins at moments of videoclipera, although he manages to spare the bad

atmosphere. Supported by a brief appearance of Sandra Oh, seen in "" Between drinks "", and the unknown Odessa Rae

(not counting a waiter who leaves at the beginning), the two actors memorably carry their duel that

the director is out of hand the last third, which is not up to the circumstances,

rushing in all the final turns and leaving a bittersweet taste to the viewer m� It's demanding.

Anyway,"" Hard Candy "" is an experience that is enjoyed from beginning to end, a descent into hell

inside plaguing the moral and entertains a gray afternoon. A 7.

" 1

" Everything in this Resident Evil seems written by a 12-year-old boy hooked to the playstation, and therefore

, it is assumed that this, his p��� potential public, enjoy much more of the occasional gracietas without grace and of

the little imaginative of his gui���n.

Extinction is the third installment of the saga that adapts the homonymous videogame of the company campcom. On this

occasion, the plot of the series of games is ignored and proposes a situation in which the infamous T virus

has wreaked havoc throughout the world, ending with civilization and turning to everybody in the

well-known zombies hungry for human flesh. (Can anyone explain how a virus can desert a

planet in its entirety?). A group of survivors look for food and vegetables in a convoy with several vehicles

while Alice wanders through the desert fleeing from the Umbrella corporation. An interesting approach to the sea

that gives rise to create a good post-apocalyptic film in the style of Mad Max, mixed with theUniverse

Romerian. In fact, the tape starts in an interesting way, showing some zombie from here to wandering through

the desert. Undoubtedly, the best scenes of a film that is entangled in an absurd narrative drift that

occasionally creates occasional boredom. The problem of this third part is like its two previous deliveries, it is

the nefarious gui���n of Anderson, whose obsession with showing evil bad guys from the Umbrella corporation and focusing the

argument on them instead of the motivations and problems of their characters, makes us not

curious to know what will happen. below, and that we only observe events and action

simply because they exist. A model that is becoming dangerously common in

American blockbusters, and that get you bored in a tape of these characteristics,

as is the case. The characters are not explored or the least, being authentic mannequins to those who

see act and whose actions do not help to know their motivations, therefore, are absurd vague attempts

to approach them, even introducing them by their names, telling us something of their past, when at

no time is it known again, even in action scenes. .N The direction is moderately

functional, with the almost always successful visual sense of Russell Mucalthy flying over each shot of the

film. The production design and photography are the most important ingredients of this production,

reminiscent of the films of the Mad Max saga and represent a visual treatment promising that they make us think of a more

lucid film, so that finally that sensation is diluted as the film advances, withoutreaching

actuallythe story, and it ends suddenly with a fight between monster and heroine of the most tiresome,

predictable and disappointing. Everything in this Resident Evil seems written by a 12-year-old boy hooked to the

playstation, and therefore, it is to be assumed that this, his potential audience, enjoys a lot The occasional

gracietas without grace and the unimaginative of his gui���n. The amateur spectator of the zombie subgenre

will undoubtedly enjoy a couple of scenes that, although they do not say anything new, will leave them satisfied at the end of the

projection. Various Plagiarism / Tribute? a The Day of the Dead (underground laboratory with scientists

training dead), Dawn of the dead (super fast zombies) and Land of the dead (that armored convoy

heading to Alaska) In addition, there is more action, better filmed and with more violence than the previous films of the saga,

which make it a spectacle. It's more enjoyable, even though its story is more childish and unbalanced

than the original one. Music dispenses with the terrible typical cheap techno from Anderson to leave a better result. It's

decent, although equally deficient, than other productions that bear his name. Extinction is the mostchapter

entertainingof the Resident Evil saga, which will be remembered in its tripod as the worstadaptations

possibleof a horror game. �fico. Perhaps, some enjoy their air of Italian post-apocalyptic Z series

to Bruno Mattei or Enzo Castellari, since in their ninety minutes there is a bit of everything: crazy scientists,

Monsters mutants, telekinetic powers to the storm, songs-very tweaks of Photoshop to Jovovich in the

close-ups, post-apocalyptic costumes with suspenders and fashion glasses, dogszombies,

and crowsevil chops and hologr�� �ficos, hi-tech technology, Mile clones in balls and a beautiful shot of the subway mouth

of Tokyo with zombies for only 6 euros.���Qui���n da m� ��s?

" 0

" The film was released in large halls, it was expected as a new event, and it was a resounding success.

Triplic��� in Italy the figures of the most taquillero film.

After the resounding success of For a handful of dollars, everyone expected a sequel. The pressures on

Leone to shoot a new western were increasing, although he tried to carry out a different project.

As he himself said, they seemed to defy him, and no one seemed to trust that he could shoot anything other than a

western. Others who knew him affirm, however, that his refusal to shoot a sequel was due to his eternal

fear of failure, and that although in fact he was willing to shoot another film of the same g��� nero, I was terribly afraid

that this time the film would not work. Finally, what apparently led to the sequel was the

contract that Leone had signed to be able to get through For a handful of dollars. According to the contract, Leone

still had to shoot another film for the same production company. However, Leone found a lawyer, Alberto

Grimaldi, who offered him better conditions to shoot his film. Although he had no history, the director already had

a title, Per qualche dollaro in pi���, apparently a kind of joke about the producers with whom he

worked. in For a handful of dollars. Meanwhile, Clint Eastwood was still working on the television series Rawhide, and

for a handful of dollars still it had not reached the American cinemas. While Sergio Leone was starting

several contacts again to have some of his favorite actors (Henry Fonda, Lee Marvin), Eastwood was

offered $ 50,000 to put on his guns again and put on his old poncho and

perform the Main bounty hunter, known in some versions as Manco. Eastwood accepted. The

villain would be played by Gian Maria Volont���, who had already participated in the previous film. After much

searching for the actor for the second bounty hunter, Colonel Mortimer, Leone found in an old photo of a

film magazine his Mortimer. According to Leone, the man in the photo looked like "a hairdresser from southern Italy", but he

also had "hawk nose" and eyes of Van Gogh "". The name of the actor was Lee Van Cleef. The film, which

had a budget, was also more complex in its approach, with small Flashos flashbacks and various

nuances, but even so he had all the ingredients of For a handful of dollars, although in more quantity: the

iron��� to Eastwood, the close-ups of the glances, the music feature of Ennio Morricone, and an

unusual principle: a plane of a valley, and off-screen you hear different sounds: someone whistling, a

cigar that is lit, a rifle that is loaded, and a shot that knocks down a passing rider. The death had a

price began in a shocking way, and presented his first character, Manco, without even appearing on

screen: just a whistle and smoking a cigar so we know who it is . In the next scene, a

Bible will go to the second bounty hunter, Colonel Mortimer. The chemistry between Eastwood and Van Cleef turned out to

be effective, and they were memorable both by uncovering their revivals and kicking and fighting like

two children in the street. Eastwood repeated in his role of the three-day bearded gunman little talkative andhand

quick, but this time it might turn out less c��� only, although he kept his iron���a and his main

motivation was still money. Eastwood's smirk had in Death had a price on his great

deb���. It is also said that Eastwood's slow mode of speaking began to appear on this tape, during the

dubbing sessions in Rome. It has been pointed out that he was inspired by his Italian doubler, Enrico Maria Salerno.

Other sources, such as the actor's former partner, Sondra Locke, claim that it was based onway of speaking.

Marilyn Monroe'sThe film premiered in large halls, it was expected as a new event, and it was a resounding

success. Triplic��� in Italy the figures of the highest-grossing film, and while the film was sold abroad,

some North American producers who had come to meet with the screenwriter Luciano Vincenzone

checked in. In situ the enthusiastic reaction of the public before the film. There and then thebegan to take shape

film that would complete the "" Trilogy of the dollar "". " While taking advantage of his stay in Rome, Eastwood took the opportunity

to participate in a choral film before returning to the United States and resume the filming of Rawhide.

" 1

" Comparisons with Chihiro are odiousThe film is about a teenage girl who works as a hatter. A good day, when going out into the street, is

assaulted by an ebullient and mysterious boy, who is chased by amorphous black beings and hats.

After flying away from the pursuers, she returns to her shop, where a kind of fat lady awaits her.

This, after getting angry with the girl, throws a curse for which she becomes an old woman, forcing her to

look for Howl so that she can remove the enchantment. As explained, it seems very strange, but it is notWell,

so much.as always, very busy animations and beautiful stories. What I liked the most was that the girl, when she was an

old woman, took it naturally, saving us the foreseeable interval in which she struggled to be

young again. The characters are very curious, having a devil of the fire that hides a secret, a

scarecrow with the head of a turnip, a child who is the only normal, the fat witch who then dehydrates and

looks like Jabba the Hut (the one from the war of the galaxies), to Howl himself who does not know very well the internal struggle

that is brought and the adolescent - old woman who has his thing. The story returns to the style of the Laputa castle or

Chihiro's trip, not getting to be as good as the last one but better than Laputa's. Resuming, that if

you are tremendous fans of the saga, you will like it much, if not, wait until they take it out by fascicles and buy it

with a manga movie that you will never see. I personally, from my fan point of view, recommend it

fervently. Kids may like it, although it may give some fear.

" 1

" The film lasts two and a half hours but there is no time to take a breath. You can see Scorsese'sand

masteryalso the love he has for the cinema.

The duality of character told in two parallel lives. Two boys leave the police academy. One becomes

a policeman but in reality he is an infiltrator of the Irish Mafia. The other closes the doors to be a

policeman unless he agrees to pass himself off as a mafioso to inform them about Frank Costello (Jack Nicholson),

but they offer him no support and because it is a situation very secret they do not even keep a file on him.

It is a complicated plot. As you can infer that the two stories come together at one point: the girl. Well,

that's the only predictable thing. The film lasts two and a half hours but there is no time to take a breath. The filmrushed

is never boring and has apace. The scenes are cut without a breath of dead air. But

with supreme ability to show what is necessary for the story to be understood, and felt. Play a lot with

the form without losing balance. The plot is quite complicated and there are many characters, but it does not lose you.

Yes, you have to be careful. The film is violent. Very violent, but not too much. Although I must accept that

I have a weakness for the mafia. And even if I dislike exaggerated violence, when it comes to organized crime it

's different. Especially because it's more about the character, the desperation to survive. When it makes

perfect sense to smash a beer mug in someone's head or grab it, because it's

violence that comes from correcting an injustice that is not good, but it's human nature. The first time

that Frank Costello meets the character of Matt Damon who is going to be his undercover protege is about

10 years old; and Frank tells him: "At your age they tell us that you can become a police thief. What I'm saying is this,

when they point you with a loaded revolver, what difference is there? "" Infiltrados is not a politically

correct film, it's just the opposite . Probably does not stop offending any group of people. But if it tries to

show all the faces of corruption, it could not be otherwise. It is as authentic and appropriate as the

soundtrack of heavy metal with Irish bagpipes. The character of Leonardo DiCaprio is in a really

desperate situation. And it shows although his hands never shake. The police do not offer any guarantees and it is obvious that

at any moment they could gut it. He has no one and can not sleep. DiCaprio embodies it with subtlety.

He is at the height, and is next to a Jack Nicholson in a gray suit with a leopard tie, content but

manic. In a moment, but only a moment, this film came to remind me Cidade de Deus (City of God)

which is one of the best films I've seen in recent times. It can not be said to be Goodfellas, but it is

very good. You can see Scorsese's mastery and also the love he has for the cinema.

" 1

" He has since become a classic of those that I have to teach the visitors, so big that it willme to

coststay with one sentence, but I think I have it: "" Disc���lpala, she does not know what she is doing, she is mute "".

AntolÃgica

Infinite tears fell down my face last night seeing this jewel of gore of series Z. A group of hippies

worshipers of Sat���n arrives at a puebllucho quasi abandoned one hundred percent Yankee where they rape and beat a girl

and they make squats of a house. The brother (small, fat, clumsy and small) of the girl then offers some

meat pies infected with rage (he drew blood to a dead rabid dog) and mounts the God. Full

of discarding details, such as the friendship and subsequent romance of the initial victim with one of his aggressors

(which girl is more pious, he forgives everything, even the rape), or curélas throwing machete with the rage in

the blood infected by having brushed all the same hippy bitch. White dribbling and garage-surfing music

for the attacks, a masterpiece full of hilarious situations almost all of them starring the fucking

boy, especially when he "" goes through "" the barn door and his reaction On discovering his impaled grandfather,

worthy of the very Ed Wood. The truth is that he has already become a classic of those that I have to

teach the visitors, so big that it will cost me to stay with one sentence, but I think I have it:

" "Disc���lpala, she does not know what she is doing, she is mute" ". AntolÃgica It is already one of my favorites.

" 1

" Portrait of an obsession. Zodiac escapes from the genre of assassins and policemen, decanting without qualms for

offering an almost documentary cinema, cold although of disturbing plot.

When you see this film, you suspect that one of the possible reasons that might have led our

exhibitors to delay their release in many cinemas in Spain is that - despite what was expected by anaudience

uninformed, or simply confident in the effective but creative motivation of those who carry out the

promotional tr-ileres - we are not facing one of those products with intelligent killer at Lecter and polic���aa�� You're

smarter than your fighter. Nothing is further from what Zodiac offers us, whose long but excellently mounted

footage is dedicated only in the initial thirty or forty minutes to describe? Withoutor

bloodinessvisual sadism, and with only one calm serenity that worries and even makes one's hair stand on end (I know that is

premeditated sadism!) - the Zodiac murders, based on real events in California in the late

sixties. Five victims, four cryptograms, letters to the press, live revelations to

television, more than thirty years of investigations, some suspicion but none I'm arrested. A cocktail he would have

given for juicy scripts facing the box office if they had focused on the murderer's point of view, or on

the dialectic of the policeman on the trail of an ingenious criminal . But no, Fincher decides to bet - he already did,

although in a darker tone, in Seven - for a serene, classical script if possible, that is weaving without rush

(as the research itself describes) a plot of fake clues and hopeful signs that

soon turn us away from a truth never fully clarified, and to which Creelo believes to be able to reach who

perseveres, but leave on the road his private life and health.Zodiac escapes the genre of murderers and police,

decant���ndose without qualms for offering an almost documentary cinema , cold though of disturbing plot (centered on the

obsession of Graysmith and Toschi, and the cirrÃtico Avery), that analyzes the puzzle that those rare men (is to

thatsay, risked for what that his contemporaries abide) seeking desmadejar, despite its difficulties, in

order to putname to an elusive murderer with nfulas of showman of terror or Einstein

puzzles. This Fincher option will boo the fans of the more bizarre cop (Lieutenant

Callahan included), but he will delight everyone (including who writes) who expected acinema

seventies-style researchof Pakula or Frankenheimer. By the way, the always correct and very discreet

David Shire signs the soundtrack of Zodiac (until now Fincher trusted Shore), as he already did with

All the President's Men, or The Conversation (Coppola, 1974) That narrative discretion and

emotional distancing do not mean that the creator of Seven again shrinks the stomach in these excellent

scenes of the murders, extraordinarily planned in order to take our breath away while waiting for the

(fatal) outcome. Despite the coldness of the investigation process posed by the film, the rhythm remains

and forces us to search with its protagonists whether or not it is really who we believe the zodiac killer. We no longer

want to know who is so brutal of their crimes (that we almost forget about an hour and a half of footage), but

by the sheer obsession of closing the movie. in a certainty that consoles us. As expected, both

reality and fiction are, in this case, more obscure and disappointing than we expected. On the other hand, it is

worth highlighting the stimulating cin���filas references. who fertilize Zodiac. In fact, the same film revolves

around fiction (desires, to be more exact) as a trigger for human actions. film

Fincher'srecreates the noveladas research in the insightful book illustrator (and boy scout) Robert Graysmith

(Jake Gyllenhaal embroidering again the role of weirdo, after this little gem called Donnie Darko). TheKiller

Zodiacworks as a projectionist in a cinema and is impressed by the film The Evil Zaroff (Pichel and

Schoedsack, 1932), later looking for media recognition through of the press and television. The police

Toschi (a content and credible Mark Ruffalo) ends up serving as muse of the dirty Callahan of Eastwood or the McQueen

de Bullit (���ser��� by the pistol���n?) .Fincher is pessimistic. Human beings look for ghosts that may not even

exist, and in the end we are victims of our own passions, like the zodiac killer, like the three

detectives, like Brad Pitt's irascible character in Seven, like me , like t���.The best: \* The way to shoot the

murders. \* The aerial plans of the city. \* The scene of the encounter with the (supposed) projectionist. \* The

scene of the attempted assassination of the mother and her baby, with that terrifying ellipsis. \* That start with the theme

Easy To Be Hard, of the Three Dog Night, and an enlightened, almost optimistic city, of single-family and adolescents

that listen to Donovan or the pink ballads of Lynn Anderson and her Rose Garden. \* The cartoon of the nudes of

Y��ko Ono and Lennon in the editorial.

" 1

" When the floor of the past begins to open under our feet ... Haneke, one year after another, is dedicated to hit the conscience of the spectators. It pokes us in away

brutal, to the point of making us wobble and that we do not feel the soil that keeps us erect.

With "" Cach��� "" it was not going to be any other way. Starting from a seemingly more classical, simple andformal base

minimalist, Haneke, moving away from the "Funny Games" "but keeping close to his already established

personality in the same or brutally metaphorical "" La Pianista "", once again anguishes us with hisnarratives

critical, but at the same time aseptic, against human morality. Although apparently the film does not contain the

visual violence of previous works of his, if we unmask its true content, we will discover that the

violence, although contained, is much greater. Then we will receive a terrible pu���etazo.Haneke, in a pure state and

more full than ever, has been sweeping across Europe, festival by festival. As it happens in

his films, he has not left his head untouched. Until leading to the award ceremony of theFilm Academy

European2005, which gave no respite to any of his opponents. He took home five awards, among

which were the most important of the event (best film, best director, award of the critics,

best actor). No doubt, Haneke was already tired of collecting so much prize, that, in any case, he finally recognizes

the good work of one of the most interesting directors of the current very poor panorama. At this point, it goes without

saying that Haneke has dedicated all his work to reflecting hard on the conscience, morals,violence

hiddenand the condition of the human being. Such reflection probably comes, in "" Cach ��� "", to its maximum expression.

The Austrian director acts as a mere observer, and challenges us to a game: the game of riddles. Riddles that

lead us to our own nightmare, the most horrible fear that nests inside us, the terror of knowing

who we really are. It does not even need music to begin to recreate your personal nightmare , to

acclimate the torment to which we will be subjected, which will reach levels of tension that are truly unspeakable. Itnot

doesneed to be effective in order to ensure that the agonizing development of knowing what will happen becomes almost

unbearable. From the first to the last minute, Haneke gives us no respite. It keeps us in avilo

terrifyingthat gives no respite. His game has caught us, and we no longer have the chance to go back. As

the Bible says: "Maybe we have finished with the past, but he has not finished with us." Therefore, if

we want to play, we will have to receive a lot. It hurts us, because it is difficult to know who we really are, to

know each other in order to assure something, or to say that our past is clean. "" Cach��� "" speaks primarily

of the ghosts of the past. It is true that it uses a thread (better said, Mr. McGuffin) that

is nailed to the "" Lost Highway "" by David Lynch. But, although they both deal with the subject of consciousness, they

take very different paths. While Lynch was based on the psychological torment and conscience that harassed

his character for previous events, Haneke does it for the same reason. form but giving it a spin of

nut that decant more towards the moral. Towards a morality that we believe to have lost, but that really is not

so. She is there, hidden, to take her head slowly and torment us for our dark past. Therefore

, Haneke's challenge is based on excuses. The director wants to play with us the impossible. The impossible

from the point of view of the placement of the camera that observes Georges (or would do with ourselves, in

the same way), since it is not m�� It's a nonexistent trap. The impossible since he receives tapes in his house

that reveal more and more things about his past. Nobody is really sending them. What Haneke wants is forto

ussee what is happening to us. And let's analyze it ourselves. He does not want to tell us who sent them for the

simple fact that it is something that we have to discover ourselves. And to know that the videos are, really,

our memories. Something abstract, purely metaphorical, and materially nonexistent. Thus, no matter how securethink

wewe are on our throne, we know that our most terrible acts will always be waiting in the

deepest. We are sure to live a completely normal life, without potholes, without past crimes that justify

an extra and overwhelming present. But Haneke is responsible for putting it into question and bring out thereality

innerof us. It deals with hitting that well-to-do bourgeoisie to wake up once and for

all and be able to see what happened and stop denying it throughout his life. the

deepest of itself knows that it actually nests, even though in everyday life it does not even remember it. The

feeling of guilt continually haunts us, and, therefore, fear (it is not terror of use, is the fear of the

simple day) is something that accompanies us every corner. It gets in our dreams and takes us by the

hand to the perdici���n. With a sensational assembly and a simple direction (sometimes, it reminds us of awork

homemade) but prodigious, Haneke refers to two great actors who perform two monstrous performances:

Juliette Binoche and Daniel Auteuil. The film exudes an almost exhausting sobriety and a superbambience

and necessaryto achieve what it really seeks: to overwhelm the protagonist, and with it, the spectator himself.

Because, ultimately, what pursues is to question our supposed good moral at the time of making

a difference between social classes. Abysmal difference that causes rejection and avoids recognizing it, because

some stripped of everything to others to savor their comfortable and settled life. A life manipulated, in

essence, by the information deformed that They offer us on television. A medium that only opts for the

side that suits you best. It is indifferent if wars happen, suicide bombings or if the victim is

really the one who appears to be. As we do with all our decisions in order to achieve

a comfortable and quiet future. Passing over who is necessary. But, sooner or later, no matter how much we

want to deny ourselves and preach in a high way our goodness and the exemplary life that we have

led, I will finish. Going against us. We will attack the most unstable of our being: consciousness.

And the feeling of guilt will end up harassing what we have and what we most sincerely want:

our children. Whether we know it or not, we will go from generation to generation. And the ball will grow. Up to

a point as inevitable as it is terrifying. Consciousness, in that way, is as if it were inherited. And if we do not

understand it, it will continue there, hidden, observing, as aseptic but cruel as always, so that our

descendants will suffer and suffer it. Until we realize what we have caused. Be us or

those who come after. If somebody got to do it. Reality, however hidden it is, is the hardest and most

cruel thing that can ever attack us. More than any punch, blow or shot. Well, it's not a visceral punch,

which judges, discards, eliminates or decides. It is a pu queetazo that observes, analyzes and scrutinizes. That forces

us to decide and reflect, without positioning ourselves anywhere. And it is, in essence, the type of pu queetazo that

hurts the most. It is the hard blow of the weight of the conscience, of the past that persecutes us and makes us tremble to

the point of not feeling the ground under our feet. It shows us the fear of being observed and analyzed by

our actions and decisions. The fear of being judged for it, to be persecuted until our destruction. To

be persecuted by anyone but that. by ourselves. Of course, the rest of the world of cinema, especially

the cackling of the United States, should kneel before the evidence that "" Cach��� "" is the best of 2005,

that the work de Haneke is cinema in its purest state, and that gives hope to the rest of the typical works that flood the

celluloid and make the spectators who look for new concerns go down, every day, in the

deepest of disappointments. But, as is usual, not everyone will be willing to playgame

Haneke's. I can not stand it. It is something that the director also understands, as is also understood by our

human condition. Masterpiece by Michael Haneke.

" 1

" The average viewer is warned: if you have a bit of patience with its peculiar rhythm of narration

and with its deliberate dosage of horror, you find yourself face to face with one of the premieres of g ���nero more

interesting than we have been for years.

Maybe The Host (2006), the most successful film in the history of Korean cinema and the spoiled child of the

last edition of Sitges, is not the ultimate monster tape, but there is no doubt that it is a

serious competitor to be among the best that the genre has given us this year. That yes, it is not a film

of creatures to the use, and many of its characteristics could leave cold to the average spectator who goes to the

cinema waiting a repetition of the classic outline of most of the monsters' films that come to us from the

United States, where practically the only thing that changes is the nature of the bug to be eliminated. The truth is that

the Bong Jon-hoo film is not a typical example of this film genre, to begin with because it does not focus

absolutely on the monster, but also in the tribulations of a dysfunctional family of Se ,l, who

unite when a horrible monster (product of a mutation caused by the chemical residues of a

military base) North American) arises from the waters of the Han River and causes a massacre among the quiet passers-by

of an idyllic evening Leada, after which the little girl of the family clan is taken forconsumption

later. After declaring the national emergency, the family discovers that the little girl is still alive

somewhere in the labyrinthine culverts of Se���l, and before the official passivity they decide to undertake a b Look

for a Final Fantasy squad after the girl. After this initial attack, the tape lets a long time pass

before we see the monster again, and it's more focused on pain and unification. ���n of the family, a drama

that is seasoned with samples of a humor that sometimes reaches levels of bizarre authenticity, as for

example the whole sequence of a nocturnal vigil in memory of the v��� victims of the mutant of the Han. Also, the

personalities of the members of the clan clan are disparate and can not, and the film takes time

to follow each one in his particular quest from the little one; he is the enterprising grandfather and natural leader of the

group, the reckless and irresponsible father, the hardened and unreflective uncle (who also has a past as

leader of university revolts ) and the silent and quasi-champion archery. To all the discourse on

the family is added the not very subtle ecology subtext that of course does not miss the very evident criticism of

American interventionism (it is not coincidence, since the event that begins the story happened. �

really in the year 2000 when an officer of a US base illegally dumped hundreds ofin the Han

liters of adulterated formaldehyde, although at least no mutant has come out of it. ��a). But beyond

family dramas and eco-sociological criticism, there is something inescapable, and that is that in a movie of monsters,

the authentic protagonist has to be the creature. In this sense, Jon-hoo has played it by

showing the monster's appearances in broad daylight, bypassing the customary subtlety that is

often used to disguise the flaws of special effects. Such thing does not happen in The Host, in fact, the

monster is far from being perfect at technical level, although miraculously these defects do not influence at

all in our appreciation. The creature's appearances are so well managed that they produce an authentic

and genuine tension that does not disappear when we see him again. While it is true that the appearances of the monster

are not as frequent as we are accustomed, it is also true that this creature is put at the service

of a story that goes in other directions, and that its presence is not Only to scare the staff,

something that this film shares with what is undoubtedly one of its sources of inspiration and point of comparison

of a large sector cr�� �tico: the original version of Gojira (1954), of the Japanese Ishiro Honda, a film on

which it is necessary to return as soon as possible. In any case, a view of The Host it is more than

advisable, but the average viewer is warned that he will not find in it another copy of the

typical monster cinema (reason why he has not found, apparently, the enthusiasm that he unleashed in Sitges).

But if you have a bit of patience with its peculiar rhythm of narration and with its deliberate dosing of

horror, you find yourself face to face with one of the biggest releases of the genre. interesting about what we have been wearing for years.

And hurry, because the storm is coming: the corresponding American remake is already inevitable.

" 1

" It pretends to be both a comedy of height and a drama about human feelings, although the

resulting product is closer to the pathos pure and hard than anything else.

All the arts have always been interrelated, they have always drunk from one another for mutual benefit.

Since the appearance of the seventh art, this has maintained a close relationship with literature, and not only by the

number of novels or plays brought to the great screen, but also by the good work of many

writers, creators of authentic jewelry, eager to be considered as some, to be recognized asCharlie

pure writers.Kaufman is, and this there is no one who can discuss it, one of the bestwriters

scriptin the world cinema scene. Real masterpieces have come out of his imagination,

and while waiting for his directorial debut, here comes More Strange than Fiction. That in spite of not appearing its

name anywhere, the original idea of ​​the film is yours, idea developed by Zach Helm. Harold Crick

(Will Ferrell) is an anodyne man, who leads a gray existence, until one day he begins to hear a voice

that narrates his life. Is it about Karen Eiffel (Emma Thompson), an author who is writing her next novel,

in which she plans to kill Harold Crick? This is how Marc Forster's new film begins, with veryairs and aspirations

literary, which does not necessarily have to be a defect, as many people think. Of course, developing

the initial idea, which could have resulted in a brilliant story, was a hard task, and

unfortunately the novel Zach Helm is not up to the task. He signs a grandiloquent guide, with the aspirations of a

great great author, full of incongruities and plot flaws that appear everywhere. The characters,

blurred, lost and stereotyped to the extreme, are flatter than the encephalogram of a whistle.

It pretends to be both a comedy of height and a drama about human feelings, although theproduct

resultingis closer to the pathos pure and hard than anything else. The plot suffers several mysterious and

inexplicable mutations, as it begins as a comedy and then move to tragedy, tobecome

finallya pastel indigesto. To make matters worse the torture, the weight of the tape falls on Will Ferrel, an

actor full of nuances, specifically two: personified hieraticism can be transformed into the best

possible approach of the diab��� mu���eco lico Emma Thompson and Dustin Hoffman perform in their roles without

disheveled, while Maggie Gyllenhaal, the only positive point of the film, performs well,

eating Ferrol in every shot. I missed that the Fiction is, without a doubt, a film of great contrasts,

that will not leave anyone indifferent: either you love it or you hate it, there is no t�� Medium term. And if they still doubted

why we opted, we do it deeply for the second.

" 0

" A sequel that not only throws away all the virtues of the Aja tape, but also is a

firm candidate for the most bland and infumable that we have had to swallow in what is going of year.

Wes Craven, the man who had the opportunity to make the same film twice, is responsible along with his son

to write the script for the sequel to The Hills Have Eyes (2006), the successful remake directed by

Alexandre Aja from one of his seventies classics. Under normal circumstances, the hand of Uncle Wes would be a reason

to trust the quality of a film, and if I say "under normal circumstances" it is because all We know very

well that the Wes Craven of today is light years away from thirty years ago. The man we have today is

someone who is in a state of decline and who has ruined our hopes on more than one occasion,

whether as director, producer or screenwriter. That said, we must go to the point: The Return of the Damned (2007) is

a sequel that not only throws away all the virtues of the Aja tape, but also is a strong

candidate for the most It's bland and infumable that we've had to swallow so far this year. Worst of all is that

Wes had it easy, because no matter how hard he tried, this sequel (which in an incomprehensiblemove

marketinghas been baptized in Spain as the return of the damned when it would have been easier to put

a "" 2 "" to the title that already has )An) could not be worse than the one he led in 1985, famous not only for being

one of the most powerful clunkers of the eighties , but also for being the only tape in the story (so

far as it is) in which a dog has a flashback (!). Here there is nothing of that, since the objective from the beginning is to

emulate the intense and unbridled style of Aja and take it to the next level. The manager of the address is the

German Martin Weisz (best director of Sitges for the film Grimm Love (2006), which I have not seen), which

mimics the visual style of the ancestor tape looking for a claustrophobic atmosphere very much in the line of

The Descent (2005). Unfortunately, the results can not be more disastrous. Instead of a family of

unsuspecting passersby, the protagonists of this film are a group of rookie recruits from theGuard

Nationalcharged with providing supplies to a group of scientists settled in the hills of New

Mexico. What they find, on the other hand, is the massacred scientists and themselves prey to another family of

canine mutants, which they will have to face if they wish to survive. To begin with, this is the first mistake:

by making the protagonists a group of soldiers with weapons and training to kill, the sequel strips the

story of its human component, moving away any empathy that the viewer can feel toward the

characters. If we add that the mutants are represented as authentic giants that are short of

superpowers, we find that this interesting primitive confrontation of the first part is

here reduced to a typical monster movie , only badly made. The face to face between the beasts and the soldiers goes

through each and every one of the clichés of this type of film, along a listless direction and

a plot that is moves almost by incest. To make matters worse, the soldiers are so frankly stupid that at

fifteen minutes we not only do not feel pity for them, but we openly wish them the worst of luck.

I do not exaggerate when I say that these little tin soldiers represent a greater danger to themselves than the

cannibal savages that hide in the caverns. As a good representative of their time, the film does not

skimp on the casquer���a and in the rugged situations. Only the first scene is quite difficult to

bear (which, I do not deny, it paints well at first), although after seeing the entire film one can not help

but admit that it is about a quite evident shock therapy that tries to cover the innumerable

deficiencies of the film appealing to the easy impact. There is also a bloody scene of rape here, of

course much more explicit than that of the first part and with a greater emphasis on pleasure of thebeast

attacking, to which he even hangs the very calculated thread of drool from the mouth. The doubt that remains is whether or

not (as I have read in some places) the film tries to strain us an anti-war message about

the invasion in hostile terrain at the hands of the always ready American troops, reading that I have not only heard

about this tape but also about another pr��� Premiere, 28 weeks later (2007). If so, itme

seems toa rather poor message, and the exploitation of the deaths of the soldiers through the puerile method of

showing them as a band of boors who deserve as much. Fatality over them seems to me not only

ineffective, but also somewhat miserable. The return of the damned is, in this sense and in any other,

a film absurdly forgettable, mediocre and dispensable that can be passed without any charge of

conscience. It seems to me that Wes Craven will take a long time to raise his head again.

" 0

" That I loved, it has fascinated me and it has impressed me. Does that mean it's a perfect movie or a

masterpiece of cinema? Well, no. But it was not what was asked of her.

What is the meaning of "" 300 "" that has not already been said? At this point, everyone knows that it goes from the battles between

Persians and Spartans, which takes place in the Term���pilas and that is faithfully based on a cicle of Frank Miller.

All that is objective information that is collected in dozens of websites and blogs, magazines and newspapers of the most

varied. So, let's go with the subjective. And the subjective thing is that I thought it was a movie, that it made me

a hundred, that it made me raise my heart rate, that I let go of adrenaline chutes and it revolutionized

endorphins. has fascinated and impacted me. Does that mean it's a

perfect movie or a masterpiece of cinema? Well, no. But it was not what was asked of her. Falla, for example, the

character of Xerxes. In the c esmic it is more impressive, more se���orial, more powerful, more enigmatic. Your half

King and your half God are better off. In the film Xerxes is, rather, a reinona, divine of

death. And that hurts a little the effect of grandiosity that had the comic. And the grotesque monsters also

get tired. Fortunately, the elephants are killed very quickly. But the film is

colossal. You identify with history so much, you want to be a Spartan. Directly. And that's what we

asked the film to do: make it a show. And it is. There has been a lot of talk about the fidelity of the

frames to the graphic work of Miller and Valley, but they have been inspired, in turn, in reality.

Or, at least, in the reality that we have at our disposal: the very step of the Therm���pilas or classic paintings

like that of Jaques-Louis David. And to this they have added the Christian iconography of, for example, aSan

sanctifiedSebasti���n, of a Jesus Christ who spends the night in the olive grove or of a Judas that sells to his

Master for thirty silver coins.Snyder, to film this film, has also taken advantage of another lot of

classical imagery, such as that of Julio C���sar . And the spirit of the movie movies is there, of

course. With some gimmicky and mythological dialogues, with strong phrases like the one of the fight in the shade,

with sequences like the one of the boats arriving to the coasts, that we have seen in "" Troy "" or in "Letters from Iwo

Jima" "We could talk about the East and the West and the protest that Iran has made about the treatment

of the Persians, but look. He passed. At least, at the moment. Because I came out so amazed at the

show we've attended that talking about reality I do not want anything at all. A spectacle

of blood, violence and manhood that is called to irritate many and very diverse groups, but thatme. I am going

has completely hypnotizedto reread the comic, surely I will see the film again and, if you give me the boloto,

I will even buy a Spartan sword and shield to hang them on the wall of my house. Because the "" 300 ""

deserves that and more. "Movie squeeze!

" 1

" A film with its points in favor, but too saturated with topics, with simplicity, with sci-fi fiction

, with foreseeable resolutions. But it is also a good toy to spend an entertaining time,

widening the manga cin���fila a little.

The title of the film can be deceiving, if we look at the implicit content that develops

throughout a narrative, according to the Algunoa some, "" stumbling "", although the truth is that the director and

screenwriters never lose sight of the essentials; narration fluid and without taboos, I would say. He said that the title

can move to deceit because here what is emphasized is something else, sustaining itself in repeated situations that

refer to the com���ny I missed the sensation of "" I've already lived it "", which is nothing more than an excuse to

structure the story. Actually, it is a discourse -other more- about God or about the existence of aorder

divine, vindicating the value of sacrifice in the social and symbolic context post-September 11.theater,

Ideolgico film and regurgitated controlled by industry and the propaganda machine that takes detrs.La idea

is very simple; police thriller mixed with elements and themes of science fiction. And that's what

Scott wants to create; a serious film about the human condition in a specific context. Theelements

fantasticserve to marinate and brighten up the plot a little, a typical and relamida history in hundreds of

past and present films. That yes, in specific situations it manages to be original, like in the persecution by

road to two times. That is, the only way to save the film was introducing temporary trips,

which is nothing new either. A word that defines the main problem of this film - and that is also

the problem of most of today's commercial cinema - is the word "saturation" ". Saturation of topics and

common places, saturation of "" latigillos "" own of the police suspense and of the science fiction genre.

Both in the characterization and in the argumentative approach, everything is based onclichés. The

insubstantialtemporal paradoxes, the psychokiller patriot, the well-known secondary cast that has no

other function than doing of "" stuffed "", the typical situations "" in extremis "". that same material, under a

fresh and genuine look, could offer much more, but here it is insisted on the pale portrait and the rehash of

genres conjugated with quite awkwardness. The staging loses on the one hand what it gains for the other:

en���rgica based on close-ups and electrifying movements and changes. It serves as an effective visual style that

adapts quite well to the tone of the story, but, once again, we end up in saturation: telefilmic poturr���,

without a true aesthetic style. Under the electrifying pulse of the camera there is nothing more than inanity and trickery

. However, it has its point of honesty since the story takes place, as indicated in a

previous paragraph, with fluidity and with a more than correct dramatic sense, framing the space-time odyssey of

the protagonist agent in a process of philosophical ��� nfulas (that's it, very hackneyed and unoriginal) without the

need to give explanations that obstruct the narrative fluidity. Each meaning emerges in each of the

gestures, situations and "" encounters "" with the destination, always maintaining the central idea that, no matter how much

you try to improve, change or introduce an essential variation in the temporal continuum , there is always anredoubt

inalterable, a superior order unmovable against the wishes of the human being. And there is a price to pay. In

short, a film with its points in favor, but too saturated with topics, with simplicity, with sci-

fi fiction, with predictable resolutions. But it is also a good toy to spend an entertaining time,

widening the manga cin���fila a little.

" 0

" Not even the presence of Jacqueline Bisset and her final half hour (which is left over) manages to return to a

film that is watering after its excellent first minutes

As the plot progresses one wonders, what is watching , it happened to me with "" The fire of revenge "" that its

video-clipero montage and its strange planes caused in me an odd headache, with "" Domino "" it happens the same way, in

the middle of the film one is tired of so much flat, contraplano and parpadeo.La tape pretends to be a mixture

of tapes like "" Assassins Natos "" with a gui���n that in some moments pick up scraps of "" Amor a Quemarropa "" or "" Pulp

Fiction "", unfortunately ends up being an action movie (with the members of "" Sensaci���n de vivir "") where

Everything ends up being tiresome and boring, perhaps, the best screen is the presence of Keira Knighley and

Mickey Rourke (again topical after his excellent work in "" Sin City ""), not even the presence of

Jacqueline Bisset and his final half hour (which is left over) manages to return to a film that makes water after his

excellent first minutes. Resumiendo, a tape that should have finished with the same intensity with which it

starts, I do not I missed that it took "" centuries "" to reach the cinemas of our country.

" 0

" The film is not perfect, but of course, this is one of the great movies of 2008. Honoring the title and expiating my sins as well ���filo refers (if it can

be called Sin to end the year with "" Saw 4 "" and start with "" The Golden Compass "") decided to do penance and at the same

time to redeem myself with this film, candidate to 7 golden balloons (whose ceremony as you well know will not be celebrated

by the already endless strike of writers) and one of the m��� I think that this year's Oscars candidate, and

that is, the closer a film is released to the key month of February, the more options it has, and now it's when

we will get the CINE in that way, in capital letters, leaving the "trash" "commercial" (and palomitera) for the rest of the

year. Well, after my usual entradilla, that does not always mean something, but that it usually looks pretty

good, and that, for those of you who usually read me, it is almost part of the "" seal of the house "", we go with my opinion

about the film, an excellent romantic drama (yb���lico) that will delight both the films that go

to the movie theater, and the "" machorros "" that believing that, once more, as a pig to the slaughterhouse, we are going to

swallow the most romantic tape of the year, we will find one of those films that thrill to own and

to strangers. Perhaps, the only 2 negative notes that I see it, are, its exaggerated slowness, and it is that, it takeslong

atime to enter into matter, it is lost sometimes in irrelevant planes (It seems that there are a kind of

unwritten rule for which all the nominated films have to last at least 2 hours or more.), and the

convoluted nature of their editing, which I do not know if it ��� desorie ntado, or that I went to the cinema again without glasses, or

that I was, but in some other occasion I had to ask my companions why part of the plot

we were. And now we go with the good parts, on the one hand the excellent performances of everyone, from Keira

Knightley to James McAvoy, passing by Saoirse Ronan above all, who knows, with his hugeeyes

blue, and with his "childish malice" "equip the most petty children characters of the 7th art. On the other

hand, the utmost detail with which care has been taken to decorate, costumes, music (the score in some moments

with Briony's typewriter, as background sound.), Thus like a photograph of those that leave one wide-

eyed during the whole projection. The tape is not perfect for those 2 errors thatalready

I havereviewed, but since then, we are facing a great movie, and given the little cinema that I have seen in whathave been in

we2008 (only 2 movies) I will say that of course, if all I'm going to see from now on it is

equal to the film directed by Joe Wright, it will be for me this year one of the best years (in terms of quality)'m watching

of the cinema that I.

" 1

" Mordant, incisive and politically very incorrect, 'Borat' laughs at everyone with everyone and

is extremely funny.

The best comedy of 2006. 'Borat' is an endless loop of absurd and totally hilarious situations, created

by a Sacha Baron Cohen in a state of grace in his libretto in the form of false documentary, which leaves in total

evidence to certain sectors and ���s of the North American culture. Mordaz, incisive and politically very

incorrect, 'Borat' laughs of everybody with the whole world and turns out to be extremely funny (although it is necessary to

admit that it is not suitable for all palates). He has one of the best male performances of the year

(Sacha Baron Cohen as Borat Sagdiyev, keeping the type for the hour and a half that lasts his creation, which

unfortunately did not receive a deserved nomination. Aln to the Oscar) and, possibly, one of the best and mostchemical

hilarioussequences of the decade (three words: two naked men). It almost ends with me of what

I could get to re���r.MUY recommendable (although as I said before, unfortunately it is not made to

be digested by all).

" 1

" The film does not play with the possible outcomes, but full of unrest when it tells the number of

incidents that could have aborted the plot.

Spielberg's cinema represents the exact opposite of Greengrass'. Spielberg is a much easier author

to praise because he leaves his mark on everything he touches. His vocation is to manipulate. When he talks about Jews, he makes

his political message clear, and when he talks about talking children or immigrant heroics he knows that any

excuse is valid to provoke a emotion. There are those who admire this type of author because he does a difficult job.

This type of viewer may not appreciate what Greengrass does. His work is reduced to stripping some facts of

every element ret���rico, everything that may affect us. The style of the film is thoroughly

behavioral, we know nothing of any character except what he said or what he did at the time of the accident.

The spectator is free to sympathize with the terrorists, or with the hostesses. Everything you see are facts. No one is

going to see "" United 93 "" without knowing the end. The film does not play with the possible outcomes, but full of

uneasiness when it narrates the number of incidents that could have aborted the plot. Even if it looks like a

neglected movie, it has a deep labor. The author has chosen a space of time in which things

could have changed. He has chosen a shoulder camera that moves like a gaze. He has chosen voices and

characters that do not behave according to the circumstances because nobody knows that he is taking part in

a historical moment. The heroes do not have time to make big phrases, the controllers do not know where

the airplanes are although they see the towers burning with their eyes. The only one who knows too much is the spectator.

" 1

" Very good for the connoisseurs of the previous deliveries, and much better than the rest of the billboard of

action, for all the others. I hope that after a break we have new films by Jason Bourne.

First distinction. There are two types of people watching this movie. Those who saw the first two and those who

did not. For the former the film is a continuation of the previous two, and we can justify that its gui���n

is much simpler, or at least, the story is not too complicated . If we only see this film, it

seems to us simply a persecution full speed, with hardly any history, and where we do not understand very well why

things happen. But hey, it will be weird for the spectator to go see it without having enjoyed the

previous ones. As I have seen the previous two, I liked the movie a lot. I agree that

history is no more than an extension of the preceding ones, and almost an epilogue. I may be wrong, but it does not

give the impression of being an error, but it has been posed that way. Obviously, after the great level of previous

deliveries, the third part weakens a bit in comparison, but even watching it as a separate film, it still brings

a great advantage to the rest of the action tapes. What we have now. We are going to have a

realistic and coherent film, where the bad guys also think and have good ideas, and the protagonist is achieving

his goals by doing it even better, or with help of a little luck It is also again, very well

directed, and alternate the most frenetic moments with the camera, to others where the more general image allows to

follow the action without problems. There are those who criticize the electric camera movements in hand-to-fighting

hand, and yes, I agree that they allow Matt Damon to look much quicker and more lethal, but They have

become a brand of the movies. If Greengrass used those movements also in the shootings and in the

car chases, I would not like anything, but as a sign of the close and brutal hand-to-hand fighting, I

recognize that love it As for the actors, again perfectly, although in this case, the shortage of

gui���n leaves us with new bad guys we barely glimpse, and that is perhaps the film's biggest sin.

In this kind of stories, the figure of the bad guy is essential, and the best bad guy is the Algerian murderer, who does not

even say a word, but always gets the attention when he is on screen. Againappear

other brands alsoin the series, as the scenes in European cities andcar

crebleschases,even if taken to limit the possibilities, as well as other electronic gizmo sb Unique and some

Bourne trick to mislead your pursuers. To finish, I can not avoid citing Matt Damon himself, who

when asked about the films of Bond, I do not hesitate to answer, that James Bond would be one of the bad guys in

the Bourne saga, being in our imagination a cameo by Daniel Craig. In short, very good for the

connoisseurs of the previous deliveries, and much better than the rest of the billboard of action, for all the

others . Hopefully after a break we have new films by Jason Bourne.

" 1

" Good is the impression after a first viewing. The aesthetic quality immerses us in the oppressive atmosphere

of Miller's art. Clouds, twilight lights, dusty earth, strong contrasts of light and textures

achieved in the first planes.

���Mito or reality? ��� The history seen through the magnifying glass of the centuries? Little is known for sure

about the Battle of the Therm���pilas, but one thing is certain: it breathes porpica on all four sides. Frank

Miller spent years preparing his graphic story about Spartan gestalt mythology against the Persian army of

Xerxes and edited one of his most famous books . A few years later, it comes in the form of a film for the enjoyment of

all lovers of action cinema. 300 Spartan soldiers at the orders of their king Le���nidas confronted the

million Persians who, under the direction of the dreadful Xerxes, invaded everything in their path ��� by the 5th century BC Whether

the figures are or are not, if the Spartans were called by Athens or were they alone, if they were

servants or were they bare-chested? Remove all those prejudices and dilemmas when entering the cinema. History

is in libraries, there is only honor, blood, courage, war and death. And Warner Bros., from the hand of

Zack Snyder, presents it to our eyes in all its majesty and visual impact. For the kindness of Warner Bros.

Entertainment Spain and the invaluable collaboration of www.muchocine.com. net, to which we greatly appreciate the

attention from these lines, we had the privilege of attending the first screening of the "" 300 "" in Spain, which will

be premiered at public on next March 23. The projection was in original version, being still in the dubbing phase.

Good is the impression after a first viewing. The aesthetic quality immerses us in the oppressive atmosphere

of Miller's art. Clouds, crepuscular lights, dusty earth, strong contrasts of light and very successful textures

in the first planes (the bronze of helmets and shields, the fabric of the layers, red as the blood

that splashes on what is, perhaps) ��s, the most literal reference to the c���mic) help us to identify ourselves, by pure

sensorial proximity. Those who have the privilege of seeing it in the Imax version, I imagine they will understand

perfectly what I say. The plot, easily understandable, also focuses on the story that is told,

that we do not forget that it is as simple as the determination of soldiers in a mission with a unique anddestination

inevitable. And the script does well not to complicate it unnecessarily. On the one hand, the warriors fight like

heroes. They only do that, but they do it as the best. On the other hand, the citizens of Sparta debate in the

rearguard the future of their threatened society. Although it is true that that plot developed in the own

Sparta gives credibility to the fact of the departure of only 300 men to face an army like the

Persian, in the development of the film It turns into its ballast, into that kind of "intermediate" that allows

the warriors to rest and lengthen the footage until the hour and fifty minutes, approximately, which seems to

be politically correct, today. �a, but that would not have to restrict the creativity of a work.

Here you can leave a question in the air: Cundo studies atrevern to make movies an hour?

When we dare to ask for them? I do not mean to say that it is long, far from it. On the contrary,

almost two hours seem to fly by. But the rhythm of the film suffers. The fast camera game?

Slow camera is masterful and works very well in battles or in the fabulous girl of the oracle, but not in the

gui���n, which suffers braking when the body asks you m��� s. And in the end, the great failure ofarises for me

production: references that remind us, much more than they should to remain in simple references, to

Troy and, above all, Gladiator A certain lack of originality, which had been demonstrated throughout

the film, which leaves a small bitterness in our mouths. Something that was easily avoidable. I do not want, however, to

take away what is the great center of gravity of the film. The scenes of impossible battles, of

extreme heroism, are of a spectacularity rarely seen in the cinema. A great choreography that reaches

its peak in the first Persian horde that attacks the Spartans in front and in which they are rejected and annihilated.

The last section of the scene develops as a majestic and sublime ballet in a very successful traveling with

a purely Greek profile. Soberbio.As regards the cast, I think a great success of the casting (although Inot

doknow if forced by budget, since it had to take almost the entire digital postproducci���n) the

election Exclusive of good actors of secondary roles, without stars, since that gives realism and

credibility to the characters. Only Faramir, son of the Steward of G���ndor, appears in our mind. In this way,

the viewer focuses much more on the story and avoids what happened in Sin City, to speak of a

close referent: that one would be entertained in find the features of Frodo in the bad of the white glasses? Gerard

Butler meets like King Leonidas, in a sober role, which also does not allow more boasting than his blunt

phrases, harangues and, that's right, looks of hatred for Xerxes who would drill his own hoplite helmet. What

looks, and a lot, is body, like all its fatigue partners. The girls who enjoyed the Brad

Pitt of Troy have here to dream for a few weeks? [As an anecdote of the original version, it is curious that

a Scottish king occasionally escapes a certain Scottish accent]. On the other side, reigning over a

yes The Persian Army, plagued by monsters, mercenaries and slaves, is the Emperor Xerxes, played by

a Rodrigo Santoro whom he would not recognize even his own mother, because such is the change of image to the that has been

submitted for this role. Owner of a disturbing harem, he exercises God on Earth aided by his imposing

supernatural figure. In this sense, one of the most colorful details of the film is the wholeimagery

Persian, based on ringed earrings, gold chains, masks and their distorted voices to look more

serious, cavernous. This last one seems to me a very successful touch. Lena Headey is as beautiful as Queen Gorgo,

but she has to star in the dull part of the film. Next to her, Dominic West is very convincing as

bad bad. As for the soundtrack, it was one of the big unknowns that surrounded the premiere after seeing

the spectacular trailer with "" Just like you imagined "", by Nine Inch Nails. Finally, they have opted for a

classical composition by Tyler Bates (usual for Snyder), who also drinks from other great soundtracks

, such as Gladiator (again, on all in the voices) or The Thin Red Line, who approaches at

moments of the first half of the tape. However, the most accomplished and forceful moments, much more

suited to my taste with the images, are those in which rock is used more ca��� ero And it is there, from my

point of view, where also the film sins of timorous. Another act of bravery would be to have given Trent

Reznor, or someone similar, the possibility of creating a complete soundtrack that would not have depreciated the

historical character at all. �rico of the film.It is true that based on a film of such magnitude, which does not stop being, for the

film, a magnificent storyboard previously published, constrict a lot the liberties of adaptation, but a

greater balance in the plot or, even, focusing only on the battle would have given much more strength to the

film. Would you accuse her of a long videoclip, of perverting Miller's comic? It is possible, but I would have run

the risk of doing something more daring and not stay with that regustillo Gladiator that accompanied you in the last

15 minutes of pel��� cula Regustillo that I also think was avoidable even adjusting to the c���mic.Resumiendo, and

from my personal point of view, the film lacks valent�� Where it has plenty of trade and technique. Sometimes it is

preferable to sin of avant-garde that of imitador of Ridley Scott (there are things that surpass the "" inspired by ""). And

the reason that Zack Snyder leaves is that he lost a great opportunity. Eye, that not to have done a bad

movie, which are different things. For those who go to the cinema without wanting to see Citizen Kane, the result is more

than remarkable. Do not miss it, you will enjoy it enormously. A movie for this spring's calendar.

" 1

" Movie of an analog hero in a digital world. Mamporros, testor���nicos di ylogos and technology,

mixed, agitated and cocktails. Pure fun.

There are actors who are guarantee of success when choosing a film, at least in our humble

home. For example, the biggest one is Robert De Niro, which makes my hair stand like hooks to hang a

Guernika of each one of them just to mention it. Then there are others, who will tell me that they are not actors, like the

current governor of California (you do not catch me splitting a phalanx by writing his name) that I

love all his films. No more. And on the road between these two greats, is Bruce Willis.

Impressive, both main and secondary. The film is about John McClane, apoliceman

New York, who is entrusted with a simple mission, to take a commander to a computer hacker. ���tico. In these,

a terrorist group tries to assassinate the latter, so it begins a flood of bombings, shots,

persecutions, etc., around a total terrorist attack based on global connectivity and the dependence

that It has the modern society of telecommunications and computer science. Let's see, the film starts

quite well, you have not sat in the chair and a few have already died. I like the subject, with a

solid technological script. As the thing progresses, we start doing a few waters, but as the

Mamporrian level increases exponentially, nothing happens. We have the usual blustering John

McClane that, along with the joke of macho, overflows the testosterone in the room. What can we say

bad? Me nada.Resumiendo, film of an anonymous hero in a digital world. Mamporros, testor���nicos di

ylogos and technology, mixed, agitated and cocktails. Pure diversion.Besitos.PD: It is true that thescene

plane'sis a mess, but what more does it do? PD2: The use of special effects is not the usual I would venture to

say that most of the scenes are of specialists, which gives an added value, at least for me.PD3:

Ok, the phrase of the h�� Anal hero is not mine, but what about being a lord? Hahaha.

" 1

" Alex de la Iglesia manages the staging and the film features a couple of verysequence shots

memorable. Pity that everything results in a capricious and self-indulgent game, in an undefined dramatic tone,

and an unfinished philosophical discourse when it is not incoherent.

The films define their quality by the forcefulness that we can appreciate in the tones and forms used. It is not

enough to have an interesting story in hand if the filmmaker does not apply an efficient look. The new

film by Alex de la Iglesia is a good example of a reciprocal distortion between the conceptual basis of the story

(quite dense, complex) and the medical objective that it pursues, af���n the classic thriller and the features that best

define the genre of suspense, placing the viewer before a puzzle of characters and data that become the

codes, the material to follow the proposed game. Combining these two facets was meritorious and, of course, the

film implies a risk of being grateful in these times. We do not know the text on which it is

inspired, but it gives the sensation that the writers - in the attempt to synthesize the story so that it can

be more accessible to all the public - have not known to find the right outline and development, with which we

have a very loose and unbalanced script. Being a product that plays with the keys and the mythology of the

genre in order to create a certain effect (the surprise), it is the most predictable. The same

characterization of the characters and - above all - the presentation of them already points towards

obvious resolutions for any attentive and knowledgeable viewer of the keys of the genre. The different

turns of the nut that appear in the final section do not transcend that range of possibilities. Therefore, where

is the surprise? On the other hand, in his pretended condition of work, he does not find the necessary fluidity in

a dispersed development because of the excessive exposition of philosophical and mathematical concepts. It is not uncommon to

dedicate so much footage to this type of elements (which on the other hand are inescapable in the construction of the

meaning of this story) without the spectator being able to be part of it. Obviously, it is not about

explaining or demanding from the viewer knowledge about Pythagorean mathematics and philosophy. It is a problem of knowing how to

apply an effective look, of rhythm, of tempo, of synthesizing that set of data in a way that is

articulated in a certain dramatic exhibition. In short, narrative agility. And here what there is is a

too thick narrative. In its abstract contents and in the philosophical discourse it is shipwrecked in a mere

exhibition of concepts that concludes in inconsistencies. This film talks about senses or absence of them,

of indeterminacy, causality or chaos. Resolving the enigma of a crime depends on knowing the pattern that guides the

murderer's behavior. If there is an implicit order that governs the universe, we can predict and modify the

flow of events. The discourse - represented mainly in Professor Arthur Seldom (John Hurt) -

points to the unknowable nature of a universe governed by chance. Interestingly, the final scene

aims to underline the truthfulness of Seldom's thought, with Elijah Wood doing of the propitiatory victim, the

butterfly that beats the wings and determines the whole development of the story. Indeed, in the universe there is anorder

implicit(and that we can know, and therefore, there is no chance), which produces an internal inconsistency in

the story, and it is at this point where more It is noted that the writers play whimsically with the elements without

specifying a meaning and a dramatic tone. Worst of all is the last plane, the expression of surprise on the

face of Elijah, which aims to reflect the (unmotivated effects inherent to the film) surprise

of the viewer. The expressiveness of his eyes was never so badly used. Undoubtedly, Alex de la Iglesia manages

the staging and the film has a couple of very memorable sequence shots. Pity that everything

results in a capricious and self-indulgent game, in an undefined dramatic tone, and anphilosophical discourse

unfinishedwhen it is not incoherent.

" 0

" Rodrigo Cort���s' debut feature reminds me, for the elegant invoice, of In the city without limits. The

director rolls bravely, without fear and with an actor in a hyperactive state of grace who eats the screen. A

jugaaaaaaaaar!

Well, it is a contestant a movie that I should have seen at the cinema and that I have rented in the video, what we are going

to do. Rodrigo Cort���s' debut in the film reminds me, elegant invoice, to In the city without limits.

The director rolls bravely, without fear and with an actor in a hyperactive state of grace who eats the

screen. Cortés returns at times what the video clip gave him and he goes his hand in a couple of moments (that

horse.) but it is so visually powerful and has a gui���n so perfectly assembled in those images

(I repeat, powerful) that "you eat it with potatoes" "overcoming those initial delusions of grandeur that can put

the viewer against you. The effects can make you think of the Fincher pre-Zodiac and that, when we are

talking about a Spanish director has to be good for balls.

" 1

"A real update of the genre of monsters comes from the hand of the South Korean director Bong who,

far from the digital approach of the Hollywood industry, presents the monster in the background

against the main characters.

Nobody knows the face of the Familiar, there are people who say that it is like a huge dog, or like a black viper with

cat eyes, and they say that at night it goes through the ca���averales dragging a chain. [Jorge Lanata, Muertos de

amor, Ed. Alfagurara, Buenos Aires, 2007] That something that oppresses us, stalks us, devours us. It has been, is and

will be represented in the cinematographic ( as in any of the arts, from literature to the cosmic) through

the figure of the monster Our fears represented in an indescribable being The monster, like metaphors,

makes us prisoners of our fears, restricting our freedom of action, provoking hujda, Spainand

Despairhopelessness, and only heroicism --ah��� the cinematic-- willus

rescuefrom the absolute abyss. The fan is large. The zoo surprises us in Moby Dick or Tibur���n.

Devastating aliens, such as Alien and Predator. Sympathetic Gremlins. Clients like Frankenstein and King

Kong. Z series with a hero called The toxic avenger. And always the Japanese like Godzilla or Gojira. Our

Latin Fauno. We unravel, through the infantilization, with the Monsters of P���xar and Shreck of

Dreamworks.A real update of the monsters genre comes from the hand of the South Korean director Bong

, away from the digital approach of the Hollywood industry (special effects above

all), presents the monster in the background against the main characters. What is really

important is what happens to the protagonists, their emotions: how they face that something and how itthem

changes, personally and in relationships with others. Each of the members of the family will discover the

monster they carry inside and how to get rid of him. To do this, Bong constructs the story from different optics.

This fact produces to happen of the comedy, to the terror, of the familiar drama to a film of action. Difficult task of

which the director is successful. And that is the happiness of this Asian cinema; that disorients us and captivates us at

the same time. And even, Bong gives it an ideological tone. A political representation of the monster as an allegory of

any form of repression. And outside interventionism, hand in hand with the US superpower that,

in the same way that bombs Baghdad will also launch chemical weapons on Se paral to end the monster

(which, by the way, they created themselves), as they already did on Hirosima. That monster that throws bombs

indiscriminately on defenseless populations is the most fearsome of all.

" 1

" Outstanding film by Christopher Nolan who, after his acojonante 'Batman Begins', returns to show off

on the big screen.

I already say in advance that I have not read the book by Christopher Priest, so I will not go into the good or

bad adaptation that it is. Christopher Nolan who, after his acojonante 'Batman

Begins', returns to show off on the big screen. 'El Prestigio' (sorry, I refuse to call it as the

"" translated "" here, 'The final trick'.), The story of a battle between two magicians and a story of revenge to the

maximum exponent, has a large cast that is huge and fully meets their work, led by

a very big Hugh Jackman, the god Christian Bale, Michael Caine and Scarlett Johansson, which I will talk about a few

lines below. Everything is very Nolan: excellent accomplishment and montage, with a very well-crafted script that does

a great job with the temporary jumps, with an atmosphere and an intrigue very well achieved s.

In addition, he does not give it all chewed and makes the viewer think enough after the projection, something that is

appreciated in these times. The only weak point that I find is that, perhaps, depending on your own patience

, you can do a little long.

" 1

" Starting from the basis that "" I could not fully concentrate on the whole film "", this new release

seems very forced, there are so many things that have tried to capture that the rhythm is run over and by

Bland moments.

After seeing Daniel Radcliffe in Equus (play by Peter Shaffer, in which he is the protagonist)

naked, and with that tail between his legs, it is certainly difficult to believe that he is Harry Potter again. Let's not

forget that the Potter saga is aimed at children and as such their characters, even if they have an evolution and

maturation, they always keep that veil adolscente (how to m� ��nimo), clear that in the case of Daniel, such

"" apparatus "" completely removes said veil. So, starting from the basis that "" I could notconcentrate

fullyon the whole film "", this new release seems very forced, there are so many things that have been

meant to show that the rhythm is run over and at times insipid. At least I have not enjoyedmuch

this film asas in the previous ones and that we had a Helena Bonham Carter (God love her) and Evanna Lynch

(Interprets Luna Lovegood) as a sinister touch of this delivery (No s ��� if you notice that every time you

throw more to the sinister theme, introducing Dark characters). For me the best thing about this film is it "" without a doubt "",

Evanna Lynch (August 16, 1991) is a Irish actress of 1,52m tall. It interprets to Luna Lovegood in

the fifth part of the saga fÃlmica of Harry Potter. At the auditions for the paper, he beat 15,000 applicants.

Even before the paper was given, she was already a big Harry Potter fan; This is her debut on the big screen,

God more than debut, no doubt is the future replacement of Helena Bonham Carter and we'll see if new muse

of Tim Burton along with others of his style as Chirstina Ricci. Only to see it is worth going to the

movies. For the rest, the visual theme is still spectacular, as the excellent production that has already been

a hallmark in the series. Potter's world, despite everything, is still fascinating.Yates, director of

Davidthis release, will also direct the following Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince that begins to shoot in

September of this year. Tieneoy is scheduled to premiere at the end of 2008. Except for the protagonists, the rest

of the cast is not confirmed. If you thought that this was staying here, you were wrong because in 2010

we will be able to attend the end of the saga with: Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows, moment in which thecareers

artisticof the Young protos will plummet for some time.

" 1

" Almod���var talks about women again and turns them into the absolute protagonists of his story

The good thing about artists is that they can cause love, hate but almost always curiosity. There are those who

hate Almod���var. And who venerates it. There are those who try to see their films without being influenced by the commotion

that he creates as a character (which, by the way, is unpresentable). And without prejudice (although seeing thetrailer

criminalis a shock) I went to see his last film. As I talked to her, it seemed like an absolute wonder and I did not

get to see bad education because nobody told me anything about her. I wanted to satisfy my curiosity with her

return. that the best of Volver is his title: he returns to his land, returns to his usual themes, returns

to demonstrate that he has musical taste, returns to his fetish actresses? and the verb will be conjugated in future time, since

it will return to the Academy, it will win Goyas again, it will gain an international reputation again The film is

unclassifiable , as my companion of HL says (although I do not share the punctuation at all) I am

familiar with the "" manchego "" world that he portrays, that's why I see that one of the points m��� s loose of the film

is to fall back on a glamourous Pen���lope Cruz the weight of the protagonist. Come on, that in equal parts is

out of place and in others gets excited. In fact, and that specialists can tell me, Cruz is

illuminated in a different way. Come on, like they did with the Hollywood divas. Does anyone know the details

of Pe's contract as an actress? I remember perfectly when they told me how neat and complex was the

contract and the conditions of Salma Hayek to put her in La gran vida, by Antonio Cuadri. The mostaspect

attractiveof the film is the "fantastic" " The always fantastic Carmen Maura. Reconciling a story with that

element (I do not specify more because I think it would be a spoiler) is great and gives the film anweight

original, very little seen in our cinema . The actresses are very well directed. Lola Due���as does a good

job, as well as Blanca Portillo and Chus Lampreave (who knows little and who should have been more

comical). �var talks about women again and turns them into the absolute protagonists of his story; He does not

hesitate to return to his constants of the "man who only lives to torment".music of Alberto Iglesias

I see themisplaced, but it works well at times. Alcaine's photography is remarkable and Salcedo's montage

very successful. An interesting film, quite irregular in its rhythm and pretensions, but one of the most original

and personal of Spanish cinema. Actualol actual.Sin going further, I think the best analysis of the film (quite

detailed and with spoilers) is that of Mambotaxi, fervent admirer of Don Pedro.

" 1

" Authentic wonder of entertainment. A tape full of authentic and realistic action, which, despite its

long duration -144 minutes, does not become heavy.

I, who have always stayed with Roger Moore, did not fear Daniel Craig at all. It's more, I wanted to

change the face of James Bond, after ridiculous movies starring Pierce Brosnan that touched

the science fiction. For now, the most prestigious agent in Britain has returned, more innovative, real, mature

and imperfect, albeit with a twist of argument, since the new adventure is based on the first adventure, written

by Ian Flemming and titled Casino Royale. The fact that a film is written by Paul Haggis is already saying, and a

lot. The double Oscar winner and nominated for his perfect Million Dollar Baby script, brings the film's

main script (written by Neal Purvis and Robert Wade) a touch m��� s of seriousness, realism and

brutalism. And the truth is that it shows, and a lot. The new Bond is an agent with flaws, mistakes in his

work, iron, and above all, very crude. The film opens in a beautiful black and white, with a lot of

contrast. James Bond, an agent without a license to kill, is charged with a couple of shots to a blow in his

office, although previously he had explained how he ended his contact (attentive to the moved scenes of the

bathroom, shot with an innate sadism in the last Bond). From there, the magnificent credit titles begin

, with mixtures of card games and pistols and moving characters formed by aces, diamonds and

hearts. The fact is that Casino Royale has a very careful start, with hardly any cracks, attractive. The rest

of the film will be better than you see it, since otherwise it loses all the grace (well, it has already lost it with

what I have said now). Let's go talk about Daniel Craig, then. I have to say that I feel absolutely happy

for the choice of this actor, what I say, actorazo. No one better than he could have played thisguy

tough, even if a ghost pelt (but not to be thrown into the void by a swamp, no), with iron��� English, elegant

when needed and beast and sÃ © dico when he does too. In addition, in this new installment, the secret agent

maintains a long loving relationship, nothing transient, as it used to happen with the previous ones, so the trait

of gawking for that delight that is Eva Green also has to stand out. In the end, what this English actor would say is

the perfect Bond. Now let's go for the Bond girl. Eva Green, noted for her performance in So���adores, by

Bertolucci, could also be the perfect Bond girl. Why? Well, the truth is that it has several

reasons: it ties, so to speak, with the protagonist, since it creates such picaresque chemistry between the two of them (at the

beginning of their relationship) that makes Vesper Lynd (that's what she's called), be a woman of strong character and not

at all, a weak symbol of more, as happened a in the other Bond. Here, both Bond and Vesper are a symbol of

strength. In short, both are the Bond and the perfect Bond girl, and that makes Casino Royale

Casino Royale. Another strong point of the film are the numerous scenes of action. All of them, from which

the film opens, located in Madagascar, are really vertiginous, full of tension, long, but nevertheless

not heavy. I could highlight each one of them, and it is that both the one already mentioned in Madagascar, the one in the

airport, the one in Venice or the one that is located in the museum, for not leaving me the hyper-tense intermediates between

Each game of poker, they make the film show its more adventurous and at the same time more realistic side. And is that

Casino Royale does not lack anything. We have talked about love and action, so I lack the drama. The

tape has many touches of this genre, so many, that I will highlight some of them: the heavy conscience thathas

Vesperin mind, after seeing James fighting on the casino staircase , makes her immerse herself in the

hotel shower to forget about the past, so Bond, or no, will help her by sitting by her side. Or in that

same piece, do not miss the agent bleeding as a desperate and half crying for having charged that

pair. That Brosnan would never do it, come on, he would not even mess around fighting. Attentive, SPOLIER. And finally, the

last scene in which Vesper appears, drowning in the submerged elevator of a Venetian building and with Bond

trying to get her out of there, although knowing perfectly well that He is saving the woman who has betrayed him.

This scene is, simply, the best of the film. End of SPOLIER. Finally, within the most artistic aspects

of the film, highlight the evil Le Chiffre, played by Dan���s Mads Mikkelsen. In all

the James Bond films, the villain of the function had always tried to destroy the whole world, or

destroying it (Panorama to kill or Die another day). ��a) or liquiding it (all the others). At Casino Royale, the

villain does not intend to do this kind of thing. His intention is his work, the trafficking of weapons, and instead of

subjecting Bond to machines that border on science fiction, he tortures him with a whiplash. directly (attentive to that

scene, it is terrible and at the same time ironic). Well, to say that Mads Mikkelsen is splendid in his role, both

crying blood and making tears cry to his enemies. Within the technical aspects, Casino Royale does not

lack the smallest detail. The music, superbly carried out by David Arnold and Chris Cornell (in the

magnificent main song, You know my name). And of course, the visual effects, that without being passed of

thread (he ah��� dies another day), they are incredibly cre���bles (like the scene of the collapse of thebuilding

Venetian). In short, the film by Martin Campbell is an authentic wonder of entertainment-

of goodness. A tape full of authentic and realistic action, which, despite its long duration -144 minutes, does

not become heavy, far from it. Do not miss Casino Royale, even if you are not James Bond fans. I'll say that's

better yet.

" 1

" A correct ��� prima prima with a careful technical invoice and correct choice of the distribution By labeling we will say that we are dealing with a tragicomedy and another hanging one more, we will say that a vision to the

past in the Cu���ntame style. A formula that seems to give good results and not just to keep membersloyal. A bittersweet

of a specific generationimage in which not everything is going to be a showcase of topics : the tender

look of Carlos Iglesias to the past of many Spaniards as emigrants, coming from a gray Spain, is

sweetened by means of a dose of sentimentality and humor, well raised and distributed by afootage

calm, but not without rhythm and hook. Very round this title has been left to him, the first one who writes,

performs and stars in 90% of his sequences. A correct ���per premium with a careful technical invoice

and successful selection of the cast becomes his presentation card as a filmmaker. Without forgetting

AzulOscuroCasiNegro, Un Franco, 14 pesetas was one of the most interesting proposals of the last Festival of

Malaga, and it was acknowledged that the author's good intentions were met when recalling and anchoring a cap�� The

forgotten title of our recent history. The Spanish disembarkation in Europe during the fifties and sixties, which should make

so many comparisons with our present, has not had much impact. n in the cinema,

except for costumbristas comedies in the style of Vente a Alemania, Pepe, who in their day played a correct role according

to the political intentions of the regime. Churches plays with the real fact but also points out ways to

establish a sustained balance between the tears and laughter without being syrupy in the end. Author of the

script, he has rescued part of his memories and mixed them with those of many returned emigrants whohim

toldtheir stories. It was a long process, not expensive. You can see it when you see the little pictures that dot

the action: gui���os to the cultural shock after the arrival in a country much more advanced, the exaggeration On the way through

customs, the return to a strange homeland where the priests punished the children for their lack of spelling

and Franco (the title, with may���scula) makes his own as a good feudal lord. The chorus of actors that

accompanies the director acts as support: Javier Guti���rrez, Nieve de Medina and Isabel Blanco - for more signs, the

young Swiss owner of the hotel-counteract the protagonism of the Churches-actor, excellent in his role? somewhat

tormented, to put some snag-. The fact that he had apprehended the tics of his performance

eliminated any burden of arrogance, which many actors carry with them when it comes to being on both sides of the

camera.

" 1

" Unaffordable blues and sweat band, of little pedagogical and typical redemptions of the Deep South America,

which is unforeseen and unlikely from its first minutes.

Probably this tape adheres without difficulty to that famous adage of an anonymous author who asked to make

the virtue difficult because Black snake moan is a curious tape, at least, and it is also It's different.

Curiosity and the difference does not make good movies but appreciate when weoverwhelmed with blockbusters

predictable and flatresolution ingenuity. It is also a picture of customs, a picturesque portrait of thesouth

Americanwith crude brushstrokes of primitive blues, touched with a dry stick, born of the soul and sung with

enough pain to make it believable. Ah��� it is possible that all possible interest for Black snake moan is born,

although there will be someone who pays an armchair to see the procrastination of Christina Ricci in a role of risk, but

grateful and in which she performs superbly: a fierce ninf���mana who has no flesh to lean on and lampasbarraco barrache

for letting herself be crucified by anythat comes her way.until today boring

Samuel L. Jackson -- when was his last decent film? - that recreates a depressed, closed character,

housed in the nebulous blues and recalling the happy times, when he played them on stage

and was happily married. These two characters, signified by the fatality, moved by

the miseries of life and almost without resources to overcome, are the only thing that can be saved from the film, which is

enough. Around him, a painful, excessive, impossible to believe guide, laboriously fatigued during a

footage always too long. Let's consider one thing: if a blues lasts three minutes, a film

that recreates , basically, a blues must be a short or a mini-short or a clip of those that occupy the

quasi-infinite files of youtube. No, specifically, a film, a feature film, as it was said before. There is

a time when we are saturated with history, soaked, tired of the child with a raging uterus

who wallows with anyone because of his addiction to sex. The bluesman acts as therapist, psychologist, father and

guru to get her out of her venereal slavery and put her back to society and be rewarded for

it. It is already I should add - do not think I spoil anything by counting this little detail of props - that the

methods of recovery perpetrated by the old bluesman consist in tying the wench to a radiator and wait for

the "" monkey "" to come and placate the vertigo of the flesh. This absurd mixture of sweat and guitar strumming will

irritate more than one, I know. It will bother whoever goes to the cinema to watch movies. It is a mere display of

brilliant performances, well-assembled atmospheres and a great planning in the assembly. In his

demy, there is no gui���no who seems to aspire to be so fails to be lost in a shipwreck of

great intentions, but bald���os results. It remains, in any case, the respect of a director, Craig Brewer,

for the blues and the formidable choice of some actors in a state of grace, plotted to take forward an

irregular, strange, in no At the moment credible. They would have made a videoclip for any new song

by Robert Cray or my beloved BB King and this would have been the audiovisual blow of the year. At least on MTV.

Music is the cure. The blues is the cure, that sang John Lee Hooker accompanied by Santana in a piece that I

have put in the background to write with more motivation this review.

" 0

" Mediocre version of what has been seen too many times: insubstantial and forgettable, with great moments (the

beginning) and aesthetics of a disturbing expensive video clip.

Eyes of evil is not lost. Nor does it establish the solid references to the classical cinema of the genre and it

limits itself to exploiting with shameless and bombastic advertising apparatus the sobada story of the body count, that is, the

casual group that is � in the wrong place at the wrong time and the extraordinarily gifted

psychopath to collect corpses. Do not look for the kind reader characters of depth, strong reasons to justify the

killer's bad milk or a secondary story that arouses the idea that the scriptwriter is

sufficiently aware of the noble material that molds. The horror cinema has given glory to the History of Cinema,

but these times of intellectual anxiety, of the public engrossed with morbid, scarcely seasoned in setting aside

mental laziness and demanding, what a beautiful word, quality In what he already pays what he voluntarily - we assume - he

attends, what abounds is the fast food cinematographic, to which we have already mentioned some time. Fast food

weighed down by the uncomfortable sensation that the organizers of the market take the viewer as a perfect

asshole. Not all the blood reaches the river of frames of this monstrous savable by moments, although

inevitably destined to oblivion. The height of the matter is that Dan Madigan, screenwriter of the quasi-mess we are

dealing with, is officiating and master of ceremonies of the American WWF, wrestling, and is even produced by a

company branch of a branch chain. Then we can not ask for much. The man has allowed himself to be carried away and has

written a libretto of pop songs. Ah��� is the choral group doomed to extermination, the brainless gigant���ndeconfigured

whose castrating mother and of disturbed Christianitythe hard disk when he was a delicateinfant

and promisingly civicand human. We also find the foreseeable arsenal of gore scenes that have dazzled ever

since the Saw franchise opened again the closure closed by Michael Myers or the Italian Z seriesbalance. The

of video storeteenager aftertaste has become brutish with the hitherto little-used resource of going to

prisoners who rehabilitate an abandoned hotel: slasher with an abundance of twisted scenes that would blush a

fasting Hannibal Lecter and effectively compose the trumpeter's declogue ���nero The election of the

huge Kane, born in Madrid, by the way, guarantees the physical tension, but the director, Gregory Dark,

once swamped in porn movies, makes it decay in the middle section of the tape, losing what is, in my

opinion, a major start. Nothing: a broken illusion. The rest of the footage is boring, peppered with

movimientosgile camera movements and correct ambience - it will be lacking - taking into account the budgets handled

- and some gracieta that Disarms the disgust in the stomach and paints a smile on the stiff

face.

" 0

" It is clearly the worst of the three adventures but it does not constitute, or should not, any surprise.

This is one of those projects that have never interested me too much. The huge opportunities missed

by the previous deliveries had eliminated any possible interest in seeing how they finished the job. If

we add to it the terrible criticisms received, even from fans of the previous chapters, we have the causes of

my delay in paying the entrance to see the film. But at last, I decided.� Pirates of the Caribbean: At the

end of the world�? � is clearly the worst of the three adventures but it does not constitute, or should not, any

surprise Because, at the risk of repeating myself, I have to say that it has the same defects and the same virtues as

its predecessors. The problem is that the defects appear here more accentuated and the virtues are less noticeable.

It is still Johnny Depp the best of the function even if his character starts to turn out to be something burdensome at

times. So much did the people in charge know that without Depp there is no film that, despite the end of the

previous delivery, it does not take a moment for it to appear on the screen. The rest of the characters are mere comparsas and it

is painful to see how actors like Geoffrey Rush, Jonathan Pryce or Stellan Skarsg���rd areThe

wasted.script is still almost non-existent, with di�� Fairly empty and even ridiculous; a mere excuse to

create situations that require visual effects, that's it, spectacular. Some stories are not finished well,

characters disappear without saying anything and we are given one of the most silly endings of recent history.

And that if one stays to see the credits of the end, which I always do, but those who have stayed

only to see that scene must have left the room with a monumental piss. Again the confusion between showiness

and spectacularity is the queen of the function. And it's not anymore because, in reality, the film does not have

too many scenes of action, adventures, drama or comedy. Its great merit is that, not offering

practically nothing, get your two hours and three quarters do not become excessively long. But that's a

very small achievement for a film that pretended to be much, much more. Final rating of moonfleet.es: 4 out of

10.

" 0

"What made Anderson's movies great was the combination of his prodigious imagination and his

sentidocured sense of humor, and in Viaje a Darjeeling the first, but not the second

Very rarely a short film has given so much to speak at a festival as the Hotel Chevalier de Wes

Anderson at the Mostra in Venice. And everything, because in it appeared an integral nude of Natalie Portman. Naked

that at the moment of truth is anything but a film nude, and from which the Israeli actress took

little time to repent. At least this time he did not demand that he be eliminated from the final editing, as he did in

Closer. This short film is part of the film Journey to Darjeeling, in fact it is his prelude, in which he presents the

character by Jason Schwartzman. After the brilliant Los Tenembaums and Life Aquatic, Wes Anderson offers us a

trip to his new personal universe. On this occasion, Anderson intends to parody the spiritual journeys and

interior discovery that are so fashionable, but he always does so with the utmost respect. Perhaps in

an excessively respectful way, since after the first minutes in which one feels fascinated by such a

delirious and bizarre journey, the absence of the iron��� and the mordant sense of humor of Anderson is discovered .

As is usual in the cinema, all the characters are of the most eccentric and Martian, but at the same time they are

pathetically entrainable, and it is impossible not to take them a great affection. ���o. However, what madefilms great

Anderson'swas the combination of his prodigious imagination and his sentidocured sense of humor, and in

Journey to Darjeeling it is true the first, but not the second. And although the trio protagonist is very well, no

actor has been able to better represent the characters of Anderson than Bill Murray, whose cameo is the best of the film, and

Gene Hackman. Travel to Darjeeling is a film that has failed twice, and this is becausepersonal world

Anderson'sdoes not leave anyone indifferent. However, on this occasion, even its most acrimonious followers will

feel disappointed.

" 0

" After the huge success of the 2003 irregular adaptation of the brilliant comic created some fifty years

ago by the brilliant Ib������ez, it was not possible to to doubt a sequel that would of course repeat thestep by step

foundations of the originaleven if a couple of names are changed.

After the huge success of the 2003 irregular adaptation of the brilliant comic created some fifty years

ago by the brilliant Ib������ez, there was no doubt a sequel that would of course repeat thestep by step

foundations of the originaleven if a couple of names are changed. The director on this occasion is Miguel Bardem

author of the ugliest woman in the world or night of kings who already had some similarity to a comic by the shape of

their images , replaces the main actor Benito Pocino, who physically seemed much closer to the

role but I suppose that the much greater popularity of the neng Edu soto made him win the game. For the rest of the

cast, the same situations are repeated again in brilliant special effects that end up tiring with repetitive ones. Clearly

some scenes are really funny but most of GAGS are forced

without No time to approach the original spirit of the adventures on paper, something that unfortunately could be

presupposed. The best is again the talent of the filmic Pepe Viyuela who creates a Filemon perfect with the

vitola of the perfect loser, his companion does not end up convincing me here or as a humorist. Forced film

that after repeating each shot ends up being heavy and without the necessary grace.

" 0

" Ic���ar Bolla���n tells us a small story full of strength that will excite the viewer for its

veracity and the simplicity of the staging.

The quality Spanish cinema this year is shining by its absence to the point that it becomes really

complicated to compile a list of the five best titles of this 2007. It is ironic that some of the

proposals that would enter the list would do so more for reasons of the rest than for their own merits. It

is also shocking that several of these films are raw stars, and they are still in a year in which they have

premiered filmmakers such as Gerardo Herrero, Imanol Uribe or Julio Medem. Let us hope that in the next months the

panorama will rise, and the inflection point can be marked by Ic���ar Bolla���n with Mataharis, a story of three

detectives who struggle to unveil the secrets of others and keep yours safe. But do not be

confused, Mataharis is not a film of intrigue, full of glamor and conspiracies, but it is a

realistic portrait of the situation of working women in our country . The great script would have worked the

same if, instead of detectives, they had been journalists, for example. Ic���ar Bolla���n reflects with great realism

the problems suffered by couples and especially women to reconcile their professional life with

family life, even if there are children involved. The San Sebastian filmmaker tells us a small story full

of strength that will thrill the viewer for its truthfulness and the simplicity of the staging. Having told

three different stories at the same time without any lame would not have been possible without the excellent

work of assembly that has Mataharis, since at no time the tape becomes heavy, or the inter Pors for

some of the characters. The interpretations are all worthy of applause, but it is impossible not to highlight the

three protagonists, who perform a superb work that is characterized by its sobriety and contention. In

Mataharis, Ic���ar Bolla���nagain, she claims to be one of the best storytellers in Spanish cinema,

Oncemaking a film that is very much in keeping with what our country's society feels. Undoubtedly, one of the

best titles of the year.

" 1

" Who gives value and meaning to democracy? Return the tyrant. The eg���latra returns. But he also returns his genius, his great success and hiscapacity

reflexive. Lars Von Trier returns And he again attacked us with his wild moral messages. After the first and

controversial delivery of his trilogy about the United States ("" USA, Land of Opportunities ""), "" Dogville "", the

charismatic director dan���s returns to the big screen with "" Manderlay. "" The film was presented at the last

Cannes Film Festival, and from that moment on its presentation journey has begun. throughout Europe, achieving very

good reception in certain places. and a certain fear and rejection in others (���adivin���is cu���les?) Lars Von Trier,

in his zeal for sowing politics wherever he is necessary and without paying attention to any type of leniency, continues

his particular "" moral "" at the point where he finished the first "" Dogville "". But since then many things

have changed. Nicole Kidman is no longer Grace, now occupies said position Bryce Dallas Howard. And James Caan

is not his father either, now he is the versatile Willem Dafoe. It is very complicated that some actor support two films in a

row with Von Trier, otherwise they ask Bj���rk.Pero the story takes its course. Grace (with

the company of her father and her "" g���ngsters ""), after showing her true face in Dogville, continues her initiatory andruns

supposedly innocent walk until sheinto Manderlay, a place in which, in spite of the sorrows,

slavery still prevails presided by the strict Law of Mam. And, of course, our protagonist establishes there

with the selfless desire to fix everything and for injustices and oppressions to stop showing off. But,

over time, it will be seen that the results are totally opposite to what she expected. For more than two

hours, our beloved Grace, her ego, her conscience and Their intrinsic desire for authority, they realize

that it is not enough to want to supplant an entire culture and want to impose that of oneself to question

the good state of a population. Thus, on this occasion, Grace is presented much more as a kind of leader,

but, unlike in "" Dogville "", she is the one who tries to to force his power, he does not try to win it like

he did in the first chapter. It gives the feeling that the town does not see in Grace the innocent one who appeared,

trying to escape, in Dogville. Now she believes much more in herself and her convictions (whether real, feigned or

simply complacent), achieving that the development of history, in that sense, is totally

inverse to that of her predecessor. Therefore, You can see how from almost the first moment (from the moment

you feel comfortable and integrated into the population), our protagonist tries to "" open your eyes "" to a people

who were totally submissive and would not be able to evolve in their state of lack of freedom and

devoid of any kind of protection or license. Grace and her ethical and human condition are in the duty to help

that poor uneducated mass, educate them, rediscover them and make them prove the true meaning of democracy.

Surely they are prepared. And if it is not like that, a strong hand. The truth is that in "" Manderlay "" in Trier you can see

much more duster than in "" Dogville "". While the latter was totally universal, it was certainly ambiguous andus to

subjecteda morally brutal personal reflection (above all because of its very political ending from the point of view

). �tico), "" Manderlay "" is enclosed in a clearly smaller circle. It is reduced to an environment that smells

rotten until it is enough (referring to the US, of course) and in which all criticism has a place. And it

is that the director accuses a certain lack of skill in approaching the subject with greater objectivity and leaving

us all this work. It gives the sensation that he wants to position thetoo blatantly

spectator(although deep down we know that his eg���latra character is desiring him every moment), that did not

happen in "" Dogville "". It seems that his critical posture has lost a nerve, and what he gains by being direct

loses him in subtlety. In spite of those small mistakes (many of them due to his own personality)

director), the bitter, bold and ironic criticism hides a message that all of us should understand and

try to learn. The ideological position of Trier has a lucidity that today in day is hardly seen in the movies.

We would have to look at the Europe of a few years ago to make comparisons about it. The

controversial author (along with other names) of the movement "" Dogma 95 "" (which already s��� was political) attacks without

contemplation a country that defines as false, hypocritical and inconsiderate. What in "" Dogville "" was more

global, here is a central (and frontal) attack against the US fallacy against those leaders who create a

personalized and interested democracy, stealing their true meaning and reducing it to that of a kind of

silent dictatorship. Against that system of votes whose value is questioned as soon as the

difference between the truth and the number of votes is glimpsed, simple result of a selfish,human condition

manipulative and destructivethat , before a complicaci���no ideological difference, establishes the most bloody condemnation

or the quickest and simplest death penalty.Thus, Grace represents the true example of thehero

Americanwho comes, in spite of the fact that no one is sailing him in that funeral, to save the people submerged in the totality

of poverty and governed by tyrants who strip their human condition with atrocious acts and humiliating They try to

impose their social and political norms of coexistence without attending to their previous culture or

behaviors or traditions, or worry about the people or ask if they really wanted to change their

lifestyle or was the one They wanted and were unable to face such a sudden change. The village was helpless in

front of something they could not understand and seeing how the change was getting out of hand

impossible to assimilate in such a short time, ends up saying that all past was better and better known bad

than good to know. For once in the last works of Trier, the main character does not suffer the unspeakable

for to arrive at his desired goal, at least in the physical aspect, since in the mental one that ais glimpsed

more contained suffering, trigger of the disappointment interested in his person.In this respect, it should be said that

the shadow of Nicole Kidman is r elatively elongated. His claw and potential in "" Dogville "" was much greater than that

of the fragile Howard (despite the fact that the papers required or not one act or another), that within a contention

Timely kills them quietly. Of course, it can not be denied that the daughter of the ineffable Ron Howard (like the

rest of the cast) borders at a high level. The outline of the film is exactly the same as that of its predecessor in theaspect

formal and structural. A story, with narrator included, that is told in an entertaining way and divided into

chapters. In a "" moral "" wrapped in sarcasm and iron���a, Lars Von Trier traces the story of Grace, his

arrival, the establishment, the coexistence and his subsequent departure from Manderlay as if it were a play

, with the well-known and controversial basic stage drawn (although it does not obtain the protagonism of the

first delivery), its luminous games and its Vivaldi music (jumping to the bullfighter, as usual in ���ly and

according to your convenience, your own rules established for the movement "" Dogma 95 ""), which impregnates everything from a

deceptively reassuring environment. For the spectator virgin in matter it will suppose a shocking bet, but

for the connoisseurs of his previous delivery, in that aspect, it does not suppose any novelty. In short, a work

that, without arriving at the genius of its predecessor, s� �� that is interesting as a compulsory reflection when

considering our moral actions and democratic conditions. The clarity of Trier is overwhelming

in this regard, and his moral discourse faultless. All of that, along with his completely untimely irony (attentive to

the final credits with "" Young Americans "" as a background, what a bad grape the very cabrán is spending), they manage to

sketch us a smile, in order to deepen our internal human, social and political forum. We could

say, therefore, that in their favor they have the treatment of a Such a controversial subject in a veryway

intelligent, without being pedantic, agile, reflective and lucid. It really forces us to learn. And, despite its

duration, without being as extensive as "" Dogville "", digested with ease. And a very interesting fact.

It does not treat racism as such, nor by race, color or similar differences, but it opens up the

human conditions of democracy and its limits of reach and credibility. It is something that really appreciates

what comes to us lately. However, you can also blame a certain and evident bias that

spoils a little the austerity of your message, and a focused and closed appearance � Only in thecriticism

USthat makes us unable to universalize as much as "" Dogville "" his intention. And, of course, its staging

and its aesthetic is unoriginal and groundbreaking, as we have seen it before, but, being aone

realistic, it is not nearly relevant, since the characters are n sharp enough to make us

forget the rest. In fact, this was the "props-saving" idea of ​​director dan���sA the best of many

is unbearably pretentious. What will he do? It's the least we can expect from a guy

like Trier. maybe the most pretentious and eg���latra director of the moment. But its results make us

forget and we can forgive (almost) everything. An authentic smack to what some countries call democracy.

All an example of irony, lucidity and images that overcome sarcasm within a very controversial subject

and, therefore, for many will be, therefore, a reason for rejection and discomfort. We must recognize that the good of Lars

has happened at certain times. Just in case, and not to overwhelm us with so much political treatment that has

flooded the cinema lately, Lars Von Trier has decided to delay the filming of "" Wasington "" (without "" h ""), the last

installment of the trilogy. And I think it has been a wise idea.

" 1

" Babel reaches very high levels in terms of cinematographic art. Not only is it a masterpiece, not

only has it become a modern classic, but it is cinema, real cinema, cinema with capitals.

There are some films that create great expectations even before they begin to shoot, and in

most cases as the information multiplies, those expectations are falling. However

, some films not only manage to maintain those expectations, but they manage to increase them

progressively. This is the case of Babel, one of the most anticipated works of the year, for the excellent

sensations that he left in Cannes, for his director Alejandro González I���� ��rritu, and for his extraordinary

cast. Alejandro Gonz���lez I������rritu is one of the most personal filmmakers that have emerged in recent years,

and proof of this is that his move to Hollywood after Amores Perros has not "corrupted" him, but has made him

grow even more. A series of events will unite a group of people who live and suffer in different

parts of the world: in the mountains of the Atlas, in Morocco, in Japan, in California and Mexico . It is a

story that speaks, through different cultures and different languages, of the incapacity of thehuman being

currentto communicate with his peers, and also of the loneliness and isolation that this entails. We take

this opportunity to protest against the decision of UIP Espa���a to double Babel, since it is a betrayal to the very spirit

of the film , m���sa���n when a good part of it has to be subtitled. If before we talked about the

growth of Gonz���lez I������rritu, Guillermo Arriaga is the same, who with Babel signs one of the best

scripts written in the �� Last decades, and undoubtedly, will go to the history of cinema. Alejandro

González Órritu directs with precision the surgeon that jewel of gui���n, and with his narration so personal, and a

sense of cinematographic rhythm ��fico impeccable, manages to do something that is within the reach of very few: a cinema

that oozes truth through all its pores, without anything artificial or forced. Babel is one of those films that captures the total

attention of the spectator, which leaves him stuck to the chair, and when they finish, it takes several minutes

for him to react and assimilate what he has seen. Gustavowonderful musicare also worth mentioning

Santaolalla'sand the excellent photography by Rodrigo Prieto. The interpretations are, as a whole,

extraordinary, and although it is unjust to name a few above the others, not to do so would also be unfair.

Brad Pitt, Adriana Barraza, Rinko Kikuchi and Cate Blanchett perform simply great works,

making the difficult easy, and contributing remarkably to that feeling of reality transmitted by the

group. very high levels in terms of cinematographic art is concerned. Not only is it a

masterpiece, not only has it become a modern classic, but it is cinema, real cinema, cinema with

capitals. And before that, the only thing we can do is take our hats off, and applaud one of the greatest

geniuses of 21st century cinema like Alejandro González Iríritu, and enjoy with his new creation

" 1

" The film has absolutely nothing worthwhile, to go and see it, I do not recommend it to you, so

do not waste your time or your money.

The film is absolutely predictable, it is boring to the point of absurdity and the battles are a real garbage. Yes,

I admit, the issue of how the great Scalibur reached the rock and how Pendragon had Arturo and everything else

is original, it is, but it could have been a great movie because the script is not excessively stinky, but

hey, popcorn movie at the end and a child-actor who puts the same face for everything, everything interprets the same, go

fuck casting, with that of good children there. Director Doug Lefler, does not have much filming in the body,

his career is focused on directing some chapter of Xena, H ���rcules (among others) and that if, a lot of Story Board,

that the kid the Story that he has eaten in all the years that he takes profession, they are noticed. �cula

has absolutely nothing worthwhile, to go see it, I do not recommend it, so do not waste your

time or your money. But all this mess around "" The Last Legi���n "" (Cuyo trailer is deceiving) is because

the movie was wanted to do with speed and to get out of the way and kill 4 birds of a shot. This film

meant an investment for some studios and Hollywood producers that intend to consolidate and launch

new products to the film market. And so that you know what I'm talking about, I proceed with my

skinning section: What do they do in Hollywod when they want to launch new talents to the market? Answer: Make a

mess "" The last leg "" where the actors-products to be thrown suck close-ups sometimes even

absurd and out of place. And you ask? "Is it really profitable for gringos to make such amovie just

badto promote actors?" Answer: Obviously, I know that each one of those actors-product will be

consecrated through Des of several movies that you already have filming or signed and that will report millions of

dollars to the production companies that work with them and in addition you have to keep in mind that "" The last leg "will not be

a blockbuster but will support the investment that has meant, with which everyone wins. After all this is a

business.��� And who are the actors-product we are talking about? 1 - Colin FirthWhat is in sight nothing more and

nothing less than 7 films to be released of which 2 of them are foreseen as blockbusters, which will end up

turning it definitively into a new Clive Owen, with which it will finally be able to unlink it from thegenre

televisionto which it has dedicated most of his at carrerastica career. It is the biggest investment of this film.2 -

Aishwarya Rai One of the most spectacularly beautiful women of all time. Of the few comparable with

the great divas of classical cinema. Imported from Bollywood where she is a star consecrated, her leap and

consolidation in Hollywood will turn her into a new Angelina Jolie. She is also an excellent actress of action

, which will mean that she will oust the pusilmines to rise up with heroin and superwoman roles. Aishwarya

is full of talent and is a polished diamond ready for display. Your participation in future

productions will be rewarded with millions of dollars. You have 2 American films pending premiere,

among them "" La Pantera Rosa 2 "". 3 - Rupert FriendDesigned to become the new Orlando Bloom (whose

fame has risen to the head and is asking for a unpayable cach���). This young man who has been confused on many

occasions with Orlando since he is also a knight of Keira Knightley and the paparazzi conundred with Orly. The

first shots that you get in "" La ���ltims legi���n "" come on, look carefully, they are studied to get the

most out of their beauty as they her destiny will be the sexual icon of all the teenagers of the next 5

years. His artistic career is made up of 6 films made between 204 and 2007 and he has to release

another 6 all made in 2007 and 2008 (just after "" La ��� Last Legi���n "", what a coincidence). You will not complain

about the doctoral thesis in skinning that I have done to you in this critique.Adem���s if you are sensible you will give me �� You are right.

" 0

" This is one of the best portraits of what the Vietnam War meant for themiddle class

American. An entrainable and tragic look at the same time.

The conceptual and expository simplicity go hand in handdiscourse, with its cadenced narrative, in

with a discordantrelation to one of the most tragic paradoxes of human existence: the need to seek harmony and

balance , friendship and love, facing the reality of war and violence. In a certain way, there

is also a need for violence, and the greatest singularity of the film directed by Michael Cimino, consists of

in synthesizing the paradox in a single character, "" The hunter "" played by the perennial Robert De Niro, who

already in his montanaes, in the first third of the film, shows this b�� Searching for their fawling hunts

: the shooting and the agonizing death of the animal, and the suffering reflected in the eyes of the latter, seem to

reproach us for the gratuitous violation of life , hitting the conscience of the spectator as well as that of

De Niro himself, who, on a second occasion, misses the shot and lets his prey escape in accordance with a new

scheme of values ​​that emerged from the experience in Vietnam (" "deacuerdoooooo" ") Solitaire but friend and companion of

his friends, the main character is located in the central axis of the drama, as being strong in courage and

determination, to save��� to his friends in the most bloody trances, and he will comfort the women of the lost. "" The

hunter "" can have two readings that complement each other: on the one hand, it is the story of a man who reaffirms his

personality through the experience of war. On the other, it is the story of a group of men and women

whose lives degenerate based on the stability of proletarian and puritanical American society

based on national traditions: families, work, alcohol and casinos. The aggressive industrial orography of the

city ​​- in its first sequences, a noisy truck enters the town, throwing fumes and prowling around the

factories, showing us the landscape that opens up the film - serves as an ideal context for a superb display

of human relationships that break after the "" crusade "" in Vietnam. The illusion and the festivity represented in the

first section contrast with the subsequent dejection, disappointment and disappointment. And so, it can be said that

contrast is one of its main characteristics, even because of the abrupt way of transferring the viewer

from a difficult and costumbrista universe (a group of friends in the casino, listening to the music of a piano, with

a gesture of deep melancholy) to the hell of war (corpses and the screams of a Vietnamese burning

alive is what we see in the contiguous scene), the assembly is configured in such a way that history is defined

better than ever when viewed from a global perspective, not so much by the development of its parts and moments,

some of them harmed by an unnecessary use of the slow rhythm, with which the narrative often falls into

the merely descriptive. Incidentally, this film would have been much more rounded with a cut in

the footage. The final scene is really illustrative of the essential intention that animates the film: asong

patrioticEthical in memory of the lost friend, the only consolation they have left. This is one of the best portraits of

what the Vietnam War meant for the American middle class. An entrainable and tragic look at the same time.

" 1

" Firewall is not the last film by Richard Loncraine, but the last adventure of Harrison Ford. Firewall is not the last film by Richard Loncraine, but the Last adventure of Harrison Ford. And it is what

sells. And go if it sells. Someone like Ford has guaranteed a minimum of public that wants to see him in top form

and doing what he knows how to do perfectly: interpreting. In this case he is a computer expert. responsible for

the security systems of a bank that is about to merge with another big company. The problems

begin when a bad bad guy incarnated by a great Paul Bettany, studies the life of ���ly and his family to be

able to kidnap them and control them better and thus be able to take advantage of the knowledge of Stanfield (Ford). The

film is based on the kidnapping and blackmail of a main character who is willing to do whatever it takes

to protect your family. However, the patience of the protagonist reaches a limit and the same reason

why he becomes a victim becomes his trump card to win. It has a resemblance to Rescate, come on. And

that's when we see the Harrison we wanted and we were waiting for. He was accompanied by Virginia Madsen as

wife; since Between drinks it seems that it is already requested. And rightly so. The gui���n is also plagued by certain

mildly ingenious situations and with a somewhat more refined but effective cruelty that carries with great

credibility some good actors.Although surely the aspect t�� The movie's technician will be unlikely

(Malaciencia can have it for a post), the message of the film is very clear: the firewall without human control

is useless. Technology can be used in thousands of ways and can help us achieve thousands of things,

but they always end up in the hands of humans. Unless the Terminator prophecy is fulfilled.

" 0

" It is bad enough to say enough, it contains di���logos that seem to be taken from the cheapest telefilm in history,

and the typical ones abound as they never did in another movie

After reading reviews that rated Alien vs. Predator as disastrous, I never thought that I would go to see its second

part, or even what it would be done. Unfortunately, this sequel exists, not too hopeful for

science fiction movies. It's probably a bit better than its predecessor, but Alien vs. Predator 2 is

too lazy to be considered a movie. If anything, it could be broadcast in telivisi���n, and thus fulfill

perfectly as a film of series B, but I do not know who had the idea of distribute it as a blockbuster

either. It is bad enough to say enough, it contains di quelogos that seem to be taken from the cheapest telefilm in

history, and the typical ones abound as they never had in another movie. �cula (look at the cartoon of the young man in

love, pretty pathetic). The script is practically nonexistent, it seems to be written according to the

march, and the (human) villain character has much less expressiveness than the Alien or the Predator (excessively

crappy the final fight between these two). Yes, it's a shabby, very shabby movie (also look at the credit

titles), with unforgettable phrases like "the government never err "" or an ending that is more than the

"" bad "" teen of the teen story. And it would have been much better had it been left as

I thought it would end, with the helicopter with the last survivors crashing. In short, amess

huge, made without a hint of grace and with truly pathetic interpretations. That's right, it contains a couple

of pretty scary and not too bad scenes. Better avoid it, they will win.

" 0

" East? The hills have eyes? is one of the best proposals that have come to us from the genre in

recent years.

In 1977, a still first Wes Craven directed the film of cult "" The hills have eyes "", shortly after

having directed another small cultic scholar as is "" The last house on the left "". In these two films

we found ourselves with a marked use of earthly and realistic violence, as stark as it was cold. "" The hills

have eyes "" can not be considered a horror film in the strict sense of the term but rather what

I come to call "" films about and / or cruelty "" And it is that in that proposal, Wes Craven placed us

in a deserted space nowhere lost, in broad daylight and with maniacs willing to eat

a family that traveled in caravan. This was "" The hills have eyes "", and its result was more than correct,

being one of the most outstanding films of its director. In the midst of the remake of the 70s horror film, it

was to be expected that, sooner or later, one of "The hills would have eyes" would come to us, and so it has been. The

project, as is always to be expected. a remake of a cult film arises, it was initially received

with low expectations by many fans, but little by little the new news about the names

involved in the project made us think that something good I could get out of all this. And, as soon as it was confirmed

that Alexander Adja, the promising director of the remarkable "" High tension "" was going to be behind the scenes,

expectations were growing, and without a doubt the wait has been valid the penalty. Once the film is seen, one has

the feeling that Adja has had a free hand to do what he wants, and that "High tension" "" There was

no boast of quality lost in time. And, "" The hills have eyes "", remake, joins the also

great remake of "" Dawn of the Dead "" as the only two reviews of cult classics of the genre that

have managed to surpass their originals, regardless of who may be. It is more, this "" The hills have eyes "" is

one of the best proposals that have come to us from the genre in recent years, and without a doubt aexercise

crueltycollapsed in its final stretch of moments that will delight all fans of the most brutal genre,

the gore and also the original Wes Craven original. said, the brutality of the film before us is difficult

within a commercial production today. Without going further, the recent "" Hostel "" that despite being entertaining and

correct does not reach far from the levels of sadism and violence so high announced by those responsible, it

remains a story for children. Enos compared to this movie. Perhaps, to the more ag aficionadosneros fans like

the gore and several brutal films, it does not impact us so much or at least not in the measure that it can impact to

spectators less used to this kind of movies, but I think that anyone who sees "" The hills have

eyes "" certainly will not be indifferent to the images. At the beginning, "" The hills have eyes "", remake , after

a spectacular prologue is dedicated to follow almost schematically what we saw in the original. Therefore, we

go into that gas station and later in that shortcut that will take a family to hell. But it is

not long after this when Alexander Adja takes the reins of history, introducing us to the family of

man���acos, who this time are deformed mutants because of some evidence of the ej�� �rcito. From the first moment they

appear, the action is unleashed in an "in crescendo" of cruelty, sadism and torture that do not take pity on

anyone, tracing the attack to the caravan almost to the millimeter. We saw in the original, but this time even

more cruel. But it's shortly after this when this remake pulls an ace of manga, which will take place in an

unhealthy place where the horror will grow beyond the version. Cran Craven.Everything in "" The Hills Have Eyes "" has a

spectacular visual appearance, a very careful composition of planes, good work in resolving themoments

keyand a disturbing rhythm that It makes us always prepare for a new event. Now, yes, we can

say that "" Dawn of the dead "" was not an isolated example, and as much as it sometimes costs us to

recognize it, a well done remake can be superior to its source of influences. All in "" Hills Have

Eyes "" is an improved, expanded and uncensored "" Wes Craven movie, a gift for fans of the

original and genre in general.

" 1

" It is perhaps the best version of a horror movie in the last five years, without a doubt

the horror movie with summer capitals

Without a doubt, when a few years ago Wes Craven directed this film, I doubt very much that he was influenced by

getting a box office hit. Before, this type of film, bloody and scary, had a very specific

audience. Now we try to open the hairpin as much as possible, so that an adult can see it, and also a

16-year-old boy who goes to the cinema as a gang. You lose the sparkle that the original version had, and it becomes a

palomitero product, for those who have a stomach, of course. Of course this version of "Las Colinas" They have Eyes "" is

infinitely superior to the version of "" La Matanza de Texas "", and of that joke that was "" The House of Wax "", here

nobody is cut a hair, and sometimes rubbing the brutality (Aaron Stanford covered in blood), but that does not

make a film essential. That's it, it's the movie of Terror with capitals of the summer, without a doubt. If you

like the blood in spurts, you will enjoy, because here the liquid runs with a joy ���a extreme. The story

is very easy: a family en route through the desert to California ends up taking a shortcut that will take them to an

area inhabited by humans altered by nuclear radiation who know only kill, rape or dismember every

unhappy person who crosses his path. Thus, father, mother, adolescent son, teenage daughter, eldest daughter, eldest daughter's husband

and baby make up that beautiful family clueless that will serve as entertainment for such children

of his mother. The cast is riddled with recurring backgrounds, such as Aaron Stanford (Pyro of the

"" X-Men ""), Emilie de Ravin (Claire of "" Lost ""), Kathleen Quinlan ("" Apollo 13�? ?) or Ted Levine ("" Memories

of a Geisha ""), and at least the director is not Uwe Boll. It is directed by an unknown Alexandre Aja, who has

softened the original. There are two minutes of footage that the director cut to be rated R in the

USA. I would like to know what they are going for, although surely the DVD will include them as extras. If they are more beasts than

some of the scenes of the final assembly, I prefer not to see them. This movie is not boring, but disturbing,

sometimes unpleasant, but maybe it is due to being so accustomed to light versions andhorror productions

decaffeinated. It has been a blockbuster in the USA. I was not surprised because it is perhaps the best version

of a horror film in the last five years. Even so, and as I said before, you can avoid running to

see her at the cinema, and wait for her premiere on DVD to have a cushion nearby, or even pause her so as not to have

indigestion spontaneous

" 1

" Unnecessarily long scenes, coarse and gratuitous eroticism, crappy make-up,interpretations

unfortunate, and an infernal dubbing.

First, this movie is bad, bad, bad. A group of American kids are going to spend the night of

Halloween in the woods, with beers and hormones of leftovers. Meanwhile, a local farmer, (coincidentally that

evening, look your way), finds a grave with a threatening inscription, (covered by dry leaves and a bit

of earth), and after opening it, (thing that everyone would do in their situation) a zombie sticks a piece of the whole

neck. From here the plot is over, because the film becomes a senseless massacre,

everyone dies, and where the viewer knows that everyone is going to die. Needlessly long scenes, eroticism coarse and

gratuitous, make-up makeup, lamentable interpretations, and an infernal dubbing make one think about stopping

the movie constantly. Only save a couple of details: the murder in family perpetrated by son, daughter and

wife zombie of the father. And an enigmatic phrase: "They're dead and they're dangerous." "This is the 1988

movie, directed and written by Bill Hinzman. Considered a classic by many. Basically it's a

fucking movie. But hey, I swallowed it. Will it be coprofag?

" 0

" Christopher Nolan gives us a story perfectly set and withtwists of gui���n nut

surprisingin which it highlights the danger of obsessions, which can end in tragedy.

"" Every great magic trick consists of three acts. The first one is called 'The presentation': the magician shows something

that seems ordinary, but, of course ,. it is not. The second act is called 'The act': the magician makes

the ordinary become something extraordinary. Now, if you are looking for the secret. you will not find it, that is

why there is a third act called 'Prestige': this is the part with the unexpected turns, in which life

hangs by a thread, and then you see something shocking that you had never seen before "". With these wordsexplains

Michael Cainethe performance of the magic shows at the beginning of the movie The Prestige, but that

has reached our screens with the title 'The final trick' (horrendous) translation to Spanish). Two magicians (Hugh

Jackman and Christian Bale), both apprentices of the same wizard and initially colleagues, begin to hate each other after a

tragic accident. Their rivalry to get the best magic trick will lead them to try to boycott

constantly, this obsession to be the best will bring unexpected consequences. A struggle to

achieve the professional success that will make us think at each moment which character is less despicable until

we realize that both are morally equally petty. Obviously, the masculine interpretations

(Jackman, Bale and the always correct Michael Caine) take all the limelight. As in the case of

many directors, it seems that Nolan maintains its tendency to invisibilize the female characters, who

become mere objects of accompaniment of the protagonists. Scarlett Johanson seems to have in the

film the only role of wearing her corset. Only the character of Bale's wife is granted a

role in which he can excel more (not too much). In what perhaps the film fails is the enjoyment of the

spectacles of magic because the spectator is too busy trying to decipher the trick to be

fooled by him. In addition, the fact that the spectator is explained the trick of almost all the exhibitions

(less of the most important, obviously) subtracts emotion from the subject. Something that did not happen in The Illusionist. Another

problem is that at times the film becomes somewhat repetitive, as it takes many turns on the same idea of

obsession to know the final trick. However, the gui���n no longer surprising and that the director

always keeps - like the magicians - an ace up his sleeve to maintain the attention of the spectator. The film

perfectly fulfills the task of any magic show: constantly entertain and deceive a

spectator who will spend the whole film asking himself What happens after the movie hides a

frightening message: to succeed in life, everything is limp. The end justifies the means for these magicians in that

they use deceit and manipulation to achieve their goals. An aggressive struggle to achieve fame, to

be recognized as the best before society. A competitiveness that does not understand friendship, love or

any other aspect that is not related to social prestige. A fight that endangers one's

personal relationships and even the physical integrity of competitors. Christopher Nolan gives us

a story perfectly set and with surprising twists of gui���n nut in which it

highlights the danger of obsessions, which can end in tragedy. Feelings as universal as

envy, resentment, competitiveness and ambition are experienced at the limit by the two protagonists until

their moral destruction. Because the road to the success of the two protagonists is also the road to their

personal destruction.

" 1

" At the beginning, "" Cocalero "" seems like a documentary ... But with the future of the course we realize that

Landes managed to capture something historical: the arrival to power of a common subject, outside the traditional

Bolivian aristocratic establishment.

In general, although I watch documentaries, I try, or avoid commenting on the blog simply because they do not havein

massgeneral and people primarily seek cinema as a refuge to entertain themselves. It costs,

therefore, if you are not familiar with the genre to make time to watch documentaries, even up to

me, that I see a few costs me! Starting from that base, you will ask yourselves, after such an

introduction. Why read the "Cocalero" criticism? It seems to me that this proposal by Alejandro Landes is something

more than a classic documentary. Landes is a writer, born in Brazil, raised in Ecuador and graduated in the US,

a restless spirit that after participating in the production of "" Oppenheimer presents "" (television program of

the tev�� � American) decided to follow the last months before the national elections in Bolivia, where

a singular character competed with serious chances of victory. "" Cocalero "" is, then, a journey about the

rise to power of Bolivian President Evo Morales. Landes accompanied by hand in hand, Evo in

multiple places of his country, in political events, in privacy with his company. ��eros and friends, in the hard

confrontations with the right and the military in each media exhibition. At first, "" Cocalero "" seems like a

documentary. But with the future of the course we realize that Landes managed to capture something historical: the

coming to power of a common subject, outside the traditional Bolivian aristocratic stablishment and fen� �� less

popular than it was for that people to achieve that fact. From the point of view of the edition of the route, this one is

full of funny moments, (the joke that Evo makes to the military leadership about respecting

hierarchies is antològica especially in the context in which it occurs!), offers many spaces for rest and

reflection (the comments of the candidate to substitute Senator Morales hill are very interesting) and there are

enough clarity in the panorama that shows society. Perhaps Landes did not suppose at that moment

that he was accompanying Evo that his material would have a historical and transcendental value because of the juncture they would go

through, but It is true that this proposal contains many elements of interest that approach it to be a

more massive product than other traditional genre. Beyond your political ideology, "" Cocalero "" tries to

graph the moment before the consecration of a popular leader, but not any leader, but a citizen of

Aymara socialist origin who for the first time in the history of Latin America becomes president sustaining

values ​​of integration and respect for the pluralities that exist in their land and with the enormous task of

reintegrating Bolivia into a framework of economic stability that it urgently needs. Well by Landes (who now

resides in Buenos Aires), the people of Hoyts are very intelligent for including it in their programming (it had a lot of impact

on this year's BAFICI) and congratulations to the people of INCAA Tita Merello for his new projection equipment

(he did not know it) and the image quality with which he reproduces in an acceptable size the DVD copy that he had. A

very interesting product to know more about politics, roots and brotherhood, "" Cocalero "", great debut of Landes.

" 1

" At the exit of the cinema, long faces, sidelong glances, remorse and an intense debate about whether

there was any "" puntazo "" that was worthwhile. I did not see it.

Take time to do this criticism. moreover, taking time to read this critique is a great way to

waste your time. But perhaps a server, resquemoroso, resentful, hurt and somewhat ashamed, can seek an

apology in one of those inherent needs of man: to share the worst of life with the others.

Error n�� Number one: let go. You know, the fault is always the others. That if Scary Movie was not bad, that

if I feel like re���rme a while, that if there is nothing better to do tonight. I can look for a thousand excuses, I could even

claim that I was drunk (or that I wanted to be, I do not remember correctly), but the fact is that 6.50? That

worth the entrance they passed to other hands, perhaps more wise than the others. Error number two: see it. One enters

waiting for little. very little. Maybe 3 "" puntazos ""? A couple of gags to remember? Any of those nonsense that

seems funnier over time? But nothing at all. Time was passing and I refused to recline, to

stretch my legs and enjoy a good sleep (as did the companion next door). I wanted to endure.

Six euros are worth a little patience. With the expected 3 "" puntazos "" the thing was at two euros per

"" point "". Today the change does not go wrong. However, they did not arrive. Not even a triple on the

horn. It would go into details, but it would be a disservice to anyone who reads me. This time it was about

parodying the epic movies: Pirates of the Caribbean, Superman, The Crónicas of Narnia, Charlie and theFactory

Chocolate. Four orphans enter Gnarnia and try to defeat the White Witch. On the way they are

crossing with each other (now a pirate, now a magician.) And finally. I do not know, I do not remember it or matter

too much. The serious thing is not that it lacks an argument (nobody asks for that), the serious thing is that they do not even try to

parody these films, ridicule them, look for the comic side. It's like a rehash of sequences of one and the

other, always falling short of grace. The few moments that deserve a smile are those in

which the sophisticated resource of "" giving a blow to another "" is used, which ultimately is as old as the

movies. Add to this the discomfort to see so much wasted money (not the money, the budget to manufacture

both stage and costumes) and the unfortunate moments videocliperos (I came to think thatcast

some retransmisi��� had beenn of MTV) and you'll get a real movie trash. At the exit of the cinema, long faces,

sidelong glances, remorse and an intense debate about whether there was any "" puntazo "" that was

worthwhile. I did not see it.

" 0

" For fans of indie cinema or for impenitent pajilleros Returning to the subject of movie posters and the films that hide behind, in this case corresponds

quite well. We have two people doing a sexual act, which agrees very well. And the title is a

play on words between "" lie with me "" and "" lie down with me "". That is, horns and folleteo.La film deals

about a girl who has an excessive sexual appetite, let's go, like a typical man. One day he meets a

boy and a crush arises in what is being his crotch, so he decides to go to a field to romp

with another while the one he liked sees him from the car to the Once his girlfriend sharpens his saber (really

good). And it begins a session of amorios and folleteos (between the protagonists) during hour and a half, showing

how the opinion of the protagonist changes on the sex and the love. Well, the film has little, quite little.

At first glance, we only have a kind of low budget porn movie, which is not too

bad. From a second glance, we can see a real love story like life itself, of sex and grumo, no

roses and wine. Which is not bad either. But the set does not kill, since it does not end up hooking. The actors

do their part, but you do not get into their skin at any time, especially the male audience crashes the acts of

the protagonist. We can say in its favor, that it is a low-budget Canadian production, so it

focuses on "" cheap "" aspects, but I did not end up liking it. And in the end I got really bored. Resuming, for

fans of indie movies (or as it is written) or for unrepentant pajilleros who have to justify their

onanism under "serious" films.

" 0

" Fascinating and full of fantasy storyHac���a already enough time that I did not see in the movies a movie that I liked. I mean, I really like it

. Also, for some time now I had been waiting for the premiere of "" The Traveling Castle "" (or "" Howl's Moving

Castle, or "" Hauru no ugoku shiro ""), the last movie Hayao Miyazaki's map. On Friday they released it, on Friday I

saw nothing more coming back from the Congress, and I can not say that I have not seen a film for a long time that I really

liked. Before anything else , a couple of data: when talking about this man is often referred to as "" the

creator of Heidi or Marco "". Or it was mentioned to him, because for some years (mainly thanks to "" Princess

Mononoke "" and "" Spirited Away "") has begun to be known to the great public ( between which I include myself).

As you can see in my list, "" Spirited Away "" is one of my favorite movies. In 2002 I won the Golden Bear

at the Berlin Film Festival - becoming, I believe, the first animated film to be awarded

this award. �n-, and in 2003 he won the Oscar for the best animated film. Well, having said that, I continue. ""

Spirited Away "" is a magical film, in which each scene is a surprise. Actually, and astold me

Guizmoat the time, it is a kind of "" Alice in Wonderland "" to the Japanese. The first time

I saw it, I liked it so much that when I finished it bothered me that I could not continue with the story. For that reason, I had high

hopes for "" The Traveling Castle "" and, as often happens when you expect a lot of something, a little bit

afraid of being disappointed. Luckily, it was not like that. In a Supernovapop article I read that the movie "" has

been rated as a minor work in Miyazaki's career "". The truth, I have no idea who

could say something like that, and it is not a subjective opinion, because it is nominated for the Oscars. In any case, say

what say, "" The traveling castle "" is a fascinating and full of fantasy story. You never know what is

going to happen next, and that's a pleasure. As for the protagonists, what can I say? The

demon Calcifer, the scarecrow with the head of a turnip, the Witch of the Landes and Sophie herself, turned into an

old woman, are great characters.

" 1

" More of the same, and there are three. There are franchises, more than pel���cuasl, which confine us to laziness: laziness to see them, laziness to remember them,

but to which We went wrapped in j���bilo, recognizable in the costume of greedy consumers offilms

adventure, with popcorn and screaming three rows up. Hollywood in this chapter of sale has itsincome

most appreciable, but not the most substantial. Pirates of the Caribbean: At the end of the world obeys that tired

formula to exploit ad nauseam the baptismal goodness of the product, that is, the appetizing and fresh first

delivery. Because this from Jack Sparrow, H���ctor Barbosa, Davy Jones or the revitalized Will Turner here and the cohortworm-eaten

ofspectra, bivalves with the right to parliament and eyes of n quecar that open portals towardsdimensions

unknownit is nothing else than a product, one of prodigious manufacture and overwhelming technical means. Up to this

point, everything is correct: popcorn, pirates, treasures, tentacles and colors in tutiple. The music is not out of place and the

figure of the incomprehensible captain Sparrow already well accommodated in the freak of certain new generations, ��� lives of

heroes of modern cartoon, subjugated characters to the vertigo of marketing and ad hoc merchandising. In addition to

all this, the tape entertains, will miss, but not as much as (to the naked eye) should. That plus of

entertainment has it before its self-sacrificing workers deploy the magn ... I'll try props and get into

some high-tech lab so that millions of white crabs will move a boat through the desert sand, where

it is (by far) the best scene on the tape and almost the complete series, at least for this chronicler

and talludito, claro.No one can go to the cinema with the certainty that he will have a bad time. In any case,

unless we are the age of my son (ten years) we are going to lose - said with the small mouth - two hours of

our always precious time, that we could well have consecrated to admire the granitetic purity of the Bogart of

his best black series of the forties or the teaching of Siodmak at the time of converting a vulgar melodrama of

fotonovela (Only the sky knows it, Imitation in life) in a dramatic prodigy worthy of the bestculture

classical. But we will not loosen and return to the nervous crab and the filibustero deception, to the slippery guide and

to the excessive (burdensome) accumulation of branched stories that, in the end, muddy a m��� s simple comprehension

of the primary narrative material. After all, this is a film made for teenagers. ��� Or is it not

really so? The meritorious fascination of the images annuls all miniscule reticence. There are scenes of an

overwhelming plasticity, worthy of lasting in the memory of non-judgmental philosophers and a less

demanding public, in general. I would like it (and sometimes it costs, I know) to be a spectator of easier contentment. The ship in

the sand, the samp���n flying among the stars or the condemned dams that sail in shallows through a dark

sea ​​full of ululating omens and wonderful mysteries, dialoguing with the living, they are little pills with a lot of

knowledge in this very long collection of remnants that end, by the work of an illuminated editor and a

certainly responsible director, in a passable film, discreetly passable, when (in view of the � exposed

and felt) could be a monumental roll, an affront to the cinema of adventures and a disrepute to the intelligence

of those teenagers who religiously pay a good fist of euros for the Industry (that entity

quasifantasmag ���rico) mold the imagination and build them, in the absence of Jules Verne, Robert Louis Stevenson or

Emilio Salgari, an accessible inventory of heroes. All the great special effects machinery and the convoluted

humor that tromp The arguments of the previous installments wane here and scandalously.

There is no continuity, but there is a certain complicity. Those who have not seen these tapes very badly wear it to

get into the skin (scabs and pustules, if you prefer) of this. It was maybe my case. I lost myself in the story and

I had to be rescued several times to reencontrarme with the plot and arrive at the end airy, so pleasant

always.The identification with the characters (foundation of all children's literature or quality youth ) loses

the bellows of yesteryear. Sparrow, the playful and clownish captain, has been blurred and no longer has thatprofile

hooligan, histrionic and loquacious and even the high-born damsel who becomes a pirate who interprets herself Keira

Knightley is lost, despite its good wad of lines, in a tricky plot, in excessive debt to the

history that forges it and reduced it to a fractured compendium of solvent sketches, but inevitably

boring. There is a desire for sophistication that cancels the primary mechanisms of pirate cinema, permeating

the whole of a perhaps unwise prudent tendency to grandiose spectacle without attending to the elementary spirit of

things, to a certain simplicity very convenient to excite, without overwhelming , to entertain, without breaking the

patience of the spectator. The trilogy here ends its journey through the box office and toy shop windows. The

commercial exploitation does not end: the pirate continues his journey through the seas of profit and the forging of a

myth. The ���picas now work in another way: they are ascribed to less lyrical languages, although of a

brutal plastic force, lacking solid referents and based on literary models of height,

sustained in tangled intrigues that strangle the fluidity of the plot and obstruct any possibility of

true enjoyment. Last minute and separate mention is the unsettling presence of the guitarist's mythical guitarist. The

Rolling Stones, Keith Richards, who went to the drunk and untidy filming set to be carried away by theorders

director's. What did they want?

" 0

" Between the soft comedy and the maudlin drama, the film is as predictable as it is not very incisive in

the approach to its conflicts.

The presence of Meryl Streep in the cast or her original poster led me to dismiss the idea that this

would be a typical film about issues as repeated as the dichotomy. a between personal and professional life. But

I was wrong. The Devil wears Prada tells a story already seen hundreds of times in the movies and does so with the

lack of originality of this type of film. Halfway between the soft comedy and the maudlin drama,

the film is as predictable as it is not very incisive in the approach to its conflicts. Anne Hathaway embodies the

role of the inexperienced and beautiful girl who lands in a job interview to opt for the position of secretary

of the editor-in-chief of the reference fashion magazine, Runaway. In the surreal world of this publication ,

where the skinning of the company is the daily bread of those who work there, Miranda Priestly (Meryl Streep)

directs Runaway as if it were the crasher that whips the oarsmen of a galley. And his employees render him a

vasallaje own of the medieval. In such a particular world, the demand for work begins in the early hours of the

day, when the employees of the magazine strive to dress in fashion and dress with the mostaccessories

exclusive. After presenting this particular world, the plot of the film follows a development of the most predictable.

The girl landed inversors���milmente in the universe Runaway is a good daughter, a good friend and a good

girlfriend. He says he does not feel part of all this 'troupe', but the challenge of overcoming the demands of hisslavery

laborwill seduce him by that "" dark side "" as he becomes more effective and decisivethe

Soconflict is served: the more you get involved in your absorbing full-time work, the more your principles andlife

personalgo down. He must choose between the good, his personal life, or the noxious, the superficial world

of egos from which he seems to have been abducted. Maniquea and stereotyped, the film does not delve into any of

the issues put on the table and the profile of its characters is so prototypical that it is not worthwhile to

assess the work of a simple, effective cast. The Streep plays bad bad boss, but, as the movie

is very soft and as well-intentioned as all of its kind, in its moral the medium rescued from the

diabolical aura that to wrapped throughout the footage. And the beautiful Hathaway, from whose baggage you

can only highlight her work in Brokeback Mountain, will learn the lesson of life of rigor. And it has its logic

that the film is so lazy and is so much in the world of 'glamor', as its director, David Frankel,

has tanned in the direction of episodes of series such as Sex in New York or El S���quito.

" 0

" ìpica film about the 300 Spartans that fought the Persian forces in the Strait of

Thermopilas. A classic of ancient battles essential to see. There are no great special effects, but

you do not have to. The script, the sets, the actors, in short, make it a film of those that must

be seen.

300 crítics that the glorious Tito Chinchan has already taken, measures with the same reliability as the goals of Romario,

which he says has already counted up to 1000 that he gets his children when he plays with them. And of course, what

better for the 300 critic than to criticize the 300 movie. Well, nothing, obviously. So I've gone to the

origins, to the source, at the beginning and I've seen the original movie of 300. Nothing of the fag that is based

on the comic by Fran Miller, no , no no. Much better this, that has that rancid taste of old film, where

the combats are puerile, but that everything is wrapped in the drama of a good script and actors delivered to

a great final result. Ole that pelicul���nm���s majo.La film is about the emperor Xerxes of the Persians who

decides that he has to conquer the world. At that time those who took the cat to the water in the West

were the Greeks, so the Persians sent the most powerful army ever known against the Hellenes. The

latter, for a change, did not finish seeing the danger, they did not want to see it or what I did, so only the

Spartans and the Athenians allied against the Persians But not all the Spartans, who said they were having a

binge and did not come out from there or from the pony, if not just 300 to stop the thousands of angry Persians who were going

to leave that done a lot. Well, with two balls that those Spartans fought. Viva Sparta and the mother who

pari���ed her, alive. I think the subject is already being sufficiently outlined, is not it? The film tells a

story of government intrigues, rudeness, honor and courage, impossible amoria,betrayal

aberrant, fighting, power and misery. And all seasoned with those impossible dialogues andsets

very elaborate. But very elaborate. The fight scenes weaken a bit, but it does not do so if it does not

magnify the film's epic. And that not to mention the end, which puts the hairs as escarpias del 23.

Uf, and the voice-over that tells us the events that happened later we got up from the sofa to go to Liberate

Sparta, or at least to go for some popcorn, or to piss. Resuming, the only film about the 300

Spartans that fought the Persian forces in the Straits of Thermopilas. A classic of ancient battles

essential to see. There are no great special effects, but you do not have to. The script, the sets,

the actors, in short, make it a film of those that must be seen.���������Truendo clasic���n !!!

" 1

" Typical movie chorra, starring a chorra actor.The typical film chorra, starring a chorra actor (to see the face of Justin Long one knows

perfectly which is a full-fledged gañan), and with an argument as high as possible. It also produces Tom

Shyadac, usual in the filmography (comedies) of Jim Carrey, and responsible for Ace ventura and other

comic strips. The argument is laughable, since I do not understand that USA custom of being "" cool "" or "" popular "" or going

to university, here server did not go to the faculty (or she enrolled) and I do not think that my life is better or

worse because of it. A movie for geeks, where the most imbecile of the panorama walk by her making the

dumb , and where, for all the feminine frenzy that appears, there is not a single chest or provocative situation (wow,

I even missed it). And with an end of trials, of those that they like so much in the USA where theis advocated

happy ending.

" 0

" Supportable metallurgical wind that will delight many and be the infernal tostín of others.

Michael Bay's mastery of action films can not be taken as a joke: he has built an empire in the

entertainment film segment in the same way that Steven Spielberg did (which, incidentally, produces the

tape) based on very precise and blatantly profitable elements. All are passed through the alembic of

patriotism (note very American taste) and none lacks a generous ration of impressive visual spectacle

, overwhelming, syncopated and exultant. There will be no one who goes to see Transformers and does not literally get

knocked out. The overwhelming display of special effects knocks the strictest viewer: here already

conjured to boycott any pleasurable sensation that his academic brain receives, instructed in cinema by me. Cas

openwork, oblivious to these summer blockbusters that dazzle the teenage girl and generate outrageous

dividends at the box office and a circus of apothecary burguer figurines. If someone wants to sit in a comfortable

cinema seat and be contaminated by a spasmodic caterva of shocking images, please

sign the film on the agenda and not will be, in any way, disappointed. A row followed by this

fanfare of effects, the thing has its crumb of humor, its point of comedy and even a little love story

with acn��� that works with astonishing naturalness. And there are delirious scenes that will convince-at least not

displease too much (I insist) the acid critic who already comes with the written lines and s� He hopes that the

gilipollesco speech of this type of cinema confirms what his highly trained and professional professional vision had already

foreseen: a mastodynt spreading of computer marvels an insipid guide, lean in talent

and always too long. I point out the scene in which the robots of yore go to the protagonist's house in

search of an absolutely necessary object for the correct development of the plot. Or some surrealistic

dialogues about the goodness of democracy and masturbation as a Zen method of intellectual decontamination.

The rest: Transformers is a very heavy movie. It must be for the metals. It stretches unnecessarily and abuses

what one well accepts that pleases: the choreography of infographic savages, the massive destruction of

everything that comes along. If we dispense with the luxurious pyrotechnic apparatus, we only find faults in the

terrain, evident fractures, limitations to judge this store of electronic pirouettes with meridian

objectivity. A very different case would be if the enthusiastic spectator is already conveniently warmed up to the

event for having been a fan of the series or fine taster of the toys of yore in his young years. Then

Transformers is not only his film: it will be his bible in pasta, his digital catechism, his infinite summer love.

Or all together and greased with sidereal oil so that the mechanical assembly of the pieces does not lose its composure.

It not was, no, my case.The americanista director Tufo undermines the universal interest in history, but

teens lounging in his chair greedily devouring popcorn and soda sorbiedo thundered do not

require semi Ethics neither have compromised the quality of their leisure with any professor of History of the Cinema that

pretends (there are them) to crush the action cinema by being of action. (N (genre usually no longer in the

historiography and scarcely glorified in the usual lists of best films). These kids will have an

unforgettable time. The cinema must entertain and this one does it in majestic mode. ��� What is a film roll? The

biggest roll of this summer and last summer and the other, but a film has not looked

like a box-office sweep for a long time. And that's what it's about and that's where Bay and Spielberg (Dreamworks,

please) have put all their efforts.

" 0

" Modest, simple Western, apparently less stylistic resources. Western of traumatized hero,

although stoic in its primordial function, almost heroic. A masterpiece.

Riding alone, very faithful translation of the original Ride lonesome, is a western of sober invoice, without

effects, subordinated to the narration of a story and beyond any other consideration is Ethics Thethis

professionalism of an undervalued director contributes to, absent from the usual lists of post directors

who from time to time populate journals in the branch of the network. Budd Boetticher was a master of the

western, where he made a dozen great films. The majority with Randolph Scott. Scott plays a

bounty hunter who brings a prisoner before the law. A couple of outlaws with a very curious invoice approach him

on the road with the pilgrim idea of ​​stealing the merchandise. The general plans of the camera of Boetticher (

who was also a bullfighter, here too the curious fact) amplify the idea of ​​the hero lonely,

mythical, convinced that his solitude is the best in the world and that his mission requires no other company than

his horse. We are looking at a very original western, which has gone down in history (at the same time, secondarily and

jubilantly) because of its neutral color, because of its appearance of western film, little of the west , to put it in

some way. The characters have a novel dramatic content and the story, impetuous, spurs them

so truthfully that it seems that we are witnessing the first western, a virginal and primary genre.The cin���filo

remember ��� with special pleasure the most remarkable final plane mounted in gràa in which Ben (Randolph Scott)

gives, finally, settle his revenge (his dead wife) or the scene in the that an Indian arrow hits the

body of a stagecoach driver. Plans that demonstrate the efficiency of an extremelydirector

meticulous, an artisan in the sense of manufacturing a narratively portentous, accurate work, capable of

feeding the interest of the spectator from very few ingredients. Classical film or such Classic time in a

lesser sense of the term because there are other western of greater name. This is wild and masculine,

significantly spiced up by a few brushstrokes of humor very much appreciated and, above all, honest in

the demonstration of the value of a genre that, in the end, it was dying as the twentieth century was maturing and the

viewer (the American and the one who is not) believed to have already seen all the films of the West when the

genre is infinite and has enormous possibilities to expand its unquestionable preeminence in the History of

Cinema.

" 1

" A film that travels through the inner world of each viewer. a more open way of seeing life and the

roles that each of us develops or could develop; a message written in the subconscious of a

precious music and a great beginning.

Originality always presses, and ingenuity still. And this happens with Shymalan, that we are going to see a

film of his, and although we know his tricks, we know how he manages his characters and his inner world always towardsto be

questionsasked by the spectator , we are surprised. And at least, it captivates me. They are

simple stories told so that at first glance they may seem complicated, and it is nothing more than a union

of small details and references about our world and the other, the m��� s big, the imaginative, what in his

films recreates. With "" The young woman of the water "" brings us to earth a story, a legend, a nymph and her

rocky path towards the return to her world. A film that goes through the inner world of each viewer that

really gets into the role of the film, which accepts that it is more a philosophical way of making films than a

movie. ��cula of terror, like most people who do not know the main thing, believe. It is the eternal return to the

question of who you are, or what role you think you have in this world; the enthusiasm to know that the boringworld

and stereotypicalcan be changed by means of imagination and desire, the desire to make good movies, to

show the world what one wants without being carried away by the unbridled mass and imbecile. This

time, the director will bring us a more open way of seeing life and the roles that each of us develops or could

develop; a message written in the subconscious of a precious music and a great beginning, and

with the end of the film itself, a message that does not come more than to say how to evade the monotonous ridiculousness of the

world, with that final message, that seagull flying over all, slowly losing itself by the cloak

that covers us d? Oh night: while there is life, there is hope.

" 1

" Luc Besson knows how to handle the action, and here he shows it again by keeping the whole film apace

fastwith hardly any rest.

Luc Besson directs this film based on his own books in what is said to be his last foray into

film as a director, although some rumors suggest he could return to Put yourself behind the cameras to direct your

sequel. This film tells the story of Arthur, a boy who lives with his grandmother in a house far from the

town whose parents have abandoned him and his only consolation is to live in fantasy. thanks to thebooks

traveland inventions of his grandfather in Africa. But tranquility will be threatened when it discovers that due to

Grandma's debts for keeping the house will be evicted in forty-eight hours. Arthur will put all

his efforts in the search of a treasure hidden by his grandfather, but for that he will have to travel to the tiny

world of the Minimoys. The film mixes real action with the action in the form of drawings by computer in a

totally coherent and perfectly complemented the one for the other. And it is precisely in this last place whereis

all the most exciting actiongenerated and where Arthur will live great adventures, all with an animation

achieved to the detail and a really successful character design, you can see hair and freckles very

well outlined in the faces of the protagonists and the princess is really beautiful, one of thefemale faces

most beautifulseen in animation. �n.Luc Besson knows how to handle the action, and here he shows it again by keeping the whole

film a fast pace with hardly any rest. At the most we can attribute some slips of gui���n, especially

that of the rope of the knife that sings enough, but in general maintains a good level. Despite being

directed to a p��� public child, Arthur and the Minimoys is perfectly enjoyable for any age and is

undoubtedly one of the animated film of the year along with Monster House and Cars, with still to see Happy Feet.

" 1

" Never goes out of style and continues to fall in love with everyone who sees it. The Time: World War II. The place: Casablanca, a city of easy access but almost impossible to

leave, especially if your name is on the list of the most persecuted by the Nazis. As it is the case of

Victor Laszlo (Paul Henreid), who goes to Casablanca hoping that Rick Blaine (Humphrey Bogart), the owner

of the "" Rick's Cafe "" will help him, a man who takes no chances for anyone. I save for Ilsa ( Ingrid Bergman). Almost everyone

knows what Casablanca is about, some of them will even have seen it several times and they will know some of the

memorable phrases that the immense Bogart shows in this film. (not counting that of "" play it again,

Sam "" who became famous for a film by Woody Allen xD). It has been described as a Hollywood legend,

a jewel, whose value grows as time goes by.But, why do we like Casablanca so much? It is astory

lovethat has a historical context. rich thousand times taken to the screen in the history of the cinema and that we will have

seen in more recent productions, with better special effects, a spectacular photograph (of course, what

to film in black and white will surely limit a little xD) and incredible locations outside the studios. However

, Casablanca was shot entirely on the Warner platies in 1941, with a total budget of about

$ 870,000 (which today would not give or pay the second assistant anystar

self-respecting.), at a time when the actors did not choose their roles, but signed contracts with

producers to make a number. A certain number of films and these were the ones that they chose for them, even though it was more

valuable to the actors not to put up with the wrong words if they did not want To be seen on the street in the street. On the other hand, none of those

involved in Casablanca trusted too much in her, they thought it was just a studio film more. In fact,

George Craft (chosen by Michael Curtiz after rejecting other candidates because he didto play a

not fit the billtough guy), he rejected the role of Rick Blaine, claiming that he did not have any interest in participating in a production

of this type with the unknown (until then) Swedish actress Ingrid Bergman. It was a big mistake for Craft and

a great success for Bogart (the seventh casting candidate), which led him to interpret the role that would give him

the "" eternity "" cinematogr�� " �fica. Apart from the casting, there were many more problems that even

endangered the almost million dollars that the film cost, like the very worst English. �s by Michael Curtiz and the complicated

relationship of the Epstein brothers, responsible for the adaptation of the script based on the theatrical work "" Everybody

comes to Rick's "" or the question The fact that the actors often arrived at the plat��� without knowing what dialoguesthem

touchedthat day, although Humphrey Bogart may not be the prototype of a modern sex symbol. He was

far from the beauty canons of the time) or had to shoot the scenes with Bergman

up on a platform of 23 cm. to compete the portentosos 20 cm. that she did, but with

Bogart's eager voice, her deep, almost abysmal gaze and her overwhelming presence did not need much more.

Also the modest Ingrid Bergman, in this film may be away from the typical "" femme fatale "", but it

is indisputable that there is a palpable chemistry in each one. of their scenes together and that the acting power of

this production is one of its strong points. For all that, Casablanca is a film that never goes out of style and

that continues to fall in love with everyone who sees it. .

" 1

" The makeup and the prosthesis are the only thing that can be saved from this film, in which everything is quite

simple, repetitive and unoriginal. Neither the fans of the genre will manage to spend an entertaining afternoon with this

return of the damned.

After the interesting remake of "" Hills have eyes "", directed by Alexander Aja, we are presented "" The

return of the damned "", sequel that does not add anything and that takes a step back in the genre. The best without

any doubt, is the teaser. Simple, simple and 100% effective, in which while a southern music sounds, the

camera is supported in the desert. Then one of the cursed ones goes dragging one of his victims,

then, as another of the murderers pulls one of the chains on the ground, and the camera twists,

realizing that it is a subjective of the other victim. That is why, I understand that they have managed to

"" deceive "" someone, since the gui��� It is very unfortunate, as well as the staging and other elements.

Almost everything in the first part was virtues, Martin Weisz throws it down, with a simple story, with some

dull protagonists, in which you never find affinity or empathy, with monsters that leave a lot

to be desired, and with a film that is not held anywhere. Not everything is the director's fault. Wes Craven and his

son Jonathan, are responsible for signing this "" gui���n "", in which a group of soldiers go to the mountains to

deliver material to some scientists and company. ��eros of the army, but when they arrive, the only thing they find is the

uninhabited base. The cast is quite unknown, embodying soldiers who are not exactly very

professional and expert, and who will have to fend off if they want to survive. The first defect is that

being armed and being military, the public does not feel close to them, nor does it put themselves in their place. In case

this happened, we present a range of characters representing different aspects of society, including

the anti-war soldier, the mother, the beautiful girl, the Hispanic, the African American sergeant,

the generous etc . In short, a sad campus, which should not have made the Craven think too much, when

creating them. The makeup and the prosthesis are the only thing that can be saved from this film, in which

everything is quite simple, repetitive and unoriginal. Neither the fans of the genre will manage to spend anafternoon

entertainingwith this return of the damned.

" 0

" A dramatic comedy with touches (several .. many) of fiction not entirely bad. It is, without a doubt, the best

film that Adam Sandler has done.

We all know that one thing can be expressed in many, many ways, even if it is imaginary. If one wants to

teach you how to solve life with a simple remote control, that is the odious Adam Sandler. I say

hateful because I have not liked any of his films, except in this one, Click, directed by Frank

Coraci.��� Perhaps the idea is not morally correct, that with a command you solve all the problems

(as if the protagonist had so many!). Well, the fact is that what Coraci wants to tell you is that you

live life as best you can, taking advantage of every moment that, even if you are lazy, you have to do it. It is

clear that it is not a great film, of those with a totally hopeful and complex background, no. Click is a

comedy, om���s well drama, come on, both things (very well mixed) that I know, it has a moral background, but

you see Adam Sandler and Kate Beckinsale in a little house with a garden And with three children and come on, you do not believe for a

moment that it's a serious movie. And it could not have been serious either. Anyway, the film

fulfills its duty and I repeat, it knows how to perfectly combine the dramatic situations with the cosmic ones. But it

must also be said, and that is that Coraci's film is somewhat irregular. The script is not bad (look at

those sequences of the future that appear in the end), nor the interpretations either (startling that of

Christopher Walken, who gives me every day). It's the feeling that he does not know where he is), but it shows too many

typical and unbelievable scenes. In any case, it has not disappointed me at all. In short, acomedy

dramaticwith touches (several .. many) of fiction not entirely bad, but no exception (good). It is,

without a doubt, the best film that Adam Sandler has done.

" 0

" No one in their right mind can believe anything that is counted in their 90 min. of footage, no one, I repeat,

no one, cares a "" cucumber "" what happens, what will happen or what happened before, in fact, is one of those tapes

that are seen and forgotten so fast as it is viewed.

While a server was biting his fingernails, waiting for 21:00 to be given and the lastgame to start

league, he could give (and at the end of the day) �) the league to the team of my loves, my long-suffering wife, whom I had all

day dressed in the Real Madrid jersey and maybe as revenge, decided to watch the tape that today

we bring the truth is that, those who usually read me, you know the "" tirria "" that I have to all that

romantic comedy worth its salt and this is not an exception n, where, from a more open argument than the English court

the first Sunday of each month, you can only save the presence of our precious Elena Anaya, the

first face that appears in the footage. is that the film, once again, sins of all kinds of stereotypes that

one can see in any desktop telefilm, starting with the main actor, continuing with Meg Ryan

(What's the deal? done in the hills?) and ending with Kristen Stewart, whom we met as the daughter of

Jodie Foster in David Fincher's "" The room of the panic "". Nobody in his right mind can believe anything of what

is counted in its 90 min. of footage, no one, I repeat, no one, cares a "" cucumber "" what happens, what will

happen or what happened before, in fact, is one of those tapes that are seen and forgotten so fast as it is

envisioned. In short, that I did not like anything, and that as I had my mind set elsewhere, it made me heavy and

leaden.

" 0

" Mediocre B or C series device that only intends to sell an image and open, if possible, a

franchisee ... To

maltreat the Ghost Biker with this prank with a budget is unforgivable . It does not matter that Nicolas Cage

puts on the leather jacket, starts the bike and burns like a masclet��� yankee. It does not matter that the

bunglers in charge of selling us this mess have sworn by Mefist���feles who love the Marvel Comics Group. What

they have done is muddying it, spoiling a good opportunity - the one that was given to Spiderman or the X--

Menso that the myth of the cosmic reaches a new public, although I imagine that the cater teenagers stationed in

the queues are not going to demand too much and their faces will be shining and joyful when they leave. The mine, which is already

a few decades away from having acne, has not gone beyond the shock. Or perhaps disappointment because I, like Cage, am afan

devotedof Marvel and always harbor the noble desire not to spoil those noble materials that led

my childhood to my adolescence and that now, in different formats, protects the My son's childhood towards

his. In any case, the perpetrator of this flam���gera infamy (Mark Steven Johnson) already warned of his

mediocrity when I put Daredevil on the billboard or the still less dignified Elektra. Now he has limited himself to writing

(multi-talented the boy) a gui���n traced from the c almic to which he has not contributed anything personal. Far from these

creative levels the great The Unforgettable Simon Birch, but the inspiration escaped as it did not have, apparently,

reflections or desires for a persecution in rule. This Ghostrider has, however, a remarkable technical level,

what less. The biker burns credibly, what a phrase. The bad thing is when there is no combustion: everything is

languid, dull, badly brought and worse presented. The pseudo-religious comics activate mythical mechanisms that I

no longer share, but I am quick to understand that there is a public audience for these apocalyptic fanfares in the day

of the trial. end and the arrival of Antichrist: echoes of Dan Brown for modern minds. Anyway, the

original story of the acr���bata Johnny Blaze selling his soul to the devil is seventy and it is not fair to smear

everything with these religious speculations again. To make the sacrificial pyre higher, adding that the

dialogues are ridiculous, although one has the confidence that all this piles of parliaments have been written

badly to give a touch ���par���dico? to the farce. Peter Fonda near a motorcycle seems Easy rider, but

here he crawls painfully and does not give at all the impression of scare the staff in his role of the

same Devil. Eva Mendes dress me as if I were going to burst the shirts for her audacityand Nicolas

mammaCage, note that I have left the friend for the end, does not make any effort to be an actor and is limited to to exercise

some hideous grimaces that do not give the tormented Blaze facial traces of being truly under the chains

of torment. It has been a long time since Master Coppola's nephew does not make the cut on a big screen (

Adaptation, the man of time) because Wicker Man and World Trade Center are painful evidences of hispasotism

dramatic. One should not overlook the lack of ambition of the film in very specific aspects: the poor wealth of

the bad guys. The Biker will snack on them in a spit twinkling. Or that ride in the desert (and that

air ac���mic) towards the dusty and spectral village with the two riders in flames on the backs of their respective

rumps. Even the Terrible Villain is laughable: what lack of courage, what little enthusiasm. And they are not arguing

finances: they are comfortable when it comes to handling digital tricks and other tricks for the gallery and

the wonderful trailers. Here it would have been enough, if I had known, to see the one that advertises it. We would have

saved so much. They will have better times and they will bring us other heroes and other villains. Meanwhile I'm going to the'm going to

shelf and Ipredate tonight. John McTiernan in his best times. The only Schwarzie movie that can be

saved. The apotheosis of action cinema. A hero of caste, racial, brave and prepared: without

lost love or magic. A wicked and perfect villain: he did not speak. 0 reflections All reflexes.

" 0

" Acting Duel by Steve Buscemi and Sienna Miller in Interview. Interview is the fourth film by Buscemi, one of the fetish actors of such emblematic directors as Jim

Jarmush, Tarantino or the Coen brothers. In this case Buscemi chooses to adapt a script of the disappeared Theo Van

Gogh, in addition to surrounding himself with the team that Theo usually gathered, including his director of photography. Thomas

Kist. The similarities do not end there, Buscemi chooses the same style of realization as Van Gogh: three cameras

in hand and some free actors to improvise in this acting duel between Buscemi and Miller. After two weeks of

rehearsal, nine days of filming and a three-act approach that Steve Buscemi felt needed the

story, we get a result that is a real time bomb. An action fight, a contest

between two characters, where nothing is what it seems and in which there can only be one winner. In the words of

Buscemi "" is a war for power from the dialogue "". The action takes place in one night, ajournalist

consecrated and intellectualhas to do an interview with a famous actress, but who chooses empty projects and

soap operas. Despite the reluctance of the journalist, we will discover that this actress has many facets.

Buscemi's career as an actor has made him and Sienna Miller ainterpretations

veritable and accurate, where the viewer goes discovering that neither Buscemi is such an intellectual journalist nor

Miller the blonde actress as superficial as she seems. History tells us about the world of appearances and the

world of celebrities from a perspective that the viewer will find extremely interesting. The narrative

unfolds with good rhythm and freshness and after many turns it still brings a final surprise to the spectator.the

Despitefact that following the style of Theo Van Gogh, the freshness of

interpretations and improvisations, the warm lighting of Thomas Kist underlines the story with the right amount

of glamor and becomes the perfect ally of the narrative. Buscemi for 2008 and

2009 are as an actor, but undoubtedly with this film he discovers himself as a filmmaker with his own voice, and a

director whose trajectory has to be followed.

"1"

Two hours entretenidillas thriller with certain doses of action, not much for a afternoon

weekend

Tony Scott is, in my opinion, correct head with some skill for mounting fren ���tico. Sometimes he

offers the best of himself and he gets good films like "" The Last Boy Scout "", "" Love at point-blank range "" or "" Spy

Game "" and sometimes he they come out worse but, in general, with qualities like yours you can only aspire, it's not

enough, to direct commercial tapes of those that entertain for a couple of hours and then forget. "" Deja

vu "" is one of these last ones. I will not go into details about the synopsis of the film. I'll just say it's about the

investigation that Doug Carlin (Denzel Washington) is carrying out to stop the terrorist who blew up

a ferry in New Orleans. Of course, the t�� Yaulo already gives clues about it, time travel will play its role

in the film. But let no one break their heads thinking about travel in time seriously because it has no

meaning. We are facing a Hollywood product that aims to entertain and not before a physical ortreaty

mathematical. And as a product, although simple, it works. Despite that simplicity that I mention, we must recognize thatdo

elements of a certain originalitynot lack history. For example, we witness one of thepersecutions

most peculiarthat have been seen. At least on paper, because in images is shot with desd���ny simple

correction losing all the force of the idea. The same could be applied to the rest of the film. Regarding the

actors, to say that Denzel Washington fulfills his role as a policeman as many other times, Val Kilmer shows

that it is perfectly interchangeable with Alec Baldwin, Paula Patton is very beautiful but little else and James Caviezel

reminds us that the freaky and fanatical fancy is a role that he likes to interpret. I do not roll up anymore because it's not

worth it. Two hours of thriller entertainments with certain doses of action, not much, for aafternoon

weekend. If that is what you are looking for, in "" Deja Vu "" you will find it.

" 0

" A love story simmered, a story of coincidences, of circles, of eyes.All��� for the year 1998, Julio Medem released his fourth film �cula as director, The Lovers of the Polar Circle.

He confessed to including many autobiographical references in the story, and also confessed the depression he

suffered at the end of the shoot, after his total involvement. n in the project. I think that it is corrected with the happy end

of "" Luc���a and sex "". The symbols, the colors and the music of Alberto Iglesias are the main signs of

identity of the personal universe of Medem's cinema. When a film exudes charm and fascinates me

deeply, they do not come out the written words. Something that describes this melancholy film is difficult to

explain. Start with Gonzalo F. Berridi, responsible for photography. It's hard to think how he managed to

make the coldness of the images fit like a puzzle in the love story of Ana and Otto. No doubt it

worked, like a deep dream where there is nothing more mysterious than love, the rest is cold, fragile and

intangible. In this aspect we also see how Medem rescues Otto's mother from the hot climate. The story is

sublime. A life full of coincidences or maybe a predetermined destiny. The protagonists are in charge of

narrating the same story according to their points of view, turning the libretto into an almost poetic delight, and at

certain moments shocking. Some will see it too corny, it may be, for tastes there is nothing

written. There are so many things that fascinate me about the film that I can not keep one. Is not thatwonderful

love phrase that Otto writes on paper airplanes? The director did not want to discover it so that each one

imagined the phrase of perfect love. Najwa Nimri is splendid, evocative and mysterious, Fele Mart���nez is maybe

below her but meets like the young actors (including the son of Julio M���dem) who

perform different stages of the couple, Nancho Novo and the rest of the cast. A love story

simmered, a story of coincidences, of circles, of eyes. Destiny, Finland, Alberto Iglesias, Najwa Nimri.

A story of brave people who jump out the window, waiting for the chance of their life. Lovers of theCircle

Polaror a hypnotic wonder.

" 1

" Marked by a constant instability in its gui���n, it seems that something is always missing and that the facts

presented have been constructed lightly on paper and on the screen.

At least, it is curious the struggle of some film studios for a new box office success and for what

I call in the cinema "" stages "", so that you understand me: it premieres a film that beats all the records,

becomes a classic of the history of the seventh art and marks a generation. Then, 800 films appear

in the same line and with the same plot and / or technical premises. It happened with Star Wars.Pas��� with Matrix. Passed

with The Night of the Living Dead. Passed with Seven.Pas��� with Terminator.Pas��� with Alien. and of course, I passed

with The Lord of the Rings. In a way, it is about the already old history of supply and demand. Sometimes good

things come out, other pure clunkers and other products that leave you totally indifferent. In this case, and

according to my opinion, we are in a product that, although not at all a by-product, is the typical film

"bluff": adorned in the promotion to the satiety and that in the viewing is simply in antape

entertainingto spend a pleasant time. Adapted from the homonymous work of Christopher Paolini, written in

adolescence, The film tackles the story of the Dragons Horsemen, trained to do good and to

protect the people. Men prospered and cities grew. Until one day a child named

Galbatorix was born. The Riders accepted him as one and surpassed everyone in skill and dexterity. Endowed with amind

superiorand a strong body, he stood out among all the Horsemen. One day, in the darkness of the night, he stole a dragon

egg and convinced Morzan, another Rider, to join in the study of black and forbidden magic.

Later, in a bloody battle, Galbatorix managed to dominate everyone and proclaimed himself king of all

Alagaesia. And here begins our story. Eragon, a simple adolescent peasant, finds a blue stone

in the forest and, thinking that it is a guide of good luck, takes it to his farm. Suddenly, a dragon is born from

the "" stone "" and marks it as his Rider: from that moment, Eragon makes the myth of the Dragon Riders

revive and becomes a hope against the tyranny of Galbatorix. Marked by a constant instability

in its gui���n, it seems that something is always missing and that the facts presented have been constructed lightly on

paper and on the screen. I do not think that Eragon has that evil that many adaptations suffer in his passage to

celluloid, where many times he transforms himself into a book of a few pages in a script that barely covers

two hours of projection. error already comes from the book, which suffers from alack of originality

too alarming: it is a story that, although manid, promises and that taken by other paths would not have

led the viewer to see something so typical, sometimes too typical. Being able to reach much more, the film

remains in that wake of films that follow others -as I mentioned above-. In any case, it also has its

points positive or at least salvable. The young Edward Speleers has a good stage presence in front of the

cameras and he seems to perform well in front of them. Jeremy Irons, Sienna Guillory and Robert Carlyle do not do badly and they

give classes to this production. Also Saphira (the female dragon of Eragon) is magnificently constructed and

interpreted by the benders (in the original version, Rachel Weisz lends her voice). The special effects

are interesting and with a competent soundtrack. I hope that the second installment of the saga is able to mend the

errors of the first and that prove that it is more than another of those franchises to use and throw, despite giving

evidence of a totally flat story (I am afraid).

" 0

" Mar���a Antonieta is quite improvable, both in the aspect of the solidity of the script and in the sometimes

apparent lack of feelings behind the scenes. . In spite of everything, it has anproduction design

admirableand a style with an exquisite taste.

After seeing the great Lost in translation, one could have very high hopes with the new project

of Francis's daughter, Sofia Coppola. At least, I had them. For it turns out that her new project, for her, the

closing of the trilogy of incomprehension, is based, not on the story of some young sisters or on two

individuals lost in Tokyo, but in the life of Marie Antoinette, the one who at the time was Queen of France.

This amazing decision, according to her, is based on the portrait of a young woman misunderstood in the court with a style

of the director. For me, it is based on the portrait of a misunderstood being in a court that does not understand

anyone and in the excess of cakes, lace and flowers. But above all, Mar���a Antonieta presents a delicate staging

(practically perfect), some formidable performances, a beautiful photograph and a music chosen

with an exquisite taste. Gui���n maybe present an excessively slow and repetitive rhythm, but you will tell me what more

can be said about the life of a teenager who lives on cakes and lace . So what is

missing is deeper relations between the court, political debates (appear, but very superficial)? In my

opinion, I think Coppola could have taken much more advantage, not of the young girl, but of everything thathim

surrounded, even if it did not belong to him. Ok, it's entertaining and cool to record cakes, shoes (���attentive to the All

Stars!) And lace, but I think the director of Lost in Translation could have filled this void that is so

noticeable in the history. Although it is true that the gui���n is not bad, far from it. I mean it may be

a bit empty, but poorly structured is not. Despite its slow pace and some other low, it is a

totally innovative and captivating film. Although this, I think it's more their style than not the gui���n.cakes

Austrian, flowers, dresses and rock and roll. Some will criticize the style of the daughter of Coppola saying that it

is empty, posh and disproportionate. But let's see! In his films, for me, what influences is the style. So

you enter or not enter. I entered Lost in translation, and I was amazed. His second long was in

the 21st century, that is, it was not a film of the time. Marie Antoinette, evidently, only is. And one wondered:

how to translate his modern style into a film of the time ?. Well, very simple. The question is in having good

taste to add modern music in scenes of the time and make you believe that society has not changed so much. And

for me it gets it. It's more, the poppy style of the film is what attracts me the most. Maybe sometimes it exceeds

(especially with showing shoes and clothing) but it really is what they lived that set of "" animals ""

of the court. Although I have to say that the best thing of all is the music. Songs of New Order, The Cure or

Gang of Four appear, and all of them are exceptional (highlighting Celebration, of the first group). Althoughmusic is also

eighteenth-centuryintroduced, I suppose to not burden the staff too much. Undoubtedly, the best scene

with modern music is that of the masked dance, with a song by Siouxsie and the Banshees, totally

incrimible. Sofia has been accused Coppola not to portray the people (who at that time was touching

poverty). I think it's a bit short, as is the court and the political events, but I also think that the

key scene of the film is that in which Mar���a Antonieta assumes her defeat. Going before the people, who intend to

kill her. It is an excellently shot scene and that counts more than it seems, as well as the delicate and

risky plane of the change of frame (whoever has seen it already will know to what I mean). So, in

short, I have to say that the film fails when it exceeds and instead, when it summarizes an important event in

a small sequence, it is when it becomes more incredible. ���ble. Another point that is absolutely remarkable is the sublime

performance by Kirsten Dunst. His role, despite containing completely empty feelings, is interpreted with

common sense and common sense. Without a doubt, the performance of this girl deserves some prize, although I doubt that they

give it to her. Also great are the appearances of Jason Swartzman and Judy Davis (how old is she!), In

totally different but very peculiar roles. In conclusion, I can To say that Mar���a Antonieta is quite

improvable, both in the aspect of the solidity of the script and in the sometimes apparent lack of feelings

behind the scenes. maras In spite of everything, it has an admirable production design and a style with antaste

exquisite.

" 1

" Apocalypto is a remarkable film, which does not stand out. It does not excite, but it works perfectly. It has

an effective mechanism, which is none other than that of any machine with well-incorporated parts.

Mel Gibson, as a person, is quite indigested. He is a man determined to be all the worst: misogynist, racist,

ultra conservative religious or homophobic are some things visible in his personality or, at least, in some of

his interviews or acts in p�� Public being evidenced by his inappropriate words. Now, if

we go to value Gibson as a filmmaker, as a film director, things change considerably. And is that

this guy is, in fact, one of the best directors we have today, in addition to an author as

the glass of a pine, of the few that are left today in the cinema American commercial Possibly, next to the

great but hated by many M.Night Shyamalan, one of the few hopes that we have left to think that,

the cinema, far from the remakes, sequels and prequels, can produce films that imply an art risk. ���stico,

a surprising creativity and moments of cinema with capitals without having to pull the badly assumed

pedanterà of others considered better (1). Everything started with a small one. a film entitled "" The faceless man "", of which I

remember rather little. It was later with a masterpiece called "" Braveheart "" when he began to be taken

seriously as a director, beyond his talent as a box office star. The real boom came with "" The Passion of

Christ "", a film that garnered various but devastating critiques all over the world, becoming a

authentic social phenomenon. Beyond its commercial success, this film already let us see in its director a

guy with clear ideas about his film, of marked violence and passion. n, as well as avisual style

sweepingthat leaves no one indifferent. Gibson became an author and gave us another masterpiece received

with prejudice by many. Now, with "" Apocalypto "" he confirms himself as a definitive author, as astamp

differentiatingmarked by a particular vision of the cinema and the world (2). It is noted that Mel Gibson likes to

talk about human suffering through torture (3) and, if "" In the passion of Christ "" this suffering it was

the basis for all the footage, in "" Apocalypto "" it does not stay behind. Death, in the form of a wild hunt,us

greetsfrom the first minute of the film. It is here when we see a group of Mayas, among whom is

the protagonist, chasing an animal through the jungle to hunt. Act afterwards, one of them eats his

testicles guided by a joke from his companions, who assure him that, in this way, he will be able to overcome hisproblems

sexual. The villains of the story or, at least, the most savage and ruthlessenter the scene

citizens of history. Its intention is none other than to assassinate the town of the protagonist and the few

survivors who are to take them to their village to exterminate them by a ritual in which they give their

hearts to a God (which is none other than the sun) to, in this way, quench your thirst. Quickly, and without counting

much more, the film will become a show of action that has nothing to envy to tapes m� ��ticas

como "" Cornered "" or "" Predator "". A violent man hunts that holds some spectacular andmoments

sweeping, in the best tradition of the genre. All with a compact rhythm and (almost) perfect.

It is true that, among the intentions of its director, is not telling a hundred percent a historical

film, but do not forget details of all kinds, however much some are dubious credibility. Therefore

, what Gibson intends, especially since the second half of the story, is to offer us a typical story of

action and adventure. And, in this, he is not mistaken in anything. "" Apocalypto "" provokes the spectator with his unbridled gore and

without complexes, with his dazzling landscapes and his photo, sometimes, masterly. Stun by his concept

of cinema-show with that touch of true author so recognizable and surprised by the work of

characterization of the characters, by the careful selection of casting and by the risk assumed from his own

pocket by investing an amount close to 50 million dollars (some say more) to carry

out a film spoken in the Mayan language and with unknown actors who, for the most part, they are

true natives. In the end, "" Apocalypto "" racked up around 50 million dollars at the box office in the

United States and, it seems, is even more interested in Europe, where it starts to speak for itself. its violence and

provocation, as happened with "" The Passion of Christ "", although on a smaller scale. And this, although not

spectacular, are the expected figures, or even more so, for a film that involves as much risk as the one we are

dealing with but which, as usually happens with good auteur cinema, knows how to sell yourself thanks to the name of your manager

, which is already a reason to visit the cinema for many fans or, in any case, people wanting to

check how far it can go with each new film. "" Apocalypto "" is a remarkable film, which does not

stand out. It does not excite, but it works perfectly. It has an effective mechanism, which is none other than that of

any machine with well-incorporated parts. Come on, it has to work without problems. And is that

watching films like this, one is assailed by certain doubts about how certain shots can be shot, about how

someone can create a setting so hyper realistic and credible about a cavilaci�� It's so difficult and

controversial. After all, this is the film of a director who knows what he has in hand and to

which the camera does not make his pulse tremble. For that reason we can see in "" Apocalypto "" great moments of cinema

without the need of pretentious games or falling into absurdities that interfere with the rhythm. Gibson goes to the point and does

not let us escape until two hours have passed. And, going back to M.Night Shyamalan, we are talking about two of the few

directors that we can find today, within the commercial cinema, who have the gift of filming and

writing with an innate facility, with a notorious devotion. towards the cinema and what each plane means. In

short, two directors who join hands, in their respective styles, to create quality films without falling

into rough terrain that pervades the screen of tedium, who know how to combine the rhythm with the slow tone without

the frog attempt, and that they understand that, like other arts, cinema needs a heart when it

wants to do something that really reaches and impacts the audience. Another thing is the response that manythem

give. (1) ��� Someone can explain why everything that Christopher Nolan applauds is done, without going

any further "" The trick final "", when the abysmal difference of quality and work between that film and

"" Apocalypto "" or "" The Passion of Christ "" is obvious? Okay, it's a matter of tastes. Even so, you can see the

work of a creator, someone really aware of what he does and how he tells it. I, for more than

I try, can not see these virtues in the flattest and empty Nolan. (2) For Mel Gibson, the world seems to be

a hard place full of evil . Violence comes from religion, from the mandates of the people unleashed in

madness at the mercy of superior suppositions, whether supernatural or earthly. For that reason, "" Apocalypto ""

does not stop offering us a vision of the world that is not too far from the current reality. "(3) In" "The man without a

face" "the internal and external torture of a man destroyed by its horrible face servia to articulate the

superficial fears of the human being in the form of torture, one of the most primary, our own; In

"" Braveheart "" William Wallace ended up being tortured to death for fighting against the tyranny of those

supposedly superior beings he spoke of before; "" The Passion of Christ "" composes the explanation in

perfect images of the torture by antonomasia of history: that of Christ for humanity.

" 1

" No intrigue at any time, the thing is very predictable and once you have finished you realize that the

whole movie is absurd.

Let's see that, let's see that, my conscience told me. To detoxify the brain of megaproductions

Americanwith shots, explosions and other action. And in what moment I paid attention to the brain, when his thing is to

leave it on the nightstand before going to the cinema. In short. The film is about a girl who has a piece of paper where she

says she catches one at random. Overall, he gets on a high-speed train and picks one with the face of a fool, who

quickly thinks he has linked. This is done to make those who chase Anthony Zimmer (a famous

international swindler) believe he is and kill him and the real one escapes with roses. But as the

movie progresses, the fool's face turns out to be less clever, with less help, and

falls in love with the one who cheated on him. ���� at the beginning. And at the end is the great surprise that does not surprise anyone (except for

the house in which it develops). This is a fart in all its glory. The story they tell us is quite

absurd, based on the continual coincidences. I was not hooked at any time to the car, and that the plot is

very slow. Then the things that the protagonist does make me very nervous, skimming the most absolute foolishness. Do

not intrigue us at any time, the thing is very predictable and once you have finished you realize that

everything is absurd (if you see it, think about whether the situations fit or everything is the result of chance m�� �s

extreme). Resumiendo, roll without arguing interest, with characters that do not finish attracting and a story

that happens to us so far that we do not even get to see it.

" 0

" A very good movie, with well thought out details, a correct address, a superblyscript

craftedand above all, two incredible actresses who make the best interpretations of their career.

Helen Mirren was great in the role of the Queen of England in The Queen and unfortunately I have not yet

seen Dreamgirls to appreciate the acclaimed performance of Jennifer Hudson in her supporting role. Both

actresses won the Oscar for Best Actress and Best Supporting Actress respectively at the lastceremony

Oscar, and I must admit that the first one deserved it. And so, if this prize would have been taken by

Judi Dench for her performance in Diario de un Esc���ndalo, I would have been even happier, because what she gets

with this performance is nothing more than achieving mastery. And the same goes for Cate Blanchett, in one of the

most superb performances of this attractive and incredible actress. Patrick Marber is the writer of this

film, which also He was nominated for an Oscar for his more than correct work. As I say, the script of Diario

de un Esc���ndalo is good, but what stands out here are the interpretations of Dench and Blanchett,

masterful creations with human sensibilities, and above all, some incredibly

perverse and bohemian personalities, respectively. Their looks, their di���logos, their summits (above all Dench's,

in a really terrifying final performance). It is not that the role of Cate Blanchett is worse drawn or

treated, but there is something in Dench that attracts me a lot, and I do not know if it is that loneliness in which he remains and that

perversity with which he wants to catch things. That of the Australian is a more normal role, with its temptations and

forbidden relationships, and also, with its doubts and fears. In short, perhaps the veteranwinner

Oscarfor Shakespeare in love if he is here of true Oscar, but Blanchett (who won it for playing

Hepburn in The Aviator) manages to get , practically at his height, withdramatic explorations

extremely intense(see the discussion in extremis with her husband, a phenomenal Bill Nighy). It's strange to

speak at the beginning of a criticism about the interpretations, but it is necessary to recognize that in this

film what really stands out are the two. Although evidently, in a film not onlycan be

the interpretationswell and the rest be very bad. Here the direction of Richard Eyre is more than correct, the

Marber script is very well structured and the music of Philip Glass is simply moving . And do not

forget the magnificent photo, carried out with elegance and with shades of very ocher colors and

sometimes very gray. The truth is that everything in a newspaper of a scandal works, not perfectly, but only in

an adequate way, without exceeding at any time and always being enjoyable, and, as in any film

of quality, with superb moments and others that not so much (the confrontation of Blanchett against journalists,

somewhat forced). A very good film, with well-thought-out details, a correct direction, a script, not

Oscar, but it is superbly crafted, a crevice and overwhelming atmosphere in several moments and above all,

two incre��� bles actresses who make the best interpretations of his career. Unforgettable in thesense

interpretive.

" 1

" A typical desktop film, which does not bother your viewing but, after its foreseeable argument, is

forgotten with the same ease that is digested.

On Saturday, while making time to go to an unfortunate family event, I found this

film that Four put a mid afternoon and where we had Whoopy Goldberg (for this woman do not spend the years) and

Haley Joel Osment (the famous child of "" The sixth sense "") when he was small, in addition Gerard Depardieu in his

American stage (which lasted little, to tell the truth, because he has not been seen again in Hollywood). Norman Jewison

composed here a film, half dramatic, half fantastic stica on the imagination original Osmentcharacter,

if it is true Whoopi had already talking to imaginary beings in winning ymtica "" Ghost "" with

keeping ALG Quen that another parallel, between the histrionics of the Goldberg and the candor of Osment and Depardieu, that

unfortunately and after having almost 2 hours with the soul in suspense is advocated towards a hapEnd too

P andelducorada (and sweetener). Osment, with just 5 years old you could see ways and you could even guess a certain

talent, and that is, do not cheat us Let's see, since with permission from Dakota Fanning, and some other "" whipper ""

infant���lm���s, we are facing one of the most well-known children faces of the � Last decade. In short,

typical desktop film, which does not bother your viewing but, after its foreseeable argument is

forgotten with the same ease that is digested, go, fast and little consumption m� ��s.

" 0

" Voluntarily removed from all realism and fully assuming the present style in the cosmic, 300

offers two hours of bloody battles, artistic dismemberments of all kinds of extremities and heads,

but, above all , a surprising visual result.

Frank Miller, refresher of the c enmic in the decade of the 80s and one of the established geniuses of the ninth art along

with the legend of the graphic novel Alan Moore, begins to glimpse a new future for the pairing that vi���etas

and celluloid have been playing in the last few years: "" With 'Sin City' and '300' there is a kind ofcinema

hybrid. I love the energy that animation provides. And that, together with the visceral impact of the actors,

achieves a good combination. (?) It could be considered a long 'affair' that has become a marriage. (?)

Before, the normal thing was that the comics were spoliation. They kept the name, but the 'movie' could even go through a

parody of the comic. It is time for my office to leave the jungle and occupy its place along with otherforms

artistic. "" It will add to the words of Miller that, within this boom of translations of the ���mic to the cinema, it would fit

a differentiation similar to that already established in the c desdemic for years: the one that separates the adult c delmic from the

rest of comic strips destined to a majority public of heterogeneous ages. So, if on the one hand there would be

'mainstreams' created to destroy the box office with titles like Spiderman, Superman or Batman, on the other hand there would be

tapes suitable only for adults based on cult comics, such as the upcoming Watchmen, the sequel to Sin City or

this 300. The objectives of both types, given the disparate funding that they require, will be very

different: while some pursue large incomes that transcend those generated only by the film, the

others, without renouncing the commercial success, are born from the respect of the background and the form of the adapted work. And they are

likely to be much more profitable in the long run, judging by their budget contents. Going no

further, this adaptation of the succinct c���mic 300 has had a budget of about 49 million euros and has already

reaped 100 million in its first ten days of exhibition in the North American rooms. But in addition, and

focusing on strictly cinematographic aspects, the result of this 'adaptation-translation' is

spectacular. Visual and argumentatively, the tape is a tracing of the c���mic m���tico of Miller. Filmed entirely

on the background of a blue screen used as a canvas to which to add creative backgrounds born from a Mac, the

film perfectly captures the main virtues of the c���mic: the magnification of the heroism present in the

battle of the Therm���pilas between a handful of Spartan warlords in front of the gigantic army of theempire.

PersianWillfully abandoned of all realism and assuming completely the present style in the c���mic, 300

offers two hours of bloody battles, of artistic dismemberments of all kinds of extremities and heads,

but, above all, a surprising visual result of which the Outstanding director Zack Snyder (The Dawn of the

Dead, Watchmen?) is primarily responsible. He is also faithful to the discursive line maintained throughout the entire

field: the resistance of Sparta in the face of the unstoppable Persian expansion was the last hope that

the Democracy and citizen freedom survived in Greece. This 300 is a risky work that only Snyder

could have signed with such success. It will recommend it to those who are willing to embark on an emotional

story with an absolutely novel aesthetic and without expecting any concessions to the conventions of the

genre. .

" 1

" Maybe I had one of those silly days, when without waiting too long, you let yourself go and convince. The

fact is that I have enjoyed a lot with this story full of illusion and magnetism.

I may have had one of those silly days, when without waiting too long, you let yourself go and convince. The fact

is that I have enjoyed a lot with this story full of illusion and magnetism without great pretensions,

entertainment, which is enough. The movie begins with a magic function in a theater, and then Conn with a

long flashback that occupies almost the whole story. Then it goes back to the starting point and it is at that point where thetakes

m momentosm momentogical moment of the whole tapeplace for me. That last number made my hair stand on end and I kept

smiling. I've read several critics of the movie, and each one worse. However I do not agree. I did believe

the characters, thanks to an Edward Norton able to become a magician of overflowing personality and I

became a spectator more of his magic numbers . I also believe that this is the great success. Numerous

mid-light sequences (like the cinema's own theater), a spectacle in front of the illusion of numbers and admiration forAdmittedly,

its beauty.it can be simple, but it is I do not think it has great pretensions, but that of the

very object of magic, to entertain, and it succeeds in spades, acclimated with the mystery and romance of

fair times. But thanks to the subjective component inherent to all expression, There will be some artists who do not

convince and even bored, and others who fit in the chair and let themselves be fooled by a beautiful illusion that in

my opinion deserves the sorrow.

" 1

" How is it possible that with so many Alatriste values ​​does not work? Because it's not cinema. It's a twovideo clip

-and-a-half hourwhere we only see the heaviest scenes in the plot.

The sensation that invades you after seeing Alatriste is the great film that could have been. Or better yet:

the films that could have been made with a material of such quality. I do not know if it was an excess of

ambition of ingenuity, but the fact is that we can say that it has become good that "" who covers much,

little squeezes "". More than a movie, Alatriste is a slide session. There is a continuous obsession with

photography, short shots and, what is a great failure for a film that is supposed to be adventures, for a

camera that does not move. The result is a film that has a lot of history and that takes place at the rhythm of

coitus interruptus. And the worst of all is that it shows the care that has been dedicated by all those responsible for the

film and that there was money to spend. The work they have done with the costumes is excellent and the selection

of actors is right. Viggo Mortensen is the perfect Alatriste and, thanks to his great work of

interpretation, we can forgive him the strange mixture of English accents and porte���o that forces him tospeak

continuallyin whispers. I would even say that the character has lost part of his loquacity andhave been removed

Viggo phrasesto not expose this problem. The Quevedo de Echanove is perfect, Javier C���mara

plays a very convincing Duke of Olivares and Ariadna Gil gives life to the sensual lover of the captain.

Even the scenes of battles are recreated with enough success, very far from the external blushes

of Juana la Loca, and convey the rawness of a combat in which it is killed and killed bysteel

sharp. How is it possible that with so many Alatriste values ​​does not work? Because it's not cinema. It is a video clip of

two and a half hours in which we only see the scenes with more weight in the plot, but with the disadvantage that they do

not tell us the rest of the plot. Lack of development of the characters, the argument and even thereality

historical. With this, Alatriste excites the viewer, but it does not move him. It does not matter who lives or who dies,

because we have met five minutes ago. In fact, some characters seem to have a couple of sentences

to be able to kill them next. Some scenes that we should have left stuck in the seat do not

go beyond anecdotal. If only they had used the first four scenes and added cinema among them

we would be talking about a typical Alatriste that has left us wanting to continue living his adventures. In

summary, producers and director have put a loaded gun in the hands of those who say that Spanish cinema

does not deserve big budgets. They have had so many media, they have been so ambitious, they have lost

the perspective of what they had in hand. I am convinced that at no time have they realized what was

happening. Taking the loose scenes, Alatriste seems to be a great job, but even the best montage in

history could not fill in gaps that had not been filmed. If only they had taken a couple of steps

back to observe the set of the work, I'm sure they would have realized that Alatriste

is missing cinema from the first five minutes Unfortunately for us, for the Spanish cinema and for the

captain Alatriste himself, it has not been like that. Cruise: Some years ago Alatriste was about to take the

movies starring and directed by Antonio Banderas and Enrique Urbizu's guide. Seen the seen, in the gui���n

we would have won (The Box 507, The Ninth Gate), but the other I'm not so sure. Recommended:

viewerI have read three of the five books published by Alatriste and it has been difficult for me to follow the non-

plot line of the film, so someone who has not closer to the novels it will have more

complicated, not being able to fill in the gaps in any way. Even so, if you go to the historical cinema, you might

find it interesting.

" 0

" We already know what the exploitation in the low budget cinema consists of, if something becomes minimally

fashionable we have the smart director or producer on duty pointing to said fashion to see if the flute sounds.

We already know what exploitation is in the low-budget cinema, if something is minimally fashionable

we have the wise director or shift producer pointing to that fashion to see if the flute sounds. No and not

another is the purpose of the debutante couple MICHAEL BARTLETT and KEVIN GATES that after pseudocumentales of success

with undead as REC, the next film of rosemary DIARI OF THE DEAD or as not the American Remake of

REC that will take by title QUARENTENA, the couple throws themselves to the pool to continue with the open road to

see if this way they get a success. Away from the proposal comes to work at the box office or not, we

find an absolute mediocrity in a film filmed in any way with a script that is the same as

always, its technical aspects are non-existent, the makeup is amateur in a film that seems shot in a

weekend of bad way.Some moments of terror well done that surprises in some punctual plane

but fails to save a boring set where everything is already seen. Among the actors stand JONNIE HURN

seen in PENETRATION ANGST or ANIMALS and JAMES FISHER that stood out in HOOLIGANS. All are very young interpreters

who start their careers, the truth is that as they do not get to participate in better titles they have it raw.

" 0

" Magnolia becomes one of the best works of 1999 (and look that this year was prolific), as well as

I have the conviction that this movie With the years, he will become one of the great film classics.

After surprising the world with the excellent "" Boogie Nights "", the young director Paul Thomas Anderson,

had a challenge ahead, to make the people who had vibrated with the previous film, you will find in

Magnolia something really stimulating, writing an innovative and complex guide that tells the events in

the lives of nine people during a period of twenty-four hours in the city of Los � Angels. In that sense,

Magnolia begins in a less original way. In its initial sequence, in a rather ingenious way, it

addresses three narratives of deaths that have incredible coincidences. From this point, the film dives into

the lives of the characters, creating in the viewer a tangible expectation of discovering how they all

interrelate at the end of the story. Perhaps Paul Thomas Anderson's greatest achievement is his ability to

achieve the viewer becomes involved with all the figures that cross the screen. By interspersing different

plots, the director manages to maintain a constant rhythm. Thus, while we accompanied Earl Partridge

in his convalescing terminal cancer, we discovered that his wife is in a kind of

"crusade" "" of self-destruction for having cheated her husband for years. In between, we meet Frank TJ

Mackey, a "guru" of self-help who teaches insecure men to flirt. Meanwhile, we are informed

that, in reality, Frank is the son of Earl (something that the nurse of the second finds, Phil, at the request of the

dying person). In addition, Jimmy Gator, the presenter of a program of questions featuring

gifted children-among them, little Stanley, always pressed by his father. Gator is also the father of

Claudia, a young woman brutally hooked on cocaine and who happens to meet the sensitive policeman Jim

Kurring. And we can not forget about Donnie Smith, who in his childhood was one of the great stars of theprogram

Gator? And this is only the beginning, amigos.Con a gallery of characters so interesting, be? It would be unjust to single

out a single act, since the cast of Magnolia is totally competent: if on the one hand we have

Philip Seymour Hoffman, whose look of kindness and understanding is exciting, on the other we have Tom Cruise in one

of the best roles of his career, intense and exaggerated. On the other hand, John C. Reilly shows us that he

deserves a place in Hollywood by maintaining a perfect chemistry with the talented Melora Walters - and at the same time

that the young Jeremy Blackman demonstrates a talent in the making, veteran Jason Robars initiates one of the

most intense roles of his extensive career. We also have the always competent William H. Macy, who

represents a pathetic and confused individual with his own feelings. The only disappointment, according to my opinion,

is that of Julianne Moore (and see that this actress usually like me almost always), which begins the historical film and

it goes away deflating little by little. With 188 minutes of footage, Magnolia does not tire, since there is always something to

look at on the screen. Always intriguing, the film has two scenes worthy of praise: the first happens

when Jason Robards remembers his first wife and regrets the mistakes made in the past, making a

moving speech while all the characters go through their own moments of difficulty. The second

is even more exciting if possible, since it represents the climax of the suffering experienced by everyone, who end up

joining to sing a single song. messages, the beautiful script of Anderson, emphasizes issues such as

love and disappointments, the complicated relationships between parents and children, and are, to name just

two themes of this superb film. for me, Magnolia becomes one of the best works of

1999 (and look that this year was prolific), as well as I have the conviction that this film ���cula will become, over the

years, one of the great film classics.

" 1

" Balanced and restrained development, without stridency or boasts, contribute to give the film a

harmonious and pleasant cadence.

I like French cinema. Maybe it's because he's one of the few with enough effusions not to be overwhelmed

by Hollywood. When Americans try to collect their billboards, instead of kicking and blaming the state for their

inability to tune in with the spectators, they dedicate themselves to making good movies. And that's why they

continue to come, one after another, great productions of our not always appreciated neighbors. The

Secret of Anthony Zimmer tells the story of a scammer pursued by the police of half the world but whose

physical appearance nobody knows. In that fierce fight for the hunting of the intruder criminal, one Akerman has

the advantage of knowing that our protagonist would do anything to see the beautiful Chiara again. But

the seasoned thief, aware of the intentions of the detective to hunt him through his muse, convinces her to

approach a stranger in the street, and make Akerman believe that it is his prey . The chosen one will be

Fran���ois, who immediately becomes fascinated by the beauty of the young woman, without being able to imagine that it is only a

tool at the service of the unknown Zimmer. Sophie Marceau, a few months from turning forty, is still

a beauty full of talent, a luxury for the viewer, while the rest of the cast is

correct. The balanced and restrained development, without stridencies or boasts, contribute to give the film a

harmonious and pleasant cadence. An unquestionable success, this debut in the direction of Jerome Salle, who

won the nomination last year for the best debut in the Awards C���sar of the French cinema,

award that finally fell on the magnificent work "" The Nightmare of Darwin "", by Hubert Sauper.

" 1

" Once more real facts are mixed with fiction, running the risk of confusing the unfamiliar of

events about what is veridical and what is not.

Portrait of an obsession is a tribute to the famous American fotgrafa Diane Arbus, framed in this

dangerous and ambiguous genre that combines in a somewhat reckless historical facts contrasted with

fantas These are typical of a cinematographic guide. In particular, it narrates the random and controversial love story of

a well-to-do family reporter with an arrogant neighbor, s���trapa and an��� rquico that introduces her into the underworld

and leads her to rub shoulders with all kinds of asocial and marginalized individuals. Nicole Kidman is an actress with

a significant amount of records, which makes her feel comfortable in this type of papers, while

Robert Downey Jr shines with its own light this time, giving good sample of who recently makes good use of the

time he spends outside the prison or the courts. One of the great r? Moras that can have this film is

the intention of the distributor to try to present it as a pure thriller, resorting to

artima���as such as changing the poster or giving it a Spanish name. Queol that no similarity has with its original, Fur. In

the technical aspect, the film is quite correct, with an appropriate use of short shots and silences.

In any case, Portrait of an obsession touches, at times, the vulgarity in his argument, and lacks the

drive, the effusions and the capacity of absorption of the spectator that should have to be considered a good

movie. Anyway, the val���a of the day protagonist can be sufficient motive to decide to dedicate

the little more than two hours to him that includes its footage.

" 0

" Anti mili pamphlet with which the word tru���o fits perfectly. He has three funny expressions, a

guy who looks like Eugenio and a girl in balls. And yet, it has disgusted me. Fuck that bad.

Director: Francesc Bellmunt.Duration: 107 minutes.Standing: January 21, 1989, although it was authorized in the 80,

with what or we have another errata, or is that such a big shit there was no g ���evos to premiere before.:

Viewers1,237,461 of human beings, since this data, I have the cold cone of fright. In life there are films that

a person can call tru� And I'm staying so wide. But when that word is mentioned by a servant, who

has swallowed shit and cairns the size of a trolleybus, it takes another dimension. So great is the tru ,o, that I am going to

inaugurate the tru���oteca, for those films worse than bad. Of those who are sure that the director is

starting laughing at home saying, "" and people are watching the delivery is what I did to laugh at

everyone "". ���cula is about a fifth (not beer) that must be incorporated into the military from

Barcelona to Morocco. So a train is formed with all the future soldiers, selected selectively among the

most absurd stereotypes that you can get in your face. And then some riot, others doand

bullshityou think incredulous "" Is not it worth my time that I'm losing it with such a trick? "" Poor Alvaro de Luna,

the of hardships that have had to happen in life to accept to do this "" movie "". The gui���n isnonsense

total and absolute. But not a nonsense funny and absurd, if not a shit in a boat. The actors are the worst of

the worst, stuck in silly stereotypes. The plot is nonexistent, and the worst comes when theapproaches

end. It turns out that we are hacked by an anti-war pamphlet that ami, a declared anti-military, revolted my

guts until I was almost convinced to enlist. But if I was not able to move from the couch to turn off the TV, as if

to shoot shots. Which laziness is worse. Resumiendo, anti mili pamphlet with which thefits perfectly

word tru���o. He has three funny expressions, a guy who looks like Eugenio and a girl in balls. And yet

, it has disgusted me. Fuck that bad.Besitos.PD: I have the doubt to see that the film has seen more than a

million people. If someone of the time went to see the movies, I beg your opinion. I just can not

believe that someone could like this. PS2: Another doubt, why did such a spawn need five

screenwriters? I already missed when I saw the credits, but it has come to mind now.

" 0

" A fun, entertaining, beautiful and, at times, touching film, provided that the viewer is

able to tolerate the lack of verisimilitude of some moments.

For some reason, independent -or presumably independent- North American films usually

present their stories around a group of atypical characters that interact in some way

(usually, being part of it). family). "" Little Miss Sunshine "" is not an exception. As long as you do not

hate that style - absurd dialogues, surrealist situations - you can find very good works, like this

road movie, which does not invent anything new, but what counts, counts it well. "" Little Miss Sunshine "" tells the story

of a family's trip to California so that Olivia, 7, can participate in one of those

grotesque children's beauty contests. That is to say: a girl with glasses and rabbit teeth (that's it, very

funny), a father obsessed with success, a grandfather who has been thrown out of the residence by his hobby. Lasna

drugs, a suicidal uncle, a brother who has vowed silence and a mother more or less normal in avan

brokenin which you have to get up because the first does not work. All narrated with agility,

so that the result is a fun, entertaining, beautiful and, at times, touching film, provided

that the viewer is able to tolerate the lack of verisimilitude of some moments. You could not miss the

dramatic touches, but, that's right, in its proper measure. The t���o-nephew dialogue in front of the sea and the final scene

of the contest are perhaps too cloying moments, but they do not manage to match the rest, which will please those who

enjoy -as I do- witty comedies with curious characters and little morality. "" Little Miss Sunshine ""

has been lucky enough to get covered by the Sundance festival, but I do not think she will stay on

the screens for long. At least, in cities like Zaragoza. Take advantage and go see it, it's worth it.

" 1

" After years of waiting, the devotees of Hommer are in luck for being able to enjoy it in size

XXL. The movie is almost the least.

Few could have imagined something more than 20 years ago, when The Simpsons began to appear in the

Tracey Ullman program, which two decades later, those little characters They would be part of the daily life of half the

world, and there would be almost 500 episodes, thousands of objects with their faces and phrases, fanaticclubs

fanand even a feature film. Matt Groening has become the undisputed reference of

adult animation, and in his shadow have grown other projects that have tried to follow his wake, without

reaching at any time to the height reached by the series of the Fox neither in ingenuity, nor in originality nor in

charisma. Now, when the broadcast of the season 19 has just been announced, The Simpsons, the film is released.

Taking Hommer and his people to the movies was in Fox's mind for years, but Groening's opposition to

the project slowed his development. It can not be denied that the film has all the ingredients that have

become an overwhelming success to the saga, and that its interest is accentuated by the fact of being able to enjoy the

adventures of the yellow family on the big screen. On the contrary, it may arrive too late,

when the imagination of the writers begins to show signs of exhaustion and the argumental quality of the

last seasons has begun to decline. The film is not bad, and as a curiosity it is interesting, because it

continues to maintain the transgressive and critical tone that has made it immortal. Perhaps Fox is more afraid

of the response of the general public than usual and therefore focuses his usually indiscriminate

sarcastic exits on estates such as the Church, which today in daytime it seems the most vulnerable to attacks. In

spite of everything, welcome Simpson.

" 1

" Dancing to the sound of Bergman For the skeptics who believed that the cinema was losing all humanity and was sinking in

the most absolute vulgarity, we still have Ingmar Bergman We still have his work of confessions, of a fleeting light

among so much darkness, of celestial music, which requires a reflection (obligatory) prior to his viewing. Our

pleasure, anyway, It will be brief. Bergman, according to his own words, here signs histestament

cinematographic. The testament of a genius. As if his films were being prepared, the acolytes that

we find in his cinema, something more than sense and sensitivity, we can not stop throwing prayers so that this does not

happen. It is the only thing left for us to satisfy our spiritual concerns. But, at 87, however

much his legacy could be lengthened, we must kneel in front of reality.do not want to be

Many of uspart of the signing of Bergman's will, but it is true that every time it is more exhausted, after

disappearing from the celluloid with "" Fanny and Alexander "" in 1982. In fact, "" Saraband "" in its beginning was only

a television proposal in Sweden. But, on his own initiative, it has been released little by little throughout the world. With

almost the entirety of his life devoted to film, Bergman is still the Bergman of all time. And it's a

pleasure to confirm it. But "" Saraband "" does not stay there. Goes further, if that is possible. Here is the whole

spirit of the teacher, culminating its zenith, reaching a degree of unspeakable maturity. It is all an example of

how to finish a race, how to reach the highest without changing or forcing a bit of your personality. What

in other "dying" directors is decay, in Bergman is maturity. And they will not be able to observe his work more than

with envy and neatness. It is what differentiates art from the purely aesthetic. "" Saraband "", whose production

dates back to 2003, but its premiere does not reach our country until now, it is everything, cinema of confessions.

Here, the visual power of films of the size of "Wild Strawberries" is transformed into the potential of dialogues

and people. Bergman immerses his camera anal to the most recited of us, until we reach a neighborhood

that goes beyond what impossible in the purely material. The camera is close to our faces, to

decipher, to scrutinize and continue to penetrate to penetrate the look. His emotional analysis, serenedeliberate

and, is so human that, at times, it surpasses the unbearable. Its density, its simplicity at the same

time, does not give rise to breathing. In many moments we become so involved in the torment of his

characters that we can not keep the type. Therefore, "Saraband" is not a movie that pulls us from the couch

kicking. It is not a film with which to get passionate. "" Saraband "", like the whole filmography of the director, generates a

feeling of impotence so strange that it causes, at times, our eyes to flee from the screen seeking

refuge. It is more violent, in that sense, than any film that pretends to be through other methods. The theologian

born in Uppsala, gets in full (without possible return) in the turbulence of a family that is the genesis of

any sentiment ripped from our nature most replete with humanity. From the most cruel andhatred

deranged(which seems to have no meaning at times) to love more rampant, going through torment,

anguish and sacrifice. A sacrifice that details the inexplicable family ties that unite and generate

all kinds of reactions, but that gives us the pleasure of knowing that we are the same person, the same blood.

the same pain. We always have the discomfort of knowing our past, knowing our roots, and feeling that

we are, inexorably, part of them. Our life will look for new ways, separated or not from our family,

but that invisible union that grabs us and does not let us escape is inevitable.Bergman, in "" Saraband "" retrieves the

characters from "" Secrets of a Marriage "", but in a different environment. While the second focused on

a particular topic, in his last film, Bergman, he talks about everything and nothing in particular. He portrays the

obsessions of his entire cinematographic life, such as the flirtations about death, the tense family relationships

that awaken the most profound and irrational hatred and the most sincere love (among which there is a paradox, as

much as it seems), convictions, deep belief and elitist musicality surrounded by the person of

Freud or Strindberg. And here we have it all. And it scares the Bergman movie follower a lot, since it has an

air of vital and intimate testimony that makes many (and obvious) things come up. As if it were a play or

a piece of a camera, Bergman builds, then, a story that is structured in 10 fragments, in

addition to a prologue and an epìlogo.Esa story follows the rhythm of a music that hides the sins in the most

intimate of us and manages to corrupt us to egoism and intolerance, without attending to confessions and emanating

from unhealed wounds of the past. The sublime music of Bach and Brahms, at certain times and

intentionally, comes to rumble in our bodies to the pain. It is no more than a metaphor urged by

genius to reinforce the sense that the narrative intends to acquire. Therefore, without going any further, the title

("" saraband "") is related to the times of the Bach suites, composed for cello and usually performed

in pairs. Like the intense conversations of the protagonists, who engage them two by two, acquiring a

musicality that establishes the connection between the musical metaphor and the emotional situation. As a metaphorical point of

uni���ny and family destruction (and musical, that is, to continue with the structure of the work), we have Anna, the

mother, the wife, the "" daughter "". She (said actress is, neither more nor less, a wife of Bergman himself who

died of a cancer) is the point of family coherence, which if it breaks down and disappears, It will cause the

loss of stability in said nucleus. The amputation of a member of the family takes place, and the

consequences splash up to Marianne herself, as we came to see in that beautiful and poetic epìlogo.As���,

we have a range of topics ranging from the religiosity of music and some of its images (despite

focusing mostly on dialogues and people , there is some scene that gives off an almost utopianbeauty

and celestial) until the successful treatment of the old age or the stifling torment that accompanies the characters and

goes further than the personal suffering, to reach a spiritual torment and, in essence, metaphysical. Like

them, we will feel anguish, but thanks to sacrifice we will achieve the beauty of the company, the touch of a

skin that it avoids that the pain is something unbearable, and it will turn it into a crude, but pleasurable obtainment of

emotions. That is the way we are human beings. Paradjics? ���Incomprehensible? Maybe too

primary and simple. Like those relatives who, after the loss, splash the environment with hatred, crying out for

revenge and displaying an inexplicable intolerance and egoism. But, at the same time, loving. Therefore,

nothing makes us think that, as some quote, Bergman presents something more negative than usual. It is

himself. It is your maturity. With that overwhelming coherence and full of sincerity within the totality of his work,

and, with it, of his hand, as it could not be otherwise, he also says goodbye. It's Bergman. We are ourselves.

With our anxieties and our vital adventures. And what surprises every day within its way of making

cinema (art): it has a domain to take the catharsis of the moments of the talks beyond doubt , without giving

an opinion to make a judgment about it, simply showing and introducing, as great artisans do

with existential concerns (see Kieslowski). And it shows us the pain that exists there. � inside, the storm of

emotions, the torrent of inexplicable sensations, confusion and desire, the inherent power of pride ... and

beauty, even if it escapes us and hides in the most rec ���nditos of our being. You have to know how to

look for her, since sometimes she seems not to want to be found. Ingmar Bergman says goodbye. As usual. At the

highest and far above their "" opponents "" cinematographic. He says goodbye with a sublime mixture between the

power of the theater and the cinema, focusing on the dialogues and the actors (the work of Liv Ullmannsovereign

and Erland Josephson is) to face the full weight of the work. If "" Saraband "" is not a Masterpiece (adding what

it represents and is at the same time) or not deserving the absolute best 10, it is not easy to say what another film

could deserve it. His first shots, his antològic confessions. the film is of simple development,

but it is so complex and profound, it contains so much vital sense in its interior that, at times, it will escape the

comprehension of many. It requires an effort "" extra "" and a preparation and prior knowledge of the filmmaker. Perhaps

, for this reason, the spectator who is not prepared will feel how the dialogues weigh on him, he will notice himself uncomfortable,

dazed and anguished at his density. But those are the side effects of knowing Bergman. Although for

them it's too late. Or not. That's it. "" Saraband "": Bergman's testament, does not stop listening

or reading among the philosophers who have pursued the figure of genius during his career. But a testament

has pages. And those pages can be read again and again throughout life. And with them learn and, every

time, discover new things. As much as Bergman disappears, as he reflected at the beginning of the criticism, his

footprint will never do it. There is his imperishable work for souls in search of direction. A course that, despite everything, they do not

know. We lost Kieslowski, we lost Dreyer. and the cinema lost one of its eyes. Now. is about to

lose the other with the disappearance of Bergman. Despite the greatest of sorrows, these pages are indelible.

They are pages of a genius. And that is never forgotten. Forever, Ingmar Bergman.

" 1

" These films, just like the romantic comedies or the horror films, are always cut by the

same patron, and they seem "" raw "" to those of Fernando Le Den from Aranoa but in plan "" Americanitos de Abajo "".

"" 8 Mile "" by Curtis Hanson opened a "" new fashion "" in the cinema, "" the rapper's films "", tapes in which

the avatars, adventures and / or misadventures of guys who are not "" little sisters of charity "" and

trying to escape their miseries get into this rap where any bad boy, with his

"" hiphopper "" and his baggy pants, armed with a "" pipe "" can put together a "" massacre of the cagalse "" and where the

apprentices of the "" GTA S.Andreas "" rule his "" ball "" provoking a strange law of the jungle where thewins

"" negrata ""with the worst face of an animal. In short, I believe that in the previous paragraph I have beaten my own record of words

"" in quotation marks "", let's go to the movie cula, one more, starring "" 50 cent "" that in some parts puts face of

circumstances, other face of bad and other face of grief, the worst thing is that this boy (like Eminem in "" 8

miles "") has the same expressiveness as a ladri and where it almost matters more to sell the BSO of the film than

to collect more or less at the box office. And it is that these films, like the romantic comedies ortapes

Terrorestn always cut from the same pattern, go they seem "" raw "" of Len Fernando de

Aranoa but plan "" Americanitos foot "" In short, I have not discovered anything new and who has thought to

see it, to stick to what there is (no more, no less, no cheat, no carton).

" 0

" It could have stayed even as a child-family movie, but the scene of wild sex

busting walls makes it prohibitive and uncomfortable for children.

If the director Ivan Reitman tried to make the phenomenon of superheroes on the screen funny, we could

say that he has not reached the approved one. "" Ghostbusters "" or "" Polide de Guarder���a "" gave him the successes. With "" Junior "" or

"" Evolution "" he tasted the bitter taste of the blockbuster failure and with this, as I told you last week, he

has met with the bump of the year. �o.Not for less. This crossing of "" Superman "" with "" Fatal Attraction "" is

predictable from beginning to end, and I could not assure you that you are going to laugh no more, because this comedy It is

as easy to digest as it is to forget. Reitman comes to what gave him more results with "" Ghostbusters"" comedy

with special effects, however lacks something bsico: actors and history that lead to delante.La

form in which they know Matt (Luke Wilson) and G-Girl (Uma Thurman) has neither a head nor a head, it is more

absurd. As their relationship develops it is even more absurd, and the Thurman really does not go crazy until

they cut with her, so the boy's reasons for breaking up are really pat�� Ethics In short, everything forced

to get to the one that the spectator waits for: a superhero who is jealous and spiteful with a simple mortal, who in turn

prays for another (Anna Faris). From there maybe it starts the most interesting and funny, to say the least

, of the film, but it ends up being diluted in something more convoluted with a lex luthor of all to a hundred ya���nm�� �s, a

final worthy of a Superman of everything to a hundred.Uma Thurman was the only one who could save this film. Draw a

new Glenn Close with that bad temper that gives you who has been Tarantino's muse. But of course, if you put it before

Luke Wilson, who has the same expressiveness as the collection of vases from Planet DeAgostini, nothing can be

done. This actor is horrible in every film he participates, and it starts to be a cheap solution when younot

canhire Owen Wilson. Anna Faris is in her line: flat encephalogram. What do you want me to tell you more,

this is not "" Alatriste "" or "" Memento "". It could have stayed even as a

child-family movie, but the scene of wild sex busting makes it prohibitive and uncomfortable for

minors. Is it like to recommend it? they say in a comment of "" Alatriste "", in the cinema it is cool

, there are popcorn, and for those who are autonomous it will make you forget that on October 20 there is that palmar VAT.

If you are going with the idea of ​​amortizing the price of the ticket, I assure you that in two months it will be at yourcashier

rental DVDs.

" 0

" One of those movies that seems to have been living together for a long time and that one has a hard time sitting down

to watch.

One of those films that you have known for a while and that you have never stopped to watch, has

been today, when a company has the edition on DVD (Already discontinued) and when inserting the Disc and start

listening to the first bars of "" Dancing Queen "" of ABBA, when, I do not know very well why, I have said, "Let's

see it!" Toni Collette does the work of her life here, the film that gave her fame (by the way, you have to

see the kilos that have been removed this way). ��orita, it looks like an Australian version of "" Rosa de Espa���a ""), in this

"" modern "" version of Cinderella, passed through the sieve of tragicomedy m� It is deep and at times it

even has touches of the most decadent cinema of our Spain in the sixties, with Collete the actress Rachel

Griffith, whom we have been able to see among others in " "At 2 meters under tie "And, it is strange how, for a

time now, for a woman to contract marriage has ceased to be one of her main priorities,

there is no longer that mundane obsession with dress in white that lives our protagonist, and even in some

instants the film seems to be light years of the most recent news. It's a bit like having somenotes

bittersweet, and a rare final sensation, go, such a broad and open ending that one unfortunately has

to take charge. I can not stop without talking about the soundtrack of ABBA, where the song "" Dancing Queen "" is

repeated so many Sometimes, it does not get tired, and that is what the mythical Nordic group has, that one can

listen to the songs several times and not feel sick at any time. In short, one of those films

that seem to have been living together for a long time and that one has a hard time sitting down to watch.

" 0

" Very estimable political tape, which creatively addresses a hot topic.Excellent film, well directed by Robert Redford, at the same time interpreted by ���l The same and a group of

few but great actors / actresses.Film eminently political, that approaches with moderation and good tone a matter

of the most hot actuality, important���simo for the security in the planet . The skulduggery of

US policy regarding the performance of its troops in the Iraq-Afghanistan armed conflict (which

can now be intentionally added to �na Ir���ny and its seemingly real nuclear threat), are expressed in a

credible and truthful way, taking past and present data, which reveal the dark and bastard economic interests

of the US Government. And to express it, Redford tells us in three aspects, threephases

complementary. The one of a boy, student in a University, that thanks to the world events that

continually happen, has lost the illusion in a better world where the peace and the justice imperen, distancing

of the personal fight that could contribute its bit in solving it. The second aspect is formed by the

two soldiers, old and very bright students of that university who, having a future halag���e���o,

won by hand thanks to their effort, they prefer to take part enlisting in a war in which they do not believe, but

which they consider must take part, in an act of social responsibility towards their country. And the third, that of the

senator and the journalist, where we see clearly the perverse connections between politics and the press, with

politicians trying to win their favors so as to have their connivance and to have easier benepl� ��cito of

its trusted citizens to whom I will surely run around without any flushing. All told in just over

an hour and a half, so the wording can not be more. s measured and adjusted, rich in good dialogues and,

as I said before, excellent interpretaciones.Una very estimable film, which help to reflect on a

subject of vital importance, doing it in a way very entertaining and nothing maniquea. Promotes free thought and

personal integrity, in front of the wolves that threaten the unsuspecting lambs

" 1

" A film in which defects and virtues have a similar weight, and which resorts to the usual topics

of Ventura Pons.

I can not say I'm an admirer of Ventura Pons. In fact, it has always seemed to me that his work tends to

suffer from a certain parochial localism, and that somehow hides some of the eternal complexes (Inever

havebeen very clear about superiority, inferiority or half and half) of Catalan culture, permanently

engaged in marking sometimes fictitious differences with the rest of the country. In any case, and

precisely because of that individualizing affair, the Catalan director has always been the avant-garde in terms of

narrative techniques and shooting techniques, which in turn always arouses the curiosity of the

amateur. Amor idiota tells the story of a middle-class man, a teacher, who stumbles one night

chance with a woman who works hanging posters announcing the streetlights, and falls madly in love with

her, arriving to commit atrocities for approaching her beloved. The interpretation of Cayetana Guill���n Cuervo is,

as dir� Ristoa Risto Mejide, flat, while Santi Mill���n does not believe that he is an actor so worthy of praise as

lately they seem intent on making us believe. In any case, the presenter of Spanish Version has an

undeniable attraction that seems to remain unchanged with the years and with which it gives a special dose of

morbid to the committed scenes of sex that They are always present in the films of Ventura Pons. In the technical

aspect, it seems excessive, to the point of dizziness, the use of zoom and abrupt changes of planes, and

also You can see some abuse of the narration in the first person with his pseudo-philosophical messages.

Gui���n can not be denied that it is impregnated with the agility of its director, although it suffers from

absurdity at times. In general, a film in which good and bad almost they can be compared, and whose

viewing will not be a waste of time but will not provide excessive satisfaction to the viewer.

" 0

" The molluga appears patrinada. The pertufole is sintrapi���o, although it glots the glotona of the pergalota. In

short, Inland Empire, is the bar���ofla in plastrullo. It does not reach plastruflete, but almost.

Against all odds, Inland Empire, the last film by David Lynch has been released on our screens. And

the truth is that, by pernobbling the percullate, it debillofla in parnasio. Lynch blasts himself into the idyll of the

term. No���ela postra in the catrica del jabugo. Butrof��� and cremafosa are placed on the muplasta;muplasta

suddenof crofeguine. Apliculla in the prefetr���.David Lynch, in Inland Empire, chroma���a escrofolla. And

tropo���a. His sirlesio is frunoso, but not incrote. ���epa the country of the ���e���a ���u���ote; ���appa: ���apote. To do this, he

mastered the truque���a Laura Dern. And the cropa of the proca is cropicuta, breticulando the croupier, the pacrasia

and, sometimes, the llandriga. Mocre de napra of the mocrosa furfella. But this one, doubles the crumb of the ���opro and

merofutre the corpuscle, with the help of the percutafle, the alsina and the bisofre.Adem���s, esprenta���ufla the corpilobium

of the irlatrefos, amusing towards the pespotre del s���frago. Exceptional mackerel of merkhallafle ingroluentes,

where the pasaplonio of the marsuplio surplolopia to the fabrasa of William H. Macy. Pericrotasa of the bislab���, of the

refollo to the cralutrendo, but rotating by the farlasia of ���ecaplote. Tomatrafo encotrilla: the virlotu���. Aplegrote

in grapunta of gra���ota and promilloso. Tomoso and pastroso, am���n de blu���eque. The re������ of the callostro in the

pulpit of the most purreglostro. Astrufe in the pagotra.Jeremy Irons crepalla to the gre���asa oftrupastro

Lynch's; the muquitra of the frenastia, colgasa and fregolla. Pe? Remola flasá. And the flasio, the answer. Lumiflasa

comisod���, la blasa. Pasió la verme���a, that the day is nuflasio. Corcoya de la moya, moyasa and moyas���n.

But, despite this, the fribelote is in alcafresio. Silent, but aquirulotre with breasts.

Parpalluga.The molluga appears patrinada. The pertufole is sintrapi���o, although it glots the glotona of the pergalota.

Papr��� and cafrune are unnecessary in the tromoya of the retrucote. Mo���afla incadelasa. And morafr��� of the bardag���. The

mutinga of the riverola is snorted with the barulla. Although lacueva is matrova in the carcavona of the pollastre

rustiflo and is violated: "" ���Moraviy��� the mollari���a of the babote and the lavisa! "". Contenetre of the pasamotre of the

Castollafra to the conillastres; the great Castollafra de casolla, the castrolla de la llapa and the llapete. Mirlonga

the abastra of Lynch's trolocuense. The tree is golla and something more, but little. In short, Inland Empire,

is the bar���ofla in plastrullo. It does not reach plastruflete, but almost.

" 0

" The lambs maybe had to keep quiet. They have already talked a lot. They have told too much.

Calm lamb, nice lamb. Or lamb with potatoes, but not with cheeks. Not on skewer.... That already

one .....

AnywayderailsI still have Dr. Lecter in my particular bestiary. There is an inargumentable love for this bad

cinematic bug. Blame a perfect Anthony Hopkins, especially. Like Hitchcock's mcguffin, in

these fascinating bad stories we do not want, in any way, to dive into the back of the myth. It is not

necessary to know what games you played as a child, if you raised your cousin's skirts or if, secretly, you read Anatomy

Manuals compared to a Baba's principle falling down, lying down. The mystery, once dead, is

a photograph in an album. And it seems to me that this installment of the franchise has achieved that: dismantle

the metaphysical principles of the protagonist's evil, tell us without blush the origin of their phobias and their

vices as if a little pink novel were We will try and pretend, in two hours, to exercise the gourmand public of

gossip in a psychonalist session. Hannibal, the origin of evil, does not compromise the future of the series. The

story of Thomas Harris has plots that he does not know, but that will open up to him as proactive harlots as soon as

Dino de Laurentiis moves the bag of coins and feels him in front of a laptop remind us of the motives

of the wolf, as a story said. This one, overflows in truculencias: the very dubious category ofcinema is enchanted

unpleasantwhen we all know that to move or to make us shudder of p� Only one does not need to write

an M on the chest of a miserable person or burst a neck based on equestrian traction. The worst thing is that David

Webber, the artifice of this mess, has taken us for fools. Believe that we are going to settle for four

circus cannibalistic pirouettes: that our capacity for fascination is enough with a refill of blood in the

mandible of the future monster when (I insist) what and We were looking (and I have not found) is a

coherent explanation of what we already know. Let's say that the character has been screwed with a three-

quarter bang with as little discursive intent as psychological depth and that only deserves to be saved by the

setting (never marred) and by the way, simplicity in the way we tell the story. That is, A plus B plus

C and then D ending it. We do not know at any time the causes that produce their perversion, the birth of

their dark side. The episode of the child is not well explained (we do not reveal a lot of plot) nor is the

revelation of evil an appropriate vehicle to fulfill a vengeance that we understand, From the beginning,

it borders on the pathetic. I see more dramatic intent in Grissom's parliaments at the CSI on Mondays.

This justicialismo of comic does not sneak: we have already seen many films so as to let us entangle so

easily. And the reference of The silence of the lambs weighs a lot. And not everything is disappointing. One warns,

well looked at the set, a desire that is choreographed with a comfortable budget and a desire more than sincere

to produce a film at the height of its predecessors that, with ups and downs, were worthy. As soon as I have a

little while, I go to my movie store and look for a double edition (with plenty of extras and a cardboard box instead

of the classic one and cold plastic wrap) from The Silence of the Lambs. Ah��� redeem me. You will return to the

simple appreciation for this bastard with a method that will go down in the history of cinema as the most deranged

scholar, intelligent, attractive and fascinating mother has given birth. And now we know that she was Lithuanian and was killed by

a blast of Nazi shrapnel in a cold morning near Kaunas. Oh, and have someone explain to me about the mask.

I do not get it.

" 0

" If you expected Fresnadillo to give a personal touch to the recipe masterfully prepared fiveago

yearsby Danny Boyle, you can get used to the idea that the only new thing to see It's a Real Madrid jersey.

You can not go to the cinema with expectations. Sometimes the film is what you expect from it, one in a hundred

exceeds those expectations and the vast majority of the time you leave the room with some disappointment. This is whatme

happened towith 28 Weeks Later, although I admit that it is my fault, because I expected something more that

finally stayed in an outline of something ���s. I would argue in my favor that 28 days later I already offered a

novel approach within a gender that I did not have much to contribute, except for a bloody

entertainment time. This, added to the fact that the director and screenwriter was Juan Carlos Fresnadillo, responsible for the

interesting and sometimes surreal Intacto, I had predisposed to see something totally new starting from the

magnificent first delivery. Finally, what We have more of the same with a twist as the English would say,

but more of the same at the end of the day. Not even differences in the point of view are appraised and I almost dared

to assure that in the credits it could appear Danny Boyle like director without nobody suspected the opposite.

If anything you can see some novelties at the aesthetic level and the short shots abound, with which Fresnadillo seems to

feel at ease. On the other hand, the idea is the same: man is worse than his own infrected with anger that,

after all, can not resist the disease. And that's not bad, but if in the end the film falls into the

cliché of the group of strangers who come together to flee from a disaster, the main idea is diluted and loses all

strength. After a very promising start and half an hour of preparation of a scary scenario, there is a

climax that threatens to make you have a hard time if it is maintained. Unfortunately, the fall is almost choppy

and the second half of the film is a pack of cliches with some author's touches, as if to make it

clear that they did not want to do the same always. Towards the end, everything is quite predictable and

sometimes excessive. The characters are too blurred (especially the aggregates at the end) and this does

not affect you the least so much they are eaten by an angry person as if they are met with a bullet.

Besides, I suppose that Robert Carlyle's cach��� must be so high that they have been forced to include him in

some scenes where he simply does not paint anything. On the other hand, there are untapped characters, such as the

protagonist's wife and the American military commander, with whom they could have lengthened the first part of

the film and delayed the explosion starting from the one that breaks the delicate balance. In short, I hoped

that Fresnadillo gave a touch of personality to this film and it seems that the only thing that has contributed is the

shirt of the Real Madrid del ni���o protagonist. I see too much seguidismo and I have the impression that the good

ideas accumulate in the beginning and are exhausted halfway to the end, leaving a film without a soul. It is true

that 28 days later (which seems to me better than this one), it derails at the end, when they arrive at the military camp, but

at least it was a more risky proposal than that of 28 weeks after ���s. In the end I have the bad taste of

what could have been and was not, although they can always fix it in 28 months, of course.

" 0

" It's a mix of some of the best horror movies made in Spain, and by itself, it's an

insipid and anodyne story. The most successful horror film lovers will love The Orphanage, while

the rest will cause them great indifference.

Two weeks ago, the Academy of Cinema made public that The Orphanage would be the film that would compete for the

Oscar for Best Language Film. Not English The debut of Juan Antonio Bayona could not have been better, with

the international criticism surrendered at his feet, with an extraordinary international distribution, and all this

endorsed with the support of the Spanish Academy. ���ola. If the Spanish cinema is in crisis, of course it does not affect

terror, since it is the most successful genre. International harvest, both critical and public. The

Orphanage is the most recent example of this, although the presence of Guillermo delcan influence in a certain way

Toro as a producer. The first thing to say about Juan Antonio Bayona's first performance is that it is done in

the classic style, which is very much appreciated. However, and perhaps in the search for that classic scent, the film

recalls, to a greater or lesser extent, many previous films, such as La Residencia, Los Otros, El Espinazo of the

Diablo or Fr���giles. Guillermo del Toro's hand is clearlyin the final result, andsay

visiblethe gossipsthat the assembly that the public will finally see is his work. More than scary, The Orphanage causes

boredom among the respectable, and some other gimmicky shock achieved by the skill of Bayonne. The

tape neither awakens the interest at the beginning nor manages to maintain the suspense, since it is very foreseeable and incurs in

numerous topics of the genre. Technically it is very well done, but this does not hide the flaws and inconsistencies

of its gui���n. For his part, Bel���n Rueda is not able to carry the weight of the film on his shoulders, and

performs a correct but somewhat forced interpretation. The Orphanage is a mixture of some of the the best

horror films made in Spain, and by itself, is an insipid and anodyne story. The mostlovers

successful horror filmwill love The Orphanage, while the rest will cause them great indifference.

" 0

" Do you want to see a Japanese woman expelling an egg from her vagina? A Japanese with a black penis? A classic dramatic erotic

film in which Orientals come out in balls? If you answered no to all three, I do not

recommend it. Although the egg scene alone is worth it.

I had prepared a beautiful entradilla, with a hodgepodge of prose that would have delighted the visuals, in

addition to cultural enrichment. But that Tito Chinchan with the aspect of a demon has defeated the wings,

so we are going to talk about the original title. You will tell me that it is coincidence, that there is no malice, but that the

film is called "" Ai no corrida "". How are there no runs? If they're all the time, give him a hit!

Muahahahahaha, fin���simo humor ingl���s.La film is about a Japanese prostitute who falls in love with the owner of

a house of t���s. The thing is going well in the beginning, all day giving sex without stopping, but she begins to

become obsessive compulsive (in addition to possessing a uterine furor of biblical dimensions) what is

turning the relationship into a self-destruction that ends badly, as it was seen come.13 passes that

had to do at the Cannes festival when they presented.hairs on their

Somebody had to get rid ofhands, since I doubt they would see the film itself. The theme is to see the two Japanese carving all the

footage, spiced with a multitude of bizarre and funny sequences. I am convinced that the triumph of

the years has been with her, given that my book of the 1001 films that must be seen says that it must be seen. And

I've listened to him. In the end, do you want to see a Japanese woman expelling an egg from her vagina? A Japanese with a

black penis? A classic dramatic erotic film in which Orientals come out in balls? If you answered

no to all three, I do not recommend it. Although the egg scene alone is worth it.Besitos.PD: What

we laughed my half courgette and I, mother.

" 0

" When a movie makes you forget that you're in a movie theater and it almost gives you the feeling that you're

the one you're fleeing to save life, is that that film is good, apart politic.

It seems that every feature film played by the hand of the former actor and now director Mel Gibson is

accompanied by a great controversy. It already happened with the controversial "" passion of Christ "" and now returns to our

screens with Apocalypto, of which some try to brand racist. The main issue is that the movie �cula

is, first of all, a history of action and, in no case, I think that it tries to present us an essay on the

main causes of the decline of the great Mayan empire (and not the disappearance of the Mayan civilization as I have read

in some articles). So and all, the data shown in the narrative are not false, namely; the Mayas

practiced human sacrifices (extirpations and beheadings) and even self-sacrifices (perforation of

some parts of the body to thus bleed). In this way, they believed to feed the gods, something that was

necessary for man to feed, in turn, the products created by the gods. It is also true

that in the last period of the empire the population was divided into independent provinces and, therefore,

with different political, administrative and military bodies. From which it is derived that the struggles between different

provinces was something feasible. Nor is it very clueless when we are told that there was an exhaustion ofresources

naturaland the population was getting sick (it is one of the most accepted theories by anthropologists). logos to

explain the decline of this great empire). What is not spoken of the advances that the Mayans demonstrated in matters such

as Mathematics or Astronomy? Well, not because it would not contribute anything to the narrative, it just was not

necessary. I will say again that this is a film and not a documentary of the Nathional Geographic. What shows a

bloody image of the Mayans? Well, no more or less bloody than most civilizations in the fifteenth

century. Do you think, perhaps, that all Spaniards were dedicated to colonizing islands and murdering natives? As a

Spaniard, should I be scandalized every time I see a movie about Hern���n Cort���s? (and more so when the English

massacred even more but nothing is said about them). Saying this, since he thought it necessary, Apocalypto (which in Greek

means "I reveal "") is a great action film, that's it, with a high content of violence (not in

vain, it tells us about the abduction of a village, its subsequent torture and humiliation. And, above all, the courage of a

man to save his family from death). As in The Passion of Christ, the dialogues will be produced in

the native language according to the geographical and historical situation, in this case, the Maya Yucatecan; However, the

image will gain much more power than the word being the last one used with discretion but with intensity.

The natural settings as well as theadaptation of the actors within the

physicalgeographical environment (in fact, many of them are natives of Mexico); If we add to this that the faces of the

actors are not well known, the extreme integration of the elements will make us feel the story more

realistically. In summary, when a film �cula makes you forget you're in a movie theater and it almost gives you the feeling

that you're the one you're running away to save your life, it's that movie ���cula is good, politics apart.

" 1

" The last living man faces a horde of infected and the reality of being a bad remake. Imagine that an apocalypse decimates humanity and that you are the only human being left on the face of

the earth. Now imagine that you are not alone at all, that you are the only human, yes, but that you have to share

space with a race of mutant vampires, and that of day you can campaign at your leisure, but at night you have to take

care of them, so they do not give chase. This is the premise of the novel "" I am a legend "", taken to the movies

before on 2 occasions, possibly being the m��� s famous "" Omega Man "", a film starring Charlton

Heston, titled Castilian as "" The Last Living Man. "" It could be said that this movie is a remake of

that, although it could also be said to be a remake of "" Harry Potter "", "" Snakes on the Air "" or a

documentary about the alignment Manchester United in 98, since the only thing that has in common is that

one Neville comes out. A Neville who, moreover, is suffering from kingpinism, something that crashes quite co n the

personality of the protagonist of the novel, but anyway. If that were the worst. In this film the vampires

are replaced by infected (not zombies) enrabietados and lelos, very different from thesect

afro-seventiesof the film by Charlton Heston, which They devote themselves to attacking wildly and in command, with

assault on Neville's mansion-arsenal included. Look, in this you can tell it's a remake of amovie

Heston, since it turns out to have guns even under the rugs. But even though there are a few things that

rattle, the pel�� �cula manages to become entertaining, until the hour and a half of film, the writers

decide, in a totally anticlimatic, to end the film, in a final of the " "I want

the money back", and an explanation of why the movie is called "" I am a legend "" stuck with shoehorn,

vaseline and many pushes. In short, that they have taken a license, they have smoked it, they have changed it from top

to bottom and with the excuse they have made a bad movie of zombies (perd���n, of infected) and they have loaded the

fundamental premise of "" I am a legend "" that is not the "" I am a black shooting the zombies "" but the "" I am a

monster and I fear those whom I fear, since for them, oy Legend "".

" 0

" Dialogues that remain in the memory, a character not only funny, also sympathetic and human, and a

few scenes as memorable as the dance in the kitchen.

Although the proposal of Viscarret is not too risky, because the idea or the contour of the film are

nothing in comparison with the imagination of patrios like Coixet, Amen���bar or Almod���var, it is grateful that, being

this a debut, it manages to go branching along paths never explored until now, apparently simple and very

realistic. Di���logos that remain in the memory, a character not only funny, also sympathetic and human, and

a few scenes as memorable as the dance in the kitchen. Under the stars is a title that I think will

not go down in the history of Spanish cinema, either because it is too independent (sometimes antonym),

or simply because tell a story that we have heard more than once. But as I say, it is the grace of the

set and the magnificent interpretations that make it, this, an exemplary debut. The beginning is somewhat

typical, with the protagonist (a great Alberto San Juan) half lost that changes of airs when they sayhim

tothat his father is very serious. It is then when he travels to the town where he spent his childhood and, as he

remembers, he goes exploring and opening up in a freer world. You will also meet the always wonderful Emma

Su���rez, who here shows that his is the drama. But a filmic air is also present in the film, that

touch that makes it simply delicious, even though the environment where it is surrounded is not exactly so

charming. Also highlight the charming presence of the little Violeta Rodr���guez, in a very wellpaper

writtenthat changes the life of our beloved main character.And in passing mention the correct gui�� �n,

which sometimes goes too far trying to deal with too many issues at once (for example, the story of the brother agon���as

over, although in the end it helps to round off the main plot), but at the same time he gets a linemelodramatic

really successful. And it's not that this is a great film, one of those masterpieces of national cinema such as

the Fauno or Sampedro, but, without a doubt, it is a brave proposal that, from something simple and very seen, creates something

truly charming. Under the stars is one of the most beautiful films I've seen in time, and this is

appreciated. I have no choice but to add the name of Viscarret to the list of directors who promise. And is

that to start well is already a lot.

" 1

" The Farrelly brothers have gone into an auger, producing year after year an increasingly shabby, lesscinema

elaborate, and where, despite some excellent first minutes, the thing begins to deflate more and more,

until arriving at the unsuspected.

When I went to see, "" Love in Game "" I realized that the Farrelly brothers had dropped the ready, and that after

"" Two silly fools "" and the mega-success "" Something happens with Mary "" in addition to the nice cutrez "" Blind Love "" these

had entered into a spin, producing year after year a cinema every It is even more shabby, less elaborate, and where,

despite some excellent first minutes, the thing starts to deflate more and more, until it reaches thetrue

unsuspected. It isthat Ben Stiller owes a lot to the Farrelly, thanks to them and to the film that

starred with them together with Cameron D���az is today's adéa of one of the stars of the comedy of our days ,

but "So much to ridicule over and over again? (and see that in "" Something is wrong with Mary "" he does it in a basket).

Add Malin Akerman, the incredible father of Stiller, Jerry, apart from Michelle Monaghan, and the final cameo of

Eva Longoria, all together, but not scrambled, on a tape, which of course I did not like anything, but that

nothing, nothing. And where few things are saved from burning, and that is, the absurd humor of the farrelly makes this

time one finishes the projection mosqueado, and not wishing to see its next comedy.Very week of bad cinema that I have

!! And they go!! PS: I did not know so many sexual positions, I will have to ask the RRMM a "" Kamasutra "" and study it

carefully.

" 0

" I liked it a lot and I think that if you are unprepared to see it, stripped of prejudices, you will love it ...

I remember that "" Fantastic 4 "" was one of the first criticisms of this blog A couple of years ago and maybe that'swhy

alsoI clearly remember that it was not a good movie. A lot of money invested, a costly

advertising campaign, a mixed result. For that reason, when presenting the sequel of the saga I went to the cinema with a certain degree of

skepticism: same director, same cast, same result ??? But no! That has positive the world of cinema,

that phrase "" never the second parts were good "" is not always confirmed. Here Tim Story decides to

play by the visual display instead of working the emotional of the characters and the film wins in

entertainment and conviction with the new format. "" Fantastic four: rise of the Silver Surfer "", may not have

much to offer for those who are not followers of the Marvel factor���a, however, what it proposes

is a direct, intense story, full of action and excellent special effects that will delight

any average viewer. We will not find subtleties in this part, the script is quite simple and the four

protagonists advance through history showing a great predisposition to the resolution of conflicts

through subtle means, but this Good. The sequences of battles against the Silver Surfer are very good

and the scenarios that the production goes through make us remember any film of 007. For those who are

interested in the plot It all begins when an enigmatic intergalactic herald, Silver Surfer (character that

combines the work of the special effects company WETA - The Lord of the Rings -, with the actor Doug Jones

- Abe Sapiens in Hellboy - who put the body to play it and none other than Lawrence Fishburne who

contributed the voice!), Arrives on Earth to prepare it for its destruction. But of course, in this path of

destruction you will find an original ally in the central villain of the previous installment V���ctor Van Doom (Julian

Mac Mahon, reliable as in each chapter of my favorite series, Nip / Tuck) who recovers expecting revenge

from our heroes. While this villain travels (Silver) the world generating strange creatures, Reed, Sue,

Johnny and Ben (Ion Gruffudd, Jessica Alba, Chris Evans and Michael Chiklis, in similar tune, fulfilling with the

gui��� and not much more) they must solve the surfer's mystery in a complicated context for the group where

the main couple wants to get married. And not only that, but to have a normal family! !! As you can imagine, this is the

sympathetic side of the film, with some isolated discussion about the responsibility and harassment of the media. But it

is the least. What the ticket price is worth are the action scenes; the most interestingtechnically

arethe persecution in Manhattan and the attack on the amusement park in London. Although to be fair, it

must be said that the film proposes something simple and meets it: there is entertainment in it. Well by

Tim Story, well by screenwriters Don Payne and Mark Frost who adpatan a story from the mid 60 's and add it

to an attractive content for the public that today fills the rooms around the world; I know they are

fantastic. I liked it a lot and I think that if you are unprepared to see it, stripped of prejudices, you will

love it.

" 1

" A pity that such a well-worn idea ends up going to the "" garete "" for an easy development. When I read the articles about the film they had published of Luc Besson, I found that it affirmed

(in repeated occasions) the total originality of the tape, and the do not make tributes to any previous tape;

and, sadly, Mr. Besson was lying like a scoundrel, since not only do the characters look like an

updated version of the "" Dark Crystal "", but there are also references to a hundred movies, ranging

from "" Pulp Fiction "" to which he makes at least 3 tributes throughout the film, going through ""Fever

Saturday Night"" or Something else about tapes like "" Count with me "" "" The Goonies "" or even the saga "" Indiana

Jones "", so Besson, better not to go from originals and have a bit of decency when you do not discover "" the formula of the

coca-cola. "" Another negative part to highlight are the errors, one of them with a fat line, since, and

without revealing anything of the plot, they could have reviewed a little bit Guin not stay in evidencia.Por

Moreover,is a pity that such a well thought TRADA (the initial premise for a childrenfilm is the idonea),

is end up going to the "" g arete "" by an easy development, and in some cases very little gimmicky, the pity of such an

accomplished animation (some characters become entrainable), which does not get to the right port the

tape, and that sinks by leaps and bounds towards a more than run over end.

" 0

" Wonderful, fabulous, fantastic and impressive. But also violent, cruel, heartbreaking and sad.

Wonderful, fabulous, fantastic and impressive. But also violent, cruel, heartbreaking and sad. Of course

it is not a story for children, but a story for adults as strong as they are sensitive. We are told the

arrival of a girl and her mother to a rural house, occupied by the Francoist army of the Spanish postwar period

with the purpose of hunting and exterminating the maquis in the area. The mother, pregnant, and the child arrive at the

house to be near the stepfather of the child (husband of the mother and captain of the troop installed in the house)

at the time of the birth of his son. Meanwhile we witness a fantastic story that lives in the

imagination of the child, whose purpose is to escape from the horrible world outside where war and death

are at home , but at certain moments it appears even more terrifying than the reality itself.

Ariadna Gil is the mother and the child is played by Ivana Baquero. Both are good in the film,

but I would like to highlight the performance of Maribel Verd���, as the housekeeper of the house, and Alex Angulo, as

the m�� �dicic of the area. Separate mention needs Sergi L���pez, whose composition of Captain Vidal creates a monster a

thousand times more terrifying than any of those that can inhabit the imagination of the girl, and that deserves

nominations and several prizes in all the festivals, Goyas, Oscars and Arieles several that this film

chooses. It goes without saying that the film ���cula is also impeccably technical and artistically speaking: music,

photography, the design of the fantastic world ��stico, the gui���n, the rhythm? all deserve these five stars that

crown a director, Guillermo del Toro, who already pointed good manners and now has earned the mention

of teacher, who is the one who makes masterpieces.

" 1

" A heartbreaking and forceful vision of current Argentina, which invites reflection on the

situation of a world in which half of the people die of hunger and the other half of obesity.

I suppose that many of you will know that proverbial maximum that says that in many occasions, the lack of

means sharpens the ingenuity. Clear example of this is the large number of titles that became

box office and critics without having counted for their realization more than strictly Basic And sometimes even

that. The Project of the Witch of Blair and a long list are clear exponents of it. Well, something like this is what has

been happening for a few years in Argentine cinema. The deep economic crisis of the country has

led to the appearance of films shot almost "in real time", with a low budget, but magnificently

compensated for this section with scripts that ooze sharpness, ingenuity and dynamism in some cases; or they

portray with disheartening crudeness the current reality of a once rich country that now suffers the

consequences of years of continued plunder by a corrupt political class like few others. El Polaquito

belongs to this last class. El Polaco is a boy who lives in the suburbs near the central

train station of Buenos Aires, and who earns his living singing tangos in the wagons, while he suffers from oppression. Den a

neighborhood mobster who is dedicated to exploiting young people for their own benefit. His deep love for a

prostitute with which he establishes a relationship leads him to face everything and decide that his future does not have to

be doomed to begging and exploitation. The film, based on real events, perfectly recreates

the atmosphere of disillusionment and pessimism prevailing in a certain part of current Argentine society, but at the same time it

sends a message of hope for the country, a hope that necessarily passes through the young. The dantescas

conditions in which they live and the lack of vital expectations of the youth, before the impassibility of all

is the leitmotiv of the tape, made with few wicks but full of strength, drive and talent. El

Polaquito is a heartbreaking scream, a call of attention to an untenable situation before which nobody does

anything and which condemns thousands of human beings to ostracism and certain death. Now that the Argentine economy has been

growing at a frenzied pace for three or four years, once the pothole has been overcome, this film claims

that in view of the optimism of the ruling class , we must bear in mind this part of society for which the

only feasible objective when they get up each day, is to be able to arrive alive at night.

" 1

" Our little critic, suggested to record it in video at the end of the film, to see it no less than 1000

times, it will qualify it as excellent .

Well, the truth is that with this I entertained a lot, and I have to say that I was not the only one. I had a lot of won to

be a story with Celtic characters, such as Elves, I love all those things since very small.

But returning to what interests us, our young cr�� Ethical, he remained hypnotized by the screen in one

of the longest films he has ever seen. Normally it ends something tired towards the end, and usually ends up in the

arms of one of us, but this time it was not like that. The adventures run by Arthur, in the company of

a Princess Selenia, too full of sensuality for a young audience of barely 4 years old, who does not understand about

swaggering, keeps in a fun and entertaining tension, amusing characters ���lficos and

trepidantes luchas. Without a doubt, a good way to pass the time, and to be able to understand that the smallest ones,

are also capable of great achievements with effort, tenacity and bravery. And since our little critic suggested

filming it in video at the end of the film, to see it no less than 1000 times, he will describe it as

excellent .

" 1

" Thriller about pedophiles, urban avengers and political justice that does not quite surprise because of the boredom

of their proposal ...

The murky thriller swings between introspection Bergman - tormented characters who express without

language the edges of his disturbed soul - and the usual rationing of clichés that pervade the standard thriller -

characters whose past matters sparingly -. The murky thriller dives into the morality of that dirty epic, in the

nature of human behavior. It matters more the origin of the problem than its solution. So it is the

character-hook of this thriller more murky than thriller that gives Richard Gere the opportunity to redeem himself from

insipid slips and that irreconcilable sambenito with the oblivion that is to have been (to be, qui��� n know) icon the

star-system, man-object around the good actor that, sometimes, is. The persecutor of psychopaths he

has played has become a kind of obsessive moron, a sullen and asocial official who has

turned his office into a crusade of which he is, by his own investment, hero, champion , standard and, above

all, ambiguous executor arm. The ruggedness of the Welles case (disturbed behavior, pederasty,

heels of the norm in general) is found in its director (Andrew Lau or also Wai Keung Lau, authorHongkon���s

of theof the already known and overrated three parts of Internal Affairs, the Scorsese Infiltrators Group) a

methodical author, determined to tell the American story of sex criminals andredemptions

impossible. Af���na Seven in its stormy aspect, in its purulent epidermis, The Wells case provides a

novel mechanic in the thriller of inspiration (the persecutor turned into what he pursues), a

aesthetic approach closed, distant, articulated by the burdensome (sometimes) didactic of the sombre and

unbalanced federal agent who plays a meritorious Gere, who only seems happy (it is a saying ) when

tracking tracks, scrutinizing crime scenes or confirming the unshakeable nature of the evil. The Welles case is

also a film of modest pretensions, despite its cast. The portrait of the private life of self-sacrificing

officials displaces the foreseeable - and here almost non-existent - portrait of the private life of the psychopaths on

duty, who are not sufficiently drawn or (even) smudged, lacking narrative autonomy. All that

makes the footage heavy. The interior demons of the conjurate to impart justice muddle his

mission and throw him into another crusade: his own, that of a lost man, battling mills, spurred vaguely

by the nobility, but abysmal to the simple and sinister revenge

" 0

" Of course I expected that at least the first part would be overcome, if it surpasses it, it is still

worse, more boring, less defined characters, catastrophic interpretations, fights without any n sense

shot to the rhythm of a video clip.

I think I'm a little masochistic because I did not need to be a lynx to figure out that this film could only be

a pesti���o. We all know that both ALIEN and PREDATOR separately were two fantastic myths. At the

time giving two films as remarkable as full of action and terror. Over time some luminaries came

up against amusing monsters to attract fans to the battle, the first attempt to balance With a

resounding success in the mediocre but at least funny FREDDY VS JASON, evidently was born in this way a

new way to assault the box office, therefore not missing another confrontation with the ALIENS and PREDATORS

resolving their differences in one of the biggest filths ever filmed that was boring. In an

attempt to regain the hen of the golden eggs, the sequel is entrusted to the STREUSE brothers

in special effects in numerous superprod ucciones like the saga X-MEN or 300. Rode���ndose of a

young cast very little known where they emphasize JHON ORTIZ that makes double in the billboard with its intervention

in AMERICAN GANGSTER and STEVEN PASCUALE that triumphs in the television Conn with the RESCUEME series. Of course I expected

that at least the first part would be overcome, if it surpasses it, it is still worse, more boring,

less defined characters, catastrophic interpretations, fights without any n sense shot to the rhythm of a video

clip. The only thing that stands out is its special effects, which is why almost the entire budget was invested. Of

course the gui���n is again non-existent.

" 0

" Animation film that must be seen (we must support the animation, beautiful) but that leaves a strange

taste when it ends.

Most of the tapes made by digital animation have many pros and some against, "" Robots "" can not

be an exception, the pros, because it's great made, that even seems a film made with the

method "" Stop-Motion "" (for those who do not know what it is! Search it in the Google! That I will not waste time

explained ndolo yo), and that the voices more in VOS than dubbed (although Flo does not do it badly and "" the serrano "" of turn,

either, wow) are great. The contra? The script, which although it is signed by two screenwriters of comedies

(City Cowboys, Un lio padre, Dulce hogar, sometimes) is quite simple, linear and predictable to the

satiety, in fact, dir ���am���s, you see the end of all events coming from the minute 5��� of the

movie. It's true that Fox (and BlueSky in this case) leave with this movie. �cula aa���os light to the great also

"" The age of the ice "" (that taking advantage of the premiere of "" Robots "" has been released on DVD with an edition

"" ultrachachi- great ""), however and although as I said the animation is excellent, both Pixar and

Dreamworks have done extraordinary works such as "" The Incredibles "" or "" Shrek-2 "" that leave this as

a "" mere apprentice "" of the previous and although the tributes and pigeons to the history of the 7th art (from "" The

Wizard of Oz "" to "" Metropolis "" by Fritz Lang) are more than patents, the film flinches with simplicity, maybe

because you keep thinking about the idea that the animation is only for "" nanos ""? In short, a movie of animation that you

have to see (you have to support the animation, beautiful ones) but that leaves a strange flavor when it ends.

" 0

" It is consumed as fast as the medium popcorn carton. Even in a terrace cinema session, with

prices in half and the possibility of seeing two in a row, this movie is perfect.

Who said that this summer there were no mutants? After enjoying / suffering with? Spiderman 3�? �, and waiting for

two weeks to come by here? The 4 Fantastic? with its sequel, the surprise of

halftime takes place: Nicolas Cage, alias the visionary. He has taken a liking to this of the powers? And already of step to the

face of insipid in his papers. Next? It is not a film: it is a short story with the right duration, and with

actors who do what they can so that it does not become the biggest bore of 2007. The thing did not take more than

the 88 minutes that the tape lasts. Lee Tamahori has already forgotten the film's aesthetic that he printed to his best work,

"Mullholland Falls ?, to focus on the Worst of his ways, repeated like churros in? Dies another day? or

? XxX 2�? �. With a base as solid as a 1954 account by Philip K. Dick (? The Golden Man?), And whosework

prolifichas given wonders such as? Blade Runner? or the semi-decent? Minority Report ?, the director has had to

run into this time with the worst of his enemies, the typical Hollywood screenwriter who adapts and destroys an idea

that seemed quite consistent with a man Quea that is becoming a classic of our times:

replace the mistakes of gui���n with a succession of action scenes dressed with � Last in digital effects.

Voil���, we already have the movie to premiere. The main premise is what would you do if you knew what will

happen to you in the next two minutes? It would not help me much, but Chris Johnson (Cage), a magician from Las

Vegas, gives him to be a whole piece of hunting wished by a National Security superintendent (Moore), and some

terrorists somewhat disorganized. After a sequence more than stupid that presents the powers of the subject in

question and provokes the illegitic warning of the feds, the following is the race against the clock to stop a

group of villains who, after stealing a nuclear bomb, pretend to destroy everything, and who also want to

capture the protagonist, I'm not sure why. In between everything, Johnson starts a more

unnecessary relationship with a girl, Liz (Jessica Biel), who will be stuck in the middle and serve as an insulting

piece of meat that can be exchanged. .O (unique) to highlight everything, the scenes where Cage dodges bullets, gives slip to the

agents that lurk, or provokes authentic avalanches where it exits controlled by millimeters and that

serve to hinder the rest of his persecutors. The prediction powers that Johnson initially shows

give a lot and that? Vision of the future? that only two minutes are a better gift than flying, being invulnerable

or good X-rays that go through Biel's clothes. Like a good Bond, Cage ends up guiding the good ones

towards the elimination of the terrorists in a tour of some stores that are the most entertaining in the

film? And here it's over �� everything positive, the rest is to forget. If you ask an explanation about the powers of the

protagonist, you will not have it. If you want an explanation of the National Security obsession by Johnson, you will not

have it. If you want an explanation of the suitability of starting a love relationship when you are in search and

capture, you will not have it. Even, if you want an explanation of why Liz alerts Johnson to the intentions

of the feds when they have told him he is a criminal and he knows him for a day. ,A, you will not

find it. And if you want an explanation for one of the worst firecrackers of all this year, I do not have one. And

what about Nicolas Cage? This man begins to be a classic on our list of "the worst of the worst". Your

choice of work in recent years is unfortunate or at least deserved reprimand, because I say I

read the scripts before signing. Again the face of cardboard in the action situations, again the

same ways and again his face of puppy lap in the scenes with girl sharing plane. I already begin to

tremble every time a film with Cage is presented as a protagonist, and that's not good at all. Julianne Moore

is not that she signs her best work either, but even doing it regularly outweighs Cage in the scenes they

share. Biel is a mere pretty face in all of history, and since you had to include scenes with agirl

good-looking, what better than her. If there is no more remedy and you are not ��is to take two hours at the cinema,? Next? it is

consumed as fast as the medium popcorn carton. Even in a terrace cinema session, with

prices in half and the possibility of seeing two in a row, this movie is perfect. If not, abstain from

such a loss of scarce hour and a half of your life and expect that in three months it will be released on DVD.

" 0

" If you like the world of journalism and want to see something (based on a true story), it's worth

checking it out.

For those of us who dedicate ourselves more or less to this "" writing "" this film, almost

unknown recounts one of the things that we often face, you sit at the keyboard to write

something (I collaborate in a film page, in another one of monologues and in a pair where I send some other news

loose) and sometimes you would like to "" make up the reality "" to give it another focusmany times have you

Howstopped at the keyboard thinking, perhaps, that the news you were writing should not have happened like this, that it

had to have happened in another way and that, unfortunately, it did not You can do nothing to change it. This is

life! Every month when I have to present the different articles for the websites where I work, I think thething.

sameWhat would happen if I completely changed the article that I am writing? What would happen without instead of

basing me on truthful and concise information, making it inventing it? This is what the protagonist of this

film, played by Hayden "" Anakin "" Christensen, does in this film and we see how things are going, he goes from being

a brilliant editor to being a pringao . I found it curious to see in the film criteria that a priori are not

always respected when it comes to releasing a magazine in the light, it is not always checked if the information is true,

not always read articles that are presented, and NI DE CO���A the director defends the editors to death,

rather presses them to obtain 200% of what they publish. Bad times in this, the

information age. I know that I would have to give my opinion about the film and yet, I am here starting from the

little that I know of this world, where the staff is squeezed a lot and where They give few (if

any) opportunity to people who know, letting if they do the famous ones of turn or the "" children of. "" Once

I have rewarded myself at pleasure, I will see if I can talk to you. little of the film, brilliantly shot and in

an entertaining way, since the time and 28 minutes of footage is flirting, perhaps as a negative note is the heaviness of

the soundtrack that accompanies almost the best moments and scenes of it. The performances by the

actors are excellent and the direction seems sober and at the same time effective, with a perfect picture. Anyway,

if you like the world of journalism and want to see something (based on a true story), it's worth checking it out

. For me, without a doubt one of the biggest surprises of the year.

" 1

" Enchanted: The Story of Giselle is a film that will delight the youngest, and that is

seen for adults, that in some At one point they will laugh at your particular sense of humor, or at the

spark and natural grace of Amy Adams.

It is incredible how most children's movies make the serious mistake of not assessing the intelligence

of the youngest, believing that they can accept anything without protesting. The great studios have seen

the ears of the wolf and many have gone to work, producing some films that do not take children as fools

, to the great joy of their parents. Enchanted: The Giselle's story aims to be a new step of the

Disney factor in that sense, since at first glance it seems a parody of the typical fairy tale. The

first few minutes of animation make it presage, and the perspectives seem to consolidate when moving to

real action. However, little by little, that self-parochial intention is declining to be transformed into acomedy

romanticto use. To this evolution the musical numbers contribute notably, and it is that it seems that in

Disney nobody has thought that that of including songs in a children's film is of another time. The final result is

precisely what the film intended to avoid, to be an excessively ���o��� and sweetened product. If the tape

is something more than bearable for the adult audience it is thanks to the interpretation of Amy Adams, although

sometimes its exaggerated pito voice can cause a slight attack Of nerves. James Marsden and Patrick Dempsey are

on the contrary too soft. Enchanted: The Story of Giselle is a film that will

delight the youngest, and that is left to see for adults, who at some point will laugh at their

particular sense of humor, or at the spark and natural grace of Amy Adams.

" 0

" Not a single reparo can be put to this story of adventures and fear, able to be fun

equally for children and adults.

Monster House is, at least for those who subscribe to these lines, the best animated film released so

far this year. And I think I do not exaggerate if I qualify it as a pioneer in the assumption of aesthetic andpatterns

thematictypical of a genre, that of terror, barely employed until now in animation. .N That is to say, that

Monster House, still a suitable tape for all the public, would come to be the first of its kind shot

as if it were a horror film. Without leaving aside the binomial adventures-habitual humor in the animation of

the last years, in Monster House there are continuous guides to cinematographic referents of the g� ��nero of fear. The

haunted house, the fear of a mysterious neighbor suspected of hiding terrifying secrets (I reminded myself of the

crazy one You will not kill the neighbor, with Tom Hanks), the anonymous calls and threatening to the telephone, the

occurrence of strange events on Halloween and some other aspects, such as ambientaci���nymovements

and camera, are debtors of a cinema very different from the animation Inn.Even, looking for more parallels, the

triplet of researchers formed by these preadolescents reminds the entrayable Goonies, withprofiles

very differentfor each character. DJ would be the bravest and most qualified researcher; Croqueta, thefriend

chubby, funny and little supporter of exercising as a hero in exchange for risking the skin; and Jenny, the girl

they both sigh and who will put some sense in the group. The very characterization of

Nebbercracker, an old hunched man with a thin, fearsome face and dressed in ragged clothes,us

is also familiar to. And the point of humor is exploited through picturesque sidekicks like the Skull geek-pizza maker,

a twenty-year-old specialist in videogames and physics that DJs and company will go to. Paraa to ask for advice,

Zee Kangaroo and her boyfriend Bones or a couple of clueless polis.The graphic treatment of Monster House shows

that, in digital animation, there is always margin to continue surprising every new film. Apart from the

magnificent treatment of textures, this tape stands out for its fragile camera movements and a

perfect atmosphere to introduce us to its mystery proposal. But the main virtue of this film

directed by the debutant Gil Kenan, and sponsored by the fox of Spielberg and Zemeckis (who missed the shot with

Polard Express), lies in its magnificent and intelligent gui��� n. Not a single reparo can be put to this story

of adventures and fear, capable of being fun equally for children and adults. Although it goes to stereotypes

already seen in hundreds of horror films, the true story behind this monstrous house is

quite original and unpredictable. If you want to discover it, join DJ and company during their unique

adventure. The fun is guaranteed.

" 1

" Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull is, probably, the best film that will offer us the

year that is about to begin.

I must admit that Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade, seen just before the last delivery. It does not age

well at all. It is the only adventure of Dr. Jones with downtime and minutes not tedious but not very

busy. I remember that while I was reviewing it, I could not stop thinking about this fourth part, giving the stop to the

dvd and plugging in this new adventure. which is discovered as the best and most authentic of the whole saga. Understand me:

I love the search of the Ark and the Temple of the Cursed is mega positive, but it is that in The Kingdom of The Crystal Skull

concentrates the very essence of the adventure. An (unexpected and majestic) Sean Connery lying in a wheelchair

, drooling (but with a lot of class) puts us in a position: 1951, Dr. Jones is early retiree and a

fan of beekeeping because he is �� convinced that he can keep the life of the insects in the

honey.A good day, while the doctor takes a nap in his garden with his feet resting on a strange bathroom. He, Mutt

Williams, a musical representative from three to four with a ridiculous mustache, sneaks into the house to steal a

gold microphone, possession of the doctor, to try to record a catchy single, the song of the summer, with his

new signing. As Indy has a very light dream, he wakes up and Williams flees on a motorcycle until Indy,

with a hand and with some f / x that leave the Transformers in underpants, is mounted on the back seat.

Then come the tributes and the surprise: downhill and without brakes reach the 14o km / h and where they now

had trams is a lush pine forest. and a mysterious cave where the raptor tries to hide. Once

inside the madness is unleashed: extraterrestrials, wicked women like you've never seen before and a final turn that

you could never imagine but read more ah���.Load of eschatological humor (thought that linkear���a

eschatological, what?) and without the usual morality to which we he has got used to his director, Indiana Jones

and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull is, probably, the best film that he will offer us the year that is about to start

. '5, INNOCENT! (see the day of publication of this critique)

" 1

" Shocking documentary about the most profitable film of all time. It gives a reflection of a society

that is supposedly very advanced and is moved by religious fanaticisms, powers in the shadow and absolute repression. Very

necessary

They have succeeded, I can only say that, they have succeeded. Look, people say that they watch the documentaries of the

Serengeti where the lion lies low in baobad and the lioness goes hunting, so that when he returns home he who

lay down would give him a 10-second cap before going back to napping. And we all know that it is a

lie, that we like the run of the Serengeti leon to do like him (without the powder) and bleed the

couch. Well, they have achieved it. They have managed to combine the culture of watching a documentary, with the cultural aspect of watching amovie

porno. The bad thing is not worth to take a nap, but to encourage the rise of the average country machismo, which

is on the floor. The movie, perdon, the documentary is about what they say the movie Most profitable object of

all time, Deep Throat. With a budget of 25,000 dollars it is believed that it has collected a whopping 600

million dollars. How did you get that? This is what the documentary tells us. But not only that, but the

revolution that supposed in the country of the opportunity and the supposed liberties. Where, under the skin of a lamb,

wolves are anxious to nail their jaws in everything that smells of liberation. I am still astonished, and not

only by the maid in the felatory art of the girl. Well, I have to say that the critical documentary genre that

comes from the other side of the pond I usually like a lot. In this case, it is true that we can not believe what we

see. As I said before, if this happened in the Spain of the Caudillo, it would have its logic, but in the country of

the opportunities it seems unreal. The one that could be mounted by this film completely exceeds the limits of

human imagination, leaving the Spanish Inquisition and its Famous Torquemada. The documentary is

divided into parts, the filming of the film, its diffusion, the commotion, the trial (I swear that there was a trial, by the

way, Jack Nicholson leaves as a young man) and the resolution of history. Totally impressive and essential,

although scenes come out somewhat strong and hilarious.Resumiendo, shocking documentary about the most profitable film

of all time. It gives a reflection of a society that is supposedly very advanced and is moved byfanaticisms

religious, powers in the shadow and absolute repression. Very necessary.Treating documentary���n.Besitos.

" 1

" A great poetic work, as amusing as dramatic, as direct in its aesthetic intentions as ambiguous

and polyhedral in its ultimate meaning. Cinema that is dream and part of a hidden reality.

The perfume is the essence of everything, because there is nothing that is as primal as the smell, located in the

fragrance of the being that transcends the beauty of the merely physical and elevates it to the altar of the poetic and sensual

Perfume disrupts because it is a subtle mystery, of a carnality so evident that it symbolizes it in its

mesmerizing ethereal smoke. There was a boy born from the filth of every day, who rose above

the filthy commoner who could never cradle him with the proper maternal scent. The same social stench becomes

motive and weapon to return malice by kindness, or kindness in spite of so much evil. If you find your perfume, you will

find yourself. When the circle closes, you return to the origin, the filthy origin that charges you thedebt

final. Great story of a savior that derives in victim of his own humanity. European production directed by

the German Tom Tykwer, inspired by a well-known best-seller, we are before a film purely symbolic ���lico.

Its beauty lies - as in a lyrical or epic poem - in the story represented under the metaphorical gaze of the

metaphysical. It is an unusual tale that gravitates and sustains itself in a varied assortment of aesthetic resources that

dress it with the proper garb of the so-called "political function" "" Once again, background and form coexist in harmony withauthors. Let's look at it

the pretensions of their: the story begins with a delivery so terrible that it does not seem real; there is

no harshness, the way of giving birth resembles a deposit of feces above a garbage dump of rotten fish

(located in a physical and social environment of dirt and violence); It is more of a dream nightmare. The creature,

always in the center of the gaze, survives a first sensorial hell, which leads to a future

search for sensual fragrance. His isolation and social rejection guides his steps towards the love that no one can

ever give him. From that point of departure, defined with precise precision and with an enormous sense of the

visual, the central character is defined in his tragedy and his gestures in conflict and need with an environment of

aromas. Ethics are as important as the development and the dramatic changes: silver,

dark, ocher and brown in keeping with the protagonist's state of being, and the smell always

symbolizing their emotional connection with the protagonist. environment in the first steps of his initiatory journey. Thescheme

chromaticis transformed when he meets his first love, the first fragrance, the first victim of his need

to find identity and sense of his deprivation. The fragrance becomes an obsession, it must be retained,

because it is what lasts after the death of the loved object. They are essences, without aroma there is no life, there is no

identity. From that point of the story, more vivid colors predominate, in consonance with a new state

of being. He has found meaning in his life and travels in search of essence. Solitary on the heights of a mountain, he

discovers his interior when the interferences of the obsessive sensory world that enslaves him fromdisappear

the outside. Par���bola, in any case, of the incommensurable inner path that transcends external noise. Only

remains to find the masterful fragrance that allows you to control the unconsciousness and banality of the fragrant

plebe, hungry for cruelty. Words, just words. His metaphoric power opens a window of meanings, not

because it is as deep as he pretends, but because of being so devilishly playful; under his dramatic tone and

disturbing, it flaunts a laudable sarcastic laugh (see the death of the perfume seller played by Dustin

Hoffman or the cardinal's speech in front of the fearful plebe) that often transforms into a fierce s�� �tira

with Kafkian tints. In a first section, we believe we are witnessing a surrealist parabola about aoutcast

social, then we enter a phase worthy of suspense film about a psychokiller. The mixture of genres

and textures confer the rules of metaphysical play. We are, then, before a turbulent allegory thatus

looks atwith very bad milk but, at the same time, it seems not to want to take itself very seriously. A poetic toy

rich in flavors. Physical and spiritual. To all this we must add the remarkable ambientaci���ny andrecreation

historical, the superb staging, the sober but elegant direction and It is precise in moments that require a

lyrical meaning, and a montage that emphasizes - in a very appropriate way - the obsessive action of itscharacter

centralaround the remaining cast. As for the narrative, the subtlety that emerges from aomission is appreciated

crucial: we never know if the last victim (the one who will provide the final drops for the

composition of the spellbinding perfume) it has been forced or voluntarily yielded to a necessary sacrifice;

the retreat in the gesture of violence and the subsequent exchange of looks between the beautiful girl and the young

fragrance collector accentuate the ambiguity by opening a channel of possible meanings and

interpretations, in perfect conjunc- tion. n with the political vein that reinforces the proposed game. However,it

sometimessuffers at the time of conjugating all thematic elements and does not have the depth that it pretends:may

therebe some confusion in its mixture between the explicit and the implicit. Metaphorical ���cito. What is, in the last

instance, "" The perfume ""? ���Par���bola of an outcast? ���Met���fora of a hypocritical society? Oda to an innocent who is

born and dies devoured in a world of beasts ?. The use of slowed shots in the scene of the

massive spell is also debatable, although in this case it seems to be justified by the reference to the

on���rico. Or maybe, simply, the work exceeds the understanding that now a server can grant.

This has a look of future masterpiece, applying a more sedate look. Today, regardless of taste, what

can not be denied is that "" Perfume "" is a great poetic work, so fun as dramatic, as direct in

its aesthetic intentions as ambiguous and polyhedral in its ultimate meaning. Cinema that is dream and part of a

hidden reality.

" 1

" Trepidante. It does not have another qualifier, although it chokes the spectator based on all kinds ofeffects

postpro.

I spend a good time this morning watching the fastidious (it does not have another qualifier) ​​Running scared, here, to the parrot,

The proof of the crime. And it is a movie with possibilities, what happens is that throughout its one hundred and twenty

minutes there is time for (many) good things and (many) bad things. The fact is that the movie, filmed with

nerve by Wayne Kramer, who already gave us three years ago the estimable The Cooler, sin, especially in its

first half hour, of excessive (we could say something like "" chokes the viewer to base of all kinds of

postpro "" effects), but then take it with a bit (but only a little) more calm. Among the

numerous successes of the film highlights the sequence that takes place in the house of marriage that "" welcomes "" Oleg,

simply masterful. I do not intend to say anything more about this sequence. Well yes, David Lynch sure likes.

Paul Walker does not clash (something I had looked through there) and is grateful to see Palminteri on the big

screen, but do as usual. As I said, to spend two hours entertaining may be the most

advisable this month. A 7.PD: It's a pity that he has half a dozen finals and a couple of the usual traps

of the modern thriller world, the last of them to kill them all (screenwriter, producer and director,

although surely the fault is the second).

" 1

" This movie is quite poor (and I do not mean budget), if we compare it with the first, but itnot

isparticularly boring.

Another movie more, and in this case it's up to "" I still like god "" which is the sequel, if it can be called

sequel, of "" Like God "". It was the year 2003 when "" As god "" came to the screens, that funny comedy

had Jennifer Aniston protagonists, Jim Carrey and Morgan Freeman, all got a great success.

Well, of the three the only one who remains as god is Morgan Freeman (because he plays God) which

shares the leading role in this film with a second part of the first part, Steve Carell ( In the role of

Baxter), Carrey must have seen the gui���ny and run away? that man���a have the studies of taking sequels from

where they can not be removed. On this occasion, the argument is that God is presented to Baxter, and tells him to

build an ark in the purest style Noe (Learned something? Look at the Bible Genesis 6.14) and he manages to

mount it with the help of his family (in which all the existing topics for American families are fulfilled)

and also Do the animals that go to the ark collaborate? The question is why does God mount that racket? Why do not you

punish the bad guy directly? the bad guy is John Goodman (Mr. Stonepigeon) and it's bad for wanting to get a

bill to build in the limits of natural parks, we're going to be corrupt and want to make a

profit with the construction. God should not know marbella? because otherwise we would already have 5 or 6 arks

built. The humor, is soft and easy, nothing to do with the humor that was in the first film thanks to the

good Jim Carrey, this new protagonist has a humor? that has an air to Steve Mart���n (and it's a humor that

I do not like). Yes, the film has a couple of pretty entertaining scenes and what I liked the most was watching

the ark? And the performance of Morgan Freeman in the role of God, with his Reflections that he makes

throughout the film and the message he gives to take care of the planet. To finish, this movie is quite poor (and

I do not mean budget), if we compare it with the first, but it is not particularly boring.

" 0

" Everything that happens in the movie is incredible. If you think about the amount of things that happen

from the first to the last frame, it is to freak out. The amount of gui���os, of jokes and sarcasmos.

The moment Homer gets up, pissed off, in the middle of a movie starring Rasca y Pica and says he

does not understand why he paid a movie ticket to see something he could have tasted free at home,

turning to the camera and calling everyone who was in the movies, makes the style of a

funny movie, simp� ��tica, ���cida, mordaz and sinverg���enza, which is exactly what we always expect from

the yellow family. I do not usually follow the Simpsons on TV, with what I did not have verycourse, something

Ofespecially relevant had happened in Springfield in the last few years that conditioned the viewing of

the film. But no. Everything seemed to be the same: Moe, Homer, Bart, Lisa's little fool, pragmatic Marge, the

detestable Burns, etc. Therefore, to enjoy played. To enjoy seeing some USA of txaranga and tambourine that, to the

always lucid eyes of Matt Groening, as bad as it is, it can always get worse. The protagonists? In addition to

the usual ones -who in a show of gui ,n, they all leave- is the magnificent and almighty President of the

United States, Arnie; and his subject so concerned about the environment that it could be a paranoid transcript of

Al Gore. And the argument goes, of course, on the star theme of all the agendas of the world world: climate change

. Look that the heavy ones of the ecologists have been burning for years with the global

warming, the ozone layer and the melting of the poles. Well now, suddenly, occupies the highest place in the

agendas around the world that in the world is? Or pretends to be- someone.And Groenning does not lose the opportunity to stick his

finger in the eye from so much coarse wind, turning Homer into an environmental quasi-terrorist, into

Springfield in a kind of deep South American town, with its akelarres and hangings. There is a

flight to the lost paradise, a love story, a tremendous confusion of personality, the return of the hero. It is

incredible everything that happens in the movie If you think about the amount of things that happen from the

first to the last frame, it is to freak out. The amount of gui���os, of jokes and sarcasmos.Por example, ��� has

commented something on the poster that appears in a moment given, with the legend "" Hillary 2008 ""? And without any kind

of criticism, a simple frame of subliminal advertising. And, in the end, because everyone is so happy, happy and

festive. The bet to move the series to the big screen has gone well to a Groenning that is still in a

state of grace and that, possibly, will be reinforced the audience ratings of his series on televisions

around the world .They deserve it.

" 1

" Night in the Museum will entertain and make both adults and children alike, delighting them.

In the last few years, it is dif Easy to find a good movie made for the smallest, either because

some fall into the error of not treating children as intelligent beings, or because they sin of excessive

sweetening. It is almost incredible tothe inability of the current film industry to

witnessmake decent children's films that are not animated. But there is still some example that makesglimpse

hope, like this Night at the Museum. Who has never imagined that the figures of a museum come to life?

Well, that's the approach to this fun and entertaining film directed by Shawn Levy, and starring one

of the most popular filmmakers in today's film scene, Ben Stiller What you have to keep in mind is

that the film is a vehicle for the performance of Ben Stiller and his dudes, as well as those of his

teammates Luke Wilson and Steve Coogan. In contrast, the always pleasant and fun presence of Robin

Williams, and the returns of Dick Van Dyke and Mickey Rooney, serve to even the balance. The tape will entertain

and make both adults and children laugh, delighting them; and there will be few children to

whom Night in the Museum awakens curiosity and love for history.

" 0

" Said in a few words: the display of Liman is not up to the story that requires greater

psychological penetration. Although it handles tempos and suspense very well, it is evident that there is a certain

imbalance between form and background, between what the content offers and the representation of it.

The identity of Bourne is the excuse to investigate the mythology of espionage cinema, here the character

played by Matt Damon represents the paradox of the ordinary man who is forced into the spiral of

plots, mysteries, intricacies of an apparatus of power that acts without tapujos and without nobody can give

explanations. Amnesia is an opportunity to break with the past. Doug Liman's film is a journey to

encounter himself through the exorcism of the demons that lurk inside and outside: the

interiority of lost memory and doubt at a crucial moment that determines the final decision. ��n, and an

exteriority populated by men executors of death as autonomous hidden in the secret.The CIA is the

almost omniscient organization that seems to control everything, a myth deployed with remarkable scenography��� and

characterization: lonely and armed men who wait for the moment to kill according to plans that

only a few know. The ignorance of Bourne, daughter of amnesia, is a phenomenon parallel to the ignorance of

the leaders of the conspiracy, one of them, in the end, also become t�� �Tere of those who

manage a macabre game. The alleged ambiguous tonality of the story is based on an intelligent premise, but the

visual execution and the development do not go beyond being a routine trìmite that in the last instance It results in a

thriller with a conventional scheme and situations subject to the genre topics. In a few words:

Liman's visualization is not up to the level of a story that demands greater psychological penetration. Although it

handles tempos and suspense very well, it is evident that there is a certain imbalance between form and background, between

what the content offers and the representation of it. Some action scenes usegadgets

unnecessary. , in other occasions the story becomes too predictable, when not inane because of the

narrator's inability to compensate the reiterative scheme of the narrative (f eljese the reader as

in the whole movie). Apenascula hardly happens much more than always the same: search-mismatch-search-mismatch-

search-mismatch.) With a progressive depth and penetration n in the psychological drama. However, we are

facing a very dignified, entertaining film, has a couple of action scenes very well filmed and, in short,not

candisappoint the lovers of the genre, especially for the nostalgic of those films tenters

about espionage in the Cold War. Circumscribed within the scope of cinema as art (the only area thatus

interestshere), only a film that is too warm, although correct and entertaining, and when it encounters the

dreaded cliché. As abundant in a specific genre as this one, it does so with enough dignity.

" 0

" In Chapter 27, debutante JP Schaefer, the look focuses on the figure of a cursed character for

every devotee of the American culture of the last decades: Mark David Chapman, the murderer of John Lennon.

American cinema has the virtue of looking for formulas of reflection about the interstices that surround

its luminous lifestyle. And on many occasions he does so by choosing his most undesirable characters, through

them purging social sins or simply underlining that the basis on which his culture is based

has nothing to do with dreaming. Or golden one who has made himself. Freud said that we can only be

healthy if we examine our diseases. And this maxim has been the trend of cinema made in the USA since that

generation of directors formed by Scorsese, Coppola or Malick focused their gaze on the subsoil oflife

American, portraying the life of everyday beings but marked by violence or uprooting. In Chapter 27,

debutante JP Schaefer, the look focuses on the figure of a cursed character for every devotee of

American culture of the last decades: Mark David Chapman, the murderer of John Lennon. The very idea of

portraying the life of this accursed character has led some associations of musician fans to try to

boycott the film. The truth is that the very idea of ​​trying to center a film on an anti-icon of

pop culture assumes in the hands of a faithful adept a pernicious and evil attack that should be attacked. But

in the hands of a skeptic of any fan-atism (as the one who subscribe this article) this idea becomes a

priori attractive and if I encourage myself until necessary. But what at first seemed like It was an attempt to subvert and

reflect on the American culture (pop) and its perverse effects, when seeing Chapter 27 my

illusions deflated. Do not even think the thriller aficionado with psychopath that here will find

elements to enjoy. And is that despite its excellent technical and artistic invoice, Chapter 27 is a

by-product of aesthetic new age that drowns when penetrating without escape routes in the mind of an autistic Chapman

that becomes omnipresent through a monochromatic voice over. The rhythmic and slow rhythm of the tape (with

that constant presence of rye rocking in the wind) will help little to find in it something more than a

trip of three days by the streets of a (that's) beautiful Manhattan, or to see how a discreetita Lindsay Lohan

gives us a decent piece of paper (but nothing more). Everything remains in spectral air, like the one inhabited by the

ghosts of Chapman. A pity, especially for the enthusiasm and dietetic effort of Mr. Jared Leto (the best

of the film, everything is said), that lost thirty kilos to interpret to Chapman and to endow it of own life.

There seems to be a common tendency in Hollywood to identify quality with transformism. Things of the

industry. Until today the one that signs stays with Taxi driver and his bitter violence, without redemption. Or the nihilism

of Colonel Kurtz. Or even, if I turn on, the feverish incontinence of Tony Montana. ButChapman

Schaefer'slanguishes before my eyes, completely losing the bad mood that was expected from such astory

potentially juicy. Maybe another will try. Let's hope. For now, Chapter 27 can not appear on

our billboards. If it had been a John Lennon biopic, another rooster would have sung. Things in the industry.

" 0

" Subtlety in details, superb interpretation and a magnificent setting that show that

talent is neither bought nor sold.

The truth is that I feel a little intimidated when I think that I'm going to make a film criticism

directed and starring by who forms along with Joseph Cotten and Jack Nicholson my particular Olympus of

celluloid. Orson Welles was a strange, bohemian, nonconformist type, who ended up fighting with the entireindustry

American film, from which he was practically expelled for his ultra-progressive ideology in some states. United

dominated by Semitic and conservative capital. The Stranger belongs to its golden age, close in time to

Citizen Kane and The Third Man (I feel chills just writing these titles ), shortly before his

enthusiasm for Spain led him to spend great seasons in our country with one of his great friends,

Antonio Ord������ez, on whose farm the remains of the great filmmaker. In El Extra���o, Welles plays a Nazi

who after the war leads a quiet life under a false name in a town in America, and whom a "" hunter ""

locates in Much thanks to the fans the watches of the old SS, who occupies his free time in fixing

the clock of the village bell tower. Charles Rankin is the name under which Franz Kindler hides, and whom

Mr. Wilson will try to catch, to which another monster of interpretation gives life, as was Edward G.

Robinson . The characterizations of the characters reach insurmountable levels in the dark and somber appearance

of Welles or the affability of Detective Wilson, who manages to establish a certain friendship with the orondo and pleasant

store clerk, whom once used to obtain some information. This contributes to the film's

tempo being slow, but at the same time dynamic, in a difficult combination of factors that are seldom

seen. The simple detail of the way in which the persecutor of Nazis is convinced of the real identity of Kindler

is of an unparalleled subtlety. All this without forgetting the rest of the cast that also shines at a great level

(especially Loretta Young, the ignorant and naive wife of the ruthless criminal). But in any case, and

being outstanding in this section, the interpretation is not the most important of this film. From the technical point

of view also it is impeccable, and it uses frequently chopped and contrapicados of images, that next to

a superb handling of the illumination and the shadows, they create an atmosphere of tension and suspense of an enormous

intensity . These "" daring "" along with a depth of gui���n plagued by second readings andmessages

politicalare what make The Stranger (also known in Spain). as The Stranger) in a true

masterpiece and in inevitable reference for subsequent productions of similar cut, framed in what was

called Film Noir (film noir). I am aware that I have made an inordinate enthusiasm in these

l� Lines, but the fascination that has always exerted on M. Orson Welles prevents me from being moderate when

it comes to him. And especially if we talk about a wonder like this movie.

" 1

" Apocalypto will delight all lovers of strong emotions and good movies. Mel Gibson returns to give us a movie lesson, in this case with "" Apocalypto "". To this actor anddirector

Australian, many things can be attributed to him, but what no one can deny him is his talent behind the

scenes. He is one of the best storytellers that we can find today, and his images have an

amazing strength. If in his previous proposal he revealed to us the Passion of Christ, and how life was at that time,

now he shows us the Mayan culture. It is visually spectacular, and we must acknowledge that there filmed in

natural settings, such as pudindonos show more credible avatars of this civilizacin.Rodada in

Maya , and arriving at the screens without doubling, "" Apocalypto "" wraps us from the first frames in aworld

fantastic, in which the different characters are presented to us, and in which they convey the message

that With fear, it's not going anywhere. Fear is a disease that corrodes inside and that you can not

live with. Something that our protagonist will have to take into account, if he wants to be able to continue enjoying his

existence. After this beginning, we are presented to the other civilization, with which we will be the rest of the footage.

Trips, slaves, prophecies, sacrifices and finally, survival. Gibson shows us anending

amazing and fast-paced film. A very physical shoot, where there are hardly any dialogues and that introduces us fully into the

jungle, showing us the abilities and limits of the human being when it comes to survival. There are several messages

that can be drawn, since we need a God to guide us and take an appropriate course, that evil is

among us and that we must overcome it by supporting and helping us in family. There is also the appointment with which

the film opens, which tells us that any great civilization does not succumb by an outside power but because

previously it has been destroyed inside. ��� people who take other interpretations, but the main thing is that

Gibson tells us a story, and in an amazing way. It has strong moments, as in "" The Passion of

Christ "" that show us how hard and bloodthirsty they were at that time. Finally, there is a brutal image (and no

by violence) that takes place at the end of the film and that obviously I will not gut. "" Apocalypto "" will

delight all lovers of strong emotions and good movies.

" 1

" The main problem with the tape is that it has all the fragmented films. Just as some

stories are just great, others click and bore a bit.

The Ten is a modern review of the Ten Commandments. Nice film to replace Charlton

Heston's afternoons of Holy Week (TV producers take note that the idea I give free). Paul

Rudd, the man who lives in nothing with his tables presents ten stories to illustrate each command

daring to star in one himself. The main problem with the tape is that it has all thefilms

fragmented. Just as some stories are just great, others click and bore a bit. It has

reminded me of the excitement that it provoked in my New York Stories (keep the distance, that one is a

masterpiece and another a trivial entertainment) Brilliant episodes of the boy that falls from the sky, or the

nudists but not so much the good of your neighbor, Christ or the doctor who jokes. That's right, the veryactors

correct, the creme de la creme: Paul Rudd, Jessica Alba, Winona Ryder, Adam Brody, Gretchen Mol, Famke Janssen,

Rob Corddry, Liev Schreiber, Oliver Platt, Justin Theroux, Ken Marino. They all jump from one story to another

sharing small children with protagonists. Partial and moderate fun.

" 0

" If the next Bond is directed by a director of the good ones, of those who have their own personality,

I am sure that he will be the best Bond in history.

From the beginning I defended the choice of Daniel Craig as the new James Bond, as long as that

implied a change of direction in the series. Well, once seen "" Casino Royale "", the sensations are good

and, despite the flaws, there is a clear conclusion: habemus Bond. "" Casino Royale "" is, first of all, a new beginning

of the character and could very well have been titled "" Bond Begins "". As in the "" Batman Begins "" of Nolan here

is also appreciated the willingness to do something different and original with the character. There is a special care to give a

narrative meaning to several of the typical elements of the series: the initial adventure before the credits or the

use of the Bond tune at the right time. The big difference with Nolan's film is precisely that: the

director. Martin Campbell is very far away from Christopher Nolan and that the film notices. It is not that Campbell

does it badly, in fact it is possibly his best work, but with another director we could be talking about something

big. The film is divided into three very clearly differentiated acts. In the first of them,

almost all the action of the film is concentrated and, although it entertains, it does not give the viewer respite, resulting

almost too long. That yes, it is necessary to recognize that it is very spectacular (and that it does not resort to the typical

gadgets). The second act is more leisurely and develops the characters. Do not think that is why it is more boring

because it is not like that. It is a pleasure for a follower of the Bond saga, to attend his birth, to feel more real, more

believable, without losing for that reason the halo of invincible superagent mythical. The third act is the conclusion of the

story and what I like least about the film because the final climax is not as successful as it should be, there is a

certain Confusion in the action and some decision difficult to understand. That's it, the last minute is priceless and

leaves one eager to see a new movie with Craig as "" Bond, James Bond. "" In short, it happens with

this movie. It means something that should not surprise us. There is a good scriptwriter giving the final touches to the script (Paul

Haggis, signer of the screenplays of "" Million Dollar Baby "" and "" Crash "") and some good actors (among which

stand out) Judy Dench, Eva Green and an inspired Daniel Craig). In the equation of the great cinema, only a

good director would be needed and that's where the rest of the producers have to throw . If the next Bond is directed by a

director of the good ones, of those who have their own personality, I am sure that he will be the best Bond in

history. "" Casino Royale "", if it is not, it stays very close.

" 1

" Cinema of excellent quality, that captivates from the first frame, does not grant truce, restless and emotional.

If the Provocacy were personified, he would fix his residence in the USA, he would be a Catholic of Irish descent and,

endowed with a nice ass, he would attend to the name of W ���inik Ma? Ki? imakkun ���ol in Mayan language, (canbe

thistranslated by "" the undesirable ""?) Despite the regrets, Apocalypto belongs to a type of cinema of excellent

quality, which captivates from the first frame , does not grant truce, restless and emotional, so it should

seriously consider the suppression of some scenes that force you to close your eyes. Gibson's

filmography will be perfect when it stops producing side effects, such as nausea and dizziness, in the spectator. Mel

Gibson, that bad actor, that great director who has so many interesting things to do The arm���

with The Passion of Christ, and when he was accused of making a "gore" version of the New Testament and of blaming

the Jewish community for the death of the Nazarene, the Christian Church (that of Rome, also) procured him his protection,

the Gospel according to St. John gave him reason and Pontius Pilate continued the lav Holding hands in public event. If

he had not forgotten one of the three Mar���as, that of Cleof���s, his would have been the fifth gospel, but as

Wilder said, no one is perfect. n, it rebuilds politics by offering what is considered a

biased view of the Mayan population, putting its cruelty first and obviating the fact that it is one of the great

civilizations of the Americas. Pre-Columbian Africa. Come on, you're not likely to get a sa? At si? Ipil (pardon) to

return to Mexico. In defense of the New York-Australian filmmaker, it can be argued that, by placing the action

in the days before the arrival of the Spaniards, the only thing left of the once flourishing Mayan civilization

is a practically extinct culture, which it represented no danger to the conquerors. A people, in

fact, self-annihilated, as indicated in the film. In the absence of exact chronological references and

specific geographic locations, it can be assumed that this is �� recounting an episode of rivalry between

independent cities existing at this time (quich���s, zutuhiles, mames), the so-called flower wars that

had as its object the capture of living men to be sacrificed to the gods, as reflected in thestelae

Mayanand in the Bonampak frescoes. An awful exercise in which the reason of their existence based the

fearsome Aztecs, true nightmare of the bearded men. On the other hand, the director also shows the

legacy of his high architectural knowledge and astronomical, that had reached their splendor six

centuries ago, in the Ancient Mayan Empire. In the sixteenth century, there are not even the great city-states of the

New Empire, which have been devastated by internal disputes; even so, it brings us closer to the "" stone city "", with

its hierarchical political system, its main monuments, its religious fanaticism and its mathematical precision

in the prediction of eclipses. Nor is it alien to the exciting legends of the Popol Vuh (written in Maya

quich���), nor to the millennial prophecy that augured a new beginning followed by five hundred years of darkness, which

forced them to hide their elders at the top of the mountains, in the interior of the jungles, to preserve a

wisdom that has reached our days . (They were not misguided, the Old World burned more than

three hundred cÃdices.) That is to say, Gibson's cinema has plenty of explicit images always, but never It has

lacked conscientiousness. However, I do know that some historical data are missing that allow us to close the

gui���ny and, incidentally, cultivate the respectable. For that reason, when leaving the cinema, there are multiple doubts that assail

the curious-ignorant like me, such as "Who is the conqueror, Francisco de Montejo, year? 1527 of

Our Lord ?, ���Ciudad de Piedra is Technotitl���n ?, "la "" brutal force unknown "" of which they speak is that of

the Aztecs ?. Some questions that do not find an answer in the "" How is it rolled "", so we go back to the starting

point, to the historian William Durant's quote that is valid for "" almost "" all cases (Obviously, Mr.

Gibson, to know that "" A great civilization can not be conquered from the outside if it has not destroyed itself from

within "" does not justify the permanence of the United States of America " rich in twenty-first century Iraq). And little else can

be reproached, perhaps (to continue with the politics of Yucatan), the recruitment of an American Indian

who gives life to a Mayan Indian, as did Rob Marshall (Chinese instead of Japanese) in Memoirs of a Geisha. For

the rest, at the cinematographic level, the direction is perfect; the production, impeccable; Artistic direction,

unbeatable; all interpretations, superb; the costumes, artisanal; the photograph, overwhelming; the

montage, especially anguished, and the story told, the bravest legacy that a people could inherit, the

only one that gives meaning to any life, the one that encourages, the one that encourages getting up. and fight.

" 1

" It is an episodic film that summarizes more than forty years of life in less than two hours of footage, sweetens

the character, takes pity on him, so that It seems he never did anything wrong.

The film narrates Camar���n's life from his childhood to the moment he returns from the United States. after being

diagnosed with the terminal cancer that ended up killing him. The film is therefore framed within the biographical

genre, "" biopic "" as the Americans call it. Regrettably it does not go out of its norms, falling inand

eachevery one of the endemic evils of the genre. It is an episodic film because it summarizes more than forty a��� He lives in

less than two hours of footage, sweetens the character, takes pity on him, so he never seems to do

anything wrong. Camar���n is drawn like a martyr genius, incapable of doing any harm. In addition, the film does not

show the creative process of the artist, just gives a few brushstrokes, but too little, especially

considering that Camar���n was a revolutionary within the world of Flamenco. The characters appear and

disappear throughout the footage, in the case of Ver���nica S���nchez who plays his wife, a character that is

introduced into the middle of the footage, showing us the infatuation and the later wedding, and disappears until

almost the end of the footage. The characters are one-dimensional, as an example Camar���n's first girlfriend, a

girl of which the only thing we know is that she is capricious, nothing more. In addition, the film is continually

seasoned with the artist's songs, but not used to advance the film, which would be logical ,

but as scenes of their performances for what ends up looking like a great playback, with many media, but a

playback, especially chirping the differences in the quality of the sound when the characters sing. At

an interpretative level the film is very good, although I do not consider fair the prizes awarded to Jaenada for

her performance, since it is still an imitation, a mimicry. .N Carlos Latre does it continually, at

another level of agreement, and not for that reason they give him prizes. The original soundtrack, which also has it, is discreet

and shows again how very few Spanish directors know how to make use of the original soundtrack. As adata

positive, discover the m� ��sica de Camar���n, they will look for their musical experiments that seem very interesting, but

unfortunately they are hardly reflected in the film, which basically focuses on their problem with drugs,

although he shows it without a claw, so that the hell that the cantaor went through appears too softened.

Finally, a curious detail, the shortage of gypsy actors in the film.

" 0

" Western of Shakespearean inspiration, emotional review of the ancestral idea of ​​revenge. A

masterpiece of the western and one of the best interpretations of a luxury secondary, Donald Crisp.

Anthony Mann's westerns are typical to the way Budd Boetticher's are. Both dominate the

cinematographic writing and generate suggestive images: the slightly drawn rider in anlandscape

overwhelming, the hero fatally marked by the overwhelming weight of the inevitable tragedy. The man from Laramie

anticipates the western of Clint Eastwood, who is the last director who has taken care to dignify the genre.

The argument refers to the black film antolÃgica in which a man decides to investigate the reasons for what does not

need research: who sold the weapons that some Indians bought to end up killing his brother. This

story of revenge is not new: the characters, the sets, the score change, but the plot has the same

traditions, the pure, non-mutated essence where men are always pioneers and fight gallantly against

injustices, which tend to be landowners who they appropriate other people's land to graze their livestock or they are

caciques of rampant anger who do not allow a stranger to cross their plot. This is what James

Stewart does, which suffers excessive punishment, unnecessary humiliation. Then it is when he decides to put himself at the

service of Kate (Cathy O'Donnell) facing the "" waggoman "" that stuns her. There is no lack of love affair, which is

resolved in an unconventional way. Nor do we miss the typical violence of the western, which Mann stylized

to reduce it to a dry, minimal, concise and forceful expression. It does not get bogged down in demonstrating evil, but

all key scenes are bathed in a rich sense of violence as the only viable

solution. a balbucente cinemascope, The man from Laramie is a perfect example of a film in which the landscape

is more of a protagonist, perhaps one more binding and decisive than the apparent and real ones. A masterpiece of the

western and one of the best interpretations of a luxury secondary, Donald Crisp.

" 1

" Million Dollar Baby was a movie about boxing? The same thing happens with ���sta and the baseball. Dennis Quaid, a good actor so wasted like Kurt Russell, stars in this story of second

chances directed perfectly by John Lee Hancock (to his credit the wonderful gui��� AWorld

Perfect) and brilliantly written by Mike Rich, apparently expert in stories of the same ���ndole.

The story of The Rookie can not be simpler and more trite: Jimmy Morris is a boy whosefather

militarydoes not do more than change residence for work reasons, but they come to Texas to stay. Jimmy

is passionate about baseball and there is hardly any interest in that sport. However, he continues to practice and

eventually becomes a science teacher and trains the institute's baseball team. But one good day he

reaches an agreement with his students to win a minor league. And that will change his life and give him a second

chance he could never wait. Many will see the typical Yankee history "" bigger than life "", since it is based

on real events. But the script, the dialogues and the interpretations are the best and make a

reality seem like a great work of fiction. A great jewel that I will adhere to as soon as I find

a DVD. Million Dollar Baby was a movie about boxing? The same goes for ���sta and the baseball. Highly recommended

To highlight the music of Carter Burwell, who on more than one occasion shines (Fargo, Conspiracy) and on which he will

make a small or post to add a couple of wonderful themes.

" 1

" A small disappointment. Both for the rejuvenated and now strong new Mexican cinema, as for the subject

dealt with in this film that I gave for a lot more.

A small disappointment. Both for the rejuvenated and now strong new Mexican cinema, as for the subject dealt with

in this film that I gave for a lot more. A light years from the surprising at the time Amores Perros (Pulp

Fiction a la Mexicana) with the common point of a Gael Garc���a Bernal ��� this time too lazy or

unconvincing in the role of Father Amaro, a naive and influential priest of corruption. Corruption within the bosom

of the church and its power (too similar already in the domain of a political party ) is known by all (even

by the faithful themselves) here reduced to a simple problem of skirts. Nothing new under the sun within mind

stronger memorieslike Camila or El P���jaro sings to death. The problem here is not the gui���n (which really

has nothing left) but the appearance cinematographic, almost without depth, as if made lightly and more

like a soap opera in the afternoon than a film with a few glimpses of denunciation. It narrates the growth of

Father Amaro in the church and the discovery of not so holy things and their subsequent decline,

renouncing celibacy in the hands of a beautiful parishioner. Unreal characters in unreal situations, with

secondary barely or badly sketched. A guerrilla priest, an inept mayor to say enough, the same Amaro

who goes from naive to amoral in five minutes. Another example of the free is the character of a humble old man

who appears in the first minutes, and reappears briefly towards the end without anyjustification

apparent. Its director, Carlos Carrera seems to take the text of the Portuguese Queiroz (of 1896) too

faithfully in his tone, flat and without explosion not for some isolated scenes (going back to the nonsense)

as those of a sick child or the one of a hospital hemorrhage. Well achieved that yes, the gloomy aspect of a

chapel of town with its overabundance of images and whiff of business and an accentuated nihilism from beginning to

end. Only its contestatory sense is the apparent reason for existing of this film. Am?

" 0

" It starts with the political movie vitola of the season, and yet it remains in a meapilas portrait

that could well have been made 40 years ago. �os, with the censorship in full swing.

With the Church we have met dear reader. And after this little tribute to Miguel de Cervantes, it has to be said

that if it is difficult to make a film about religious issues today without offending anyone, also It is not talking

about it without hurting any kind of sensitivity. For more centuries that have passed, no matter how theoretically

evolved the human being is, there are certain themes that will always cause political controversy, and the Religion, whatever it

is, is one of them. And if you give a religious film a title as striking and provocative as Teresa: The

Body of Christ, you have already served a good rationale of politics, which will mean expectacin turn increased

by the pblico.Diez years after her cousin pear, Ray Loriga returns to the address to show

from a new theoretical point of view to Saint Teresa de Jes���s, a key figure in the history of the Catholic Church

. Loriga's intention was to bring to the viewer a character well known to everyone, both in the

history books and in previous films, with a fresh and new vision, distancing Saint Teresa from

pure mysticism and showing his most carnal and human side. However, Teresa: The Body of Christ moves away from the

initial and commercial intention of Loriga, offering a blessed and prudish vision of the character; Instead of

portraying a woman, with lights and shadows, and his struggle, the filmmaker makes a purely hagiographic portrait.

Also, it must be said that one of the keys to the passage to the posterity of Santa Teresa was his greatwork

literary, and that this work appears on the tape in a dishonorable second plane. The script, part of which are

composed (in a surreptitious way) the own verses of Santa Teresa, is flat and lacking in feeling. The

direction of Loriga is very bad, slow to the point of exhaustion and lacking in any notion of what therhythm is

cinematographic, to which his ill-fated contribution happily contributes. mounting. Ray Loriga is more concerned with theaspect

visualof his work than with the story itself, and that takes its toll on him from the initial sequence. There is a series of

scenes, the endeavors of Santa Teresa, in which the film borders on the spermatic. The only positive aspects

of such an ineffable title are the costume design and the photograph of José Luis Alcaine, really worthy

considering the af���n of its director for making colorful paintings in movement. The best of the film,

without a doubt, is the sober and contained interpretation of Paz Vega, which shows everyone their naturalcapacity

interpretativewith a brutal change of register. Teresa: The Body of Christ starts with the political film

vitola of the season, and yet it remains in a meapilas portrait that could well have been made

forty years ago, with censorship in full swing . Maybe some critics should form a secret

Inquisition, in which we would act moved to preserve the good name of the cinema, taking works like this to

their deserved destiny: the purifying fire.

" 0

" Risky and sensible, slightly haughty, but outstanding in its resolution, Magnolia is afoal

runawaythat knows where it goes, a spectacular punch in the nose of the well-to-do, urban American, gentrified (

unknowingly) and afflicted, like so many, of loneliness, of disgust, of pure incommunication.

Magnolia is a dazzling alembic of stories that refer to Short Cuts although it does not coincide with this in the

���cida vision, although happy with which all the planes are knotted. The film by Paul Thomas Anderson delves

into narrative constructions of greater complexity. It is a film of enormous impudence, which gives conclusions of

a forcefulness without palliatives. The spectator who attends this controlledof the foundations of

explosionsociety does not leave the cinema staggering, but it costs then the return to everyday life. In the head bore the

short stories, the arrogant planes and the vicissitudes of fundamentallycharacters

tormentedof which we only know the degree of torment that crushes them in a gray life, morally

reprehensible, if not perverse. Biblical (not only literature but iconography as the

testimonial rain of frogs) report that Anderson reflects aloud on the faith and how the shadows of

utop��� They leave a residue of ideological dandruff. Chance conditions life, we already know that, but whattells

this overdone directoris that chance also has its ���pica, its battlefield and its absurd map of

shadows. This is how we see all the characters of the farindula that portrayswonderful script

Anderson's: hopeless, shattered, painfully doomed not to encourage any hope, but even

in that posture Negative, in that firm and severe deconstruction, Anderson tries to humanize his creatures. The

wonderful ending, which is not necessary to disembowel in these lines, is armed with a disconcerting naturalism, which

knocks down all of a sudden the ideas that we had been supplying during thethree hours

previous. In them, they have told us specific events, tiny stories (nine,

actually) that happen at the same time in a valley in California. Coral in the way Robert Altman filmed (he is no

longer among the living), Magnolia slightly decomposes the dramatism is heeling too much towards madness.

Julianne Moore, as the young wife of a dying old man (Jason Robards, great), spends part of her performance

screaming, stressed, stubbornly fed her spiritual nonsense with pills. Ah��� Anderson loses the north,

but he excuses himself because the material narrated is enormous and it is not easy (I do not imagine it) to fill in the gaps that

the stories are abandoning (and there are certainly some of them and one in them). particular, look for the reader,

visible and uncomfortable). Tom Cruise does not come out very much, but it fills more than in many movies where it occupies the whole

screen during all the minutes. It was worth a Golden Globe that meritorious interpretation of the nomination

for best supporting actor in the Oscars. And there is one of my favorite recent actors, Philip Seymour

Hoffman, who plays an absolutely nuclear role in the film, the presenter of a television program in a

crisis of identity and values Do not be intimidated by its excessive footage: it is consumed with avidity, it is savored at

times. Cinema served with neatness. Filmed cinema, spoiled in its excesses, but useful to cope with the weight

of so much film dumbfounded, impregnated with predictability that usually occupy the billboards of our

vices.

" 1

" A tangible demonstration that any topic, no matter how hard it is, can be treated with elegance and

serenity, and in which Stanley Kramer directs an unpredictable and surely unrepeatable cast.

There are films that are incapable of causing any impression; others, that impress when they are seen; and there is a

third and small group of films that impact since the cast is read. And he belongs

to the Nuremberg trial (��� Vencedores or defeated?). This statement, which might seem exaggerated at first if you

do not know the cast, is transformed into logic when names like Spencer Tracy, Burt

Lancaster, Richard Widmark, Maximilian Schell, Marlene Dietrich, Montgomery Clift or Judy Garland (

that's it). The film, which can be supposed to narrate the trials that judged the few Nazi hierarchs who

survived or were arrested after the war, was carried out in 1961, 16 years after the end of the war, and

therefore with a repose of tranquility that pain and anger had not allowed to have before. With some

characterizations and magnificent interpretations. In fact, the film goes beyond the easy criticism of the

losers of war and its barbarities, and delves into the personality and feelings of a former German

magistrate, who is being judged for his harsh performance nte the regime and war. The interactions

with the judge (the unforgettable Spencer Tracy), and those of the latter with the character played by Marlene Dietrich,

make up a product of enormous quality and whose extensive footage, which reaches three hours, is spent in a

sigh The delicacy in the story of the facts, treating them firmly but without ruthlessness, is undoubtedly the

work of Stanley Kramer and Abby Mann, director and screenwriter, respectively.or losers is a

Victorsmovie. Sincula without technical bravado, not necessary on the other hand, in which the weight of the argument falls on the

di���logos, and in which once more, body language has great weight and the use of short shots and

silences. All these virtues made her worthy of several Oscar nominations, of which two of them were

successful; one in the person of Maximilian Schell, as the best lead actor for an

intense and full of strength, and another for the best adapted script. A wonder that nobody should leave to see;

eitherfor purely cinfilas reasons, or simply know a story that is not so distant nor is

as unique asmight seem to recent generations.

" 1

" One of Almod���var's best films, very close to Todo sobre mi madre, which may eventually receive

all the recognition it deserves.

Some people are receiving Pedro Almod���var's new film with a bit of warmth, perhaps becausedoes notin her

Gael Garc���aappeardress as a woman, does not have explicit sex scenes, or talks about a subject rugged and

morbidly vogue. On the contrary, Almod���var, in a purer state, eliminates all the excesses to which

we are accustomed in his cinema and concentrates on telling us an emotional and moving story about the

strength of the woman, the family and the feminine loyalty. The tape begins when Raimunda, her sister Soledad and her

daughter, visit in their native town the grave of their parents and their sick aunt. In that picturesque town there is a

legend that the dead usually return to life to help their family and attend to some pending.

Soon Soledad and Raimunda will have to decipher if this really happens or if they are just old stories? since

there are some issues in which they will require help. The tape goes straight to the point, the gui���n slips with energy and

strength, revealing itself little by little, revealing its true nature? Is this a story of black humor, is it

drama, is it melodrama, surreal? Maybe it's a bit of everything, less surreal, because maybe this is the tape

more attached to reality, at least the most probable of all the varied filmography of the Manchego director. The

solid group of actresses, all of them quite accurate, form an insurmountable team in the screen that the same

thing happens without much effort from the funny to the moving, commanded all by a memorable character, in

charge of Pen���lope Cruz, as a strong, determined, "heavy" woman "as described" �a sister, awoman

beautiful, who instead of sitting down to mourn before the difficulties, puts hands to the work and solves any

problem with the wisdom and rapidity with which a housewife puts order in his kitchen. The colorful photograph

shows us a different Spain from the rest of the films from Almod���var, a modern, globalized and

diverse Spain, where young women are They're hooked to their cell phone, and Latino immigrants give it a new flavor, a

Spain where suddenly in some shot only men of color appear. And all this combined with theenvironment

ruralof the land of La Mancha that gave birth to Almod���var, and that undoubtedly influenced him cinematographically

speaking, to date. An ���rida land, where the wind blows strong all the time governed mainly

by women. And it is there in that town where a quite memorable scene takes place, where several dozen women

in black, try to listen to the legends, present your condolences to the mourners and pray at the same time. In

summary, and in my very particular point of view, one of the best Almod���var tapes, very close to Everything about

my mother, that maybe eventually receive all the recognition you deserve.

" 1

" There are some sequences stuck in the hearts of those who share the movie theater. To write about a movie like "" Munich "" it is advisable to send at least eight neurons to sleep

hours first, but I can not avoid telling you everything. Tell you that the film has left me with a bad body

too evident. I know eight hours will not be enough. I know that eight weeks will not be either. There are some

sequences, some images, some broken pieces stuck in the hearts of those who, by my side, share

the cinema room today. There is a concrete message in front, and almost three hours of a consequent and fiercely

tenacious spirit behind. Violence only triggers more violence. The violence is not spectacular. Violence

is simply something terrifying. A nightmare that hides under the mattress of our bed, inside the

television of our telephones. A dream turned into a terrifying reality, disguised as religion,

country, courage, heroism. A rotten piece sickening the human heart. Propagating tirelessly.

Destroying everything. There are no winners, there are no innocents, there is no hope in a conflict in which, the

different political and economic interests, derail and catapult the possible answers, make jump over the

air the solutions, to slow down and prolong human suffering eternally. A discouraging message,

cold, cruel, bitter and brutal emerged from the darkest part of a masterful director, who continues in his tireless

search for the master, the genius that leads within. The murders narrated are not Spectacular, the shootings

are crude, chaotic, realistic. Terrorist acts saturate the footage. Saturate the mind of the viewer. The

narrative structure of account adjustments is reiterated. These are repetitive, penetrating, in a

monstrous and disconcerting routine. All in a stretched and dense footage. Without concessions. No room or

space for romanticism, or the ���pica, or even for the spectator's respite. There are nothe tape

good ones on. There are no bad guys. There are only victims. Home costs dearly. Peace is priceless in a world where

life has it. Spielberg, of well-known Jewish origin, deals with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, but does not stop

there, because he knows that the war of which he speaks to us has open fronts in many other places. The wound is

a sea of ​​clinical sores, open sores, and while one heals, others new and much worse arise at his

side. The message is therefore a universal message. And in this way focuses on narrating theconflicts

internalof one of the terrorists. Conflicts that we all understand, humanizing a drama that makes us

all participate directly. Not all the technical aspects in the film are of my liking, like that happy filter

that blends the images of almost all his latest productions. A taste that seems to share

with his faithful director of photography Janusz Kaminski. Neither do I find the already mentioned excess of

footage necessary. But we are, without a doubt, in front of one of the most important and courageous works of thisdirector

unprecedented, condemned by his own merits to be remembered together with the greatest masters of the seventh art "But

what the fuck is the movie? Friends, go see her. Suffer with the "" beautiful "" discovery of the terror of that violence

so, unfortunately, to the order of the day on the other side of our newscasts. Be upset with the true face

of state terrorism. Discover with your own eyes the heartrending sensation of feeling for some

minutes, closely related to those who really suffer the reality of violence from all

sides. Go to the cinema to be witnesses of a tragically eternal actuality.

" 1

" The movie directed by William Sachs is a lag that plays in the same league that I drink your blood or

Supersonic Man, the classic league of the Z series.

How to start talking of a film like this? I'll tell you that it goes in three sentences: an astronaut who goes

to Saturn becomes viscous and radioactive and devotes himself to killing pe���a to regenerate, even though go lose

eyes and ears along the way, the very ga.n.��� How many phrases were those? Well, the fact is that the film directed by

William Sachs is a gap that plays in the same league that I drink your blood or Supersonic Man, the classic league

of the z series. The special effects of Rick Baker are, without any doubt, the worst of his entire career. It is a

film, (although it looks like a telefilm) that goes straight to the point and after five minutes we have seen how the monster

loads a nurse a little idiot, because it goes through a glass door instead of opening it, in one of

the scenes more stupid than I remember. Then there are the di ,logos, which are of EGB level: ���Contaminate ?, I have

found Frankenstein !!! or forgotten words like tontaina and grandull���n fit into this spectacularfilm

shittythat has the virtue of being unique in creating a new fantastic genre: the regore.Intentar��� Explain the

term: in one scene, the incredible melting man attacks a fisherman, rips his head off and throws it into the

river. The scene changes and a girl of about ten years old appears smoking some pitis and thinking whether to play

doctors or hide and seek. Then the scene changes and we see the head going down the river until it reaches a waterfall.

The head falls to the rocks and breaks into pieces. Gore held. Regore. And speaking of sharps, the planes

have a disproportionately ridiculous length, they are extremely long. And speaking of ridicule,only

I cantell you that there is an impressive scene, attention: An old couple is driving on a road in the

middle of the night. On the sides of the road, as the lady of the car says, there are "trees that give lemons." Theman

meltingwalks around, therefore, the only choice In order for the elderly to palmer it is to stop in the

middle of nowhere, at dawn, to pick up lemons. And they do it. Go laugh. For a little more I can say. That there is

some ZAZ moment (the old ones in the scene of the fisherman's corpse), that there are moments in whichhappens

absolutely nothing. Highly recommended for night cann���bicas.PD: The good doctor of the film goes in search of

"viscosity" "with a giger meter, but, for what you need it if the monster leaves obvious traces either in the

form of corpses or in the form of a viscous mass? PD2: Jonathan Demme leaves. Play Matt. It's a fun game

trying to find him. I think I got it. PD3: it has just been published on dvd.

" 0

" An authentic penalty, that a film with such a good starting point, taking advantage of the huge amount of

films on superheroes, is wasted in such a way.

Ivan Reitman had his moments of glory for the decade of the 80s with those easy comedies that were so successful

. Ghostbusters, Dangerously Together and The Twins hit twice were directed by ���ly and

had a more than acceptable success at the box office. Since then, and except for 6 days, 7 nights and evolution, he has not had

any drinking project in his hands. It is a real pain, that a film with such a

good starting point , taking advantage of the huge amount of films on superheroes, be wasted in such a

way, although that especially and as I always say is usually the scriptwriter on duty that remains in the easy joke

and it does not get to go a little bit further. Who ever imagined what would be the private life of so much superhero?

How would you link Wonder Woman or Elektra? Well, the movie starts here, introducing us to a G-Girl, who would be

the envy of any Marvel superhero, but on the subject of head the truth that is very

bad. In addition, the situations that are developed in the film are totally naive, starting from the way

in which both are known, as the reasons why the protagonist leaves it. Luke Wilson is totally

unbearable throughout the film, the roll that is brought now I like it, now I do not want you is so

undefined that makes his character very unbelievable, apart from that he does not try the least to give him a little

personality. Uma Thurman, great among the greats, performs a normal role, only salvageable by those

quick savages of madness and jealousy that give her from time to time and that are in terms of theperformance of the film

bestmoments Anna Faris, protagonist of the Scary Movie movies is there of what she is, to look

tipito and little more, more stereotyped could not be her character, as stereotyped is the best friend of the

protagonist , Rainn Wilson, just as forgettable as the rest of the movie. Separate chapter deserves the

Professor Beldam, N���mesis of Girl G and that could not be the most simple copy that a good Lex Luthor could

have been, any bad of a Van Damme's movie has more presence than this supervillain (what's super

is a saying?) The bad guillotine ad nauseam, starting very well with the approach of mixing Fatal Attraction

with any Superh���roes movie, quickly reduced to a nonsense gracieta in which the only

interesting are the remarkable special effects in terms of powers of Chica G. In short, a Shame of

film that starting from a great idea has been in such a simple comedy.

" 0

" A monster of cinema, an almost perfect film that remains in the retina hours after being

seen.

A few weeks after the ceremony of the Oscars, one of the strongestcomes to our boards

candidates to get the victory. "It's not Country for Old Men", the latest genius of the Coen brothers, has

no less than eight nominations, including obviously the best film. In the book

of Cormac McCarthy, the film situates us in a time of change. In this new West there are no bandits or

outlaws, if not drug traffickers armed to the teeth, and the small American villas are no longer

peaceful places where the Sheriff can walk unarmed, now he needs a gun for his own

security. Precisely in one of these towns, in the state of Texas, Llewelyn Moss (played by a Josh

Brolin who lives his second golden age) is made with a briefcase full of money found between a good

pu� ��ado of corpses caused by an unsuccessful sale of drugs. Without knowing it, in this way it draws the attention not

only of the group of traffickers to whom that money belongs, but also of the murderous psychopath Anton Chigurt

(apotheosis Javier Bardem) and that of Sheriff Bell (Tommy Lee Jones). Begins as a brutal persecution without

truce, not will stop at nothing, tindose blood, pain, and muerte.Dejadme to say it before you begin:

very , the other nominees have to do it very well to snatch some of the statuettes from this authenticBecause

wonder."" It is not Country for Old People "" is cinema with capitals . The first minutes of the film already

warn the viewer of what is about to see. The voice-over of a depressed Tommy Lee Jones accompanies

a succession of diverse planes of the desert, authentic photographs of the dawn in the ���rida fields in

which the shrubs are shaken by the wind. When the camera finally moves, it moves slowly, to

show us the arrest of a mysterious Bardem in charge of a town policeman. Leevoice continues to

Jones'mix with the howling of the breeze, and the car moves away from the scene. All this at a very leisurely pace,

without background music, elegant and sober. And so, one realizes that we are facing a new and true

colossal of the Coens; that "" It is not Pa���s para Viejos "" pretends to join the group formed by the magistrals "" The

Man Who Was Never There "" or "" Death Among the Flowers "", moving away of the easy comedies to which we

were accustomed in the last years. There are few who doubted the ability of directors

to surprise the public again. This film should serve all of them to dispel doubts, since not only

has the quality enough to belong to that select group of works of art, but it can even

overcome them. Because, I repeat , what the directors' modem has created is a monster of cinema, an almost

perfect film that remains in the retina hours after being seen. Only because of its level t Technical and artistic,

"" It is not Country for Old People "" is made with the label of masterpiece. The Coen brothers once again demonstrate

that they are the best at using the panoramic format, offering impossible plans in which every centimeter of what

appears on the screen is essential to compose what they are. Fine pictures. All without exception, from the

most grandiloquent to the most intimate plane (Bardem washing his hands in the laundry room of the police office),

are huge beauty. And evidently, fused with each other with a sophisticated and intelligent use of the camera

capable of becoming almost a secondary protagonist of the story. Attentive to the entire sequence of the

hotel.But where even better works everything is in its argument and mix of genres. Because "" It's not Pa���s para Viejos ""

is, after all, a film of action from the West (1). It is simply a thrilling pursuit in

which three gunmen (and some more who join the party) seek to take their prey, be this a suitcase

of money, a death Ens in the locker, or one less criminal in the streets. What is surprising, is that starting

from such a (apparently) simple base, the film manages to propose doubts and questions and very difficult answer (or

is your title the best answer?), both morally and socially. What would you do? Who is really

good? How far can you trust a stranger? Do we do anything to prevent crazy people like Chygurt from

wandering our streets? Ah, and Javier Bardem embroiders his paper. Not only is it impossible to find out the

true nationality of the actor (his English is much better than that of many Americans), but his

character of authentic terror. See how he decides if a person lives or dies, with that look of bloodthirsty madman

, gives real chills. The s���mmum, the scene of the gas station, with that terrible dialogue between ���ly and the

owner of it. (1) Joel Coen himself affirms that "it is the m It's close that we'll never make a movie of

action. "

" 1

" Boredom. That is the word that defines the first serious trip of the Clint teacher when I finish seeing

Flags of our parents.

Boredom. That is the word that defines the first serious trip of the teacher Clint (blood debt was a

little dull too, but it is that it is pretentious on top) when I finish seeing Flags of our parents.

Where to start? The film has a loop structure and the same three scenes are repeated incessantly

during the two (long) hours of footage. First we have a flashback of the battlefield, then ascene

dispatchand then a sports field scene. And so the movie goes by. Then there are the actors, who neither have

charisma nor emotion, especially Adam Beach, unfortunate, who makes Ryan Phillippe look like an actor. The

secondary ones pass by, and we find Paul Walter or Barry Pepper, (the latter seems to have just come out

of Saving Private Ryan) or Billy Elliot repeating his role as King Kong. Music is as repetitive as

the narrative structure, that is, it is also boring and tiresome. The story is pretty insipid and it's very

trite. The positive? The blic sequences, superbly treated and shot with overwhelming classicism.

You will see the letters of Iwo Jima, because it can not be more boring than this one.

" 0

" Anyway, bread for today and hunger for tomorrow. Since I gave myself to read news about "" Missi���n Impossible III "" I was with this movie, almost from the

first tapes of Michelle Monaghan, hence they made reference to her again and again, again and again. The

film, quite simplistic and pretending to give it an "" attractive "" narrative air, is not more than typical and

typical about "" Buddy Movies "" (police tapes that proliferated at the end of the 80's and the beginning of

the 90's, having the saga of Richard Donner "" Lethal Weapon "" as maximum exponent), and although it tries to take off jam��� s

get it, predictable, loose and with an irregular development, forget almost with the ease that is visiona.En

order, bread for today and hungry for tomorrow.

" 0

" The mediocre and predictable result is a direct consequence of the insufferable inertia of the Americans to

conceive the cinema as a simple industry.

Eragon is to the cinema what McDonald's is to gastronomy. Fast food, easy to digest and poorvalue

nutritional. I would not save it as a palomitero / familiar event of mall cinema. Because, in this

case, the producers of this marketing invention have a face as long as the brain is depopulated.

They decide to make a hodgepodge copying the remarkable trilogy of Jackson, which time will place in aplace

privilegedas the epic cinema of entertainment, and the loose and recent Las Cr���nicas de Narnia The mediocre and

predictable result is a direct consequence of the insufferable inertia of the Americans to conceive the cinema as

a simple industry. Because, although these tapes are necessary to sustain the mammoth business and thus

produce smaller but infinitely better works, I reject the overabundance of films of this

type and of the advertising and commercial paraphernalia that they bring with them. In the end, more than movies turn out to be

franchises selling video games, toys or shirts derived from a roll of two and a half hours forgettable

at once. The film, as I say, is not worth nor to be entertained while one eats the pipes. The

story is decorated with the typical elements: elves, dragons and h���roes face a dark evil that

subjugates them with the iron hand of every medieval warlord. The good must fight against evil, and a

chosen one, who now instead of an elf with a ring is a rubiales chosen as the rider of the last

dragon, will be the hope of the mens. The young man with blond hair encounters an egg and from it a dragon is

born that, in a couple of flutters and runs through the field, grows older and is able to chat

telepathically with the waiter. As it is the "" chosen "", although everyonesuch a

seems to be scared formount, the forces of evil will go after him to kill him. But with hardly any training and, from night to

day, the boy pilots his dragon like Alonso an F-1 and begins to make spells without having a pope of thelanguage

properof the world of magic. And this cross between Aragorn and Gandalf, which has the invaluable

collaboration of a court of knights and Amazons ready to give their lives for him, is the hero built with

this scandalous lack of originality But it is not enough to shoot a story so hackneyed and insipid, it is also

filmed copying? In vain? the style of others much better and plagiarizing sequences and plans in a clamorous way.

How many times have we seen a group of riders dressed in long cloaks ride across the field while the

camera, from an aerial shot, takes a 360 degree turn at high speed ? Many, ���no? Well Eragon serves us another

ration of more of the same. And why would it be that the background fanfare that plays the soundtrack sounds like I've

heard it, but in infinitely better versions (like Shore's), dozens of other times? I do not know if even

the involvement in such a project by actors of the talent of Jeremy Irons or John Malkovich is excusable.

It is worthmillionalmost without ruffling in the commercial cinema from time to time, but perhaps they

taking a few extradollarsshould have thought a little before putting their names on the credits of this disproportion . Because,

honestly, his performance is in line with the poverty of the rest of the cast. And the film is not

that I was disappointed, because it lacked great expectations, but it has bothered me, as is clear in these

lines, because it is a takeover of Tome and loin hair. I do not think I'll take it again with the consequences

of next Christmas.

" 0

" The gossips tell us that there was not a single day of filming in which the demands (among them,

adequately feeding your cat New) and the continuous complaints of Mrs. Escarlata did not tighten the nerves of the

technical equipment.

Chapter One.- All happy families are alike. Each unhappy family is in its own way. On

November 5, 1913, Vivian Mary Hartley was born in India. With Irish blood in her veins, theworld would

cin���filoknow her as Scarlett O? Hara, the charm of Tara's red earth in "" Gone with the Wind "";

one of the most charismatic and most fascinating characters in the History of Cinema. Eight years after the movie's

myth, Vivien Leigh abided by the orders of French director and screenwriter Julien Duvivier in a new

film adaptation of Anna Karenina. "" Not a word, not a gesture of yours will forget ... a jam���s. How could it? "" The

classic of universal literature, the masterpiece of l? Amour fou, shows the hypocrisy of asociety

reactionary(not exclusive of the XIX century), which full of contempt and loneliness to those who do not follow their obsolete

regulations. Between delirium and reality, the protagonist, desperate, not only begins to doubt the feelings

of the man she loves, but also of her own possibilities as a human being. An untenable situation

that forces her to escape from herself. The gossips count that there was not a single day of filming in which the

demands (among them, to properly feed her cat New) and Mrs. Escarlata's constant complaints will not

tighten the nerves of the technical team and, above all, of the director. So much so, that the producer Alexander

Korda (great friend of the actress) has to intervene on numerous occasions, traveling precipitadamente from

California to calm the inos.Finalmente, the film is released �� Ela January 22, 1948 in the British capital

and later in New York. Filmed in Russia and London, with an impressive artistic direction by

Andrej Andrejew, an excellent photo and exquisite costumes designed in Paris, it fails

miserably in the contracting of the main actor (a newcomer of which never more was known) and, what is

worse, it is failed in the narrative structure. Maybe the error was found in a not brilliant script that

showed the disagreements that arose between the director and the producer, who bet on different screenwriters.

The result is a product more concerned with showing the lavishness of Czarist Russia, theskills

interpretiveof Ralph Richardson (important actor of English theater) and the extraordinary beauty of the

protagonist (his face always appears illuminated when everything remains in gloom), that intelling

accuratelythe dramatic story. Tolstoy's novel has been taken to the cinema on nineteen occasions, to which

four telefilms and three television series are added. Actresses of all times and of many nationalities

have given life to the enigmatic lady, but the criticism is unanimous in pointing out the Swedish divine as the Ana Karenina

par excellence . Greta Garbo would interpret this role twice: in 1927 and in 1935, in a production by

David O. Selznick. The plot would lead to a passion for impossible love coupled with the railway stations.

"" Brief Encounter "" by David Lean, "" Falling in Love "" played by Robert de Niro and Meryl Streep and the recent

"" Without Control "" starring the attractive Clive Owen, are just some examples of approach of the

Karenina-man���a. Winner of two Oscar, actress of undoubted talent and false smile, protagonist offilms

unforgettable. Vivien may have lost the reins of her life for the sake of inadequate love (whichnot

is?). She may have destroyed her own happiness with both hands, as did the characters who overcame her.

Maybe he did not care or there was no way out. Or simply, you may always think that "really",

tomorrow would be another day "".

" 1

" Unnecessary, by repeated, by trivial, by foreseeable, Disorder will not happen to any history of the cinema, neither

general nor intimate so that it will be credit of neighborhood videoclub, of those that am��� I love, to enjoy when

there is nothing, absolutely nothing to do ...

Reventona of topics, pre���ada of common places, never better said because the film goes ofpregnancies

psychiatricand maternal evils elevated to paroxysm and madness, Trastorno establishes a very short dialoguetwists and turns

with the spectator, who always goes ahead and knows, at all times, thewhere he will go the

plot and the way in which the director unravels so that, in the end, everything is beautiful and one of the movies comes out with the

face of having spent a good time. And it is not that this is bad condemnation. It could have been worse, of course.

There is a decent roster of actresses who here pigeon with high note. Ingrid Rubio does not cast as a homicidal man���aca

and Najwa Nimri is on the way out, neglecting all rigor in the characterization of a character who could have given

something more than ��� .. Their history of interchangeable pregnancies is almost never credible. And the script, I fear being

excessively heavy but I believe that all the reasons of the world assist me, it is the fundamental pillar of a

filmmaker when he is not a genius (there have been and they have suppressed sovereignly a plot to make

products imperishable: put the reader names, I give Kubrick, Eisenstein, Tarkosvky, to mentioncases

distantin models and cultures). It is inevitable to bring to memory The hand that rocks the cradle because arguments

start from similar assumptions, but the Curtis Hanson's film, not being a teacher, convinces by

the sobriety of the actors and the slow and almost artisan concatenation of events that lead the

audience to the final outcome. of interest when the

narrative conventions succeed each other without any blush. The abundant cliches of the film provoke

boredom because, as is often the case, this is the film that, without seeing it, we have seen many times before. It has

echoes of what happened to Baby Jane (especially in the final section) and that forgivable mediocrity of aepisode

well-made telenovela(which I suppose there will be) so that Disto has its p� Public, but not a cinifile

audience, who likes to be surprised and who has already seen so much cinema that they can see them coming even with their eyes

covered. Lacking inspiration, weighed down by a simple script, the film contributes the scarce creative palmar���s of

our cinema in the thriller, although we are already taking flight with directors as solvent as Jaume Balaguer�� �,

Enrique Urbizu or Paco Plaza.

" 0

" For the romanticism, for so much rhythmic pause (and long footage) and for a very vulnerable Superman, not

many people will like it, although it has not been my case.

Tonight I have seen the return to the classical screens among the classics. And I can say categorically

that I liked it, that I enjoyed it and that this continuation (which is not version) is superior to the first for

many reasons that I tell you if you want. the synopsis because it is better to let go and discover the

chicha of the story, which is not that much either. The prism of my childhood distorted the memory of the

Superman of the 80s for good. Bast��� saw her as a major to verify that as a film she was quite bad, although she suspected a

revolution. n in its time. Superman Returns has to come from below because it is a sequel, and not original,

in a cinema saturated with comic films, where only special effects prevail. In addition, the only thing that

usually gets my attention is how the superheroes acquire the powers, and in this there is no such

possibility. Even so, from the beginning there are details that Bryan Singer (director of Habitual Suspects and

the first 2 of X-Men, as well as producer of House) treats the p con with respect public, counting things with simple

gestures (the dog in the bed of the rich or the mysterious silences of the child). Thank you for not giving it

all. It has the right action scenes (the avi���n, spectacular). The weight is carried by the

characters with some very successful additions, such as the child or the secondary girlfriend of the bad guy. And I

liked Brandon Routh as Superman, although Christopher Reeve left an indelible mark. The one that improves

is her, Kate Bosworth (she hated the character of the original) in a risky role, center of thetriangle

love. The two look very handsome. I do not like, however, that of her partner, a pringao, no matter how much he

loves her. Kevin Spacey as Lex Luthor meets. Not everything is right. The sequences of rescue of Supermannot

aregood (with so much misfortune, saves the money of a bank, and in the rest, except the one of the airplane, they have not been

very creative). I have read that he lacks a sense of humor, but I prefer it when they tend to spoil more than to

contribute. There will be some that are a little slow and long, and the end, to leave Open the

continuations, I do not like it, but it gets moments of emotion (like the romantic flight) with aaesthetic.

beautifulThe express mesi���nic touch is debatable, with analog� Superman religious figures as a savior and with

postures reminiscent of Jesus Christ. For the romanticism, for so much rhythmic pause (and long footage) and for a

very vulnerable Superman, many people will not like it, although it has not been my case.

" 1

" I can still hear David Lynch's laughter behind the screen. I do. I like it. I hate her.

Put the note on it when you see it. But go see her.

I can still hear David Lynch's laughter behind the screen. The bastard has managed to

have me sitting in the seat for three hours watching. Something. Start warning that all Lynch's movies, except for

a true story, scare me. This is the official synopsis, attention: The story of a mystery. The

story of a mystery in a world within other worlds that reveal themselves around a woman. A woman in

love and in trouble. J��� J��� J���Inland Empire is a self-homage given by Lynch's(it's

wackoofficial, he's crazy) as in his time and saving the distances were given by Kevin Smith in Jay and Bob the

silent counterattack or Carpenter in Ghosts of Mars. And if you do not believe me, look at the final credits. Inland

Empire is a story about actresses, whores and a family of rabbits that lives between canned laughter. And

horror, because Inland Empire is a horror movie. At times expresionista, at times videoclipera, always

different (and digital), needs the absolute delivery of the viewer from the first moment to not leave by

legs at half an hour. It could also be the incomplete pilot of a new series of mystery canceled before

the shooting is finished. Or it could also be a Lynchian review of the "" mtica "" The end absolue du monde, do not

fuck you. I know. I like it. I hate her. Put the note on it when you see it. But go see her.

" 1

" Film about four beginning bank robbers and their avatars in their first blow. I did not like it,

because it has few sympathetic moments, it's too stupid and it gets us a moralist whore that stinks. And the

worst, which is a traci���n.

Director: Mariano Ozores Duration: 86 minutes. Year: April 1, 1982. Viewers: 1,294,874 ofbeings

human. The other day he commented with a digital friend (who has all the fingers, those of hands and feet) that

this humble blog is doing a lot for the Spanish cinema, specifically by Mariano Ozores. It seems to me an

exaggeration, but it is true that I have not found any other review (more than the one you are beginning to

read) of this movie Not the majority I criticize. Will he be a rare raaaroooo geek (what would Papuchi say)?

Will Mariano Ozores be elected to the altars as the French magazine did with Hitchcock? Willhealthy by

my child be mentallywatching these movies? Or will you say in the school "" ���iaaa, what is the fucking "" at the step of your

teachers? "The film is about four people who They come together to rob the bank where you work.

Everyone has their idiosyncrasies, one who is a ligion (Pajares) is married, has a lover pregnant and

wants to run away with another. Another is Ozores who has a workshop and is one-eyed (and a prostitute wants to live with him).

Another is Juanito Navarro, whose daughter fights with her husband day after day, while her grandson suffers. And

finally Esteso is the cashier bundled with a woman with hypergorged tits. Comedieta enredo, which is usually

said. I liked the movie? I'm glad you always ask me the same question. Well, on the one hand,

I laughed, but nothing to do with other titles of these people. And on the other side I have been bothered by a series of

things that I will list to facilitate the understanding of my readers: In the first scene comes the single theta

of the whole movie. That is to cheat the spectator. As a counterpoint, we do not see the duo in their underpants (pel���na

Esteso, but give time to close their eyes) The comedita de enredo is for you to laugh, not for you to get a

tearful nonsense and goofy. The issue of the child who suffers because his parents fight is pathetic.,

Finallywhat did he paint that apology against abortion in a movie? of this? I suppose that for things like this,

Mariano Ozores was associated with the extreme right. Resumiendo, film about fourbank robbers

beginningand their avatars in their first blow. I did not like it, because it has few sympathetic moments, it's

too stupid and it gets us a moralist whore that stinks. And the worst, which is a traci���n.Comedy Ozores without

boobs and few laughs, bad thing, amigos.Besitos.PD: Greetings to my faithful follower, Mr Chinchan's father, who

makes me much publicity, I know it. What I do not know if you will find out that I am talking about my father, he, he.

PS2: The scene Juanito Navarro and Antonio Ozores dressed as a priest, with Pajares in the middle of a nun's dress

telling a woman Chick who passes "" Go ass to put injections "" I thought it was very good. PD3: Have another

moment "" tricky "" of criticism "" to something "" that we could say that surprises. That dark office, with acharacter

sinister, that moves the threads prior to the elections. Ains, Manolete, if you do not know what you're getting into.

" 0

" The independent cinema is again in luck, sensational directing work in a story of

those final morals that they like so much.

During this year (of which we have been only a few days), I have made the firm intention of being more serious

about my cinema viewing , and something more demanding, that does not mean that I do not continue to see the commercial cinema (and

pigeonhole) that I like to see and then criticize, but also try my taste somehow (and

yours). ) towards some kind of films that, otherwise, would go completely unnoticed. This is the

case of Juno, an independent film has not gone unnoticed, has raised a whopping $ 70,862,478, andis

thatthat It is known that in the States all that Cin���fila Indie aesthetics (we already know what the division Fox: Fox

Searchlight Pictures does) is always liked by the "" Americanitos on foot "" (as I like to call them), and

although it was released on December 5, (in Spain its premiere is scheduled for early February) and has

an excellent nte cast, where we have the young Ellen Page (a revelation that we have seen in

"" Hard Candy "" and in "" X-Men 3 ""), seconded by Michael Cera (of the best of "" Supersalidos ""), Jason Bateman (the

"" mutant "" of "" Mr Magorium "") and Jennifer Garner (the series "" Alias ​​"", "" Elektra "".), In addition to the remarkable direction of

Jason Reitman, the son of 80's myth Ivan Reitman, who marveled at strangers with "" Thanks for

not smoking "", has left in the USA an excellent taste of mouth, in addition to nominations to the awards of the

academia.The beginning of the tape reminds me a lot to other films of the same court, without going further that mess

that was "" American Explendor "", and that is that, like any good Indie movie, you have to notice it from the first minute.

of footage, lest one then start watching the film and wonder where the director has left

the explosions, full nudes and extreme violence; once the foundations are laid, the tape, which today

brings us, is lost by other twists, keep in mind that the script runs by the ex-striper Diablo Cody,

nominated for the Oscar for it. Although the story is something linear (4 seasons and what happens), the best thing about

the film is, in my opinion, the superb interpretation of Page, where it gives life to that eccentric and vivacious Juno,

who does not keep silent about what she thinks, nor He cuts a hair in doing, not only what he, but

wantsalso to leave the whole world very clear, and that is, as they said by now, with 16 You can already have

(or not) your head nicely furnished. The independent cinema is again in luck, sensational work of

direction in a story of those with final moral that they like, especially recommended to all those who

consider paternity (responsible or irresponsible) or those who at 16 believe that they have little left to

do and I have to live.

" 1

" Movie S with real women, when the silicone was put on the joints and not on the tits. To

loosen up laughing for a while. Of sexual subjects I do not speak, that my girl scolded me later.

Well, today is a glorious day. Tito Chinchan is going to publish his first criticism of a porn movie, and this

is historical. Of course it's not the first one I see, but I know the one I've laughed with the most. Although I have to say

that I did not know it was porn, but since I had put it, well that is going to be done. If I've seen things like The

Nun or Rotwailer, how am I not going to see this? The film is about a plumber who finds hisin bed

wifewith another guy, who coincidentally It is your best friend. Total, who gets angry and goes to put on thewife

friend's, who quickly do it. Total, that this leads to a picha-co���o-teta-boca without stopping in the 75

minutes of film. In the end it happens as in The 2 sides of the bed, but well spent, without half measures. I am sorry to

have told you the end, but it is to avoid being told that only you have seen the beginning., this

Wellmovie is the ca���a. It has everything you can expect from a movie. Tetillas everywhere andlaughs

assured, varied scenarios and no special effects. The script is sober and fits very well with theidea

pre-establishedthat you take with only seeing the poster. No surprises or surprises, but maintains thetension very well

narrativeuntil the final surprise. As sketches of the film, I tell you a scene. The plumber is with a

girl. Total, that made a powder to the above without unzipping the monkey (it is a 100% Iberian male).

She tells him that he has left her half-heartedly (he remains whole) that makes him a cunningulis. He says that

after mantecao, n��� of n���. And she, neither short nor lazy, goes to the bid��� and "" Czech, Czech, Czech "" she leaves it

to eat soups in it. The man recoils, but in the end he accepts. But since she has gone back without

taking off her overalls, she takes a quick decision. He takes the plunger, punches it on the ground and starts galloping

on it, which encourages the plumber to a sharp saber. A crazy. Resuming, S movie with real

women, when the silicone was put on the boards and not on the tits. To loosen up laughing for a

while. Of sexual subjects I do not speak, that my girl scolded me later.Besitos.PD: I was going to put a classification based on

gold cocks, but I do not feel like it. PD2: ������������Now, traspasam���, traspasaaaaaaameeeeeeeee !!!!!! PD3: I

publish this because my girl has given her approval, otherwise I I would dare.

" 1

" We are facing a practically perfect development, which starts from one of the mostapproaches

intelligentof the last decades to lead to an impeccable direction of actors.

Fifteen minutes Shortage of production, poor artistic direction, photo of doubtful quality, excess of

defocused planes, absence in the synchronization of the assembly, di���logos foreseeable initials With these

components, eighty percent of American films are sentenced. German cinema has not yet

uttered its last word. The "awkward discourse" leads us to a conclusion as shocking as it is

desperate, a friend who lacks answers and a situation that is beginning to be close. After all

, "" What does an author have if he can not write? Like a projectionist without a film, a miller

without wheat. It has nothing"". On how many occasions would many Spanish writers be asked this same question

in 1936? On the other hand, how did Luis Rosales feel? A point of inflection, and the work, following the

compositional procedure of the musical piece he praises, accentuating the existing contrast between the exposition

of the technical factors and the elaboration of the guide, faces a trajectory of ascending evolution that culminates

in the cinematographic jewel that we know It is probable that Lenin had to stop listening to La Apasionata,

number 23 of Beethoven in order to finish the Revolution. It is certain that the sonata that Gabriel Yared dedicates to a

good man manages to break down the walls of incomprehension, the m���ssllidos that we are capable of building

human beings, those of thought. from this moment, Florian Henckel Von Donnersmarck's first feature

radiates a supernatural magnetism that envelops the spectator, unseating the prejudices that might exist

against European cinema, the least commercial, and satisfies the critical sense. The shortage of production is

justified. The pale photograph in which the sky is never blue and the painful artistic direction - in many

occasions, chaotic - that comes from the east wing of the History are not compensated with an excellent script, but

are relegated to the background intentionally, dispossessed of any attractive element that

seeks to detract from the story, that can distract from the plot. It is then when the assembly demonstrates

its consistency and the remarkable narrative rhythm printed in the plot base is clearly appreciated, in which the

most accurate of the predictions is diluted. We therefore find ourselves faced with a pr Basically

perfect, which starts from one of the most intelligent approaches of the last decades to lead to an

impeccable direction of actors. The imposing bet of casting is based on in a curious and effective triangle.

The insecure and easily impressionable character of Martha's most delicious, Martina Gedeck. The almostphlegm

Britishof the impassive German conformist, which is so well portrayed by Sebastian Koch in the character that heso much

remembersthat he played Ralph Fiennes in The True Gardener. The penetrating and indecipherable

look of the Stasi captain brought to life by Ulrich M���he, fetish actor of Michael Haneke, worthy successor to the best

dramatic records of Anthony Hopkins. �cula is positioned within the emerging German cinema of

recent years, locating its first filmmaker in that quarry of directors who with exquisite precision have

managed to face his History. It is not convenient to forget the daring of Oliver Hirschbiegel's The Sinking that, in the

year 2004, dared to treat the figure of the F���hrer from a human perspective. Nor the nostalgic look

that Wolfgang Becker throws on Good Bye, Lenin! Not now the news that comes to us from theGermany

"democratic", dated just twenty years ago and that seem to us to be science fiction, so far from the

adventures full of Western supporters that we met in 1966 thanks to theCurtain.

Hitchcock's RippedThree essential titles that obey a common denominator, the ability of its filmmakers

to incorporate the public into the cast, making us sharers, direct witnesses of the events that are narrated.

An important lesson about how a story should be told. Obviously, Hollywood rewards it. His peculiar and

always tendentious criterion will not notice the impressive work of the main actor, in the majestic

direction, nor in the quality of his original script, but he recognizes it as a whole, perhaps by reasons not only

cinematographic. It is possible that also for the care of the old times, those in which they still had

a tangible enemy of easy location. In any case, the creation of blacklists, the search for

informers, espionage and the marginalization of possible subversive foci are not unknown to them.

" 1

" Telefilm of loose budget that does not deserve to be included in this man's filmography. After all, he

made The Fire of Vengeance and the great Red Tide. Love at point-blank range, in my altar of weaknesses, occupies a

pre-eminent place.

The circus has already opened: come, see, take a seat, enjoy the vertigo and come out conveniently debased

from worries, manumitted by the stubborn machinery of routine, installed comfortably in deception. Cinema

has always been a fabulous factor of deceit. There are films that produce a greater certainty that the lie

has occupied our senses and that, in the end, we have swallowed a dreadful roll, a joking epiphany of

fireworks, a celebration Three-dimensional noise. That's Tony Scott, a noise magician. Underneath it

beats, fierce, the fury, the pulse of a director too many times no one, but vigilant jealous of anway

ancestralof making films, that of showing a hypnotic spectacle , an authentic fairground barracín festival.

His trail of suggestive images is still lavish, but then nothing remains or so little remains that

time, a stern judge, ends up erasing the profiles (first) and those dazzling images (after ���s). Scott is

a Baroque author, but his hyperbolic warp of concepts and forms does not seduce as he would like his talent to

make us suspect because this director's cinema is over-represented by a Caring wit, very lyrical, yes,

but converted, in abuse, in a parody, in a caricature that does not reach the grotesque, although it is round and itnot

isdifficult to predict that it will end �� drowned in it for absolute satisfaction of the legion of fans that it possesses.The

many shots, the abundant load of adrenaline, the light eroticism and the fast-paced sense of rhythm make

Domino a work one hundred percent Tony Scott. The story of the adventurous life of Domino Harvey is suitable for this

tsunami of technical tricks, of static video-pop, of pop resonances. Writes Richard Kelly, scriptwriter of

the cult film Donnie Darko, but what attracts is the psychedelic movement of the camera, which seems touched

by the numen of the mescaline that the protagonists get into. Mickey Rourke earns the admiration of the owner of the

chair because he is credible: more for his pimp look with bad milk than for his determination to make us see that

there is still an actor inside his brain crushed by boxing and narcotics.plays

Christopher WalkenChristopher Walken which is nothing new, but we always appreciate it. This accelerated biopic must

be seen with absolute lack of cinematographic demands: like listening to a disc of Van Gogh's ear whenalready

we havebeen inside Dark Side of the Moon. I do not know if I explain. There is time for everything. If there was not,

disregard the kind reader of this excessive exercise of egolatr���a.

" 0

" The protagonists are so human and they love each other so much that their story moves deeply and does not leave

anyone indifferent.

The Tomb of the Luci���rnagas was directed in 1988 by Isao Takahata, author of the famous series Marco and Heidi,

Takahata is an important character within the world of Japanese animation, having founded with Hayao

Miyazaki the Studio Ghibli, which have produced masterpieces such as Spirited Away, Princess Mononoke or

Nausicaa. It is based on a novel by Akiyuki Nosaka, which was inspired by his own experiences, since he had

a sick mother and a little sister who died of malnutrition during the The Tomb of the Luci���rnagas

tells the hard and tragic story of the young Seita, aged 14 and his little sister Setsuko, aged 5, the children of an

officer of The Japanese Navy. During World War II, his mother dies after a bombing and, after

a brief stay at his aunt's house, where they are not welcome, both will be left homeless having to

take refuge in a cave, in a time when food and aid are scarce. It is a story of survival in

extreme conditions, a portrait of human miseries in times of war. The protagonists are so human

and they love each other so much that their story moves deeply and does not leave anyone indifferent. It is a

beautiful film as well as a tragedy, its beauty is in really touching scenes like the one in the cave illuminated by

luci���rnagas or those of the beginning, when, after the death Seita narrated by himself, Setsuko appears from the

old candy can and his brother shakes his hand. (Seeing the film for the second time this scene isunderstood

better) Japanese animation cinema is probably the best that exists, for the last few decades they have been making

real works of art. art that are beginning to be appreciated in the West now, are films with a background

very deep and human, sometimes they are dramatic, like these light ones like Mi Vecino Totoro de Miyazaki, but

it is always worth seeing them, not only for their beauty but also for their beauty. n for its pacifist,message and content

feminist or ecologist, such as Princess Mononoke, in which all three are.

" 1

" Magnificent film. The only downside that could be put is that in some cases may pretend to be wrong.

Magnificent film by Paul Haggis. Excellent script (Oscar deserved to the best original script), which addresses

racism directly, real, without taboos. and from all points of view: the whites are notthe cocoons

always, also the blacks self-identify (I mean the dialogues of the young blacks, or the "" purchase "" "

of the inspector, when he said before he did not" "I was going to buy him like a little black man" "Perfect, with a

montagecombination of stories, each one better, with fantastic interpretations ��sticas (���Sandra Bullock and Brendan

Fraser act for real!), And with an end to the height, with which without a doubt the spectators will reflect on

the total of the film �cula.Memorable scenes (for those who have seen it: the one of the girl when she leaves her

house.) And the aforementioned gui���ne interpretations, make this film one of the best of the last

few years. That's it, the only downside I could put is that in some cases it may be pretentious, I mean,

as if The director would know that he is making a good film and I would like to prove it, so my

final score is 9. Without doubt, I left the cinema really happy. Lately it is difficult.

" 1

" A brave blow to the image of George Bush, to the attitude of a certain press and to society capable of

any stupidity in order to achieve fame

Paul Weitz (American Pie) continues his process of maturation n with American Dreamz, a brave blow to the

image of George Bush ("" I became a politician to be able to show my father that any idiot could do it ""); to

the attitude of a certain press; to the society capable of any stupidity in order to achieve fame, and to the

programs that offer this ephemeral possibility in exchange for extracting people's guts to expose them in the

television showcase. Maybe I'll devote too much time to what matters least, the songs of the contest, but

Mandy Moore is a star in the US and you have to pay the price. Now, what's a novelty is that you

were so direct in your s���tira: after a process of make-up, the actor Willem Dafoe, who can not be

further away physically from Dick Cheney, is practically nailed to the vice president. The wild MASH and Trap 22,

made during the Vietnam War, took refuge in its setting in Korea and World War II.

American Dreamz can not be more explicit.

" 1

" Film that gives the viewer exactly what he promises. Neither more nor less. A fun white glove

that makes entertaining fun. A film of seeing, smiling and forgetting on the fly.

Preceded by a huge promotional campaign, which because of the bulky and nourished attendance of the

cinema, has proved to be the most effective, it has been premiered "" Night in the museum "", an amusement that works

perfectly as a comedy of white humor, intended for all the public. Playing with the most moderneffects

specialand counting on an actor typecast in his role of kind, torp ���ny wellintentioned forty-one

-post-adolescent, "" Night in the museum "" is a perfect example of screwball comedy in which the characters are

blows, blows and blows of all kinds, tartazos and smacks included, demonstrating that the usual classic humor

continues to work like a charm. The anecdote: a young man, hired as a night watchman at the

Museum of Natural History, realizes that the figures, animals and other still lifes, embalmed,

dissected, mummified and enc When the night falls, they come alive, prey to anvitality

overflowing, chaotic and somewhat destructive. From the skeleton of the Tyrannosaurus Rex that played so much game to Howard

Hawks in "" The beast of my girl "" through the fierce lions or those monkeys always horny and playful, the

accumulation of t� ��pics of the movie theater is as constant as it is well achieved.And little more can be said of a

film that gives the viewer exactly what it promises. Neither more nor less. A fun white glove that

makes entertaining fun. A movie to see, smile and forget on the fly that does not bother, does not

bother and does not tire. And, interestingly, it will be a film that will break records at the box office, something very illustrative

about the squalid society in which we live, without wanting to get a head hot, without wanting to be bothered ,

zaherido or bothered in their daily well-being. "" Night at the museum "", perfection at the service of a

film for children that, curiously, drags masses of adults to the movies. I said. The sign of the times,

why, how many of the viewers of this film will also go, for example, to see "" Apocalypto "", " "Flags

of our parents" "or" "The queen" ", for putting three examples of movies currently in theaters that talk

about things that happen to us or have happened to us in our recent history? That's the question.

" 0

" A superb exercise in classic adventure and adventure as a metaphor for spiritual search, a

spectacle of overwhelming visual rhythms, humor, something of Wagnerian romanticism, excellent characterization

of characters and antologous description of the hero.

Many years went by, until in these days - motivated by recent news about the new adventure of the

archeologist of yore, which will reach the screens of the whole world in May. 2008 -, who writes this and

their troupe of thinking minds, decided to review the three pieces that have forged a timeless icon, and in this

third - whether out of ignorance or forgetfulness - we discover with great satisfaction that hides a masterpiece,

perhaps, never sufficiently proclaimed, and that certainly has nothing to envy a work of art as

it is "" In search of the lost ark "". "" Indiana Jones and the �� Last Crusade "" is one of the best film adventures

in the history of cinema. If we look at a classical pattern - a pattern that synthesizes the foundations of what

the art of narrating in images should be - it is one of the most important more perfect formulas that have never been made. It is model and

CANON, at the height of the great adventures filmed by John Houston or John Ford. We can also add something

from the spirit of Howard Hawks. Spielberg, borrowing a little from each one, makes his personal synthesis,

appropriate to his times, and proclaims himself - with merits and justice - Absolute Teacher of the

show. ��genes are already an evocation of the classicism of John Ford; the icon of the Paramount gives way to alandscape

mythical, the rugged aridity of the mountains of the state of Utah and the valley of the Colorado, the winds that

drag the sand, and in the distance a retinue of riders They ride in a row. It seems that we are returning to the

golden age of the Western. The paced rhythm in the succession of long and general shots, in harmony with the first

notes of John Williams, transmit the sensation of a spirit and a way of making cinema that, unfortunately,

today seems extinct. Then we discover that the riders are a group of boy-scouts, and Indiana (ourIndiana

teenage) is among them. In one of the caves, Indiana discovers a group of looters, whose boss wears

the costume of the future hero. Suggestive evocation of a genesis; the theft of the Colorado cross and the consequent

pursuit of the train, and the resolution of this, defined, from the prism of the anonymous looter who then

"baptizes" "to our hero when we put the hat on him, the destiny of audacious and amoral adventurer: that smile of

pride and satisfaction when he sees the boy flee with the precious object. It seems that he sees in himself a reflection of

himself. The beginning of the future hero.When the young Indiana arrives at his home looking for the support of his father, he

makes a gesture of rejection and thus a latent conflict is established because of a father too absorbed

in his archaeological passions and indifferent to family matters, and because of this will come future

reproaches. Once the hat falls on the face of River Phoenix, as in a wonderful merger from the past in

the present, the adolescent who emerges is already the adult, confronted with his old adversary, in the foreground

that culminates the genesis of the hero in a temporal continuum not devoid of beautiful meanings. With so much

palabrer���a we only try to say this: that those first ten minutes of footage are a master lesson in

cinema, an example of synthesis, and an exquisite taste to narrate. And, in passing, shows great respect for the

created character, which already in 1989 was part of popular culture. The following sequences pose a

return to the scheme of "" In search of the lost ark "", again Indiana as a teacher of university, Marcusreturns

Brody, the Christian mythology is again the excuse to start the adventure. Venice, a library with its

secret passages, boat chases, fundamentalist conspirators, and the omitted presence of the father of

Indiana as the main promoter of the grail search, until finally appearing in an Austrian castle .

From that point, the film becomes a cross bar of sharp blows of parody andaction.

sarcasm The relationship between the Jones father and the son Jones is traced with a sense of humor that encompasses

both the cold and distant communication between the two as a disguised feeling of mutual admiration and respect. ,

as well as the reproach and the opposition of ideas: the materialism of Indi in front of the faith of Henry. And between one thing

and another, the relationship presents an eloquent ambiguity. In sum, the chemistry achieved between Henry and Indiana Jones

supposes one of the best orchestrations, around the characterization and connection between two characters, that have

been seen in the last ones. thirty years, worthy of anthology And to this, there is a key phrase put into the

mouth of Walter Donovan (Julian Glover): find his father and find the grail. The grail as aelement

literalof a spiritual search and personal fulfillment. Between father and son, as we have pointed out

previously, there is a conflict whose origin goes back to childhood. The nickname "" Junior "" used by Henry to

name his son, has a contemptuous connotation, as an effect of that conflict in which the father does not

finish valuing his son in his just measure. Then, in the final scenes, when Indiana is about to

fall into the abyss for wanting to take the grail beyond the seal that limits eternal life, in a moment of

comprehension , Professor Henry Jones emotionally pronounces the word "" Indiana "", which comes to heal all

the wounds of the past while redeems the hero from his sins of greed. Several scenes offollow each other.

actionOutstanding: pursuit on a motorcycle, mounted on an airplane, across the desert and to the beach, in

which we see a feat of Sean Cornery, frightening a flock of birds with an umbrella, making their own

army and evoking, umbrella in hand, the words of Charlemagne, while the face of Indi draws a gesture

of admiration, but always with his back to his father, which is a constant (contained orlove

concealed, some emotional isolation) in the relationship between mbos, except in extreme moments. The

excellent montage allows a collective story, in which the secondary characters find theirrole

constituentof rhythm and narrative claw; Donovan, Elsa Snaider, a German soldier with very bad milk and eyes

of a penetrating blue. As an anecdote, we see Indiana face to face with the very Adolf Hitler, giving him a little

book of secrets that will go unnoticed. Indiana's gesture to Elsa Snaider, at theceremony

book-burningin Berlin, grabbing her neck with fury, and her response, the hate contained between them

, maybe what throbs as well. It is a mutual respect, in spite of the circumstances and the lack of scruples

on the part of each other, a network of relationships forged through an excellent construction ofdialogues.

sharp, in which sarcasm and irony prevail. It goes without saying that the main action scenes

are a great example of mastery in the visualization of each moment and problem, the handling of the rhythms, the

profiles, in an impeccable structure that ends up cohesive the group in a superb way in the battle in

the desert, between tanks, horses, camels and fundamentalist guerrillas, there where all the parties in

play meet in the resolution. Pure spectacle and narrative structure that becomes a classicflavor. The

atemporalexcellent chemistry contributed by Harrison Ford and Sean Cornery reaches a point of ���xtasis in the

last steps until the lighting. Donovan shoots Henry, and that's when Indi has no choice

but to go in search of the sacred water that can save his father. The scenes in which Indiana is passing

the three final tests acquire an intense dramatic meaning through the proper use of montage,

alternating the fear of the lack of faith in Indiana with the agonizing gesture of a Henry Jones who urges his

son towards a state of faith that allows him to reach the grail. Finally, after the last leap of faith, magic returns

and father and son recognize the mutual discovery. The four adventurers ride towards the horizon while thedisk

solarinvokes the twilight of the gods, we see the silhouettes of four horsemen who move away in one of the

best frames, evocative and significant of a farewell, the adi���s an adventure cinema made with love and

crafts. In short, a superb exercise of classicist adventure and adventure as a metaphor for

spiritual search, a show Deculo of overwhelming visual rhythms, humor, something of Wagnerian romanticism, excellent

characterization of characters and antològic description of the hero, nostalgic, sensitive, to the once par���dica and

carefree. And yes, in fact, and although El arca perdida has taken all the fame, this is the best of

all, still not sufficiently valued in all its complexity. Will we change our mind from here to a

few months?

" 1

" After some hesitant beginnings in which he seemed to drift by the elementality in thecharacters

central, he soon takes off, moving forward, building an almost entomological portrait.

It seems that the cinema of the time (medieval or of the Golden Age) becomes fashionable again in Spain; A few months

ago, "Tirante el Blanco" was released "(by the way, with a very careful box-office hit), after" "Alatriste" ",

which has worked well commercially (although very far from the astronomical figure of his budget), and now "" The

Borgias "", another megaproduction in which Antena 3 has been fully involved, co-producer of the film. It must be said,

at the outset, that perhaps the undertaking was too great to be done in cinema: the life of Pope Borgia, Alexander

VI, and his children, throughout the eleven years that his papacy lasted, is full of events of all kinds, to the

point that it has taken two and a half hours of footage to tell the vital story of this peculiar

family group. So things would have been better to shoot a television miniseries, as it would probably end up

being shown on television (on Antena 3, of course?). However, the envite, with the inevitable lack of rhythm

in which such a prolonged footage makes incur, has resulted in a positive result. Because "" The

Borgias "", after some hesitant beginnings in which it seemed to drift by the elementality in thecharacters

central, soon takes flight, getting closer, building an almost entomological portrait , which does not take

sides in favor or against, a Valencian family coming to power omn���modo in the Vatican, at the turn

of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, a potent historical moment simo (it has just been discovered America, Spain is already aState

unitaryand is preparing to be an Empire, the dark Middle Ages ends to enter the luminous

Renaissance). This Borja family, or Borgia, to put it in the Italian letter with which he has passed to

posterity, made of his own interest the purpose for which the Vatican State would be governed and , thanks to hispower

spiritual, but also temporarily (at that time, Stalin could not say that wicked irony of "" how many

divisions the pope had "). "Because I had them), the rest of the known world. Ambitious film, whichcombines

suitablythe complex conspiracies devised by Pope Alexander VI, the paterfamilias of the Borgias,wellplights

asas theof his sons (the bloodthirsty, effervescent C���sar, the tarambana Juan the short-tempered Jofr���, the

reckless and finally so scalded Lucrezia, here very far from the portrait of matahombres thatHistory

Informalgives her), with costly scenes of action and a wide array of media, it is foreign,

however, to beautiful cinematographic details: the cry of the pope before the death of his son, splendidly

given by a Lluis Homar that transmits as only the good actors know how to do theatrical; the zenith plane of

the death of the pontiff; the final scene, with the suicidal charge of C���sar and that zoom to the crystalline disk that

confirms the secret love he felt for his sister? they are details of the exquisite and creative filmmaker who is

Hern���ndez, who leads with solvency a great cinematographic artifact like ���ste, a mastod���ntica company that

has reaped a brilliant result. Another thing will be that at the box office work well: the absence of actors of

relumbr���n can make run a showy endeavor and a huge effort that deserves another treatment.mention

Specialfor that volcano still pending to erupt that responds to the name of Sergio

Peris-Mencheta, who remembers the first Javier Bardem, and I do not know the physical: it has the power of the protagonist

of "" Mar adentro "", although perhaps not its ductility? I hope I'm wrong.

" 1

" Impressive sequences, characters and images, always arising from the honesty, sobriety and passion

contained in the proposal.

The look always attentive, the ears sharpened to the maximum, the face of impenetrable emotions. The captain

Gerd Wiesler (Ulrich M���he) is one of the best agents of the 'Stasi', the secret police of the former

German Democratic Republic. He has the infallible method, the precise questions and the time necessary for

any suspect of treachery or dissent to the nation, if he is guilty, ends up confessing orhis

informingfriends. In that Germany of the East before the fall of the Berlin Wall, all citizens are suspects and

Orwell's spirit resuscitates to become the coveted dream of the mechanisms and cravings of a

government that wants to have everything under control, and its residents well-monitored. With this guide, thedebutante

thirty-year-old, Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck, begins his narrative in 1984, in a GDR that

seems to be anchored in one day. Every year, the seventies, and definitely, seated in the work of

Orwell.All���, Wiesler, al���as HGW XX / 7, is a neat and effective official with his work, and one of the best ,

among the more than 170 thousand agents of the 'Stasi' that came to be. An expert in infiltrating his nose and ears in

other people's lives, in redecorating the houses with microphones and hidden cables, and in making the word intimacy

meaningless. Under suspicion. But, and in another of the great successes of the Henckel's film, for better or for

worse, those agents of state security are presented to us as mere professionals or bureaucrats who

simply do their work, without resorting to the typical topic. It's easy to be violent or manic. And, like them, or

like the citizens of the GDR, the infallible Wiesler also has the human factor, full of errors,

weaknesses and feelings. Like that artist who must be watched, George Dreyman (Sebastian Koch), a

playwright who, through the work and commission of the interested minister on duty (Thomas Thieme), becomes another

"intellectual" "potentially subversive and low vigilance. And Dreyman, for sure, is guilty of at least

two crimes: that of having his entrails rustled in a state where talent is being persecuted, and having

as a lover an actress so desired, as desiring, Christina-Maria Sieland (Martina Gedeck). Talent without

repression. The man who knew too much, or the need to take sides. Listening too much can sink

others, or perhaps, also make us understand better. Both Wiesler and Dreyman, like this magnificent film,

are characters made based on feelings held back and about to emerge. The work of its interpreters, and that

of the secondary ones, is perfect, like that of a prodigious Martina Gedeck ("" The elementary particles ""), of

presence and voluptivity as irresistible as fr�� Agile and dangerous. There are alsosequences and images

impressive, always arising from the honesty, sobriety and contained passion of the proposal, like that look

of Weisler of surprise when checking, even though I have witnessed hundreds of times of this, a revelation that will fill

your soul with disappointment. You can even see in those acronyms of "" HGW XX / 7 "" a gui���oa another Welles, the Herbert George

Welles, author of that "" The war of the worlds "", in whose condition of being scrutinized, invaded and invaded, of

the viruses that can cause �da of a system, there are the characters and elements of "" The lives of

others "". In any case, there are plenty of reasons to make it one of the best films of recent years.

" 1

" The director converts a documentary with a very interesting theme into a collection of joined

stories told to each other.

One of the Spanish documentaries that I most wanted to see was the one of Filmmakers against magnates, whose web of unmemorable

name, discovers us that it is a part of 2 documentaries on the same subject. The other: Filmmakers in

action. The "" essay "" deals with how the films are treated once they are finished. A superblylesson

documentedabout the different image formats, the barbasadas that are done in projection both in cinema

and on television, some technical customs that are harmful to the health art� ��stica of the film like thefilms

colored, etc? In this section there is no problem, and it is very instructive for those who want to

know something more about the technical aspect of cinema. However, the director's supine awkwardness makes a documentary

with a very interesting theme in a collection of joint stories counted in chunks, as if he wrote in his

blog every 15 days and then put all the post followed to make a book. Suddenly, it jumps to the core of the

documentary: the lack of respect for the director's work in a film. And from that moment on it becomes

a boring, redundant and radical pastiche. And that only lasts half, but bored topiedras.Este

sectarianto the pith documentary not only focuses on the director and sole and allpowerful God of the

pel ���cula, but that the producers do not exist, and if they exist they are Americans, with a lot of money and a lot of desire to

destroy films in the worst possible way. The impressive collection of testimonies and interviews that re-

read this length (Stanley Donen, Berlanga, Woody Allen, John Houston, Burt Lancaster?) Is not just an

attraction, but the director , Carlos Benpar, manages to turn them into a slab: he does not know how to edit the substance

of anyone's discourse. It seems that he wants to boast of having managed to record such illustrious guests, but

only reveals his awkwardness as a director by not knowing how to choose fragments. That's it, the most delirious of all is Jos���

Mar���a Nunes, an authentic radical madman. He also has "patches" of fiction. Quen they try to illustrate the concept of

"" The artist is everything and everything he does is untouchable "". In short, an allegation against the industry, in

favor of auteur cinema, of the preservation of creative purity but it is a dishonest and incoherent product

100%, since if we are going to talk about purity, I understand why the beautiful narrator, Marta Belmonte (the

best of the film), doubles her so horribly when the rest of the talking busts subtitles them. Infumable The

director of "" this "" is clear: the director is God. And only the title betrays his intention: Filmmakers

(intention of magnificence) against Magnates (Bad bad bad guys). However, I ask myself: Who

needs more to whom: the filmmaker to the tycoon or the tycoon to the filmmaker?

" 0

" A cult film and an excellent example of how to create fears without means, while the story continues

under credit titles ...

Today we will see the ingredients that make up, not just a simple masterpiece, but nothing less than "" a

cult film "", which is different. First, the absence of money (the budget econ��� comic is practically

non-existent), it is supplemented by versatile personnel who, in addition, have free time, good friends andrelatives.

elderlyIn the absence of professional actors, that you can not pay, you ask the favor of the wife of one of the

producers, a school teacher and a stocky trucker. None of them had experience in film,

theater, or student comedies, and none of them ever made a film again. That is, therole

mainis offered to a true actor, Duane Jones, an absolute stranger, who embarks on this project

to debut in the cinema. So much he liked the experience, that it would not come out of the genre, reducing all his

filmograf���aa characters related to the world of the undead and the vampire creatures

of the night. This is also the first feature film for the director. George Romero comes from advertising, and

takes advantage of the situation to make him photographer, scriptwriter and editor. For their part, the producers

become cast actors, make-up artists and sound technicians. They do not receive a salary, but all

members of the technical and artistic team (t���os, cousins, friends) get the promise that they will "get paid if the tape

does not work". -Vives works at the box office "". An aspect that does not contribute the distributor, the Continental, which

invests a ridiculous amount of money in making it known. The chocolate syrup (the photograph is black

and white), the ulcers that are they buy a butcher and the dollar with which the extras are remunerated (they are so

few, that it takes time to get acquainted with all of them), they do the rest. And, what begins with the love of art,

shot on weekends and holidays, is revealed as the benchmark of hundreds of filmmakers; the story

with which many cin���filos fall in love with the genre. It is true that the tape contains kits that give to write

a book. The car, without a key in the contact, that advances along a road to take three curves without any kind of

problem, are not the steering wheels blocked in these situations? The same car that ends its adventure passing

by a tree that it does not touch, to declare itself in total sinister, or the blood that sprouts on the back of a

zombie that has been shot in the face, without the impact of the bullet is appreciated in his chest. Of course, it is

likely that the "blood of the zombies" "(good title for another movie) will flow differently. But it is also

true that it has memorable frames, unforgettable scenes that will be repeated ad nauseam in the

horror movies of the following years. The fixed plane that frames a tortuous road through which theapproach

protagonists, a clear premonition that evil awaits them (Jeepers Creepers); the flight of Barbara (La Matanza

de Texas, Friday the 13th); the psychological evolution of the protagonist (Scream); the truck surrounded by "" those things ""

hungry with viscera (the ones they bought from the butcher); the explosion that is reflected in the faces of the

actors (the debutante and the producer); the first shots that are shot camera in hand, paradigms of the

events that are unleashed later (impressive those that reproduce the radio receiver, the speed, the

petrol pump). With a pol ���tico of ���cida critical against the race of nuclear armament, a

waste of imagination, intelligent di���logos, and a guide of extraordinary composition that warns

of the consequences that derive from the interference in other people's wars, ("" the deceased, however dear they

are, will do without funeral, not being What dead and dangerous flesh ""), The night of the living dead

is an excellent example of how to create fears without means, while the story continues under the titles of

cr ���dito.

" 1

" Sighs of the Heart part of a good premise that unfortunately has not been able to capture or develop

properly in the film, making it predictable and slightly boring.

At present, a large number of the Hollywood comedies of the forties and fifties are

really interesting to us because of the ingenuity that characterized them. Yes, of course, in most cases that

ingenuity was part of a large advertising campaign: it had to show the American dream without a hint

of sordidness, corruption, vice. A clear exponent is the great Frank Capra. With Sighs of the Heart, Enrique

Gabriel intentionally takes the path marked by those classics through a modern and

ut ��� �pica. Fernando Valbuena de Montijos (Roger Coma) is a young and promising businessman who is about to

close the best deal of his life, but this is completely upset when he sees all the predictions of

his hor��� scopo are met, and goes to his neighbor (Alejandro Awada) in search of advice. Finally, Fernando will

desperately search for the magazine's editorial to get his next horoscope before closing the contract.

Enrique Gabriel poses the film as a tribute to a magazine of fotonovelas (the publication Idilio) that

really existed in the Buenos Aires of the 1950s, as well as to some of the people who made it

possible. Sighs of the Heart has a promising start, but little by little the story is losing steam. It

is a new example of something very abundant in the cinema, a good initial idea that has not been

developed or captured in a good film. Enrique Gabriel has also gone hand in hand with ingenuity, and has

ended up turning the tape into a cloying cake not suitable for diabetics. It has ups and downs in the rhythm,

and there is some scene that another one that arrives to cause foreign shame, like the confrontation between the two old

exiled combatants, one Italian and another Spanish. The interpretations are generally correct, although

two stand out, unfortunately for different reasons: while Roger Coma is forced at all

times, the debutant Mar���a Dupl���a is seen with ease, performing avery natural and interpretation

fresca.Suspirosof the heart of a good premise that unfortunately has not been abletranslate not

properly develop the film, making her slightly predictable and boring.

" 0

" Children's film suitable for all public, from the smallest to the largest, to see with

eyes like saucers

I do not know that they have the zarig���ellas, but they are fashionable. The last two movies I've seen of animation

appear these nice little animals which in my life will see in freedom. By the way, what a rare family,

with a turtle patriarch without turtle, a skunk daughter looking for love, a raccoon trying to be adopted,

a squirrel, a subfamily of zarig��� they and some playful porcupines (who sharetasks

family, by the way). And the bad blood of the humans who want to exterminate them, really. In short, the

film is about a strange family of animals that rise from their hibernation and discover that they

are surrounded by a luxurious urbanization, where before to a leafy forest. As they have run out of

food, they are advised by a raccoon to obtain the food of humans, with the dangers that this

entails. But the patriarch of the family, a turtle, does not see anything clear about the plan, which causes thefalter.

family unit toThese films, by definition, I like very much. And if they are good, well, I like them

more. In this case we find a film about the unity of the family, about diversity and

equality, about progress, about the coexistence of humans with other beings on Earth, about

teamwork , even, about love. And it is already known that these films have to morass moralina

on all sides so that older people can say "" I see it for the values ​​it instills "" and not because we

enjoy movies of children's animation. The plot is quite childish, which is very appropriate given that it

is geared for children. The argument develops quite agile, with few moments of narrated moral, which

is to be welcomed. And he has many moments of humor for everyone. Special mention deserves, in the Spanish version,

the dubbing of Luis Merlo in the turtle body. It seems to me that it is the role of his life and that if that turtle

spoke, it would have to be with that voice. Resuming, a child film suitable for all the public, from the m�� Small

to the largest. To see with eyes like plates, in the same way that children see it.

" 1

" What could have been an unpretentious and moderately entertaining Hollywood product like the

original, becomes a more action film.

Before entering fully into the analysis of the film, we will spend a moment talking about those

small pieces that largely determine the success or failure of a film: the tr���ilers. Most of

them are extremely false, and that of Bourne's Ultimtum is no exception. What is less usual

is to see in them errors of bulk as, when speaking of southern Europe, mention is made of London and T���nger, which is not even

a European city, and instead omits Madrid, which by the way is the southernmost European city of all

those cited. Leaving aside this small claim, Bourne's Ultimtum is the final chapter of one of

the trilogies of profitable actions of recent years. On this occasion, the spectator witnesses the

inquiries and inquiries that Jason Bourne makes across the world to (finally, and it was about time) find his

true identity and recover his memory. What could have been an unpretentiousHollywood product

and moderately entertaininglike the original, becomes a more action film, of the montón. And is that

Bourne's Ultimtum is full of commonplaces, and most of the plot is easily predictable. The

length of the tape is obviously excessive, and Paul Greengrass does not manage to print enough intensity,

causing the set to lose packing and interest. The action scenes are well saved, although sometimes

the fact of being shot on the shoulder can raise a headache. All this leads to a

forced, absurd and foreseeable outcome that will leave the Bourne fans indignant. The highlight of the film is the

presence of great actors such as David Strathairn, Albert Finney and Scott Glenn. The Bourne Ultim���tum is another

of many Hollywood action films, that will entertain the most enthusiastic of the genre, and that puts an end

to one of the most popular sagas of these years. Or at least, we hope so.

" 0

" The movie is fine to sit with your popcorn one rainy Sunday and not get up more than to piss (or

for more popcorn). Personally I liked the movie, although it must be admitted that it is a little fart.

What can be expected from a film that includes in its name a scary bug, the word

cacer���a and the word bloody? Well, that, a movie of bichas (as they say in the south) fat, who make a

bloody hunt (which jokes more bad) with a panda of greedy who want to become richer that the

Kasogui (as it is written). It turns out that snakes live in a zone of the jungle where aorchid grows

bloody(more red and it goes that shoots). And pharmaceutical laboratories, which do not know the existence of

anacondas, discover that these orchids are cojonudas to make you immortal. I do not understand well because they

want to fuck the business of curing people by creating a medicine that makes you immortal, but it is so.Total,

that the typical expedition is mounted, with the t� The good ones, the brainless, the funny black, the rough grind

that dazzles the solid, the one you see the second scene that will die devoured by all the snakes of the

world and a couple of armadillos and the simple carnaza. They come to the Amazon and the weapon of God is Christ. That if the

scales are loaded a crocodile with his hands, if a spider bites me, that if that one that seemed foolish is the most

cabrio and wants to get rich, that if the snakes are hungrier than me at 3 o'clock in the morning, etc. At the

end, what we all know already happens, so I do not tell it. The movie is fine to sit with your popcorn on a

rainy Sunday and not get up more than to piss (or for more popcorn). Personally I liked the movie, although itadmitted

must bethat it is a little fart. But to me all the bug movies are cool, heh, heh.

" 0

" It is a film to smile and to delight us with a character full of life who runs towards his dream.

Occasionally there are films that go unnoticed with so much summer blockbuster. Betweenmissions

impossibleand tired codes, between mutants and supermen, there is a place for small and delicious films

as at the time it was A franc 14 pesetas. It is also the case of Burt Munro: a dream, a legend, a

fairly correct translation but less passionate than its original title: The world���s fastest Indian. The

film, directed by a Roger Donaldson in "" indie "" plan, as Philip Noyce wanted to be, becomes

a nostalgic, autumn delight but full of energy with a monster of the interpretation as is Anthony

Hopkins. As in many products that depend on a total and absolute protagonist, there is a risk of falling into

gloating and excessive protagonism, worth the redundancy. A case not too serious was the magnificent Cast

away (N���ufrago), with a colossal Tom Hanks but with the great excuse of being on a desert island. Whohim

could makean antagonist? :) The dream of Burt Munro is very simple: he wants to run with his 1920 Indian in

Bonnieville, USA, a paradise for all those who want to beat speed records. Let's not forget that

we are in the 60s and that the protagonist lives in New Zealand. The only thing that Burt has clear is that he wants to

run and will do what it takes to get to the race. But what is even clearer is that he must live his life and

his passions. The film becomes a journey full of characters of the most diverse and

comic, emotional and even delirious situations. So attractive is the journey that the objective of the film takes a back

seat and what we feel is a true envy of the vitality that Hopkins gives to Burt through

his interpretative power. It is a film for to smile and to delight us with a character full of life who

runs towards his dream. A great lesson of cheerful cinema without ���o���er���as. A great vital lesson in which we can

change the variable of the motorcycles for any other that fills our lives.

" 1

" Alejandro Gonz���lez Iríritu has once again shown off with this impressive universal drama that will not leave

anyone indifferent (I hope you will be many ) to see it. It is not perfect, but nevertheless that is what

makes it more intimate.

There are people who are repetitive and pedantic, tiresome and not creative at all. The prodigious t���ndem formed by

Alejandro Gonz���lez I������rritu and Guillermo Arriaga could say that he does not fulfill any of these adjectives, that is,

quite the opposite: sometimes the structure of his films is repeated (three of them go with it), itnever

willturn out to be tiresome. The trick? Here is no trick. One is born as born, and this pair of geniuses are

born as they were born. After Amores perros (which I have yet to see immediately) and 21 grams (that drama

that destroys the day anyone and yet is formidable), Irritu and Arriaga have decided to finish the

triology of (in) communication with Babel. As the first was located in Mexico, the director's native country

, the second stepped American land and was located in a city of the country. The last one does not step on one

single terrain, but treads different and distributed throughout the world (Morocco, Mexico, Japan and the United

States). So we could call Babel a universal film that, at the same time, evidently speaks of

incommunication and despair, although in a somewhat moderate way - This last one, to be, of

clearcourse. I will explain. In 21 grams the drama that was presented was of a caliber, for me, that surpassed the

hardness. It was an incredibly dramatic film. But in Babel, perhaps what has been taken care of more has been the

transmission through the aesthetics and not the extreme dramatization. And that has been a relief for me. Not because the

other one was bad, I already commented before that much less, but I think that so many things at the same time would have left the

spectator with a horse depression. So let's talk about the aesthetic. As in any author's film, Babel

presents a dazzling, captivating, varied (never better said) and overwhelming (in many cases) aesthetic. But

as in every author's film, the film's argument, or rather, the story, is reflected by its

aesthetics. Therefore, the ribbon of Irritu is a story (or rather several or one fragmented) with a

static impregnated in it really disconcerting. I believe that this great aesthetic is due to the

frequent change of situations, countries and cultures. For example: the director has chosen a certain type and

different millimeters to shoot each country. What I do not know is with how many millimeters each one has rolled,

until then I do not arrive. But what this makes clear is that this perfectionist filmmaker, in addition to telling us

overwhelming stories located in different worlds and cultures, rolls each of them with aaesthetic

certain. So in short, we would say that Babel presents several different aesthetics that, however little

they resemble, qualify the film as extremely detailed. The story of the Tower of Babel told the

story of a group of men who wanted to build a tower that would exceed the limit of heaven, the power of

God. Therefore, he punished them by changing the language to each one so that they could not understand each other and so,

therefore, they could not build the tower. Alejandro Gonz���lez Iríritu and Guillermo Arriaga have taken advantage of this idea

to create the basis of their story, so he deduced before seeing it, that he could promise a lot. I see it and itme

dazzles, but I do not know why, it gives me the sensation that this lack of communication is not reflected in

some aspects (om���s, bien , I have not known how to find it). Well, these "" some "" are reduced to one, because the

only story that has no relation to incommunicado detention (for me) is that of Moroccan children. ��is Although

maybe it's me who does not see it, but of course I see this very bad communication in relationships like those of Brad Pitt and

Cate Blanchett, that of the Japanese girl with, pr��� the whole world (since it is precisely deaf and dumb,

which complicates the thing even more) and the more than evident lack of communication between the Americans and Mexicans (v. take

in the sublime border scene). So the only failure I see Babel is this lack of

communication that promises so much publicity of the film and that nevertheless, in one of the central stories, it

does not presence. In any case, this is a complex analysis film, so if this little detailnot

hasbeen made clear to me, it's because, as complex as it is, I have not captured or simply is not. Babel is, like the

two previous films of the triology, a puzzle of stories that cross each other. Although here thepoint

centralof all the stories is that metaphor of the Tower of Babel, Irritu has not hesitated to structure the

film in a way similar to the others. s: disordered and crisscrossed. However, as with violence

and drama, the filmmaker has moderated and has preferred to structure his film in a more orderly and

understandable way. I think that this option is totally favorable, either by self-understanding (21 grams must be

seen twice to capture it from beginning to end) or simply to moderate and focus more on the

story and not in the frenetic displacement of sequences. It is, Babel, really a film that is understood and

listened to as one understands and listens to life itself. Babel is, without a doubt, the closest to the

confusions and problems that arise today in our lives. As always, Alejandro has surrounded himself with a

brilliant cast with actors from his native country. What is most striking here is the appearance of the, no longer

so, star Brad Pitt, who undoubtedly plays a formidable role full of tension and suffering. Cate Blanchett,

who plays his wife, in the few moments that he appears speaking normal (before he receives the shot)

is also great, although I must admit that he then does very well as a suffering mother - it does not

stop bleeding - for its children that is the other side of the planet. Gael Garc���a Bernal (who had already worked with the

director in Amores perros) makes an unforgettable performance with an outcome that one can already imagine.

But the one that for me stands out above all is Adriana Barraza (who also appeared in thefirst film

director's), playing the child of the children of Pitt and Blanchett who commits a huge imprudence from

which she would have to be saved on her own. Undoubtedly, it plays a magnificent role that I hopewill

the Golden Globetake with it. Rinku Kikuchi (the Japanese actress who plays the young deaf-mute) also does

her work excellently, even if she has a role, for me, excessively antipathetic (more manna, or at least I

think). The rest of the cast is just as excellent, even if it has actors who are not practically known

(highlighting, for example, Koji Yakusho, a Japanese actor with quite a reputation in his country). �s). Among theaspects

technical, I would highlight the beautiful photograph of the habitual collaborator of the director Rodrigo Prieto and the

overwhelming music of the collaborator Gustavo Santaolalla, who presents a series of reallysongs.

beautifulResuming: Babel is an essential film (probably one of the best of the year) where the

circumstances produced are the result of pure chance. It has performances that exceed normal and an

unbeatable aesthetic. Alejandro Gonz���lez Iríritu has once again shown off with this impressivedrama

universalthat will not leave anyone indifferent (I hope you will be many) that the see It is not perfect, but

nevertheless that is what makes it more intimate.

" 1

" Bad erotic film by the good of Tinto Brass, a director who, from time to time, delights us with some

good moments in his filmography (no, it does not happen in this film). ���simo film).

"" Paprika is the pseudonym of a sensual girl who, to earn money for her boyfriend, gets a whore (according

to the movie a lot of times ) in a brothel where, from the first day, he will begin a successful "" career "

that will take him to different brothels in different Italian cities in the late seventies." "Mala pel� Erotic

film of the good of Tinto Brass, a director who, from time to time, delights us with some good moments in

his filmography (no, it does not happen in this most recent film) Character, in addition, pseudohistorical, when portraying the

last moments of the life of the great brothels in the Italy of the eighties, shortly before the Government

ordered to close them , it is, in fact, a very, very, very boring movie. The dialogues are painful, although

there is some more or less accurate puja about the Church and its relationship with the s cited brothels, and the

interpretations are of pity. You can not even say that the protagonist is beautiful or beautiful, because her

bottom is wrinkled and her teeth rather ugly. That's right, she has two nice tits , as Tinto shows us again and again,

and a total desverg���enza to flake at the slightest occasion (well, not her, if not her character). Some

sets, very ornate, of the different brothels , they have it here and it is seen that the people in charge of the

artistic direction have worked theirs, but the rest is a chorrrada of tomo and loin, becoming heavy and

endless, since, if the above were not enough, it is very long. And it shows, ���vaya if it shows!

" 0

" A correct approach, and above all, the return of Sarah Michelle Gellar to the screens, make El

regreso a film, at least, striking. Although do not expect anything from the other world.

Far away were those golden days of horror movies that gave us unforgettable titles such as At the

end of the stairs, The Exorcist or Hellish Possession. After many years in which the great studios did not

even produce this genre, the supernatural Thriller has resurged lately with great force, being rare

the month that we do not have any Filn horror film on the billboards. But as often happens, quantity does not mean

quality, and most of the films that deal with these subjects suffer from an enormous lack of originality,

their arguments being an irritating simplicity; with the exception, of course, of the Japanese, who sometimes

sin just the opposite and are difficult to understand because of their strange development. Asif Kapadia, who is

called the director, faces his second incursion into the cinema, after his acclaimed first feature, The Warrior,

which garnered a significant amount of awards and was acclaimed by the public and critics there for the year 2003. The

return tells the story of a young businesswoman who begins to have terrifying visions about a murder

that took place many years ago, and although it is not something that is especially novel, the truth is that the subject

is well thought out, and superbly played by its protagonist, Sarah Michelle Gellar, whose return to

the screens after embodying the famous Buffy Vampire Slayer for seven seasons is one of the

main incentives offered by the production. It should be noted, as a curiosity, that the project arose because of

the need of the scriptwriter, Adam Sussman, to write something on this subject, induced by the impression received

after knowing a loss staff of a good friend.

" 0

" It is the version of the ultra body that lessens its potential (this includes the unforgivable

absence of a certain distinctive element of the saga) and its second reading is too exposed.

To be the fourth version of a well-known story, Invasi���n (2007) seems not to have learned the lesson

very well. What had to be the Hollywood entry of the German director Oliver Hirschbiegel remains in a

medium adaptation that is not only the most liberties is taken in the original novel by Jack

Finney, but even fails to reach the minimum of g disfrute enjoyment nero to those who knew how to get their

three previous versions. To what extent this is the fault of the director or of the producers who put their hands

(among whom is Joe Silver, father of this creature) I do not know. I can only say that the result is

far below what was expected, and that the ultra-bodies seem to have suffered their first serious defeat in

their invasion of the Earth. by all, Invasi���n does not need great

explanatory preludes: it is already known from the beginning that an extraterrestrial race is takingby assault

our planet, and it does so in the form of a virus that spreads after the fall to Earth from one of our

own space artifacts. This virus spreads through our system (something that the film crushesand

againagain in unnecessary computer sequences) and turns humans into extraterrestrial clones. The

main one of the affected cities is Washington DC, place where the psychiatrist Carol Benell (interpreted by

Nicole Kidman in a change of sex of the protagonist) discovers in his patients a strange paranoia that makes them

believe that their loved ones no longer they are the same. The rest we already know: the alien replicants soon

begin to increase in numbers and to put pressure on humans, who must flee while they seek a

cure. It is in their already known instances where Invasi He gets his best fruits. In itself, the fact that it

takes place in a big city makes it clear that it is the Phillip Kauffman version (released in 1978) that has

served as the main source of inspiration, something that it shows in those scenes in which the invasion is taking

place in front of the nose of the main character, as well as in the presence of Ver���nica Cartwright in a

small paper. Likewise, those moments in which the ultra bodies make a group presence and harass the

doctor are quite good and intense, but this can hardly be considered an own thing since it is

something that we have already seen in other three times Even so, great moments are reached, especially those

that concern a criminally wasted Daniel Craig whose participation is reduced to little more than the

mans of turn. This version of the ultrabodies is missing in their already much commented action scenes,

which on several occasions seem to be stuck with shoehorn and do not come very close, with what you can tell from leagues that

were an imposition. In the studio to lighten the pace of the film. These scenes are almost always limited

to a chase in a very poor and repetitive car, in which we see the aliens behave like

intelligent zombies (similar that is reinforced in the way the virus spreads), something that istune

completely out ofwith what has already been seen. In addition, the typical plot of the child in danger becomes too relevant and distracts

the film from delving into the subtext of conformism and egalitarianism that "seems" to be the center of

history, a subtext that deals with the perennial presence of conflict in the human race and that, in a very interesting way at the

beginning, links this film with other classics like Ultim��� tum to the Earth (1951).

Pity that, at the end, the "" message "" of the film becomes too obvious and seems to be highlighted in

such a way that even the fuzziest of the room can realize . The outcome, due to this, is easy and unsightly

, far from that seen in other versions, even in its immediate predecessor, that Abel Ferrara

released in 1993.Invasi���n, therefore, will not happen �� to be a film easily forgotten, perhaps remarkable

only as a vehicle of exploitation of Nicole Kidman. As a genre, it is the version of the ultra body that lessens

its possibilities (this includes the unforgivable absence of certain distinctive element of

the saga) and its second reading is too exposed. In short, until the next remake.

" 0

" Extraterrestrial tragicomedy that despite being full of vitality is more bitter than sweet and confirms

that Santiago Lorenzo has an extraordinary talent without the need of budgets and with an interesting script.

Lorenzo breaks my heart again.

What a good storyteller is Santiago Lorenzo! A decade after Mam��� is boba returns to the cinemas

to tell us the story of two characters played by two serious candidates to the Goya: Arturo, a

miserable who loses everything (brilliant Diego Mart� )N) and Onofre (dazzling Juan Antonio Quintana), an

old man who participates in the project "" Second youth "" and that for 40? monthly provides "" a home "" to

young people who provide minimal care. The movie is an extraterrestrial tragicomedy that despite being full of

vitality is more bitter than sweet and confirms that Santiago Lorenzo has an extraordinary talent without the

need of budgets and with an interesting script and a handful of actors in a state of grace makes thepossible. I

miraclehope I do not have to wait another ten years to see his third movie

" 1

" Film about a rat that wants to be a chef and a boy who does not know what he wants. Another smallsuperaci���ny and

masterpiece oflove for the family, which will enchant the youngest and that will give hunger to the elderly.

Director: Brad Bird.Duration: Closer to two hours than the hour and a half.Standing: August 3,

2007. Many times I have been accused of fattening the critics of animation films, which may well be

true, but now that I have family that tastes children's DVDs, this fattening does not know if it will take me to put more

than 5 stars to any. Warned you are. And it is that, if a Sunday at 7:30 you have already had breakfast, you have

dressed, you have drawn, made constructions and what you have left is to see a chef's rat, while your little one is

accommodated in the lap to scream and jump when mice come out, that is not valued with stars. The

film is about a rat that is a haute cuisine lover. In their family, of thousands of inhabitants, theynot

dounderstand that hobby, since they only eat garbage and do not want any contact with humans. One day,

by chance, our rat meets a boy who would like to be a cook, and who works in the restaurant of the

deceased chef that our rat likes. As almost always with these people, the technical quality of the work

is more than remarkable, with a humanization of the rat that contrasts with its congeners. The use of hair hasme a

surprisedlot, given that it is very natural, nothing apelzamado as it could be in animals of so much fur. The script

is a movie for the whole family. It shows us that no matter how small or different you are, you can always

reach your goals. And, of course, that as family there is nothing. Maybe this is the only black point in thethe

movie, butrats are so delicious cooking. He does not have humorous points that provoke laughter,

but he does leave that feeling that the world is good and that you only have to do a bit of your part to

change it. Resumiendo, pel��� about a rat that wants to be a chef and a boy who does not know what he wants.

Another small masterpiece of superaci���ny and love for the family, which will enchant the youngest and that will giveelderly

hunger to the. How beautiful! Besitos.PD: The rest of Sunday I dedicated it to cooking three fires. I have

tuppers for the whole week. PD2: The scene in which the father gets excited and the baby looks at him with the face of "" Do you want

the tete? "" You will not see it in the DVD extras ;-)

" 1

" Anguish, claustrophobia, tenderness and talent gathered under the exceptional baton of John Houston. Something

like the Vienna Philharmonic directed by Karajan.

Those who nowadays catalog of psychological horror any film in which there are two

silences, should take a look at many productions of the 40's and 50, which, like this, demonstrate how the tension

can be maintained and provoke a certain sense of anguish just by playing with the silences, the

short shots and the Cayo Largo, directed by John Houston, tells the story of a former

World War II fighter who arrives at a small hotel in Los Cayos, Florida, to see the father

and widow of a company ���ero of trenches. Unexpectedly, he finds a gang of mobsters

staying at the establishment, and the real movie begins there. From Humphrey Bogart, little can be said that is

not known, although in my opinion n, the interpretative weight and the brightest of the performances, is the one that falls

on Edward G. Robinson, one of those actors who, by the whims of fate, does not enjoy all the recognition and

fame deserved by his enormous talent. Of Lauren Bacall, we will not discover anything either, while Claire

Trevor received an Oscar for her performance. As I said before, this film provokes a wide range of

sensations, which go through tenderness, intrigue, claustrophobia, anguish and restlessness; all this due to a

great guide and an exemplary direction. On the negative side of the scale, a somewhatoutcome

hastyand certain ups and downs in the pace of development could be placed; but without greater importance or importance.

Undoubtedly,a classic film, which only the fact that coetneo of titles peaks deprived of occupying a place

elevated ms in the Olympus of cinema.

" 1

" A great movie with a great colof���ny and great current value. The man who remains incorruptible and

clinging to his principles has everything to gain? in their own way.

King Vidor directed in 1949 this magnificent film starring Gary Cooper and Patricia Neal. It is based

on a novel adapted to film script by its author, Ayn Rand. Howard Roark is aarchitect

modernist and totally groundbreaking. But the really modern and breakthrough of this man is his integrity and honor.

After spending a lot of time being rejected by his totally "revolutionary" ideas about architecture, he moves on

to another type of work that will assign him what he has always tried to achieve: his creative freedom. One of

the things that It can throw back the spectators with prejudice, they are excessively

direct, too poetic and with almost philosophical sentences that today are not exactly abundant. However

, they are sparkling dialogues, magnificently written and that gives the character of Cooper an entity as

valuable and wonderful as the message of the film itself. To give a reference of the quality of the di���logos

could give the example of Eva to the nude. Another important point of the great dialogues is that they greatly enhance

the moments in which they are not used, in which they are played with looks and indirect sentences, as in the case

of the romance with Dominique Francon (Neal). The film is a complete plea in favor of individualism. As complete

and direct as it can be Live as you want in favor of communism. However, the script rests on aadvantages

palpable reality: the man who remains incorruptible and clinging to his principles has all theof winning?

in their own way. It may sound too naive, but the story of Roark, the architect who did not bend to the

mandates and taste of the majority, manages to realize his dream without renouncing his convictions. But for this he knows

that he has to pay a "social" price: to remain without work, to endure the criticism of fools who do not think for

themselves, to support the charity of those who succeed without their own merits and worst of all, to see how others

admire him and trust him to stop holding and surrender to the mandates of the majority. The great Gary Cooper gives

the character of Howard Roark a serenity and enviable integrity, with a vital attitude as clear and coherent

as simple to understand: the achievements of a society are achieved based on ideas that people can

glimpse. It is therefore essential to guarantee individual freedom to ensure thatall

we canenjoy those fruits of people with initiative and love for what they do. A characterand

as honesthonest as Roark not only provokes rejection in those sheep that follow the guidelines established by a

manipulated and manipulated majority. It is also a beacon for those who have reneged on everything they consider

right, such as Dominique Francon, architecture critic of The Banner, newspaper directed by Gail

Wynand. (Raymond Massey) The two of them will be the characters that learn the most in this story, sincetalent

Roark's incorruptiblewill be for them the ideal they denied and the courage they assumed. non-existent.A

great movie with a great colof���ny with great current value. Very indicated for those who know that they do not

fold to the fashions, neither to the majority ones nor to the minority ones that they presume of alternatives counting on that

the time says that they were in the correct thing. The good thing about the individualism portrayed in this film is that if

you let someone prosper in what they really love, we all win. And it is not something that socialism

defends.

" 1

" The most experienced will solve the cheating game with more anticipation than others, but the sensation of

all at the end of the long function I think it's the same as having completed a complex sudoku.

In the last few years, few directors have pointed so many ways shortly after starting their career as

Christopher Nolan. I can not think of a more resounding presentation letter, such as having directed and written

Memento, an original, cerebral and seductive power that, shortly after its release (year 2000), he

turned it into a cult movie instantly. It's logical that the most attractive anddeals

wealthyrained right after this phenomenal success. His next work, another thriller with

characters in distressing situations, already featured outstanding actors such as Al Pacino. Insomnia is

an interesting film, but of little brilliance. This film was followed by his debut in a superproduction with

Batman Begins. Nolan once again demonstrated his ability to make art with almost everything he touches, whether or not he has billions

behind him. For all the story had deposited so many expectations in The final trick (The

Prestige), and for that reason, some we have stayed with the honey on the lips this time. The film is limited to

offer the typical game of Russian dolls in which the viewer is conjecturing what is hidden at the end of each

storyline. The more seasoned will solve the cheating game with more anticipation than others, but the

sensation of all at the end of the long function. I do not think it's the same as having completed a complex sudoku. He does

not even finish hooking the friendship story turned into hatred between two of the best magicians of his

time. And in spite of the fact that all its artistic elements (performances, costumes, or photography) are scratched at a

height more than estimable, one has the feeling of having attended a excessively cold tape and

worried about jealously hiding all its plot nooks. It is curious that this film has

coincided with another of similar context as The Illusionist and that, in both cases, the magic has shone m��� It's

fine by its absence. It seems that, after so much trickery, in none of the two jobs have we managed to see

the coveted prestige that every great magician must offer at the end of his performance.

" 0

" If you feel something in the mouth of the stomach looking so happy to all the friends of Soderberg you do not have

to worry. It's called arcades. And it happens when the movie ends.

The actors of the Ocean? Sa saga have a reputation for having fun with the shootings and then promoting the

film. They talked about her in Cannes with the same irony as if they had just invented, they alone, the irony. They

look like the characters in that book "" FISH "" that explains, inspired by the sublime example of a fishery, what

are the rules that must be remembered so that the working climate is positive and not a dumping ground for

energy Fame is, sometimes, a sweet lady who gives her favors to the one who deserves them the least (

Lament is as good for the book as it is for the film). The trilogy Danny Ocean's story consists of stories of

great fortunes that change hands, millionaires and nice men who deserve to be. In the

first, the 11, the character of Clooney and Andy Garc���a compete in the field of ingenuity, money and,

above all, in the heart of Julia Roberts. In the second one, they came to Europe to play with athief

Europeanwho, from all of them, peered further, the dollar or the euro? The third travels the beaten path of

revenge. Soderbergh transmits his camaraderie with the cast and also with the public. His style is to

treat us as equals, so do not waste our time. Practice the ellipsis as an accomplice who does not want to

bother us. We should thank you, above all, if you are the owner of the video-club that will be indispensable for all

those who want to understand what has happened. Tunnel boring machines, dice factories, computer programs Athletes who read in

the pupil if a winner has cheated. There is an irrepressible inclination in Soderberg to leave us epatados,

either with the magnificence of Las Vegas casinos, or with the sophistication of the methodsthieves

of Las Vegas casino. One of the pieces necessary for the coup, the dice factory, suffers a strike by

the workers. For the protagonists the most unexpected surprise is to discover the ridiculousness of the amount of the

sum of all the labor demands of a picket. It is comforting to know how much it repays everyone

as the rest of the mortals live. It is very close to how much we care about the rest of mortals how they live.

If you feel something in the mouth of your stomach, seeing all the friends of Soderberg so happy, you do not have

to worry. It's called arcades. And it happens when the movie ends.

" 0

" The fact is that maybe a little scared, maybe vaccinated for everything with Inland Empire running through my

veins, I find a touching story about innocence from a very, very, very son

of a bitch. This is like Lynch's, you have to see her.

I know that illustrious people like Max Renn or my teacher of History of Cinema left unbearable and I

go and I find a surprise like a piano: Tideland is one of Gilliam's movies that more I like it. It has

touches Solondz or Von Trier, but it is 100% Gilliam and the first half hour is masterful.what happens, Inot

Thendoplan to spoil, and the movie is carried by that character in a surprising, spooky way,

dir�� �a me. The Note, kir, Jeff Bridges is tremendous almost a decade after and Brendan Fletcher can not

say no more. The fact is that maybe a little scared, maybe I'm vaccinated for everything with Inland Empire running through

my veins, I find a touching story about innocence from a very, verypoint of view

fuckinguntil it seems like the Texas killing. Lynch, you have to see her.

" 1

" Halfway between criticizing the world of fashion or defending it as an artistic-cultural movement,

changing its position from one scene to another.

In case anyone thinks that in this movie there may be some surprise notice that in the following lines you will

find some light spoiler on the first half hour. This goes for a rebellious girl (Anne Hathaway) who

goes out with a cook who is rebellious and with some bohemian (and rebellious) friends. The girl goes to a

job interview in the most important fashion magazine in the world (the rebels of today are like that) where she

is accepted even though she knows nothing about fashion or of the magazine or of his famous and desp���tica boss (Meryl

Streep). At the beginning things are not going well and, for some reason that escapes me, everyone is engaged She

says she is fat even though it is evident that she is quite thin. The fact is that the girl begins to

dress in fashion and suddenly the professional success smiles at her (until she looks thin, at last). As his friends and

boyfriend are very rebellious, they turn their backs on his professional success, proving that they are also a little

meme. The rebellious girl will have to face all those problems and find herself (whatever that may be

). This is the theme of "" The Devil wears Prada "" (The Devil Wears Prada), David Frankel's film that was

presented out of competition at this year's Venice Festival (that the shame falls on them) and that

has had certain cr�� Positive practices The excess of alcohol in blood during the projection does not help to

appreciate a film and thus the criticisms that come out (that is if those critics had Vistoan seen, of course,

that there is everything). The fact is that the film is halfway between criticizing the world of fashion (aworld

patheticin which the appearance is Only important and that is, at least, partially guilty of thousands of

depressions and self-esteem problems around the world) or defend it as an art-cultural movement,

changing position from one scene to another. Funcionacula works as very very basic entertainment for a

silly afternoon in front of the TV but nothing more. The only thing that stands out is the presence of Stanley Tucci and, above

all, Meryl Streep who, in a couple of scenes, leaves a few brushstrokes of his infinite talent to fill the

screen and transmit emotions even in the most hollow of the productions. I hope we can see her soon in

a film at her height and not in a product like this, which is the most conventional that can be seen today in

theaters .

" 0

" Inspired to be inspired, Todd Field has achieved a unique, special, captivating, sensitivecaptivating film

and.

I love that kind of movies that look like one thing and end up being another, totally or partially

different. With Little Children (or secret games, if you prefer) the exact same thing happens. The promotion they

did on the film was on the one hand excellent, but on the other, it was empty, as it only seemed to deal with one topic:

the tri�� Loving angle. Fortunately, the bestial film by Todd Field is much more than that: it is

a choral film, intimate, weird, terrifying and very exciting. What stands out is the wonderful gui ���n, based

on the Tom Perrota novel and written by himself and the director. Perhaps the only thing that takes away points in favor

(very few) is that Sam Mendes already directed American Beauty, in which, rather than being inspired, he takes note of it, without

copy it in no time, of course. Although there is also another thought, and is that Secret Games has as

reference (at times) to the novel of Cheever, Madame Bovary (which appears mentioned during one

of the best parts of the film) . Inspired to be inspired, Todd Field has achieved a

unique, special, captivating, sensitive and captivating film. One of the most interesting resources of the script is that

magnificent and almost perfect voiceover, which leads to the film until it almost disappears, so that we can see,

with our eyes , the fatal beginning of an outcome, which will soon be "" helped "" by this mysterious voice-over.

So I have to congratulate his writers for doing an impeccable job, worthy of veterans, although Field is not

. If the script of Secret Games is a marvel, we would say that the direction It borders on perfection. Yes, it

seems that I'm going through the movie, but it's what I've found: practically, a

masterpiece. Minimalist and oppressive at the same time, the direction of Todd Field manages tous with anforce

catchincredibleuntil we are blown up once the film is over. Not only that, but the

splendid and original montage accompanies the film to be precise, accurate. It has, the film, a couple or three of

really impressive sequences, like the one in the pool, the one in the park or the aforementioned discussion about

the novel Madame Bovary. It is precisely these scenes that enrich the film and make it a

perfectionist, unique. As I said before, this is a choral film, in which, apart from a

love triangle (narrated with an incredible pulse), the stories of a ped philo (the best ofall

them, without a doubt) and that of a retired policeman who hides a terrible past. These three interesting

stories of residents of a Massachusetts upper-middle class neighborhood combine unexpectedly to

come to a childish conclusion (in a good way, although only understanding if seen the film) where it

collides extravagantly more than one life. There was not, at least for me, better title than Little Children

for this film. As is understood throughout the film, adults behave like their

own children, that is, in a childish way and without much sense (attentive to the station scene with Patrick

Wilson). ���LIGHT SPOLIER! And this moral is fully understood once the film is over, when the

protagonists reject their dreams and ambitions to return with what they are most secure (their children, in this

case) . And here, probably, one of the best phrases of the film (that of Winslet's daughter trying

to calm his mother, which would have to be the reverse). END OF SPOLIER. The interpretations of secret

games could be a synonym of prodigious. Maybe this is the movie with better performances since Crash, to

which I find some similarities (���������SPOLIER !!! Emmerich helping Haley or Dillon helping Newton), since

all the cast is absolutely cre���ble, sensational, close. Although, within all of them, I would highlight

the immense Kate Winslet, in the best role of her career, which seems more a child than an adult; Jackie

Earle Haley, in an outstanding, perfect, terrifying and painful performance. Perhaps it is the best role of

the film, since never before had a pedophile been treated with such depth; Noah Emmerich,

where he looks especially in the outcome of the film; Phyllis Somerville as mother of ped���filo, in arole

tremendously attractive, because very rarely had the family of a pedophile been shown in a film, and the

truth is that it is indisputably tr� Logical Although they do not stand out so much, the interpretations of Patrick

Wilson and Jennifer Connelly are also great, but perhaps they do not reach the perfection of the others since the

roles are somewhat In short, it would affirm that secret games are close to mastery, being one

of the best films of the beginning of the year. Perhaps it has some other detail that is somewhat unsuccessful, such

as the rapidity and excessive frenzy that is used in the outcome, but this is simply to mention something

"bad". I did not see In the room (the previous and first film by Todd Field), but there is no doubt that, after

having seen this marvel, I think of renting it as a minimum. An absolutely incredible film.

" 1

" The respect with which Sam Raimi approached Spiderman in the first installment has been diluted in the ego of a

director accustomed to doing things his way. The result is an excessive film in many aspects,

which entertains at the start and makes you ask for the time at the end.

I am not an in-depth connoisseur of Spiderman, but I know enough to know that a character with 45 years

of history has passed through many hands and that each of them has molded it at will. This means that therenot

isa Spiderman, but many and very different, although they all share a profile that belongs to the character and

not to the screenwriter or the artist of turn. And I say this because Sam Raimi has taken to the cinema his vision of Spiderman

and, like it or not like its adaptation, the fidelity to the comic should not be what weighs the most at the time of talking about

Spiderman 3. What happens is that if the first installment Spiderman fans were quite

satisfied, I'm afraid that with the third many will be trilling. The main problem of Spiderman 3 is that The

respect with which Raimi approached the character has been diluted after three films in the ego of a director

accustomed to doing things his way. The result is an excessive film in almost all aspects: the

footage (140 minutes), the number of enemies, the superheroism of the superheroes in their eighties,battles

impossibleand Tobey Maguire doing the clown for longer than necessary. All this confirms that Raimi

has opted for a film with a lot of action and a simple plot, instead of an approach to morethemes

adult, to which a character like Spiderman is � very used. It gives the impression that the directoralready

hastired of the spider and says goodbye with a final line that hides a large plot void. They appear in

this film Poison and The Sandman, being this character the most interesting by far.is left to

Lizardlove, we will surely see in Spiderman 4, and Gwen Stacy begins to fool around with Parker. But the worst thing is

the change that Peter Parker suffers when you saw the symbiote. The habitually dumb reporter is transformed into

something like the Nicks Rivers of Val Kilmer in Top Secret. The grace would have been fine if it had lasted five

minutes and we would leave it acceptable if the thing had reached ten. The problem is that if the thing reaches the

quarter hour, including a dance number of our friend and neighbor, we have reached theridiculous

absolute. I know, that we have learned that the black suit turns him into a flat-out cabrio, it is not necessary to

insist. In summary, Spiderman 3 is a film that begins being entertaining and in the end you end up asking for the

time. Like the South Park movie, it's bigger, longer and, unfortunately, uncut. Sam

Raimi offers us everything and in large quantities, except moderation and a really interesting script. In the end, everything

is a succession of scenes without a clear glue between them, which does not mean that it lacks footage, but

quite the opposite. It is true that there are flashes of what could have been an interesting film, but

tried to please all the public, I am afraid that has angered some and left others cold . In short,

to see and forget.

" 0

" In the realm of the PlayStation, Harry's adventures force us to dust off the imagination, encourage

reading and enact fundamental principles such as love and friendship.

In the PlayStation realm, it was one of the multiple technologies, a universe in which theremains pending

subject of being human; Harry's adventures oblige to dust off the imagination, encourage reading and

promulgate fundamental principles such as love and friendship. With new screenwriter and newcomer director, the

saga magic brings us closer to a fifth, practically perfect delivery. Even for those who possess the "capacity

emotionalof a brick", resist the Potter-man It is highly difficult. Stairs that move to pleasure,

Hogwarts and its millennial emblem "" Draco Dormiens Nunquam Titillandus "" (Never tickle adragon

sleeping), "" Alohomora "", mirrors that show what you want to see, flights on a broom, "" Wingardium Levi-ou-sa "",

nocturnal escapades to forbidden forests with layers of invisibility, thinkers, porters, "" ���Petr���ficus Totalus

! "", centaurs and unicorns, paintings with life own, the and���n 9 and ���, talking newspapers, Siriux the

godfather, "" PaPicture Patronum !!! "", changing labyrinths, black lakes, the hall of the Needs or the Nimbus

2,000, are some of those things that make reborn the fantasy that, at some point, we lost. The pen of the British

writer, however, seems to have fallen into an inexhaustible well of imagination. Theadaptations

cinematographic, on the other hand, give off as much magic as the pages of their novels, at the same time that they reach

an important achievement, which is none other than a certain incitement to reading. Obviously, nobody can wait

for the Warner roll the final outcome. The answer to whether JK Rowling will be able to get rid of the

protagonist who has catapulted her to fame, as her compatriot Agatha Christie did with a certain famous

Belgian detective, is only found in a book. The Muggels, meanwhile, we wonder at whatmoment

exactarises such a perfect story. The secret of success should be sought in the exhaustive construction of

a parallel world, interrelated with the one we all know (You only have to know that the Ministry of Magic is

located just below the English Ministry of Defense), which, far from insulting the intelligence of children

(pr� Usual practice in film and literature), it is decided to develop it. In characters, based on

imperfection and involuntary heroism, who live in both scenarios, for whom Magic is not

an escape route against reality, but rather a quality of their own personalities with which they have to learn

to live. In the emission of precious messages, which depart with the one that derives from the love of a mother, the only one capable

of overcoming the evils of Humanity (also "the one" who should not be named ""), and that culminates with the assessment

that "" we all harbor light and darkness inside us, depending on us, the choice of the side we

want to promote "", to confirm that "" those who they love us, they always remain "". And in the constant evolution

of the saga, which adapts to the different ages of its protagonists. In this sense, and progressively,

the adventures focused on the acquisition of school supplies in wonderful stores will disappear, the

uniforms that remind us so much of Goodbye's students Mr. Chips, the recreation In the typical dining room that,

likewise, Sam Wood filmed in 1939, the innocent contests in whichandwere rewarded

friendshipfriendship, the famous phrase of the wise director: "In the light of the recent events. "", the departure in a

magical chess, or the skirmishes against a Lord Voldemort (���vaya, he wrote, unintentionally, his name!) extremely

weakened; to give way to other situations that require maturity. The Order of the F���nix, as surprising as

the previous deliveries, supposes the culmination of four courses of Hechicer���a, the moment in which the

obligation In studying, it becomes a necessity; or, which is the same, the point at which it begins to

grow. Our Harry has to multiply in the face of adversity, he is no longer the famous magician that everyone admires,

but the "Plotter", the deceitful conspirator, ignored by his mentor, victim of a slander that surpasses him.

It imposes selfesteem, commitment (training the army of Dumbledore) and sublevacin against themethods

dictatorialof Hogwarts. Some stages that are part of the endless school of learning that is life

itself. With such a fertile conception, followed by a solid development, it does not matter who is behind. the

cameras. Whether the same Alfonso Cuar���no a television producer, the success is assured provided that the

spectacular design of production disposes the special effects at the service of the argument, and never the reverse;

as it has been so far. Not even the original soundtrack of Williams, nor the photograph

of the first films, is added in stories in which, primarily, the script dominates, supervised by its

creator A skull "" previlegiado "", which would say Valle Incl���n, who, however, forgot to indicate something

fundamental. On vacation. How are these people, by ordinary mail, with an owl, by email?

" 1

" The film is very bad, but the stellar appearances of Tip and Coll make it imperative to watch it.

Since I was a child I wanted to see this movie, not because I was fascinated by the plot or the great actors, not even

by the suggestive poster, far from it. If not to discover what my family members were talking about when incircles

closed, while we were in pools or beaches, they commented on what bajini looks like, which pepito pools go by there. and

everyone laughs at the sight of a cushion-out bath and a cooler little man than an eight.

What time, mother m.a. The film is about a man (Don Fernando Esteso) who is a well-car salesman

known. Its areas of action are swimming pools and boit���s with surprising results, above all because it does not

know how to swim. By chance, one day he discovers throwing his seductive nets to a girl who proposes to

run a rally on the Costa del Sol. What more do you want? If we have cars, women, beach, erosism, Estesismo and

mPs. Well, I would like a little more, that the thing is too loose. And the script is very, very

loose, with a final criminal outcome. On the positive level, it has a soundtrack summit of caspism,

created exclusively for the film. Tip and Coll appear from time to time that, without having anything to do with the

development and without coming to mind, give a great point that saves the final product from the stake. Special

attention to the scene that Tip sells a car to Coll, masterly. And look, when I was little I did not understand the humor of

these people, but when I saw this film I almost fell off the chair. �cula is very bad, but

the stellar appearances of Tip and Coll make it imperative to watch it. More myth has that of

film.PD: "" Give me cream on the buttocks says Tip to Coll both sausages in their black suits "" PD2: I do not understand

why if they wanted Make a special Tip and Coll, they put the whole roll of adornment film. PS3:

Damn, in the scene that lead a Mercedes, what you see is the National I, which has changed slightly,

specifically in the edges that are now full of houses. What things.

" 0

" With so much artificial fire in the fantastic films of today, the pearls that return

to the essence that should never be lost are appreciated: fantasía , adventure, magic, love.

Stardust is a fantastic movie to use, with princes, star instead of princess, pirates, witches and a

lot of magic. How many buts can I put. Maybe the male protagonist, in the line of the new handsome heroes

, but very little thing. The story, even with many secondary elements to get the game, is drawn

something ungainly at times. But. little else, because it is well made. Filled with excellent cast characters

(like the pirate played by Robert De Niro) that go adding to a movie that of by itself works almost without

remedy. Going going, with final without noises, rom�� Only where there are and of course. happy.A film

that strangely has not had the publicity and the echo that it certainly deserves. If you can, look for it where they still

exhibit it and do not miss it.

" 1

" A great film, a story that chooses to play in the intellectual field, to finally

laugh at itself in a macabre way, with some actors who are solvent (which is not a small thing) and above all a

forceful staging and effective.

It is intuited in the career of the promising, and already consecrated, Bilbao director Alex de la Iglesia, a capacity

to face greater challenges than he had enjoyed so far. His previous films, from that

first "" Acci���n Mutante "", through works in the service of the popular Santiago Segura or El Gran Wyoming

as "" The day of the beast "" and "" Muertos de Risa "" , were productions where he already demonstrated an innate talent to

create his own world full of adorable losers, without the least interest in letting himself be carried away byfashions

prevailingand therefore capable of awakening in the spectator a nice emotional affiliation. Then I

changed perhaps a little third, resulting in his more elaborate films, with more class in the staging, and

films like "" The Community "", "" 800 bullets "" (entra���able homage to the spaghetti western, defined by himself as

marmitako western) or "" Crime ferpecto "" (this last quiz It's one of his worst films in my opinion) supposed a

step forward with respect to previous works (obviating the failed incursion through the back door of thecinema

Americanthat supposed "Perdita" Durango ""), but retaining that special touch that gives off its cinema. Perhaps the

biggest problem of all those films was precisely the very definition imposed by the filmmaker,

being almost always too parochial, with a humor rarely given to crossing borders and deliberately

freaky (in the Caribbean sense). �oso of the term). For a server, who always relied on the ability of this

filmmaker to aspire to larger companies, his latest work, "" The Oxford Crimes "", is the

consecration definitive, and let us hope that a way to transit with assiduity in his future projects (and whose

capacity already showed in his excellent episode for "" Movies not to Sleep "".) Of the Church leaves

aside his limited common places and embarks fully on the international cinema, showing signs of being a

skilled artisan (do not forget that this term has been forgotten by the worst work of filmmakers without

talent), a creator able to be passionate in his work and to create intelligentproducts. The

entertainmentplot of the film shows us how Martin (Elijah Wood) prepares to create histhesis

final mathematicalwith the help of Professor Arthur Seldom (John Hurt ), hisbeing too optimistic

hope, given that the teacher is a taciturn man, apotic and lacking the minimum sense ofempathy

emotionalwith other human beings. Martin, whose only visit to Oxford from his native United States, is due to

this purpose, sees how the death of the old woman who lives in the house where he is staying, makes the uni ���n

intellectual with Professor Seldom is a fact, with the intention of solving together a series of crimes occurredNoteable

from that death.work in the direction of Alex de la Iglesia, always

framing the point of view at the moment and the exact place, a visual part, clearly identifiable with the

great ability of the Basque filmmaker to create scenes close to the viewer, and that help to makeprogress

history. He even allows himself some luxuries where he shows the technical domain to which he has accustomed us,

like that sequence shot in the streets of the small town, where he presents the daily routines of the

series of main characters that populate such a wretched locality. Helped, that is, by an intelligent gui���n (in

collaboration with his usual scriptwriter Jorge Guerricaechevarr���a, based on Guillermo Martinez's novel),

a thorough and progressive penetration into the mathematical bases, theorems and above all, how all this affects

the teacher-student relationship and its alienation. In the world alien to them two. It is precisely in the

elaboration of this relationship where the libretto acquires its best transference to the screen, helped that if, by

an effective work of actors, especially the incombustible John Hurt, without any doubt , and despite the sought-after coldness

of the interpretation, the best of the cast, perhaps only the work of Elijah Wood asremained correct

Martin, something that, on the other hand, was to be expected before such unfair confrontation of talents. The female roles take

a back seat, being mere comparsas of the researches made by the teacher and his outstanding and

intelligent student, since both Leoner Watling (more pending to offer carnality than anything else) and Julie

Cox, they have toup underdeveloped papers (although Cox is much better than Watling in terms of

pickcredibility of the paper). There is precisely one word that perfectly describes the tone of the whole story, the

coldness to which he referred previously. Surely it will be the sensation thatprovokes in many

this storyspectators, more aware of the mathematical technical aspect that makes the story flow

smoothly through the advance of the tangible action and not so much the discovery of the intellect itself. A Of

the Church, it seems to matter little to gloat over the duels over knowledge, sure of itself and of the

mental depth that its fascinating history possesses. That's where the real conflict of the film lies,

in entering or not as a spectator in the interest that this supposedly intellectual aspect can cause (some will

call it pretentious, I do not) , which, truth be told, caused me an unusual interest, taking into account the

banality and flat and predictable aspect of the majority of recent film productions. In the choice between

brain passion, Of the Church has opted for the second, with highly satisfactory results. There is no doubt,

that in addition, this great film is very reminiscent of others developed in similar fields, with influences

that reach to remember works of criminal discovery like the films in the service of the charismatic Hercules

Poirot, the adorable Miss Marple or even the coolest and most cerebral giallo, in contrast to that other so

gimmicky. With certain film notes of the celebrated British producer Ealing (so brilliant in that

black humor that presided over works like "" The quintet of death "" u "" Eight death sentences ""), from which he

borrows some brilliant touches of ironic humor, like the resolution of history itself that, without

gutting the end, offers us the greatest macabre joke of all the history. After this demonstration of

privileged intelligence on the part of both characters, where reason and mathematics prevail in all their

decisions, they end up being the uncontrollable ones paths of passion that give the key to the whole story,

in a brilliant final note of this great director. And if it is true, that the end of the story

closes with some slight effect, a turn of gui���n that leaves some loose ends that probably would not have a

place in a completely logical analysis, let's not forget that precisely that is the final moral of the

story, the loose ends , like the motive decisions by the heart, they are always left to chance. In

short, a great film, a story that chooses to play in the intellectual field, to

finally laugh at itself. ghoulish form, with solvents actors (not little) and above all a

PUE This is a powerful and effective scene, a remarkable thriller that proves that with a talented director,

custom products become intelligent entertainments.

" 1

" Slap without a hand to? The way of the English? with which he shares a multitude of similarities but to which he

leaves at the height of bet���n.

I have decided to do the criticism of this film, because it is the best example that I can put to qualify, everything

I wanted to express when I spoke of "" The way of the English "". Well, Lila Dice is a film from 2004

(Released in 2005 I think) and that these days for those who have cable television, we can enjoy.

It is the second film by Ziad Doueiri. It is a story of teenagers in a humble neighborhood of Marseille

. Lila is a "" Lolita "" of 16 years that will drive crazy a boy named Chimo who will end up being a writer thanks

to the fact that she became the source of all her inspirations: His Musa. This story is an adaptation for the

cinema of the enigmatic French author Chimo novel. A true delight for the senses. Well directed,

believable actors and correct in their interpretations and most importantly, they represent the age they are playing

(they are not 30 years old playing teenagers). Great soundtrack, firstfirst planes

amazing, excellent gui���n and two protagonists at the height of any actor hollywoodense.Vahina Giocante

masterfully interprets Lila, the inspiring muse of Chimo. This girl is a real bomb, a beauty

similar to that of Brook Shields when she made "" The Blue Lake "". A disconcerting woman, alive, organic, believable,

great (from Oscar?) It is a very sexual tape, there is explicit sex everywhere, but what happens? That it is

a form that does not attack the spectator, with all the pornographic riddles that are said during its

development, at no time they turn out to be vile, but rather, er��� Ticas and sensual. This film is a slap

without a hand to "" The way of the English "" with which shares a multitude of similarities but which leaves the

bet���n.Os inviting reflect: Compare the master ex? dancer Vahina Giocante with ex-

dancer Mar���a Ruiz? Vahina if she is a muse able to inspire even a frog, a beauty and an eroticism to

go crazy.Compare the adaptation of both novels and how they are carried to the big screen.Compare thecasting

impeccableof "" Lila says "" with the hasty casting of "" The way of the English. "" And above all, thetreatment

sexualof both films. Se���ores, "" Lila Dice ""? is a living sample of what it means to adapt awell

novel, of what is a good movie (better or worse directed but in any case better film), than it

is an inspiring love and fuck What is a muse? Let's see if many learn from a bitch what it is to makemovies

decentand what real actors are like! Enough of so much dandruff and throwing overboard the

already insufficient budget of Spanish cinema.

" 1

" Supersonic Man does not need phone booths, he simply has to press a button of his

clock-calculator all the way to a euro and say: that the force of the galaxies is with me. Wow!

This Spanish film supposed the national response to the "" Superman "" of Donner. Where do I start? Kronos is a

masked alien who carries black badass and is sent to earth by a distant relative of

Jor-El. He leaves flying with an Abba song (or almost) and the credits are so phosphorescent that he does not read

shit. When he arrives at the land he calls himself Paul and he has a mustache. A very bad man named Dr.Gulik

(nailed to Captain Kirk of Star Trek, dresses the same, combs his hair the same and has the same fucking face) kidnaps

an elderly scientist to steal a formula For this he uses a robot that is a mixture of the

bad robot of Robocop and of ������igo the Big Brother. Supersonic Man should avoid it. Our hero, from what I

could see, He is invincible. unless legolpeen in the neck by surprise, which leaves him KO (!!!), likes to fly in

circles and performs overwhelming demonstrations of power. opening doors. Wow, Supersonic Man does not need

phone booths, he just has to press a button on his calculator clock to a euro and say:

the force of the galaxies is with me . Wow! Oh, I forgot. If you are at the bottom of the sea, locked in

a sack and surrounded by file sharks, ���tambi���n can talk! The first (and trapidantes) five minutes,

in which the attack and kidnapping, they seem one of those Publireportajes de Pascual that gave years

ago on TV. The bad guys throw leiser rays. As it's Spanish and it takes place (it's a saying) in New York, all

the bad guys are called Harrison, Peterson, Harrison, or any other name that ends up on On.Sale Quique Camoiras.

There is a drunk who comes out every time you have to make a typical joke. Quique Camoiras is great in his cameo

making stuttering jokes, very high comedy. There is a fight of the before, of those who are cool, just missing

Terence Hill and Bud Spencer. The bad guy is so bad that he quotes Shakespeare or Julio C���sar (I mean he quotes

phrases of the two, not that with them in a pub) Supersonic Man raises stone carton tractors that

have Acme written on the side. The battle against the robot, spectacular cl���max, solves Supersonic Man.. It

Giving it a flying kickcould be like this for days, three sheets of notes for the movie. Worse even than

"" Ultraviolet "" but infinitely more fun. A 2. (But you're a motherfucker).

" 0

" Two artists, two magicians, faced with a single final, be the best. But there are battles in which there are no

winners or losers but the destruction that leaves in its wake the fight in which everyone loses and gains something.

The Prestige (I refuse to call it the "" The Final Trick "" is absurd ") is a film that shows howcan

obsessiontransform us to the point of becoming people in whom We believe we can become

converts. Two artists, two magicians, faced with a single final, be the best. But there are battles in which

there are no winners or losers but the destruction that leaves in their wake the battle in which everyone loses and

gains something. This is to see Batman (Christian Bale) and Wolverine (Hugh Jackman) converted in magicians is the cane.

Personally I have a great weakness for Christian (For my taste the most credible and best-played batman

in history), His performance as Borden is magnificent, lightly touching the psychopath ���a. Looks sharpened

with the steel of the best swords, that are stuck in your pupils and do not let you see anything but that

karma that gives off everything in each scene. On this occasion I can not skin anyone, because I have already said that

the actors are all tremendous, as the voluptuous and sexy Scarlett (learns Pataki) is always

tremendous. correct in all its intentions.Although at a certain moment the scene of the birds, can begin to

reveal what is the double side of the matter, it could even have gone unnoticed, but too much emphasis

on the issue of doubles " That trick is only possible with a double "" which is already becoming predictable, something

that does not quite like me at all, another example are phrases like "" Nobody cares about the box "" I think theynot

arenecessary, As I say, there always comes a point where you insult the intelligence of the spectator. More thanof

onethem seems like a movie, I'm going to leave it in a good movie I recommend seeing. As anecdote

during the first minutes of the film we can count on the presence of Piper Perado (Violet in Coyote Ugly)

that after clunkers such as George and the Dragon will begin to emerge in the next projects that have for

2007 and 2008.

" 1

" One of the best movies that will be seen in years, not only for herself, but for what she represents.

We know The Simpsons better than our family because we are dealing with the artifact of some geniuses.

It is true that today American TV has almost the best writers that exist. True

workers of the gui���n, who work in series that have nothing to do with each other and still make

true Masterpieces. They deal with different tones, different characters and do not leave their line. That's the

hardest thing of all, because the TV series are followed by millions of people, more than the cinema, and it's very

difficult to keep us happy as spectators, any chapter of our favorite series that we like

least is us reason to criticize him, and it should not be so. The characters of the TV series are the best

developed there are, because they are the ones that the writers have more time to make known, and they

build them on the fly. In movies there are things you can not do, you know characters for a fact of their

lives, and that's it, even biopics develop characters less than TV series. This is summed up

like this, a follower of HOUSE (Myself for example) knows Dr. House better than Howard Hughs even though he has seen

ten times THE AVIATOR. What I mean by this is possibly, everyone, we know better Homer Simpson

that to many people of our own family, of him we know almost everything. We have seen it in countless

situations. We know it better than family, friends or colleagues. And not only to him, but to the whole

Simpson family. Poor one who expected to see something totally new, because he would not find it, and the

real fans of The Simpsons, who loved them deeply, did not want to see "" something new "", we wanted to

see the usual, but in a film context, not television. The good thing is that we know them so well that we do not have

to present anyone, we all know who everyone is in the city of Springfield, so it gets to the point. Thenot

movie iscomparable to the series, they are part of the same, so we could not have expected something better or

worse, it's just the family moved to the movies. The movie is absolutely masterful, with all the lyrics, a script

that should participate as a candidate for the Oscars. The story is crazy, it's almost science fiction, if

someone tells you that argument, you have a fantastic idea almost to make a prequel to how theworld

post-apocalypticof MAD MAX began. The best thing is that the writers have had time to develop astory

cinematographic, far from the pace that a TV series demands. The movie is more relaxed, more powerful in terms of the

movement of images, it is more sustained by the image than by the dialogues. The Spanish dubbing of the series

I've always preferred it to the original, but since Carlos Revilla, the original voice of Homer, died, things

changed a bit. Although Carlos Ysbert does a great job, remember that he dubbed Walter in EL GRAN

LEBOWSKI, we had years with Revilla's voice and it is very difficult to adapt. Also lost the great voice of

Pablo Sempson (if yes, Sempson) that doubled Mr. Burns. The movie is very well folded, just like the

series. We can see almost all the characters that have appeared in the series, almost all, the fun will be

when the DVD appears and we can stop it to identify them and guess which cap Titles appeared. (A

little freaky?) The story has a great cinematographic rhythm, a tempo of the host and astructure

classic, reminiscent of Wilder and the movies, of course, by James L. Brooks. One of the writers. One of many

that there are, all of the series, all have written great chapters and have created a totallyplot

cinematographic. You can not imagine this in chapter, you can not because it's pure cinema. The Simpsons is theseries

longestin history, I do not remember how long it lasts and East Enders, I do not even know if it continues, but East Enders is a

culebr���n, very good that, like a good culebr���n limited to tell us the day to day of characters that

change from time to time. The Simpsons is a series, and we have the same family forever, and never get bored,

for 20 years. And they continue to maintain themselves, they are still the series that keeps Antena3 alive along with the

news. Homer is, possibly, the best character written in audiovisual history. better than any of

Welles dare I say. regardless of criticism or does not criticize American society. Homer is a

character built on echos that we have all seen throughout these 20 years, and as I said, we

know him better than our family. The movie is not as strong as the series in some things, I mean

in some chapters of the series had more adult content and not in others, but in the movie have decided for the

second, more public, normal. You can see this movie as an animation because it is, but it is not the same, this is

for adults rather, it always has been. A movie for adults that children can go to, RATATOILLE is a

movie of children that adults can go to. Sure, a movie of the characteristics of RATATOILLLE has

organized success, because they want to see the children, and if they go because their parents also have to go, you will not

go alone the very mamoncetes.LOS SIMPSON, a of the best movies that will be seen in years, not only for herself,

but for what she represents. THANKS MATT GROENING

" 1

" A shabby show that will raise again��� DVD a good porrn of $ refresh and return to the battered

economy of the house of mouse Mickey, whonot getting off, except for tontunas how are you or the great

pel ���culas of his "" daughter "" Pixar.

The first part of this Disney film, which not only collected (on DVD, since we are talking about atape

television), millions of dollars and, in addition, sold anything merchandising that with the name of "" High

School. "" They put on the market, it seemed a supreme stupidity, but, as Disney has seen the goose that lays the

golden eggs in this adolescent teen comedy, and since my wife is a fan of this type of cinema, the second

installment had to see it (like it or not). Again, and as I said at the time, we are facing a laughable

show that, disguised as awkward music, puts the kids (cut by the same patron) in that farce

of "" popularity "" and stupidity made in the USA. The easy songs, the rhythm machac���n, and the amorous stupidities

of the protagonists on the screen, make the rest, honestly, I think it's a shabby show that will again

raise a good $ porr���n on DVD I will forget to refresh the battered economy of Mickey Mouse's house,

which does not raise its head, except for tontons like these or the great movies of his "" daughter "" Pixar .S��� that

teenagers, fans of the saga that there are all over the world, not only remember me, and all my family,

being snobbish, asshole and demÃ © Historiass stories, eye, I do not blame them, but let them know that there are 100,000 musicals

better than this one, and of better invoice.And watch that the song of the first delivery, that of "" We're soaring,

flying . "" I think it's a beautiful subject.

" 0

" Another one, another video game that arrives and crashes on the screen. Those responsible for this production are at

least aware that they are playing in a lower league.

It does not stand out for the adolescent consumption to which it is destined, but for the homage to all those tapes that

have their own entity and here they leave scraps, Matrix and Tigre and drag���na the head. In the tradition In the

adaptations of graphic adventures, this title is far from even those that have all lost

in the oblivion of time, as the irregular Alone in the dark and Silent Hill. With an argument that to

be in front of the computer is more than enough, in its passage to the cinema does not offer any consistency. He has more

than 30 films behind him, only one previous shot outside Hong Kong (Transporter) and what we have

verified thanks to ���sta, all dispensable. Corey Yuen is the conductor of an orchestra where the instruments turn

off and the musicians laugh at themselves. The sense of humor that is not missing in this parody with bikinis,

beautiful girls and a lot of muscle that at times seems like a vulgar copy of The House of the flying daggers and Los

Angeles de Charlie, perd���n , we wanted to say homage.Insulsa and without any sense, DOA (so, in confidence)

proves that those responsible lack imagination but enjoy a magnificent mechanism to make bearable

an infumable footage. It seems incredible that the story is not boring, although another thing is that the work

has positive things to highlight, few truth: the argument calls for a fragile montage that prints rhythm to the action

scenes. It's the only thing that catches our attention, so much unbalanced rhythm that in the end it positions us

before an unbalanced conglomerate of? Pele���tas? and struggles, rolled with reluctance despite being the

bulk of the gui���n. A booklet, by the way, full of easy jokes, macho cliches and a slight attempt to

turn women into protagonists, and not for their beauty or portento in the field of martial arts.

He does not have the least interest.

" 0

" Curran's work stands out above all in the main and final parts, where adrama is shown

more exemplary and profoundwhere relations open and close depending on the moment.

After seeing that the good German did not receive a good criticism, I chose to go unnoticed of her, since

before I liked to see her. And fortunately I saw that they had released The Painted Veil, another literary adaptation

with a classical atmosphere. Thanks to this intelligent decision, you can enjoy two hours of a very good

film, classic, that's it, but just as magical as others of �� �poca.El film is magnificently directed by John

Curran, almost debutante, since only he had directed the independent and unknown Praise and We are no longer

two. In his second film he uses techniques, dialogues and situations belonging to the same romantic classicist

of the time, and that does not mean that it is a film without personality, no. This is a film that behind his

apparent simple face of simple aspect, hides a personality with a huge beauty and a delicate sense

of understanding the human personality. Yes, it seems to me that I am throwing away, but when you see it you will notice

that The painted veil goes beyond the typical classic adaptation, although it hides and appears to be like this.

He said at the beginning that the film is directed with an exceptional ability and is lucky not to be bored,

because I have seen some films of the style that serve more than as a film as somn���fero (as Cold Mountain).

Although the work of Curran highlights especially in the main and final parts, which shows a

more exemplary and profound drama where relations open and close depending on the moment.good

Anotheraspect of the film is the magnificent gui���n, based on the homonymous novel by W. Somerset Maughman. Actually, in

1934 Richard Boleslawski rolled the veil painted with Greta Garbo and Herbert Marshall, which Ron Nyswaner not

only based on a novel but also made a remake . And is that perhaps one of the few failures of the

film is that it seems too much a remake, but hey, we are already used to this. Anyway, as I say,

the script is still a unique and great piece without just fissures or slow rhythm, slow, that's it. After

talking about the outstanding direction And the great script, could not end this criticism without first mentioning the

couple protagonist, Edward Norton and Naomi Watts. As you would suppose, due to the great amount of great

performances they have done during their career, both are sublime, offering us a human,roles.

avenging, tender and naivesmart at the same time For my taste, Naomi shines more, and is that the main

reason is because it goes well beyond Edward. But luckily, both actors, along with the secondary ones

(Liev Schreiber and Toby Jones, mainly), make brilliant interpretations, full of charisma.

Finally, highlighting technical aspects such as photography (A (great landscapes, above all, or

close-ups) and the music of Alexandre Desplat (winner of a Golden Globe for this film), which highlights

the main theme in piano, which is absolutely exciting. In short, we have a round film,

very classic, with a formidable script and a couple protagonist that borders on the Oscar. I wish ��� all theadaptations

modernof classic books were like The Painted Veil.

" 1

" Quo vadis baby ?, despite its limitations, it is still more than a worthy film of intrigue and

mystery

In cinema, like everything in life, the best that one can to do is not to be pigeonholed, so that people do not know in

advance what is new that a director will offer. So, if you have a radical change of registration, nobody will be

surprised drastically. And this is the case of Gabriele Salvatores, who with his latest work, Quo Vadis

Baby ?, is surprising both public and critical, since it is a story of mystereio and intrigue, With

dramatic death, that's it. In Italy the film has been a great success, so much so that it is planned to make a television

series from the main character. Giorgia Cantini (Angela Baraldi) is a rude detective,

disheveled and without practically social life, until she receives a package that will turn her life around. The package

contains the diary that her sister Ada (Claudia Zanella) recorded on video tapes, and Giorgia looks for them in a

reason that explains why her sister committed suicide. Backwards. Soon, Giorgia discovers thatapparently

Ada'sperfect life was not such, and that she had a lover, the mysterious A, perhaps involved in his death.

Thus, a search begins that will make Giorgia rethink her life and face the truth that has remained

hidden all these years. Gabriele Salvatores offers us an interesting and attractive proposal, at least in

principle, and not only the typical mystery story. Unfortunately, in a few minutes that appeal is diluted,

the rhythm seems to stop in the continuous space time, and the tape falls into the foreseeable and the obvious. Salvatores

navigates between two waters, between the pure and hard thriller and the social background, the message that the film contains, and

that dualism ends up damaging the history remarkably. Quo Vadis Baby ?, despite its limitations, it is

still more than a worthy film of intrigue and mystery, which will keep the viewer entertained, but this

one will forget �� Five minutes after leaving the cinema.

" 0

" Extraordinary film by Nicholas Ray, undoubtedly one of his best works (the other masterpiece is

undoubtedly "" Johny Guitar "").

"" A decadent rodeo star will try to remake his life by joining a young couple. This will

destabilize the relationship of the couple. "" Extraordinary film by Nicholas Ray, undoubtedly one of his

best works (the other masterpiece is undoubtedly "" Johny Guitar " "). Although, at first, it is evident that the

story is neither new nor, therefore, original, it is suggested by Ray's way of telling. Seldom

has the myth of a person's homecoming, his attempts to findbeen so clearly and di���fana narrated.

roots and the influence of a supposed hero on another normal person but without excessive influenceCharacter The

performances are excellent, with an unusually moving Arthur Kennedy. A film difficult to forget

for its humanity, with superb dialogues and admirable direction.

" 1

" Four steps are perhaps the distance that separates us from the fecundity dreamed to the real, from ourworld

innerto the outside, from genius to autism and incompressibility.

This is the kind of movies that make me happy. For what they have of personnel, and for what they can get to

surprise me. The tÃ © ndem of Michel Gondry with the revered screenwriter Charlie Kaufman had given a product as

extraordinary as "" Forget me ". But now the French has taken a necessary step, to dispense with

Kaufman (hopefully not defintively), to plunge into their own universe. To perform a work, only

in the face of danger, with all its defects and virtues, in which he gave free rein to his condition of artist, of

unique author, without the shadow of Kaufman, and to see what he was capable of. And here that Gondry stages the

representation n of two worlds, almost parallel. Not quite because they often cross or touch each other. Sometimes to

learn to cohabit, in others to continue condemned to be separated. One is on the physical plane,

imperfect but more recognizable and easy to share; the other is more abstract, intangible, perfect but only

in the imagination of oneself. Reality and fantasy. So far, so close. In the assumption of "" The science of

dream "", both worlds could be united only by taking four steps, exactly They are far from one door to another

among neighbors of the same landing. Perhaps it is the distance that separates us from the fecundity dreamed to the real, from

our inner world to the outside, from genius to autism and incompressibility. .N But there are four steps of

travel that can also be insurmountable. One of the dangers of too much seclusion in our fantasticfantasies. It would be

and fantasticgreat to have the elegance and underdoing of a Cary Grant or a Sean Connery. Or to

resemble the rebel without cause born to live fast and intensely, and to die young but free, like the

Laszlo Kovaks of Jean Paul Belmondo in "" At the end of the break ""; become the cynical and hard, and sensitive,

Philip Marlowe who played Humphrey Bogart in, for example, "" The eternal dream ""; the honest, enter���able and

popular Ransom Stoddard of James Stewart's "" The Man Who Killed Liberty Vallance ""; even in the salvador Neo

by Keanu Reeves in "" Matrix. "" Addictivity Gondry. But no. Then comes an individual from St���phane's cage (a

splendid Gael Garc���a Bernal), who invents his world; the one of a fictional television program, the

horses of cardboard, impossible machines of the time, clouds of cotton and buildings built with the "stop

motion" "of the traditional animation. And a guy with just doses of stupidity, creativity and

romance, who appears, settles in there, be it in Paris, or in the big or small screen, and steals our

hearts ,N, while feeding our illusion.A St���phane that runs into the reality of a gray job and of the

montÃn with which it must adapt itself, with a work companion in a state of permanent heat that revitalizes his

hormones, Guy (Alain Chabet); and with a girl next door, St���phanie (Charlotte Gainsbourg), what could be that nexus of

union that "normal" world? " With it, "there is so much to gain," or "so much to lose!" I saw "" The science of dreams "" will be over

four months in the past Sitges film festival. Among the spectators who crowded the

cinema El Retiro, and a public, perhaps too dedicated, who never stopped laughing and celebrating this invention of

Gondry. He was not, then, a special follower of his work. But, in one of those rare and magical times, I also

felt in communion with all of them. Like Kaufman, or that crazy point of Spike Jonze, I'm going to need more

doses of Gondry.

" 1

" This is not the Bond that the public expected. I'm not saying it because it's worse than the others. It's just that it's

a different 007, which I think will disappoint many of the most purist fans.

This is not the Bond that the public expected. I do not say it because it's worse than the others. It's just that it's

a different 007, which I think will disappoint many of the more purist fans. It's clear that

Ian Fleming's character has been reinvented to build a secret agent. Mercenary and less subtle.

Chivalry zero.What I do not know if this change is because the parents of the challenge already had thought in

advance a 180 degree turn in the franchise, without having chosen yet Ala to the protagonist of the new delivery;

or because they have been irremediably forced to do so by the final choice of Daniel Craig, an actor

with the appearance of mat���n. Surely they will say that it has come first. What is clear is that this transformation has

had its victims: the essential Q. does not make an appearance at any time , and the efficient

Moneypenny has been replaced by a secretary with less sex appeal. This is logical, because the new Bond is

now self-sufficient and not interested in love games. l will saco.No however, that reinvention can

be justified by the fact that thisthe first mission of James Bond and MI6 secret agent

brit nico By throwing imagination at him, we would say then that the boy is not yet refined. Hiscategory

double-zero(license to kill; mo mata) gets it after ruthlessly murdering two important

criminals. And, for his first job, Bond is sent to Madagascar to capture a dangerous terrorist

named Obanno. After several investigations, and innumerable undisciplined actions that bring

head to his boss M. (Judie Dench), manages to locate an international banker, called Le Chiffre (Mads

Mikkelsen), whose occupation is to exploit financial resources for terrorist groups. Bond will try to ruin him in

a million-dollar poker game held at Casino Royale in Montenegro with the help, among others, of a British

Treasury agent, Vesper Lynd (Eva Green). During the first hour of the footage, the film

has an incredible rhythm, highlighting in an outstanding way a frenetic pursuit of Bond running behind

the terrorist Obanno through the streets of Madagascar. A hair, without cars or similar vehicles. The spectacular

end of that persecution in an embassy is the icing on one of the most vibrant scenes of the last titles

of the saga.Aqu��� is where we see in all its splendor to the new 007, and we see that we are facing a James Bond

from another pasta. Wild and visceral. But, once those (approximately) 60 minutes have passed, the tape decays

considerably. It loses its initial rhythm, and becomes slow, predictable and with little interest. Its lowest moment

coincides with the plot developed around the game of p���ker in Montenegro, precisely the scenes

that give title to this film. Most of the external incidents that happen to Bond during that game are

unlikely, seriously questioning the words of Martin Campbell, director of "Casino Royale ?,

referring to it as a film that leaves behind the disproportionate fantasy of the previous deliveries. As for the

staging of this film, it is very similar to that of other titles, clearly influenced by the trade

that Campbell has in this Bond series after having been responsible for his resurgence with? Goldeneye ?.

The classic surrealist beginning of all 007 feature films has been devised for? Casino Royale? with anstyle

attractivebut without being a genius. I have missed the obligatory feminine silhouettes. As for the

cast, Daniel Craig has done a good job as James Bond. And this must be qualified. If we take as basis

the consolidated style that his predecessors have given to the character, gentleman, conqueror, elegant, ordered

in his performances, Craig does not convince like 007. Here is where all the badcould have been confirmed

omensthat they had since their election as Bond. But it is that the concept of the new 007 is different: it is

harder, impassive and uncontrolled. With this premise, Craig has built a very credible character, with great

force, that you only recognize as Bond because they name him his mission partners. .N It will be a matter of

getting used to, but it does not clash in that line; however, I prefer Pierce Brosnan. The interpretations of the

rest of the main cast are not overly relevant. M. has more presence in this film, so

Judi Dench has the opportunity to offer her art for a longer time, although in this case it is not too

remarkable. Eva Green is correct and, to my taste, her beauty is not comparable to other Bond girls (I

prefer the stunning Caterina Murino, in the role of the woman of a terrorist who is linked 007.

Delicatessen). And, as for Mads Mikkelsen, he makes an evil man out of the mound, and the bloodare an

tearsanecdote. "Casino Royale? It has half-entertained me, so that with me it has not achieved the desired objective. To

top it all, its ending is intentionally unfinished, implying that the next installment, number 22, will be

a continuation of this. ��� Marketing maneuver in case flies ?.

" 0

" Foreseeable guide, somewhat ���o���o, with characters from the imagination of the author and not from the street. I went

with all the hopes of seeing a good Spanish movie and came home again denying the Spanish cinema

.

Slow, boring, presumptuous. How can you shoot a movie about "thieves" with so much orchestral

music and only one chase (and quite sad indeed) ? There are slow cameras, there are too many close-ups and

something more action and a lot more gui���n is lacking. A predictable guide, somewhat ���o���o, with characters from the

imagination of the author and not the street. I went with all the hopes of seeing a good Spanish film and went

home once again reneging on Spanish cinema, which bores and overcomes them. "" Sophisticated. "" They do not impress the

images in slow motion, they do not impress the acting work neither of he nor of her, they do not impress the millions of

scenes orchestrated to which his director submits to us, and above all it does not impress the story of love, a little

caught with tweezers. I wonder what the producers who bet on this type of film will be thinking about.

Have you gone to see her? When I left the cinema I thought I was the only dissatisfied person. Is that "" I do not understand cinema "", of

course. Nor did they understand the little more than 50 people who "" packed "" the room. Long, boring faces and more of

a "" go rollazo "", and "" nap nap that I was "". I said it, hopeless, slow, boring and presumptuous. It's

that "" you do not know about VECTOR cinema "". It must be that.

" 0

" Animation film directed to a child audience, although bearable by adults. It has moments

of humor, tenderness, emotion and action, in addition to a couple of messages that always come well to remember. I

loved it

Go ahead, as you know my dear readers, I like animated movies more than a

fool a pencil. And if a good animation, we join an interesting plot, its funny moments, its

intrigue, its sensitive moments, and a super final, because the co meo gives me palms (with forgiveness). ). So you already know

that I'm nothing objective with these movies. The film is about a 12-year-old boy who is an orphan. His mother

abandoned him at the door of the orphanage when he was only a baby, and he dreams of knowing her. In addition to this, he is an

inventor, with a gifted intelligence, which makes no one want to adopt him. Neither he nor his

roommate, a very weird kid. Total, that it occurs to him to invent something that extracts the memories from his mind,

in order to know his mother. But the invention does not work quite well, which makes him desist from remaining an

inventor, until a mysterious lad appears in his life. Well, as you will suppose I loved it. The

beginning of the film was very infantiloid and it made me lose a little illusion, but soon this takes another

rhythm, more imaginative and absurd, that I love. The animations are as always, the host on a bicycle. The

variety of characters usually means a handicap, but I find it very successful. The plot is very good,

perhaps too elaborate for a children's film, so that an adult can not get bored. For the rest, there are

two morals or conclusions that can be extracted from the film, and I like them both (see the film and you

will know them). What surprised me the most was that they sang at the end (or I dreamed it) since it does not hit the

rest. Resuming, animation film directed to a children's audience, although bearable by adults. It has

moments of humor, tenderness, emotion and action, in addition to a couple of messages that always come well to remember.

I lovedinteresting.Besitos.PD: I do not know if go to the specialist in "" compulsiveduring the

it.Verywhiningviewing of children's films "" ;-)

" 1

" Thanks Stallone and thanks Rocky, thanks to both, for giving us, nothing more and nothing less, than a lifetime

embodied in celluloid. A life full of good values, of sorrows and joys, of real moments and,

above all, of so many, so many emotions.

First of all, I apologize for the length of this criticism and recommend to anyone who has not yet seen any of the

films, including the last one, that he does not continue reading, because I reveal the plot of a large part of the saga. This

is one of the most successful and most famous sagas in the history of cinema, with all my respect to Bond, James

Bond, who if destiny does not remedy it soon, some �a give me a Guinness record for being the

only western who has not yet seen any of his many titles. All my respects from here to his

followers, also Sean Connery and the rest, but it is already something like a paradox of chance, a

strange avalanche. of circumstances and, lately, I recognize that there is also some personal pride before

an undoubted taste of burnt rice. I have arrived very late and the incredible pirouettes of the famous English gentleman can

not really capture my interest. The Rocky saga covers three decades from the first film to

the last and most recent installment. Let me start at the beginning: In 1976, an unknown actor,

Sylvester Stallone, wrote a script named Paradise Alley (The Paradise Street), inspired by a combat

between Muhammad Ali and Chuck Wepner. The script fell into the hands of producers Irwin Winkler and Robert Chartoff

who, at first, were opposed to the commitment and willingness of Stallone to embody theboxer

protagonist. But this was really the first fight won by Stallone, who got the role and the

production of his cinematographic dream. And although in the film he loses points against the powerful Apollo

Creed, he won, however, by KO and in the first round, against Scorsese, who saw Rocky take

that away. or the Oscar for the best film over his magnificent "" Taxi Driver "". Stallone kept the title of

his guide and reserved it for another film that the same artist interpreted two years ago. Later, and in our

country, it became known as "" The kitchen of hell "". The gui��� and the movie about the Philadelphia boxer

went by the name "" Rocky. "" Stallone's movie was shot in less than a month and on a modest budget of

little money. Des of 1 million dollars and collected more than 115 million dollars in the United States alone. Public and critics,

stunned by jubilation, joined in his favor and the film was made, in addition, with two other Oscars, the one of better

assembly and the one of Best director, out of a total of 10 nominations and after receiving another 6 nominations and the

Golden Globe also the best film. If you ask me, I would tell you that "" Rocky "" is a great drama, very

well built, full of heart and typical and that narrates, perfectly, a story aboutimprovement

personal self-and b� Search for oneself It is the story of an Italian-American boxer of talent, but without faith or

opportunity, Rocky Balboa, who lives and earns a living in a low and depressed neighborhood of Philadelphia. She works

as a multi-employer, boxing for four bitches and threatening defaulters as an assistant to a small-time mat.

He is in love with Adrian, sister of his friend Poli. Adrian is a very shy woman who works in a small pet

store with whom, Rocky, will try to establish a loving relationship. Thanks to fate, luck

and in part to his striking nickname, "" The Italian colt "" is offered, from night to morning, the opportunity of his

life. He will be able to face the current heavyweight champion and dream with the title. "" Rocky "" narrates anhistory

honest, universal, of those that the Americans, in their national self-centeredness and shamelesslyof the

adjecting themselvesterm, denominate as "" The American Dream " "" The certain thing is that Rocky is a good film, but also it is a

quite overrated film, and it demonstrates the same Stallone with the sequel Rocky II, where it manages to break

the myth of "" The second parts were never good "" tracing the structure and the magic formula of the first

part with admirable respect and intelligence. Pampering the development of the characters and their world and arriving,

even, something more in each of the virtues of its predecessor. This second part surpasses or, at least,

manages to reach the cinematographic quality of the first one, but, nevertheless, this time it did not get all the

favor of the criticism. The public, however, received it with considerable enthusiasm and collected 85 million

dollars in the United States. I think that neither the first one was so good, nor the second was so bad. I think

both reach a very remarkable level and that, really, in addition to repeating in the work of screenwriter, surprises

very positively the work of Stallone himself in the direction, since the truth is that, during the 119

minutes that this sequel lasts, we never get to miss the director of the first part, John G.

Avildsen. Avildsen is an irregular director, for many mediocre, that at present is practically

retired, but that, nevertheless, has managed to reunite two titles that have changed the lives of millions of

spectators of different generations: "" Rocky "" and "" Karate Kid "". With both, not only has he managed to fill the

movie theaters, but he has managed to motivate and replenish the sports gyms of half the world.

I must admit that even I came to green belt of karate (���o was blue? Buff, I do not remember already)

thanks to that man. Returning to Rocky, we can not ignore one of the strong pillars and one of the culprits

of the success of the film and that, thirty years later, it is considered a cl� ��sic or as a

cult film, the masterful score by Bill Conti. The main theme, the song "" Gonna Fly Now "" is aicon

culturallinked for life to the figure of the myth "" Rocky "". Conti made the soundtracks of the whole series

except for the fourth installment, which on the other hand, and in my opinion, was one of the best,influenced

undoubtedlyby the musical tastes and rhythms of the decade of the 80s, and that exalted and complemented the typical

and all the exciting action of that sequel. In Rocky II, film that arrived three years ago. Later on, already in '79

and with a Stallone, just like his character, who was high on success and fame, theare effectively justified

conflicts of the plot. The film begins where the first part ends and we can see an Apollo Creed

unsatisfied with his revalidation of the world title (by the points and by the hair) before, until then,

completely unknown "" Colt Italian"". Inwardly, Apollo knows that it is very possible that there is someone better, a

true champion, and the shadow and the growing fame of Rocky torture him inwardly. The character of Apollo is

incarnated again by the actor Carl Weathers who, deservedly, becomes a prominent space in thissaga

pugilisticand will always be remembered as such. In this second installment, a great part of the sincere and

beautiful relationship of love between Adrian and Rocky is developed. After the fight, he asks for marriage and they end up marrying

happily and for the church, as a good Italian believer. . One of the successes of the saga, is to give a

dramatic background ferreo to the scripts and offer personal conflicts to each of the characters. Stallone,

as a screenwriter, understands that Rocky's antagonist, in each of his challenges, is practically

as important as the boxer himself. We understand the motivations and conflicts of Apollo, also those

of Rocky and, in addition, the characters of Adrian are drawn with care, who in this second installment opposes the

fight trying to safeguard the health of his husband. The character of Poli, that poor devil who is also his

brother's wife, or Mickey's, the always charming and cantankerous Rocky trainer. Rocky's wife gets

pregnant and Rocky is ��� willing to leave boxing and work on what he can to support his family. But

Rocky, although he is a very noble person, is also a very basic and uneducated person, and this becomes a

problem when it comes to managing the money earned or trying to work from anything else. . From the

environment of Apollo is pressed to fight again, but neither his wife nor his coach seem to support the

idea. One of the best moments of the saga is the scene on the landing of the house of Mickey. Rocky asks him to

please train him again and his coach shows him, giving him a surprise slap, that he is physically

no longer able to fight. "Do you see? You've seen it coming, have not you? And what an

old old man gave you, what would happen if Apollo hunted you several times? -I suppose he would knock me out. -No, it would hurt you,

forever. One of Rocky's eyes has lost sight. The scene is simply antolÃgica, next to others with

some phrases like: "" Adrian, I? I never asked you to stop being a woman, please? please I ask you,

do not ask me to stop being a man "" While Apollo ridicules him mercilessly in the media

, Rocky humbles before the eyes of his coach working on anything in the gym

this. The situation is painful and the provocations excessive, which causes that Mickey change of opinion and

decides to support it and to return to train it. We are witnesses then of how Rocky says "" I am sorry "" to his wife and

of how the hard training begins. However, Adrian will suffer serious health problems that will

endanger his life and their son's. The tension and emotion increase, with a narrative that

runs balanced and firm and that arrives and transmits perfectly to the spectator. Apollo wants revenge, will

go out to crush him, humiliate him and thus defeat his own demons. While Apollo is training very hard,

we see a Rocky demotivated and free to train with dignity, very affected by the critical situation

of his wife. We can feel with anguish how the hours go by, the days and how time runs out. We suffer

with Rocky, because he is not ready and his opportunities in the ring are diminishing in the hospital chair.

But this installment also has one of the most exciting, sweeping and powerful moments that I could

find in a movie. Adrian returns in yes, the son is born and, both, they seem to be finally out of

danger. Rocky is tired, but happy, he is a father for the first time and is willing to never again antagonize his

wife. He proposes to retire, to give the fight for lost, as seems to be the desire of his wife, but she,

understanding that her husband has the heart of a true boxer and that he needs to fulfill his dream, asks him to

Do something for her: -I want you to do something for me. Ac���rcate.-What.-You win. "Come on!" Then the musicbegins

and the trainingagainst the clock, and the hairs are put to one as escarpies. The great moment arrives and Stallone

has mentalized his spectators with a millimeter precision. The combat is photographed with an agility and

an amazing staging and it is vibrant and full of inspiration and emotion. ���pica is a word that can not be omitted

when referring to this saga. Rocky II wins by KO, and for who writes this

critique is, without any doubt, the best film of all of it. They arrive the eighties and Stallone, in its fullness

f�� Physical and professional, she is about to live her golden decade. In 1982 he will put on his gloves and again, he

writes and directs a third installment of the saga. In the same year, another action film icon was born, John Rambo

in "" Acorralado "", based on the best seller of David Morrel "" First Blood "" and that will give foot to anothersaga.

millionaireRocky III is, of the six parts, without a doubt the most fun and one of the most entertaining. The greatest

success, once again, is the choice of his opponent, in this case, an amazing Mr. T (Here more known

as MA in the series "" Team A ""), who takes his role very seriously and manages to create the figure of Clubber

Lang, a ruthless, fearsome and brutal prag full of hatred. Stallone seems to be aware that the criticism, being

a third party, will not be in any way in his favor, but he continues to move the

chips with great skill. He is not willing to abandon the secret formula and decides to re-mix the

genres of action and drama. To compensate, he knows he needs to sacrifice some of his chips. And if in the

second part the health of Adrian and his son served to manipulate the hearts, in this, he uses the

death of the old coach as a revulsive. The film begins with a sympathetic and almost absurd dose of

humor in which it shows how the life of the champion has become a media circus. It includes anbattle

exhibitionwith the, then, not so well-known wrestling wrestler Hulk Hogan that at times is no

less than surreal. This principle, sometimes almost jocular, is calculated and measured, to contrast with the

dramatic part with much more impact. In the moments before the fight and during a heated discussion

with Clubber Lang, Mickey suffers a heart attack, and although Rocky wants to suspend the fight, his coach

refuses and asks him to fight. In such a situation, Rocky is brutally knocked out and finished the fight, in

the locker room Mickey dies in his arms believing that he has won the fight. Boxing is asport

respectful, noble and men'sand in Rocky III, being Apollo, thanks to healthy admiration for who knew howwin

the heartan honest and fair, who, along with Adrian and Poli, is allying Rocky at times

dif Easy. The training scenes and the two battles against Clubber Lang, are again at a great

height, and this third installment returns to satisfy the great public. Rocky III becomes the highest

grossing film of the three, exceeding 125 million dollars in the United States. This third installment, and

contrary to what many people think, is for me an admirable sequel, exciting, vibrant, entertaining,

with really unforgettable scenes and with new musical themes like "" Eye of the tiger "", that will remain They are

forever in the history of cinema and they participate importantly in the greatness of the legend of thepugile

Philadelphia. We arrived in 1985. Stallone has just released the second highest-grossing film of the year in the United

States (after "" Return to the future "" by Robert Zemeckis), "" Rambo, Acorralado II "" that, on the other hand and thanks to his

doses of gratuitous violence, manages to raze in the Razzie prizes to the worst films in almost all his

sections, including worse movie, worse actor and worse gui� .N Something, in my humble opinion, certainly unfair

if we consider that it is a rather more than correct action tape. The times change and the

prototype of h�� �roes and villains too. It's the eighties and testosterone and fascist violence sells

and works. Stallone can not avoid a certain mutation between his two most famous characters. As it does in

Rambo II, Rocky IV decides to largely bypass the social and dramatic in the story line in favor of

pure and simple action. And again as a scriptwriter and in the management tasks, he manages to overcome again by

breaking the box office record of the third part. Rocky IV rises with the title of "" The highest-sports film

grossingin history. "" Again he gets the right notes tweaked and this is thanks in large part to the fact that he

finds an attractive antagonist and equal to his predecessors. Iv���n Drago, starring Dolph

Lundgren, is a boxer from the former Soviet Union trained in futuristic installations of the latest

generation and with the help of anab�� substances. Forbidden ,licas, which grant him almost superhuman qualities. A

perfect and programmed athlete with the sole intention of humiliating the American champion in the middle of the

so-called Cold War. This time, Stallone sacrifices a new piece, Drago fulminates and causes death in the

ring to an unsuspecting Apollo who, out of nostalgia, decides to return to the ring. With a style more video clip

than the previous ones, following in part the fashion of the 80s, (mtica the scene with Apollo Creed dress "" Uncle

Sam "" and dancing with the "" Living in America "" by James Brown) and regardless of the customary dialogues and

the moralizing moments of the previous ones, Rocky IV is undoubtedly one of the sports films of action.

effective and adrenal���ticas of the history of the cinema, and I know that it has been used, more than once, to

motivate athletes from many parts before their sports training. Rocky IV, although itaway from the

movesstyle and pretensions much more artistic and sober of the original, is a jewel of entertainment and

action and an authentic classic of the years 80. He weighs who it weighs. Stallone, however, he entered

the doubts with the decade of the nineties. He seemed to be aware, along with other actors like Arnold

Schwarchenegger, that spectators were slowly beginning to demand change and new formulas. Heroes

more sophisticated and somewhat less flat. The Rocky saga had already given everything of itself and Stallone felt that the best thing

was to turn around in his career. Shortly before failing in a new facet as a comic actor with two

desprop���sitos as "" Oscar "" and "" Alto or my mother shoots "", Stallone decides to end the saga of Rocky in 90 with

a final installment in which he was even seriously tempted to let the hero die. To do this, he returns the

command in the direction of Avildsen, the director of the original, and tries to rescue the dramatic paths of

the first deliveries. But this time, for a total lack of clarity in its purposes and for trying to

modernize the formula, it completely fails. Rocky V is not only the worst movie of the saga, aa���os light of

all the previous ones, but it does not contribute absolutely nothing new and only manages to denigrate at a stroke

the fantastic character that encumbr��� on fame. With a non-existent address, a lamentable,

boring, absurd guide and even in a grotesque moment with ridiculous dialogues, Stallone sacrifices

Rocky also pointed him out with the worst and most unfortunate interpretation of his entire career. This time,

Rocky's figure is unbearable. It wanders aimlessly like a memorandum tared of irrepressible verbiage, which

gets bad for the first time and upset anyone. And in this way, a saga that had resisted

with dignity the likes and preferences of practically two decades, crashed crashingly in

the 90s, reaping the worst possible criticism, completely defrauding to his followers and being more than aknock

loudat the box office. This lack of purpose, because of the lack of faith and decision, and without pretending it, seemed to be

the worst ending that the myth of Rocky deserved. But in 2007, Rocky Balboa has premiered , this time I am the

final chapter of the saga. They have had to spend 17 years, 30 years since the first Rocky, so that a Stallone with

60 years old, try again to rescue the saga from the well and try to finish it like this one. it deserves

Stallone has come out very touched of the decade of the nineties, years that have only evidenced his growing

professional decline, failure after failure, with films like "" Driven "", "" D-Tox "", "" Avengin Angelo "", Taxi 3,

Spy-Kids 3D and a long number of mediocre titles that have set him apart from success. Rocky Balboa returns to drink

directly from the same source as the first deliveries, and if in those we had a lonely thirty-something

who dreamed of leaving the anonymity and triumph against the clock as a boxer, in this we have aRocky

retired, an old veteran who faces the last quarter of his life as a famous former boxer and as a widower.

Adrian has died of a cancer and Rocky runs a restaurant with his name where he entertains the clientele with

his old battles. The strange and unfortunate aspect that Stallone offers in this lastis highly commented

installment, due to the numerous operations of aesthetic surgery and the abuse of steroids and anabolics in its

af�� To conserve the musculature to be able to continue, at his age, impressing his followers. The truth is

that we can not stop comparing his personal life with his own character and, in this case, his physical appearance

and their current professional situation, play in favor and support in part the credibility of what is exposed in this

last film. I say in part, because we also have to believe that a sixty-year-old man gets the

chance to fight again against the heavyweight champion. Although it is true that this was

almost equally unlikely in that first film in the 70's. Stallone is aware that,

despite all his efforts, his power�� The physicist has ceased to be an effective and credible weapon, as it was before,

in order to offer generous doses of spectacle. Therefore, he decides to concentrate more seriously on the

dramatic and emotional part to which he gives most of the footage. This time, he uses to perfection a

new and forceful weapon, nostalgia. Stallone rewrites a script with trade, mime and honesty andus

showsa Rocky in his decadent, lonely, aged and melancholy stage. Rocky survives clinging to the

memory of his wife and the memory of past times, which as you well know, were always better.

Stallone, very aware of the personal nature of this project and how risky it was

to reincarnate Rocky for the last time and after 17 long years of absence, decides to control theagain.

productup close and, once again, it is he who returns to carry out the management tasks. This is

a true success. In addition, he also decides to return to work as before, with a fairly modest budget,

this time of 24 million dollars. The subplots and the conflicts of the characters that surround Rocky in this

installment are excessively schematic and are subject a little with pins, but they fulfill their function and do not

interfere with the story. I, above all, would highlight the scene of Rocky and Poli in the meat factory,

where Rocky opens his heart "in a" stark "way, with tears in his eyes. the eyes, in an authentic monologue andNot

really exciting.so lucky is the final part, with a training shot with the trade of

experience, but extremely fleeting. It is necessary to see how a man of his age struggles

to get back into shape. The stiffness, the dizziness, that mentioned calcification of the joints. Feeling the

count behind, the fear of making a fool of yourself, not being up to scratch, the fear of embarrassment of offering ashow

pitifulor being seriously injured. There is a non-existent dramatic tension and, at a stroke, we

find Rocky already in the ring. In addition, Mason Dixon is the worst drawn opponent and most loose of the whole

saga. The power of this one does not seem to be encouraged, partly to help the credibility of the whole thing or

perhaps, because there is no need for any continuity or excessive depth of the character as it is the

last cap. Title. For all these reasons, we did not arrive at the combat as motivated as we were used to in

the previous confrontations, and this results in a burden that is too heavy. The combat, on the other hand, also

fails to reach the desired spectacularity and is, by far, and without counting the grotesqueskirmish

streetwith Tommi Gunn in the forgettable fifth installment, the worst performed of all. Some goodare intuited

intentions, but the staging is quite mediocre and both the editing and the realization are quite

unfortunate. The modern guides and the pretended coolest style of the times, with a confusingediting

video, impoverish the show considerably. And if not, check any of the brutal

clashes of any of the previous films. I suppose that the open shots and the more classical

montage of the previous decades, evidenced too much the physical deficiencies of the staging of

Sylvester Stallone's today A real pity and a great missed opportunity, the last, for, after

a fantastic first part of the film, to have been able to offer us the best delivery of the whole saga. ,

and in general lines, Stallone recreates an honest, fair and exciting final chapter, with an

unequivocally circular character, to reinforce the feeling of roundness of a saga that has meaning everything in your life.

And if the fortune and a break of hand (the one of the aspiring to the title that was going to face 30 years ago to Apollo) theyhim

grantedthen the opportunity of his life and the beginning of a dream ,O, the expected end is

now given another hand break. In Rocky Balboa, during the match, at the first change, Dixon breaks his hand

with an unfortunate blow to the hip of Rocky, which is thus reduced their usual

skills in the ring, and what it provides, on the other hand, the opportunity to a brave veteran like Rocky, to

equal the disadvantage and offer the spectacle of returning to endure stoically and with honor all the assaults

to the young champion. Rocky will lose the points, as he did that first time against Apollo, but

morally, he will win again as he did then. Everything ends as it began and whole generations of

spectators have been able to grow and mature as direct witnesses of the life of a good man, a true

hero made himself. Rocky Balboa is a film of remarkable quality that closes with great dignity the saga and is

also a successful and well-deserved tribute to the figure of Rocky and its creator. Stallone has managed, thirty

years later, to reconnect again with much of the criticism. Meanwhile, the public is

responding as always, faithfully and passionately and Rocky Balboa is being a truesuccess.

box officeThanks Stallone and thanks Rocky, thanks to both, for giving us away, nothing more and nothing less, than a whole

life embodied in celluloid. A life full of good values, of sorrows and joys, of real moments and,

above all, of so many, so many emotions. I, in return, can not help but write m���, so far, more

extensive and detailed criticism, written from the respect, admiration and from the heart n of who, like

so many millions of spectators around the world, has laughed, cried and screamed for so many years at your

side.

" 1

" It is a film as personal as failed, which wants to be magical but it is too explicit and

obvious. If it did not have that ending it would be a film more, failed but with interesting aspects, but the way in which

the damage ends irreparably.

After several years away from fiction cinema, Julio Medem returns with a film that must have been very

special for him.Ca���tica Ana narrates us c�� Or a young hippie painter discovers that she is the reincarnation of many

other women who died tragically at 22 years of age. Through hypnosis sessions they will go deeper

into the history and life of their predecessors. "Is she sentenced to the same end?" Ana Medem died at the age of 22

in a traffic accident, and Julio, her brother, has erected a tribute with him. film, where she reflects

many aspects of her sister's personality, in fact the paintings that appear in her were painted by

Ana Medem or are adaptations following that style. Therefore, the Basque director feels personally very

involved in the film. The pity is that the very commendable and understandable effort does not just reach the viewer. The

film is narrated as a back story, from ten to zero, showing us several moments of Ana's life

(Manuela Vall���s), from the moment in which a mysterious French woman decides to become her patron and

take her to Madrid, away from her father with whom she lives in a cave in Ibiza. Due to the chosen structure,

the narrative has gaps, ten ellipses that affect the fluidity of the set, while making it move

faster. Once he arrives in Madrid, the film begins to show his problems, since it offers a view of the

hippie commune species in which he lives surrounded by artists, superficial, stereotyped and politically

correct. In addition as it already happened in Luc���a and Sex (with which she keeps many similarities and from which she repeats

images: she floating naked in the water or contemplating the moon next to the sea, together with the own character

that remembers a bit the one played by Paz Vega), he presents us with a love story that, from such "" po���tica ""

becomes incredible, as the two characters Ana already did here. and Sayid look into each other's eyes, they exchange a

couple of sentences, they make love, and she is already forever in love with a pure, clean, crystalline andlove

indestructible. The film follows so with an atmosphere that wants to be magical and attractive but that never becomes

completely, despite trying it hard, everything seems forced or already seen. There are scattered details

that work like the idea that the ship of the father of her best friend, Linda (Baby), called as she is who

saves her from drowned, although the scene itself is very forced; the idea of ​​the cave with the doors that

lead to their past lives, not very original, but visually effective. Even with their problems, the film is seen

with pleasure and does not become really heavy, but Medem loses the papers in the last five minutes of

film, which completely destroy what has been achieved up to that moment. I do not usually count the end, but this

time I'm going to do it, so if you do not want to know it, save the paragraph. After reaching the last of their lives

by hypnosis, Ana has made a radical change, has found its meaning in life, even without looking for it as she

says and decides to make an act of political revenge cag�� Going literally in the face of a high-ranking

George W. Bush administration for the Iraq war. If we were facing a clearly political and vindictive film

it would make sense, but in this film this topic is dealt with very in passing, the conflict is named Saharawi,

the war in Iraq or the lamentable state of the Indians in the North American reserves, are named, appear,

but always in a superficial way and the protagonist never appears really interested. Therefore, the final

as it is raised is very unsuccessful and destroys the film as incoherent. You could talk about the

change made in Ana that leads to that, but it is not seen on the screen, so it seems a very

comfortable option for the director to put in the hands of the viewer all the necessary transformation. As for the

direction of Medem little to object, his style is very peculiar and personal you like or dislike but does not leave

indifferent and that is appreciated. On the interpretive level the actors are irregular starting with Manuela

Vall���s (Ana) in practically the same record throughout the film, except for the hairstyle, they are not

reflected in their interpretation. Losn the character changes. A pity because it has a very expressive look and is

very comfortable in front of the camera. Bebe (Linda) makes of herself, a racial character with great strength,

perfect but not very brave. The rest of the cast is uneven with a correct Charlotte Rampling as the

patron and an awful interpretation on the part of the actor whoas a hypnotist. The digital photograph

actssaturating in blues and reds seg�� In the scene, it is very effective and shows a clear evolution since his

previous film, Luc���a y el Sexo, where the technique was not mature enough. Finally the soundtrack of

Jocelyn Pook (Eyes Wide Shut) is very appropriate to the images with really achieved and beautiful moments,

also very much in the style of the work carried out by Alberto Iglesias for previous films. particles of director.En

end, Catica Ana is such a personal film as failed, wantsbe magical but ittoo

explicit and obvious. If it did not have that end, it would be a more film, but with interesting aspects, but

the way it ends up damaging it in an irremediable way. Alternative solution, Ca� ��tico Ano is a film about a girl

with a serious problem of constipation that finally comes to the cure at the hands of a senior manager of the

Bush Administration.

" 0

" The best of Yours are always the interpretations of a brilliant cast in which they highlight Flora

Mart���nez, Nancho Novo and Jos��� Coronado

Mal starts with a film if at five minutes one He has the sensation of something already seen hanging over

his head. A good old dog, cinematographically speaking, is able to smell that unpleasant sensation

even with just reading a small synopsis of the story. And the truth is that Tuya Siempre, which is the

return to the cinema of Manuel Lombardero ten years after In Arms of the Mature Woman, is an example that

perfectly illustrates our theory ���a.It is a story that portrays the underworld of a Spanish city

in the middle of the eighties. Lola (Flora Mart���nez) and Alfredo (Rub���n Ochandiano) are a couple who

survive by carrying out petty thefts. When the police stop Alfredo, he meets C���sar (Andr���s

Gertr���dix), who is grateful to help him in the cell and gets him a job in a local jazz to Lola. In that place

they meet a great number of disturbing characters, such as Horacio (Nancho Novo) or Manuel Gay (Jos���

Coronado). The biggest defect of Tuya is always the lack of originality and freshness of its history. The script falls

into numerous topics, and the film is full of already well-worn situations. However, the film is well-

armed, has a solid package, and has some good moments, as if they were small oases for

seasoned spectators. It deserves a mention. Especially the brilliant photograph by JosÃ Luis Alcaine, which endows the

film with the texture indicated for its history and its music. The best of You There are always interpretations

of a brilliant cast in which Flora Mart���nez, Nancho Novo (more than deserved her award in Málaga) and

Jos��� Coronado stand out.

" 0

" Lolita, light of my life, fire of my entra���as. My sin, my soul, Lo-li-ta, the tip of the tongue

takes a three-step journey from the edge of the palate to rest on the third, at the edge of the

teeth. Lo-li-ta.

1. The book of NabokovEran times of restraint and censorship spiced the Art: the law was hard and the

artist, except some exc���ntrico with desire to annoy raising the skirts to the moral and the children of good

family, aven���aa does not bother in excess: it was left contaminated by modesty, by the previous sieve. It was the

author sacrificing his freedom for the sake of his artistic object seeing the light and manifesting his creativity or,

at least, a considerable part of it. Henry Miller, in literature, was the guru. of sex, the eccentric with restraints

, with control stick in the letters and in the esc���ndalo. Readers very seasoned and openly bitter

with the official Power rejoiced in the twisted prose, factory and vaguely disturbed of many authors

whose name appeared frequently in the list of the damned. Nabokov, with Lolita, deserved a place of

honor. Vladimir Nabokov creates the teacher from Humbert Humbert, from now on HH or H, fevered from a

"supreme voluptuousness, always on", in his words, infatuated to pathological extremes of Dolores

Haze, Lolita, henceforth Lo, always using the terminology that the author himself marks in his book.Lolita is the

adolescent sin, the n���nfula prep��� of HH's exalted romantic imagination, of his passionless deviation not

repressed, but encouraged, taken to office. In those timid times, a novel about a ped���filo, and

above a distinguished, cultured and refined to the unspeakable and correct in the treatment as a gentleman of Oxford

Street was a bomb. And he exploded. The obscenity of the plot was as high as the quality of the writing. And

Nabokov, aware of the risk, but knowing the deep sub-plot of his work, asked for shouts to read his

book: that there was no other pornography that repressed it. Of those who saw on their pages the most runaway their

own runaway, the anguish of repressing themselves and the fear that the repressed matter would reveal, in the end,

the mental and sentimental poverty of their lives. That the offended, if you want to limit your natural inclination the

offense, only requires a slight flight of a skirt, a notice of stinging in the crotch of a teenager or

a beginning of hair in the armpit of a child. ���a. And there it is, morbid, plenipotentiary, imposing and majestic,

immortal, sin. All in all, Lolita is a perfect novel, a decadent novel, a complex novel likeothers have.

fewthe twentieth century, of hypnotic reading, difficult, but equally attractive because the events

that it narrates are (and here the cinematographic motif of this p abre opens up) gina) filmable material, that is, cinema in

its pure state. Llolita appeared only seven years before the film and its social rumble was infinitely smaller.

We all know that the eye is scandalized more quickly than the brain: that the image is worth a thousand words, that a

teenager sucking a lollipop in a garden is a representation No more powerful sin than a homily of

a priest angry over the excesses of today's society. Haunted by a cursed novel, Kubrick resigned to

encourage a greater curse and erased from the script delivered by Nabokov himself the subversive elements,

throwing a younger HH and a greater Lolita. That concession allowed the film to be shot. That

concession and another added: to record in England, far from the disciplined, sober, severe

cinematographic policy of the USA in the first years 60.2. Stanley Kubrick's Plea The story of HH is a

masterful lesson of guilt and sin, convulsive beauty and unhealthy love. Nabokov himself

splendidly illustrated his stylistic vocation by ensuring that he did not write in Russian or English, his

languages ​​of expression. n, but I was thinking about images. The instinct of the perverted professor makes his way, with

elegant and subtle pushes, over the confused and troubled society of Puritans and neighbors withínfulas

modern, represented by Lolita's mother, Charlotte Haze, who is the rent a room to the teacher

who only agrees to use when he sees (and here we have a fundamental part of the iconographic history of cinema with

Lolita in the garden, disturbingly lying down, wasting time in a two-piece miniature and sucking a

pyrite on Freud, I do not doubt that she would take material for two very fat tomes) to her love, to her sad and

frivolous, to the The maximum exponent of sensual pleasure is tasting a bag of popcorn and throwing straw

to finish a Coca light. Kubrick asked Nabokov to reduce the dose of eroticism of the child: they say that

already in the postproduction of Spartacus (196th) the director He was hooked on Lolita's script and that obsession

distracted him from his work in the film so that the producer called him to order. Narbokov, on the other hand,

noticing the magnitude of the fara� Unique to Kubrick's project, taking into consideration thepotential

advertisingof his novel and making accounts of the audience's reach of the film, he decided to publish under his

name and within his Usual editorial line the script originating from the cinematographic guide. Without ignoring the

rudeness that the book itself had, let's not forget that it was published in Paris by an editorial devoted to

pornographic skullduggery, Nabokov wanted meat: more evidence of the sensuality of the girl-child and more

explanatory elements of the loving relationship of HH and Lo for the motels that occupy the very greedy second

part of the film , as we will see later. Kubrick ignores all this fopp and focuses on more orthodox aspects. The

cinema, after all, is a company that gives money and was not going to let theout of hand

project get. Without going any further, Kubrick withdraws from his staging the reasons that the book was

clear and that based the deviant behavior of HH. We do not see in the film any image thatus

tellsthat HH fell in love with a young girl in Switzerland and that this adolescent precocious love, truncated trically,

impregnated her slit, her aura of sentimental and delicate man, pathologically zaherido, spurred without direction to the

tragedy and to the failure, as we will see. One of the levels of tension of the film is that the spectator never is clear

if HH wants to do the love to Lolita or is excited only with attenuated caresses and muffled and slight notices

of eroticism very fleeting in a badly placed garment or in a moh���n distracted from its fiery n���nfula.La novel is m� It is

explicit: HH sleeps with Lo and travels the States of the Union as lovers, although they register as

stepfather and daughter. The admirable thing in Kubrick is the way in which he disassembles reality and it raises, at its whim, a

parallel reality, which supplants this and arroba the first substance, the f undamento of the narrative that

we attend. Example: HH is already unhappily married to Charlotte and frolics, without touching, in thebed

marriage. It seems that they are a normal couple and the scene is normal in all its extension, but Hh is

missing his look in a photo of Lolita that presides over the bedside table. Here is the background of the narrative:

to shed light on what is hidden, even if we see what should not be considered important. Kubrick was a

master of divination, of the concealed truth so that the viewer strives to find thekeys

clarifyingand thus reveals the always crouched transcript of history. The Humbert Humbert lover is, by

excessive , pathetic. And now it's time for us to talk about the majestic interpretation of a James Mason in a state of

immeasurable grace: a Mason who abandons his tics of an English gentleman, neat and dapper, abutler

formidable, and he plays with a very deep character, which allows him to be a psychopath with aglove

white, a cabronazo illustrated with an indispensable point of madness and a few strands of social intelligence thathim

allowto scale in the crime, in its inextinguishable vital purpose: to love Lolitas, to possess them, to allow themselves to be

daubed by their grace, by their unpolished beauty. Quilty, Hunmbert's despicable antagonist, his

shadow, his persecutor and his implacable imitator, is a Peter Sellers in his sauce: convulsive, hilarious, almost

demonic. Peter Sellers is Jim Carrey with twenty years more of tables. So Lyon was a personal bet of

Kubrick and does not disappoint, although his cinematographic career has not had similar heights. He wanted a girl, and

not a little girl already turned around by the unpredictable chance of adolescent hormones, but neither the producer

nor the circumstances allowed him to go for one and had to go to this excessive, but convincing wench, who

occupies with her light shyness, with her uncouth seriousness and, at the end, with her bad temper, the whole screen.

Helley Winters plays Charlotte, and shines resplendently: lively portrait of the housewife pleased with his role in

life, neighborly and plump, cradled every night with his memories of the marriage that was extinguished too

soon and the love that had no continuation in his stifled nights under the stars of the city.

that all cin���filo de pro remembers is the fast-paced road-movie that Kubrick marks in the third section of the film.

It is true that whoever has read the novel knows that the filmed version is very brief and does not recreate with the sordid

world of the road motels of curtains with the smell of stale nicotine and its air. Cheap gin

and smelly shaving lotion. The love of HH and Lo, however, in these motels, is the part that am���, reviewed

the film on at least four occasions, is the part that I like the most. The splendor of HH is its own perversion:

plasticized in his obsession to elevate his spirit to the perfect paradise of his prep���beres muses. This frivolity

in the treatment of pedophilia (child pornography is a sinister variant with wide and detestable

cybernetic scenarios) impacts the timorous viewer, but the important thing for Nabokov and for Kubrick, by

extension n, it is the detail: the apprehensible physical aspect of this weakness, not its strictlybackground

psychological. In fact, we do not see Humbert forcing Lolita at any time: there is no evidence of a

dominant virility. Already in the first scene of the film the philosophy of all itsis clearly visible

moving footage: we see HH painting the feet of a young woman. What isis a very fine eroticism,

pulsatingnever deliberately pornographic. The risk of Lolita, as a film, has been more than compensated. Thefixation

sexualof the protagonist has placed a word, Lolita, in our dictionary and in popular speech, which is the

dictionary of immediate use and of more reliable reliability. We say that it is a lolita thepubescent

newly markedgirl who outlines in her gestures, in her manners, in her style, a eroticism, a sensuality not

devoid of provocation. �� Nabokov. Scoffing at the sensus with this Sue Lyon and a little grown up was the

first purpose of the film. The Code of the Catholic Legion of Decency, a Yankee Santa Inquisition of

the time, ended up swallowing the moral violence of the film because Kubrick stole ��� the dynamic charge of carnality

and consented to give the character of Humbert Humbert a role of love, adult, although deviant, but in love,

after all. In the novel, I return insistently because it is essential to see it after Having seen the film

or vice versa, Nabokov sharply emphasizes the nature of the teacher's passion, which is love for children,

said crudely, and not love a child. Concrea concrete, to one discovered in a garden of the middle-class house,

innocently sucking a lollipop.Nabokov puts HH with Lo: Kubrick does not dare. The decay of the

novel and also, in part, of the film comes from this revelation clarified ahead of time. Nabokov reveals

a secret that was promised sweet and long-lived. Kubrick hides it longer and the game ends up leading us to the

sensation that the secret lacks the importance that we really gave it.Lolita is stratified in

five parts very well compartmentalized, although spun with brightness. Segment one: presentation of HH, the

patient. Segment two: knowledge of Lolita and stay at Haze's house. Segment three: HH marries

Lo's mother. Enviuda promptly. HH goes through Lo el pa���s.Segmento four: She runs away and ends up pregnant, no

of HH, and married to a brute and not very sensitive man, just the opposite of his pr���cer Humbert.Segment five:

Murder of Quilty, who persecutes him, obsessed also by Lo. "" Lolita, light of my life, fire of my entra���as.

My sin, my soul, Lo-li-ta, the tip of the tongue takes a three-step journey from the edge of the palate

to rest on the third, at the edge of the teeth. Lo-li-ta. "", Reads the now famous first line of the

novel. HH narrates in first person his delivery to justice. The whole film looks like this: the confession of an

inmate, guilty of lust, suspected of murdering another lustful. Life, how bad it is.

" 1

" Princesses risks, although she loses: she unravels in the imposing comedy, in a certain reluctance to give her a

greater plot background. Without a script in which things happen, the cinema loses irrecoverable tricks.cinema

De-ionized.

Far from being an ugly portrait of prostitution that many would have wanted to put the signature of screenwriter and

director Fernando Le���n de Aranoa, Princesses is a simple inventory of the routines that They populate the lives of

normal people, who hide their sins and open their hearts to others when circumstances so dictate. It does

not complicate Le���n de Aranoa in narrative stills that would detract protagonism from what he truly

considers the essence of his film: the unabashed, slow, and exquisite friendship of two prostitutes They are against

the misery of the people and against the harshness of the world they face. Caye (Candela Pe���a) and Zulema (

Micaela Nev���rez) support the weight of the film, which is much and little, which is summarized in three

strokes, but which weighs down a wide universe of universally understandable feelings, of perfect gestures and

sincere looks. The melancholy, the tenderness, the sadness: aspects that have never completely abandoned the cinema

of this forensic society, vivisecting the newly dejected body of a city that breathes routine,

incommunicado and restlessness in all its streets. Guy, to tell the truth, there is little: it is not necessary. This

claim to pseudo-documentary filmmaking, lyrical in the way that Le���n de Aranoa understands beauty, gives a

paused film in excess, overloaded on the shoulders of two actresses in a state of grace, They seem not to act and

carry with dignified dignity the poetic burden of history. It is not Mondays to the Sun nor to the Neighborhood nor the

splendid first opera. Family: Princesas is a smaller cinema. It is more a whim of ascreenwriter

restless, and risky, that a proposal with commercial scope and artistic sights like those that precede it.

He says that everything has been carried away by the desire to offer a different vision of the physical and social fact of

prostitution. There is too much costumbrismo: an unnecessary cramming of silences, of complicities thatalready

weknow and that are too many. Sweetened as it was not necessary, the result is disappointing, given (it will be in the

end that) of the expectations created with those aforementioned tapes and that opened the illusion that Fernando

Le�� �n de Aranoa had a unique voice and a universe of long-term feelings. He has not failed

himself, in my modest opinion, but he has missed the opportunity to continue risking and winning. Princesas

risks, although she loses: she melts in the false comedy, in a certain reluctance to give her a greaterbackground

plot. Without a script in which things happen, the cinema loses irrecoverable tricks. De-linked cinema, if

there is one, will be cinema, but bordering other territories that, on occasion, provide better results with

other weapons such as music (the ineffable art par excellence) or literature (the absolute art

par excellence). Addenda: the end is ambiguous, something cowardly: perhaps the only possible, which is a pity that I do not

suffer.

" 0

" For killing a man he earns a million and for sleeping with him one million and one cent. The gringos say that the current sexiest actresses are Scarlett Johansson, Angelina Jolie, Jessica Alba,

Jessica Simpson, Keira Knightley and Halle Berry. But I think that from today you have to consider a

new actress who competes in beauty with all of them, gentlemen, I present Flora Mart���nez who from today

should be remembered for her excellent work in Rosario Tijeras. And not only is she a beautiful and exuberant woman, she is

also a brilliant actress who portrays the protagonist of the film, with such force, justice, precision and

soul, that makes the film Resulcula is totally believable. A Colombian actress who has done everything from

soap operas, theater in the US and cinema. An actress who, like the author of the novel on which the film is based,

said; "Flora made me feel and believe that she was the real Rosario Tijeras". They say that Rosario is the queen

of Colombia's assassins. That has killed thousands of men. That for killing a man, she charges a million and for

lying down a million and a cent, because as she says, it is more difficult to love than to kill. They say thather

she givesvictims a kiss before killing them, because she believes that any garbage deserves something before leaving.

They say he has never loved. And she says that of all this, only half is true.Based on the successful novel of the

same name by author Jorge Franco, Emilio Maill��� directs his first feature film after a long list of

documentaries produced in different countries including France, where he has resided for a long time. Performing

a deep, soulful, heartbreaking though beautiful tape. Plasmando the life of the slums of a

mesthetic Medellin, Colombia, where hope, love, passion coexist with violence and misfortune. A

complex city captured with justice and not only as a violent scene, under an excellent photo that

gives us unforgettable images. The well-adapted gui���n perfectly mixes the tragedy with asubplot

sexy and entertainingthat brings you closer to Rosario and helps you to get to know her better and enjoy the film more. And although the third

act is slow and repetitive, the film is worth a lot, always supported by the good performances of a

multicultural cast made up of the Colombian Manolo Cardona, the Spanish Unax Ugalde and the Mexican Rodrigo

Oviedo. The single sequence of the ritual of the wake of one of the characters turns out to be more memorable byshowing

clearlythe Latin way of seeing life and death, a collection of desperate attempts to cover

death with celebration and death. joy, crowning the sequence with the incredible and unforgettable streptease scene. A

powerful, strong film, that moves and hurts, but strangely makes itself loved. A sample that thecinema

Latin Americanhas a lot of rope for a while. Although most of the spectators will only be attracted

by the erotic pÃ ©ster (in that aspect either, nobody will leave defrauded ).

" 1

" Tim Burton has done it again. Creating a musical based on his dark, bizarre and lugubrious style was a

difficult task, but the director has achieved it in a masterly way. One of Timbest movies

Burton's.

I loved it! Look at the Tim Burton and Johnny Depp days, I do not like it very much, but I have to say

that the film is very good! The director manages to mix masterfully his gloomy, gothic and

dark style in a great musical. And I say great musical because the film is almost 2 hours, 2 hours that do notfor me

get long. It is possible that in the middle of the film the rhythm goes down a bit, but then it recovers

immediately. What he said. A pure and hard musical, come on, I think that 90-95% of the film is sung. After

a magnificent sequence of the beginning, at 3 or 4 minutes we see people singing. A magnificent

sequence of the beginning accompanied by a very good soundtrack. In general the whole movie has good

musical pieces, and the leitmotiv of Sweeney Todd is cool! The actors are great. Who would say that Johnny Depp

sang well, huh? Jejej. But the role fits like a glove, and is perfect in the Tim Burton world.

Helena Bonham Carter also does it very well, it's a good day. The songs I have to say that hooks, or at

least, left the room yesterday singing a par.xD But hey, that if something stands out the film is for its (as it

is to be assumed) design ��o production and his artistic direction, which as always, are very well taken and

perfectly knowing what you want to show. The film with muted tones already looks for the gloomy andaspect

tenebrousit has. Only highlights in that dark frame the splashes (quite gores) of blood that there is

during more than half of the film. Brutal, too much blood even for Tim Burton! Hehe It is that history

engages. The truth is that it is ingenious, and as I could not miss has a couple of touches of humor that are

appreciated. Come on, I loved it. I did not go with much expectations and at the end you leave the cinema with a good

taste in your mouth and watching one of the best films of Tim Burton, since it is his 100% style. By the way, I almost

left it. What is final? Okay maybe there are a couple of predictable things that can be guessed, but the final shot.

The final shot is the best I've seen in a long time. And I do not say more. Everyone to see it because you will like it.

Unless you hated the musicals ..

" 1

" Cr���nica intimates a maladjustment mental aura of a suspense plot fluid style and increasing

dramatic intensity. A little masterpiece that will make you talk.

Anguish: That's the word. We can, in any case, find nouns that say the same, but in another

way. Despair Impotence. Keane is also schizophrenia. We can, in any case, find nouns

that say the same, but in another way. Paranoia. Madness. Life can be wonderful, as the

repetitive and tiresome football commentator in La Sexta shouts, but life can be chaos, a suffering

impossible to bear. This is what Lodge H. Kerrigan has done: filming suffering, giving visual content

to an idea that has troubled any creator in the long and long history of human emotions and

feelings. Everything necessary to print the narrative is dispensed with the necessary fluency and the

viewer is not distracted by reasoning about how it happened or disquisitions about the relevance of

going to this or another method that illuminate the investigation: what is happening? That Keane, the troubled

protagonist, has lost his daughter in the subway station. All the rest is the titanic effort to

find it, but pessimism hinders any option of success. It seems, for much of the footage, that the

task is impossible. That the girl is not going to be found. In addition Keane is a mental patient, a being that wenot

canalways ask to act with exemplary; a being of which we are not even sure that it is clear

what is really happening. In this sense, Kerrigan elevates the condition of the subjective to work of art

because there are moments in the film in which we feel Keane and we lose the north of reality by wanting (

even mentally, fictitiously) to convince us that it is not true. The desolation, the disenchantment, the sadness

of Keane makes him tire the city, contaminated by his dirty offer of drugs, sex and confusion. It is the price to

pay for the mistake you have made. Because nothing that Keane finds is funny or has a hint that it

can lead to the difficult imaginable happy ending that, in the end, we all wanteverything is madness and

. Notvertigo. The hell of the search allows for meek recesses: places for abandonment, backwaters where Keane

finds himself as he never thought he could be. Then reality loudly scrapes this

soft surface of pure feelings. The noise returns him to the infamous territory of guilt. The glory is for

Damian Lewis, an actor in a state of grace, who makes his risky role veros���mil, in which there is no

moment of respite and where the camera rummages in its emotional intimacy like a fine scalpel that dissects

with prudent neatness the stresses of the mind, its convoluted map of feelings. To mention also the

meritorious performance of Abigail Breslin, the child of Little Miss Sunshine, which gives a counterpoint of plausibility

to a story that, in such a simple way, produces the sensation of being false. None of that: in Keane there is a formidable

prospecting of the disturbed soul, but there are also traces (and of very high quality) of cinema of the most genuineobviate

suspense, which does notthe usual apparatus of enigmas susceptible to modify the course of history and

make it run through several places. I insist on recommending this film in this sequel movie tsunami

that leaves the viewer completely stranded in boredom. A small masterpiece.

" 1

" History of a crime is a well-cared round movie that makes you enjoy from the first moment,

making the motive of satisfaction a little touch of the intention for the respectable.

Beyond what certain visual resources can achieve in a production that is supposed to be an author, the way

of narrating a story closer to the m���sm��� At least what could be a book is, if it can be said, the

dream of many filmmakers. The nuances of a story, parallel realities and otheradl���teres

literarynever find a place in the celluloid except in a few and experimental occasions. And here it is that

Historia de un crimen, if possible, manages to resemble the novel that never was. Very pompous everything, as you can see. As

was Capote in his clownish version, something that the unknown Toby Jones has managed to capture as if it were a

brother siam���s. Because he is the absolute and deserved protagonist of a film that tells the twisted

crime of the Clutters, in Holcomb, the earthly investigation after the murder and the efforts

of the New Orleans writer to create a new genre that earned him the applause of the profession and that he baptized as

A sangre fr���a. It is fundamental to reach a conclusion -which comes just in the end, as it should be-to know

the hero of the superficiality that Capote was in order to understand how, in spite of himself, his existence

was a heavy cross on his shoulders And the amount of records that the actor in question is able to

offer before the camera causes an unusual range of sensations. Pity that last year a great

Philip Seymour Hoffman already made headlines for this very. But do not compare. The skeleton of the History of a

crime comes wrapped with the bow of thoroughness. A longer presentation of characters

helps to get an idea of ​​why they all act and what is the reason for their misfortunes - a

blank page, a suicide, an incomprehensible punishment, etc. -. Without sentimental embellishments or pretended justifications.

Instantaneous that placed in a row make up a temporary radiography that begins with an outcome and ends with

an approach. When one realizes, however, that everything he has seen so far is a lie,

the director has been talking for a long time about the non-malice of human beings. And all based on leaps of

perspective that, however, do not soften the truculent of the matter. Let's not forget that we are talking about anevent

atrocious. The town gossip, with forgiveness, carried to the last consequences of a jet set with desire for

adventure is more than a chronicler could wish. That's why Capote felt good with them. A broad

and well-known cast could have become a handicap for the gui���n, although this is not the case. From

Sigourney Weaver to Sandra Bullock - and there are several good interpretations of the Hollywood Queen - they are

great as a companion of Jones. The only, perhaps, that squeaks, as always, is the hard guy

Daniel Craig. Perhaps this time the postmodern executor of inexpressiveness is somewhat more credible, but he

still has something that prevents him from growing. Finally, the introduction of the resource of the interview also in the

film grants a greater margin to the fiction, however strange it may seem. . History of a crime is a

round and well-cared film that makes you enjoy from the first moment, making besides the slight touch of the

intention a reason of satisfaction for the respectable one . It is a job that will undoubtedly deserve a "rereading"?

occasional. And you already understand me. (MML)

" 1

" We are facing the first big movie of the year. A serious and rigorous adaptation that has no qualms

in simplifying the story of the novel, cutting it to the point and stripping it of secondary subframes.

You can make good films of good books, even if you miss us. And it can be done by being faithful to the

spirit and the characters and betraying the letter everything that is necessary for the cinematographic product,

which will never eliminate the book from which it starts, can be understood by itself and is, in its own structure, a

work that stands alone. This is what Christopher Nolan and his brother Jonathan have done with the work of his namesake

Christopher Priest: a serious and rigorous adaptation that has no qualms about simplifying the story of the

novel. ndola in the precise and depriving it of subplots, to focus simply on the

story of the shared obsession of two magicians and their continuous feints in search of a revenge that does not make

sense anymore ��� of the quest for confrontation for prestige. Posed almost as a play in its

lack of scenic air, almost always in closed enclaves that refer to the stage or the stage where

the two magicians (or their engineers or scientists) perform their performances and his workouts, The

prestige (absurdly pretitled in Spain "" The final trick "", I imagine that because the same name of the

movie reminds of a certain sunken ship that conveniently later did not want to remember anyone) is a aduel

scenicbetween Hugh Jackman and Christian Bale, each one a reflection of the other and, in a juicygame

narrative, mirrors of their own. It helps that an interpretive giant such as Michael Caine has the

necessary serenity and it is appreciated that, stripped of the story of narrative subterfuges, the presence of the

three women on stage (including the beautiful Scarlett Johansson) is adequately secondary. Without renouncing the

narrative technique of unfounded flashbacks that gave such good results in Memento and Batman Begins, here the

feints within the feints make perfect the game of newspapers and discoveries,passes

structural birlibirloquethat can disconcert anyone who is not in the narrative's grasp from the

start. Because, as Michael Caine's images and voice-over announce, everything is in sight and the

film's own narrative already shows us, almost at the beginning, among the Canaries, who He is the great mystery of

the Man Transported trick. The grading of the story improves the book's climax, and it focuses

perfectly on the appearance of Nikola Tesla, perhaps too soberly interpreted by a severe David Bowie,

or maybe I expected to see something closer to Ziggy Stardust. Although he insinuates himself in some line of dialogue, it would have

been interesting to see some of Tesla's compulsive eating obsessions in thescene

lunch. With plans that at some point refer to Coppola's Dr���cula (the arrival in Colorado reminds us

strongly of the arrival of Jonathan Harker in Transylvania, and on some walk in London one can almost see

that close Mina Murray walks in the body of Wynona Rider), the dramatic tension accumulates in annarrative

intense, almost against the grain in today's cinema. Perhaps the quantum referent tongue-in-cheek tois lost

Tesla's cat and his science ahead of time, so the viewer will no doubt believe that we are seeing a

new magic trick . Confined intentionally to an apparent secondary role (perhaps in the book his character has more

strength), Christian Bale yields a good part of the footage and the performance of a magnificent Hugh Jackman, who not only

is he capable of fleetingly interpreting a double role, but, changing his pose andthat slightly his

imaginingphysicist, gives the impression of being in effect another person: habr��� to wait for the DVD to hear him declaim

Enrique IV in his continuous drunkenness. We just have to pay attention to realize that we are facing

the first big movie of the year.

" 1

" Volver is a return to Pedro Almod���var's brighter past. Volver is a return to the brighter past of Pedro Almod���var. A past in which the tragic mixed

with the cosmic in a natural way and without stridencies. In the new film by Almod���var, Pen���lope Cruz has

reason to ask himself: "What have I done to deserve this?" (1984), great work of the Oscar-winningdirector

Manchegowho has many similarities with "" Volver "". As in the previous film, death has returned to

prominence in this new film as well as the figure of the all-terrain woman who must know how to cope in

embarrassing situations. Returning is an immersion in the universe feminine of the peoples of Spain, asetting

ruralwhere human relationships are deeper and secrets and complicities become more important

As regards interpretations, a Pen��� surprises Lope Cruz who gets excited and neither should we

belittle the quality of Blanca Portillo (very contained, unlike her role in 7 lives) and Lola Due���as.

The character of Carmen Maura, on the other hand, contributes the filmic point in the film. But perhaps the greatest success

of Almod���var in this film is, apart from the freshness and originality of his guide, the accurate combination between

the tragic and the cosmic, because the cinema of Almod���var pretends to be a reflection of life, a life as that of

anyone in which the most disastrous moments are intermingled with other m���sc���micos or even that reach the

absurd.

" 1

" Pure and great commercial cinema. It has all the perfect ingredients to become the success it already

is.

Shhhh puuum! Graaaskc, ���iuuumm, oisfff. This could be a good summary of Transformers, the latest film by

Michael Bay, and that has (and rightly) raised 250 million dollars up to the date, all over the world.film

Bay'sis the best exponent of commercial and commercial filmmaking, but it is not able to. But, starting from this premise, and

only starting from it, is a great film. Tremendous special effects, spectacular sound (and

deafening), funny scenes, good music and young protagonists. So, it has all theingredients

perfectto become the success that is already . If we add to this the performance of a director

characterized by spectacular images (Armaggedon, Pearl Harbor), there is nothing else to sit in the

chair with your popcorn, your soda, and enjoy the explosion. ���n light and sound. Outstandingcinema.

commercialHowever, the film saturates. It overwhelms. So much so, that the last 20 minutes of the film, although theyus

sell it toas the final climax and really is, it becomes tiresome. Too much explosion, a lot of sound

(turned into a scream). It's as if they decided to show us what they have given us during the rest of the film,

but raised to infinity and for a period of time certainly something excessive.Shia Labeouf, in his role as

' boy-who -cae-bien-al-espectata ', Megan Fox as' attractive-girl-turned-in-hero���na' and the rest of the

characters is the height of a film of these characteristics , and allow the movie to have itsmoments

fun. And the rest? There are no more. But you can not wait for it either. Who wants a good guide todialogues

deepin this type of film? It does not do it neither the film itself nor the viewer must not do it either. With

'Transformers' one will entertain. And this is achieved with a lot. And if you manage to get carried away by the rhythm

until the end, it will be one of the movies that you enjoy the most. Without a doubt.Pilomitero cinema in its maximum exponent. It is

that. Nothing more.

" 1

" A film in which many hopes have been deposited and which can mark a turning point in Spanish

cinema.

After several months of enormous expectations, the day of the premiere of the most expensive film in the history

of Spanish cinema arrives. The figures surrounding this production are dizzying, and among them are the more than

twenty million euro budget, the ten thousand extras who participated in the shooting and an amount

rcord of decorations. Directed by Agust���n D���az Yanes, who has also been commissioned to develop the script from

the novels of P���rez Reverte, the film is a compendium of the adventures of Captain Alatriste, making a

kind of tour through the different books that make up the saga. The action starts in the seventeenth century

in Flanders, where our protagonist fights defending the empire Spanish Next to him, his friend Balboa,

who falls seriously injured and whose last will is that Alatriste takes charge of caring for his young son, and

away from the martial world, so that he never Become a soldier and run the same fate as him. Diego

Alatriste wants to fulfill the desire of his friend, but his life is difficult, since he survives on the basis of

less dirty jobs, selling his sword. A luxury cast, headed by Viggo Mortensen, and in which

Juan Echanove in the role of Quevedo, Javier C���mara as Count Duque de Olivares and the enigmatic

Ariadna Gil. The rest is also a good level and those who have been fans of the novels, will

verify that both the setting and the recreation of the characters are very similar to what one

imagines while reading the books. These and other virtues can turn into a success a film in which

many hopes have been deposited and which can mark a turning point in Spanish cinema.

" 1

" When you contrast the childlike aspect of the house with the serious, adult and real air of the scenes,is

the climax of the filmcompletely broken.

I read recently in some blog that I usually visit that the more you criticize a film for bad, the more the public goes

to see it. It seems that we are some masochistic cin���philes. In my case it does not happen at all. By deformation

blogger I am aware of the criticism of the films with the greatest impact of the cinematographic panorama in

order to contrast opinions; and that makes it a lot easier for me to see one or the other in the cinema. However,

there are tapes that, however overwhelming the criticisms against them, do not make me give up on my decision. n to

watch it. And, one of them was ���sta. The fact that Robert Zemeckis and Steven Spielberg are his godparents

are partly to blame. The trailer of the film got me the effect I wanted (the desire to see it), and the

story too: DJ Walters, a twelve-year-old boy, has too much free time and it has gotten into

his head that there is something strange in the house of the old Nebbercracker on the other side of the street. Just one day before

Halloween, DJ and his friend Croqueta have a meeting with Mr. Nebbercracker after throwing the

basketball into his garden and mysteriously reaching inside the house. When the house tries to swallow its

new friend Jenny and nobody believes what the three children say, who assure that the house has something evil, they

set out to investigate what is happening The visual invoice of the film is impressive. The

motion capture animation technique, which is used with incredible mastery, achieves unsurpassed levels of

perfection to date. The magnificent rendering of each character and its surroundings, and the

amazing handling of the camera, achieving with it absolutely amazing planes, make us believe that

we are witnessing a "real" film? of real actors. My friends, everything that surrounds Monster House? It has

personality and a life of its own; in this aspect a 10 like a house. As for the development of the plot, another

success. Who has never had fantasies of abandoned houses in their childhood? And,

who has resisted entering these houses, with more fear than courage, to discover their secret? In the

second perhaps not so many have dared, but this film plays with that approach and shows you a

thousand wonders, with a fast pace, what is it that could occur in that situation. We are faced with a product

created with an evident mixture of terror and adventure, and with clear references to films of those two

genres belonging to the d� Every 80's, with? The Goonies? and? Night of Fear? to the head. At this point you can see

the hand of his sponsors, Zemeckis and Spielberg; and, in that sense, I have enjoyed as a child.

So, in what does the film fail? Why do I qualify it as mediocre? Because, in my opinion, thething fails

main: the house. I explain myself. Monster House? it is not a children's tape; we're not looking at a movie

? disneyniana ?, type? looking for Nemo? or? The Little Mermaid ?, with white and maudlin moments. We are talking about a

product aimed at adolescents and adults who have something of that adolescence. Because from the very

beginning of the film, and during the rest of its duration, we can witness disturbing scenes, of those

that convey some fear. It is a light fear, but enough to create an atmosphere of

restlessness, which will surely provoke more of a nightmare than a child. Taking this premise into account,

it fits too much that what causes that fear, the house, is represented in a humanized and caricatured way, or called

infantilized (SPOILER: yes, yes, the windows are the eyes, the door is the mouth , the language is a

carpet and the wood with which it is built writhes to make gestures and expressions). It is clear that

there is a reason for that to be so, that unveil, but when you contrast this childlike aspect of the house

with the serious, adult and real air of the scenes the climax of the film is completely broken. That is to say,

in those moments it stops being credible, and not even the perfect animation technique of capture of movement? saves it

In any case, knowing this fact and opening your mind to the fantasy, you will spend a fun time with it.

" 0

" Hitman is a film that is above the average action cinema, and that will undoubtedly

delight the lovers of the genre for its explosive Adrenaline mix, intrigue and the work of the actors.

Thirty years ago it was unthinkable that a film could give rise to an entire empire of products, but

George Lucas arrived and gave new impetus to merchandising in the cinema. And now, on the other hand, it is common to

see how some of the most popular video games from around the world, usuallyare adapted to the big screen.

of action,Stima that at the moment Hollywood has been limited to video games of action and has not set

eyes on other types of games that have a more elaborate history and worthy of the pen of the most renowned

screenwriter . Now Hitman comes to us, adaptation of the homonymous saga, an exciting film full of

fast-paced action. Sometimes it is too hectic and run down, and there are certain sequences in

which the viewer will feel inside a video game, and miss a command with which to

control the protagonist. The argument is very elementary and not very original, although it is true that it does not bore and that

after all, the tape can not be demanded much more either. The work of the actors is quite good,

with a convincing Timothy Olyphant, a sober Dougray Scott and a seductive Olga Kurylenko.Hitman is a

film that is above the action film average, and that undoubtedly will delight

lovers of the genre for its explosive mixture of adrenaline, intrigue and the work of the actors. But

fundamentally, it fulfills its primordial objective, to make the spectator spend a very entertaining and entertaining time.

" 0

" A delicious narrative about the adventure understood as an evolution within a vital process.

It is often said that pirate cinema has in this film its best example, the ideal model that has

inspired and will inspire forever when to profile and build a hero-antih� Seroe is about. That is the

point that most catches my attention "" Captain Blood "", a delicious narrative about the adventure

understood as an evolution n inside a vital process. The great qualities of this film are all

those that will have a good film of adventures: sharp and ingenious dialogues, antagonistic characters and

built with just efficiency and complexity, fluid rhythm, fast and at the service of the intensity

of the different phases. With a good guide, achieving the optimum result is the easy sea; hero, hero,

bad, friends of the hero, enemies, the powerful bonach, etc. A lot of characters,

constructed with simplicity and without vain pretensions that end up spoiling the whole, something very typical of

modern productions, that try to make complex characters and what comes out is a churro p� ��lido,

insubstantial and inexpressive, as in the case of "" Alatriste. "" Here, not many characters and many

pieces appear here (patriotic and political elements, including ) that play a role in history, structured in such a

way that the viewer recognizes each one in its function, forming a very well developed whole. To make

a great film, you need the elements that are going to be part of it to be the right and necessary ones,

not over anything or missing anything: all, in the course and at the end of the story, have been configuring the destiny and

luck of the central character around which the narration is organized. Above all, more than ""cinema

pirate"", "" adventure "", "" action "", etc, Michael Curtiz's film is the story of a man, a story not

devoid of intimacies, contradictions and secrets. The rebel personified by Errol Flyn - archetype of

romantic ideals such as freedom, the apologetic sentiment, the service to those who have been excluded by a

certain political order - who lived � a past of military adventures, of which he denies, he is involved in

an odyssey to save the oppressed that will lead to the creation of the pirate way of life, which seeks

freedom and community coexistence, but which in the end it is discovered as an act of resentment and revenge against the

suffering and injustice generated by the established order. But the hero is aware and knows of the

human lives that his company has cost, conscience revived by the female character, who here is something more than

a cliche and complies with the opportune significance: the reproach against the immoral and uprooted life of the hero,

contributing to the redemption of the same. Every film of adventure must have a core of humanity, a process

in which the hero triumphs and makes mistakes, and returns to the origin. And in that story all the characters that surround

the protagonist must fulfill a function, to obtain that all significant, medical, but also metaphysical,

so that the h�� Hero-antihero is a reflection of our lives, of what our lives are or are not. And

so, "" Captain Blood "" is a remarkable film of adventure and a model to imitate.

" 1

" A pelli that is not for children (despite the fantasy), that although it is a bit sad, it is worthenough

seeing more than.

I have not wanted to spend much time or intoxicate to see this Mexican, USA and Spanish production,

directed (and written and produced) by the Mexican Guillermo del Toro, recently acclaimed by the cr Ethics and it seems that

also by the public. And I liked it a lot. I think it's better not to know anything about the argument to enjoy it

fully, although you can know that it's set in a house in post-war times, and that mixes

fantasy with reality. At first I have a hard time getting into it, because the beginning is slow. The first

fantastic developments are not what I expected, either, until the real part of the story gets better

until it acquires the true protagonism of the film. In the last third they touch both worlds, already with the

public in their pockets completing a round story. I liked the actors. Sergi L���pez playing the

national captain is too exaggerated in his badness, but he is a very bad cinematographic bad guy.

It has so much Nazi touch that it does not even seem Spanish (will this be a way of winning over Hollywoodfor

academics���scar?). The girl, very good. He believes it and he makes us believe it. More things that I liked: thetransitions

camera, the very real special effects and the ambience in general. What not: that does not need to be so

explicit in some scenes. What is not shown gives more impression and is more elegant. But there are a couple of

very violent scenes, and some like the capitÃn sewing that makes the hair stand on end. Take care of more

details. Why does not the character of Maribel Verd��� finish the captain when he has just delivered two blows and

cut his face? Resumiendo, a movie that is not for children ��os (despite the fantasy), that although it is a bitenough

sad, it is worth seeing more than.

" 1

" After so much criticism and so much disqualification, in the end it was what I expected, spectacular, visually

stunning, fun, entertaining, and even typical at times.

Well, I liked it. After so much criticism and so much disqualification, in the end it was what I expected, a movie of

heroic fantasy, which takes names, legends and situations of history, to mount a fable. It is

spectacular, visually stunning, trying to give a unique and heroic touch to the whole story. It is not a

realistic film, it is how a Greek peasant would tell it next to the fire a few years later, exaggerating or

simply telling what he thinks is real. We can say that defending democracy and that women can have an

opinion is excessively contemporary, but hey, Leonidas is the perfect hero, not only for the vision of

that time, but for today's viewer. It's hard, but fair, with the funny touch, and despite

losing the original voice, Gerald Butler is perfect, and seems able to eat Brad Pitt, I say Achilles,

easily. The rest, because the bad guys have to be bad, bad, and my favorite, Dominic West, (McNulty !!). The

Persians, well, they are masses of meat of ca������n, with some enemy of end of phase, but always rolled of aform

very spectacular. The truth is that the film seems to last only an hour, and it's worth seeing, as long as

you know what you're going to see. It's a great show, and whoever wants something else, has Rome, the television

series. I like both of them, and there can not be anything more different, but with both of you you stick to the

chair. But of course, dozens of wonderful critics have to come out, who talk about a movie. ��cula where under the

mask of the Persian Immortals it turns out that there really is? orcs, as if it were really aattempt

concealedof occult and conspiratorial forces to convince the poor innocent minds of the world, that we must

fight against the Persians, Iranians, which is obviously what Miller thought when he wrote the history.

I have read in different places, that 300 is homofoba (where ????), that despises the Athenians (no, if the

Spartans were going to speak well of them), that the Spartans are Yankee soldiers (actually , the yankees

would be the Persians, well equipped, with money and with numerical superiority, but good) the exaggeratedly hollows

are the Spartans (and nobody protests that they are handsome !!!) which is a film just to entertain and have fun

(that's a movie category, at least for me, as respectable as the rest, entertaining the public can be as

difficult as transmitting a message, om���s) or that the Persians were actually wonderful conquerors,

respectful and kind (already, in antiquity the conquests were not bloody, it manages to see things from

our point of view) to emphasize how bad they were really the Spartans (not worse than many others, and

even better than enough). In short, it's a movie action and fantasy, good and bad, fun,

entertaining, and even apica at times, enjoy it.

" 1

" Classic of adventures on the celestial disputes of the Greek mythology. It knows a festive period, a

Christmas nap with the children running around the house and setting the feasts in the sofa. Great

I like these films of stale colors. Those that happen again and again when theperiods are approaching

vational, see Christmas or Holy Week. I like them because you can see them for a while, go popcorn,

serve them, play with your children, and when you come back they keep on hooking you up. I've been seeing her this afternoon, in what

she did things. And not only I found out, but I liked it a lot. Do not you know how to do these things?

Are we more magnificent with the stone carton than with the computer? Who knows. The film is about the

celestial movements of Greek mythology. Apparently Zeus had a mess with a human, becoming

rain (fine way of saying it, of course), and the pre������ of Perseus. But here it is that the girl's father did

not know that the preacher was the supreme cabrio, I say haceedor, so he put them in a grave from cardboard stone (

it floats) to mother and child and threw them into the sea. Puff, Zeus became like an arm of the sea and tells him na less than the

god of the sea to take the tit���n to erase from the map the city of the murderous king of daughters and grandchildren. By the way,

he gives her a hug that melts him. Is the idea cool or not? A m��� puts me. Tremendous, tremendous. To begin with, thetouch

staleof the special effects of yesteryear, with impossible movements, as if they were missing frames, withcarton

stoneon all sides, with everything you need to stick to the sof���. The argument is totally of thepress

pink, that my dear mother-in-law warned me that for soap operas the mythological ones, where all are fathers or mothers

of humans and between them they want to kill the children. Well, what is said well, they did not get along. And the

biggest thing is the family flavor these movies have, to sit on the couch to watch her with a bowl ofpopcorn

giantcovered with the blanket and watching as they killed each other. jellyfish, kr���kenes and the mother who

pari���.Resumiendo, classic of adventures on the celestial disputes of Greek mythology. It knows aperiod

festive, a Christmas nap with the children running around the house and setting the feasts in the sofa.

Great What special effects, what effects.Besitos.PD: The teacher (I dare not write it) of

Harry Potter. The one who is the head of her house and has the face of chard.PD2: Oh, and ladies in porretas without coming to

mind. It pleased to find beautiful breasts and sober behind in the middle of a nap.

" 1

" It is gratifying to be able to see a work like Memento, that entertains, makes people think and "hooks". Tell an

excellent story, and above all, osa? to be a film told in a way never before seen.

After harvesting a great success of criticism in half the world, the experiment that is "" Memento "", conquers the

public for its originality and daring, characteristics absent in most of the films of the great

studios, unfortunately, and where many times the films are made as if they were on an assembly line,

mechanics , without feeling. but "" Memento "" is a parenthesis in all that vor���gine of theindustry

cinematographic. It is difficult to understand, difficult to understand in a first viewing, but made with so much

talent and passion for the art, that it is impossible not to get stuck in history, despite the

convoluted of its approach. As it is already known by many, the story is told in an inverted way.

That being the case, we start with the final scene and go back in time, until we discover how

the movie began. But do not think that you are going to see dialogues upside down people walking backwards. The film

is divided into several segments, and it is those segments that suffer the temporary inversion. The beginning of

each segment is the end of the next. At first, it may seem complicated for the viewer, but at 20

minutes of projection, it is easy to get used to. This investment is not just a stylistic resource of the

film, the director and screenwriter Christopher Nolan wanted, with this investment, to make the viewer feel the

most. It's possible, what goes through the head of the character of Leonard Shelby (Guy Pearce), who suffers from an ailment

called "" loss of recent memory "" from the brutal murder of his wife. This ailment is about the

inability to remember more than ten or fifteen minutes in a row. Any event that occurred before the

death of his wife (childhood, work, family, anecdotes, friends.) Is remembered perfectly, but since the

incident, he is unable to record a memory in his mind, in such a way that He does not have an exact awareness of

when his wife died, how long he has been suffering from that ailment. because the last thing he remembers is the

brutal murder. The only way that Leonard has to know what is happening to him is to take

pictures of everything he sees, of the people he has contact with (behind these photos, he writes

Characteristics of the individual, such as his name or if he should trust him, write down everything, get tattoos all over

the body with the most important information. So much concern is not in vain. Leonard looks forkiller

his wife'sand plans to kill him when he comes face to face with him. But the murderer can be anyone, and

Leonard, due to his ailment, runs the risk of being manipulated and cheated. He ends up meeting Natalie (Carrie

Ann-Moss) and Teddy (Joe Pantoliano), of whom, as the plot progresses (or recedes, depending on how you look at it),

they change from good people to beings pusil���nimes.Nolan used the temporary investment in a veryway

intelligent, because we only discovered the "" truth "" next to the protagonist. In a more graphic example, the sensation

that we have watching the tape is that we are recovering the memory with Leonard. Thus, the sensation of

suspense is guaranteed until the end (or until the beginning, according to this approach). The turns of the script

are so constant and so well structured that often the viewer is rethinking everything. and

the end, where the beginning of the story is revealed, is open to so many conjectures and so many possibilities

that it is difficult to find two people with the same theory. The script, therefore, is a true watermark, and

I can assure you that the story would work just as well if the chronological order were not the other way round. The

performances, which are They are very marked in this plot, they are exceptional. Guy Pearce goes very well stopped and manages to

convey all the anguish and tension that the paper demands. The characters of Joe Pantoliano and Carrie Ann-Moss

(who, again, repeat the film, after the successful Matrix) are also very profitable, both

actors are very careful with their interpretations, since the true intentions of their characters change

several times. The music is very melancholy, and it goes very well with the feeling that everything seems new and old

at the same time, that everything fades away, paraphrasing Rutger Hauer in Blade Runner, " "like tears in the rain" ".

I was also struck by the fact that some particularly important details are filmed in black and

white, such as the memories of Leonard before the murder of his wife. It is rewarding to be able to see

a work like Memento, that entertains, makes think and "" hooks "". It tells an excellent story, and above all,

"" dares "" to be a film told in a way never before seen.

" 1

" Poor Spanish film, considered cult by that. "" A real estate agent has strange dreams where a very attractive young woman who lives in aisland

distant. He goes to the psychiatrist, who tells him that he needs a vacation. So he moves to that island where,

indeed, lives the young woman of the dream, Nadine, an aristocrat descendant of Count Dr���cula. Between the two,is

a passionate relationshipestablished, motivated by being the young woman of a vampire's island, who is

transforming the girl into one like her. But her boyfriend and psychiatrist will try to save her. "" Although considered

cult in some sectors, it's really a boring and inconsistent film, cheerfully directed,

that's it, by Jes���s Franco , very friendly home director but excessively overrated. Here is a

good idea, but its development is a hard to bear. Slow and exasperating, in addition to being quite

ridiculous, only his artistic direction stands out, something in which the good of Jes���s.Otherwise

, quite boring and tedious, but made with a good aesthetic taste, I repeat. It does not seem like much to me,

really.

" 0

" Film about a juvenile delinquent named Jaro. Not being based on a real story, the end goes

wild and takes too much credibility from the whole. Although it is interesting to see remnants of the Spanish society

of the early 80's.

Director: Eloy de la Iglesia.Duraci���n: Hour and a half short.Estreet: October 6, 1980. Viewers: 810,160

beings Humans. Not long ago he said with confidence that the worst Spanish actor of all time was Fernando

Tejero, the eternal doorman of "" Here there is no one who lives "". That was until I saw this movie, and I

remembered "" El pico "", with which Enrique San Francisco happens to be the worst known actor. You will think that I must

be alienated, since you have seen Fernando Tejero cry, but Quique San Francisco's cry to heaven.

Seriously. The inexpressiveness of his face, and the intonation without ups and downs, worse than read, gives him that well-deserved

award. Congratulations. On the other hand, one day I found the boy in Madrid with a tremendous punch,

which makes me think that he has other gifts beyond the interpretation. The film is about adelinquent

juvenilenamed Jaro. He tells us about the life of this minor, his relations with the rest of the delinquents,

and how he becomes a small leader in the sector of tir���ny and armed robbery. He can divide the

pel� ��cula in two parts, a fairly passable first, where we are presenting the Jaro and his friends, and a

second where they try to put many things in the little time they have left and I think it lowers the

level. The actors have a low level, possibly motivated by the youth of the same, but they give the right way

(especially when Quique San Francisco comes out, that the comparisons are odious). And this type of

stories allows bad actors in favor of a hard guide with few concessions. In addition, it has aaftertaste

special, given that many of the scenarios are lugadores where I have been as a young man (like La Ventilla,

all my family is from there) and they call me a lot of attention. Resuming, movie about a juvenile delinquent

called el Jaro. Not being based on a real story, the end goes wild and takes too much credibility from

the whole. Despite this, it is interesting to see remnants of the Spanish society of the early

80's. Another Eloy de la Iglesia.Besitos.

" 0

" New film by the visionary Zemeckis who, even watching the animation to unexpected places,leaves

finallythe viewer immersed in a sensation as strange as the story that is told.

For me Robert Zemeckis is a visionary, and is that always, which Jules Verne has managed to go one step

ahead in this film, to begin with, in the 80s he took out of his pocket the trips in time with the excellent

saga "" Regreso to the future "", then made humans live with Cartoons (now we see humans in

the cinema living with CGI), in "" Who cheated Roger Rabbit? "" Years later I reflect the loneliness thatrecently

we haveseen Will Smith in "" I am a legend "" in his "" Naufrago "" with Tom Hanks, and three years ago (it seems that it was yesterday)

a technique for making movies was removed from the sleeve, using the capture of movements that seems to be the future

of the cinema that we know today, as it graphically imposes, although He's still on the streets, and he has the wonder of

shortening shots in a surprising way, and that everything is added later, in the postprod room ucci���n, and that

gave its first thuds with "" The Polar Express "" and that now, with this film that brings us, it seems that little by

little they have been improving the technique. In this case they have gone am���sy the film in question has been released in 2

ways, both conventionally and in 3D, curiously all the criticisms and opinions that I have heard

about people who have loved the tape has been because they have seen it in 3D, in my case it is not like that, and the

conventional way has been the one I have contemplated, having an extra reaction and a bittersweet flavor.

that, "" Beowulf "" regular tape where there are, despite having a roster of those that would delight the,

first any director, and after any movie fan, account not only with the voices (typical inanimated

anfilm) but with the faces, by Anthony Hopkins, Angelina Jolie (to whom we can see

"pseudodes" nuda ""), John Malkovich, Robin Wright, Alison Lohman, and Ray Winstone, who thanks to the capture of

movements becomes a young "" pipiolo "" thirty-somethings, when he already has 50true that

springs.It isin a tape of this type, action, fantasy, ;pica; Any of the 3 previous qualifiers are worth me, one

can not wait much longer than there is, and, neither cheat, nor tear the garments, nor, much less throw

their hands to the head, if the result, at no time is the desired one, since the film, based on a

typical English Anglo-Saxon poem, which was written in ancient English in verse alliterative. With 3,182 verses, it contains

much more material than any similar work in its own language, and represents about 10% of thecorpus

existingof Anglo-Saxon verse, which I do not say, but Wikipedia, which this knows an egg. And that has been,

not only the base, but also the guts and the backbone of a hundred stories, legends and even

movies (ah��� we have f�� �bulas like Conan, and even the stories of Tolkien and many other writers.), So

one can not be surprised at all since he knows what is going to be found at all times, and, although the

animation n is taken care of, excellent (much better than in "" The Polar Express "") and moves you to those dark

times, the film does not convince at all and ends leaving the viewer with a curious sensation. No

apat���ay and have not come to be 100% in tune with it.

" 0

" A film that certainly is not up to the best of Branagh because at times loses bellows and

has a tendency to excess theatrically.

Kenneth Branagh seems to have taken a liking to musicals; his last work in this genre is this

adaptation of "" The Magic Flute "", the Mozartian opera that the Norirland filmmaker has covered, placing the

action during a First World War, with the irreconcilable enemies Sarastro and the Queen of the

Night playing with the lovers, Tamino and Pamina, in a film that certainly is not �� at the height of the

best of Branagh (we would be talking about "" Enrique V "", "" Frankenstein of Mary Shelley "" or "" Hamlet ""), because at times it

loses steam and has a certain tendency excessively theatricalizing; we already know, with Lars Von Trier and his dubic

"" Dogville "" - "" Manderley "", that hyperteatralization can be very cinematic, but this is not the case. Itnot

doesmean that this naive adaptation of "" The Magic Flute "" lacks interest: the accentuation of

the humorous notes that relate it to the "" opera buffa "", like the character of Papageno, gives freshness and

lightness, and the childlike tone, like a story, of almost the entire film, gives it a dreamlike sensation ,

a semblance of semblance vision certainly attractive. But it is also true that Branagh's

version may be exceeded in its quasi-na perspectivaf perspective: we already know that everything in this world is susceptible to being treated

with humor, even the war (���ay, the great Gila!), but the one shown here, the one that took the

name of Great War for years, until Hitler endorsed it. an ominous ordinal, appears as a clean conflagration, of

beautiful uniforms of colors, where the dead do not bleed, even if they are shot; they do not burst, although,

reached by shells, jump through the air; they barely scream, even if they are hurt in the heat of battle.

It is clear that it is still a mere landscape, not exactly devastated, in which thecan take place

tests of the four elements that lovers can overcome, in order to consummate their love and save the world: qu���

nice, if it was not for the one that is falling?

" 0

" Hard, dry, vibrant and intense, very intense. A film lesson from a teacher that many retired

before time.

The clamor is un���nime: Scorsese has returned. I dare to correct this clamor: the great Scorsese has returned. The

other, the very good Scorsese, had not left. The Scorsese that has returned is the one of the great occasions. The one that

is capable of counting in the first fifteen minutes, thanks to a frenetic montage that does not decay at any time, a

whole story that would give for another film and with which defines us certain characters in an accurate way, with the

precision of a surgeon to whom we were accustomed. The great Scorsese has returned and that is something that deserves to be

celebrated. Let's remember that the film is a remake of "" Infernal Affairs "" (titled "" Dirty Game "" on dvd in

Spain) and about his synopsis he will only say that it deals with the story of two infiltrators, one in the police and another in

the Irish Mafia in South Boston. As you can see, it is a police thriller and as such the film is a

marvel in which everything works: tension, the impressive rhythm, the way of shooting the shocking scenes

of action. .N All. But I have already said that the great Scorsese has returned and that implies something more. "" Infiltrados "" is a

reflection on the truth and the destructive power of the lie, on the loyalty and the ways that we must

face to maintain it. Scorsese offers us a treatise on the sense of duty through the story of

young people who become police. Some just to carry a gun and others for the authentic meaning of

the plate. In directing William Monahan's great script, Scorsese exhibits all his talent and with all his

team. Special attention on the implacable assembly of Thelma Schoonmaker and the soundtrack of Howard

Shore. Point and aside to talk about the actors because they are all of Oscar. What happens is that the effective

veterans like Martin Sheen or Alec Baldwin are eclipsed by a Jack Nicholson who is more Nicholson than

ever and that, for those who we like, that is to say a lot. His voice, his look, his ability to know when to exceed

and when not, have made him a Hollywood legend. Beside him some of the best young actors of

today: Mark Wahlberg, Matt Damon and Leonardo DiCaprio. Although all (especially the last two)

are going out, I will highlight a DiCaprio that is gradually gaining a gap among the greats, thanks to

interpretations as immense as �� �sta. We must bow to the talent of this actor able to tell us with

his eyes a whole inner universe of anger, restraint, hatred, love or fragility. A more than deservednomination

Oscarfor this role could be waiting for him. What else is there to say? I strongly recommend that you watch this

movie. It is hard, dry, vibrant and intense, very intense. A film lesson from a teacher that many

retired before time.

" 1

" Ingenious drama with a strong symbolic load and large doses of "magic", with a special halo and the feeling

that, despite seeing something not entirely new, it is innovative and fresh.

By how the cinema evolves and ideas, plots or stories are successively exhausted, in the times that bind us,

it does nothing more than repeat the constant that the important thing is not what it is. It's counting, if not how you're

counting. "" CRAZY "", despite being aware that it is too dangerously close to the repetition of

previously established formulas, comes out very graceful of what can be seen as an example of the aforementioned.

Jean -Marc Vall���e does not cut himself when telling us about the growth stages of a young man in the style

of his late companion Lauzon in "" L���olo "". The Canadian director (for more inri), the truth

is that it achieves a certainly interesting result, influenced by a remarkable psychedelic aura, almost

extravagant and markedly hippie.Aqu���, the represi��� ny the denial of the reality of oneself, evolves

as fashion and music more purely sixties / seventies: bell-bottomed trousers, clothes difficultly

labeled to sexuality who carries it, religious ceremonies to the rhythm of the Rolling Stones, smoked and

"" colocones "" antolÃgicos presided by Pink Floyd and his psychedelia, family discussions and, above all,doubts

personal, intimate and non-transferableOur personal narrator of the family is Zac, ayoung

typically problematicman, with his doubts and his needs. Nobody escapes that the rest of the "" crazy ""

offspring (you'll know in due time why that quote the word) also has its

problems. But our closest support is logically Zac, who tells us what happens throughout his

life in his family environment. In a paternal circle so purely conservative and religious, our peculiar

v���stago, is outlined as the classic misunderstood bug. From a very young age, doubts about his sexual

orientation do nothing but bring him down the street of bitterness, and even without being sure of anything, he refuses to do so. Su same

condition, decides to repress to recover his father.As���, Zac grows, in different ���s, at different

rates (beautiful moment "" Space Oddity "" ) and with different horses on their heels: the drug addiction of

his brother, the knowledge of his body, the search for an unknown sexuality (both male and

female), the strong family religiosity that leads him to the very same Jerusalem (crucial moment in which the

director delves into lands as plastic as swampy), and the despair for a stability that does not

come. It is, neither more nor less, than the story of a growth, of an adventure in constant evolution and with

constant potholes. It tells us about the classic family discussions that make us find ourselves

, with our frustrations and our mistakes. Is it the life, the family, the music with which we have

evolved, the doubts with which we have lived together? and the moments that we will never leave behind. The new

paths happen again and again? and those roads, whether we believe them or not, are inscrutable. It is true that the

basic and, sometimes, the foreseeable or the extremely laughable / absurd, splashes the work causing it to

become somewhat excessive in terms of footage, and manages to wake up some other yawn . In that aspect, it is a

film that excessively suffers the changes of rhythm, one ends up realizing that he / she sins of irregular and that,

sometimes, a little context is left. The mix of a child with ingenuity (see the dreams that transport

our character to a dream world that, inevitably, reminds us of "" L���olo " ") and the evolution by stages in the

most pure style" "Almost Famous" "(basically because of the environment in which we are immersed), make what, a

priori, It was something original, not really so much. But with all this, it can not be denied that it is an

interesting film, treated with much success, with a musicality and an aura that does not go away from your retina

in a long time, with plausible scenes, a humor of more refined and a sincerity that invites reflection and

nostalgia in many aspects. All detailed and dosed by an unknown cast, buton alevel

borderingperfectof credibility. And most importantly: despite seemingly weak points like the tritenarrative

family conflictingin a certain environment / �� Time and with a certain belief / culture (disadvantage of

which, undoubtedly, the director is knowledgeable) or an irregular rhythm that ascends as easily as it descends in the

respective to the attention of the spectator, "" CRAZY "" is a film that monopolizes the attention of thesimply

spectator. Ittakes advantage of its mistakes to turn the unoriginal into original and interesting, into an

ingenious drama with a strong symbolic load and large doses of "" magic "", with a special halo and the sensation

that, despite seeing something not entirely new, it is innovative and fresh. No matter how hard you try,

"" CRAZY "" will not be erased from your memory in a while, because, after all, it belongs to our own

history. Like L���olo trying to escape from his inevitable "" degeneration "". Of course, do not compare the one with the

other, because as they pray for there: the comparisons are odious.

" 1

" Visual poem of syncopated orgasms and metaphysical cramps. That is, a hodge-podge of little use that

ends up being forgotten without much effort.

Hedonistic diversion, worthy of being among the freaky jewels of the year, indie caprice of dubioustaste

artisticthat appeals to morbid and a supposed and indomitable freedom of artistic expression to give us a

generous ration of free meats, various fornices and self-inflicted with Manhattan in the background. None of these

visual licenses contributes to anything remarkable that elevates the simple tone, burdensome and, sometimes, coarse in this

unprejudiced and proud film of its label of narrative or intelligent, but hollow porn,in a

muddiedmetaphysical drift of baratillo balance, where the characters dissect their schizophrenias, exorcise their

vices and even violate contorsionismos l���bricos so surprising that you do not know one if you attend a pedl���cula

or cabaret show-circus for seniors idle and out. Everything is to deny the inhibition, to

abolish modesty, to psychoanalyze the powder at dawn with smooth jazz as a sound pillow. I do not

know if the project is simply piggy or it is exotic or it is cinema artie of hippies resonances. I do not know ifis

this militancyhealthy in the voyeuristic or there is some static deviation (not moral) in thefilthy

variegated,and kitsch show of this universe pl ���stico of individuals tel���ricamente disturbed by theasphyxia

existentialof sex. Freud los pillara. Without being a mess of film, it is dispensable. Without being aberrant, it is

obscene. As if to Woody Allen, in a Hebrew-burlesque paranoia, it occurred to him to rewind hismorons

usualand put them to ride girls and boys while the city, in the background, throbs like a fetus strained by

jazz.

" 0

" Never more crush an ant. What if, when we get home, we give them those candies that when they

chew up?

I may have more of a field than "other film critics," but at no time in the film have I doubted

that the sinister bugs Those who fly our little protagonist are wasps. The first clue about

their nature is that they have a lot of bad milk, the second is that they are endowed with sting, and the third and more

inescapable is that they feed on other insects. Logically, today I went to see the film, this same

morning. My little girl liked to see her for a long time and she is almost removed from the poster, so

we went to see her at IMAX, on a screen as tall as a 7-storey building. in 3 dimensions. The criticism

of the youngest of the house is as follows: "" Never more crush an ant. What if, when we get home, wethem

givethose candies when they chew up? " goal accomplished, has not moved from his seat in

the 8 minutes that has lasted. He says that he loved it and that when we return. As for the argument, it

has not seemed repetitive at all, or similar to "" Antz "" or "" Cari���o I have shrunk the children "", unlike other

children, it has managed to excite me without resorting to the elimination of the father figures. As for the

child, I did not think he would "have fun killing the ants in his garden", rather he used them as a way of

expressing the anger he was not capable of. desccargar against matn the neighborhood was being too

grande.Quizs guilt has been of 3 dimensions, or maybe not, butagree with my son and give excellent

to the pel ���cula. Even a child of 4 years is able to perceive some of the most morally charged messages in

the film, such as how bad it is to attack some Few ants just for fun.

" 1

" There is no other way than to applaud, rejoice and enjoy this cinematographic orgasm called

'Infiltrados'.

Awesome. Shocking Really cool. Scorsese has left. But calm, not like in 'The Aviator'.

This time he has given us not one, but many film lessons, all within the same film. Much had

been expected from this film. And there is no other thing to applaud, rejoice and enjoy thisorgasm

cinematiccalled 'Infiltrados'. There is a long list of films. of mafiosi, and although I must

admit that I am not the most acrimonious follower of these films, 'Infiltrados' could well become a

classic.of current cinema. The drama of the double life carried out by the infiltrators of both sides, their

worries and fears make the long (not excessive) duration of the footage not only run without watchful looks

or yawns, but the desire to know the outcome of the story to increase while enjoying the

excellent capture of frames, intelligently confused. The development of history does nothing but

increase all the virtues contained in this film, to reach an end at the height of the circumstances

(although he can sin, typical in Scorsese, of eternal). The certain thing is that one is left with the sensation that, even

finishing at any moment of the last fifteen minutes, it supposes a great finishing touch to such an excellent

film. �cula. And it has all the elements to become the film of the year (with permission of 'Sons of

men'): it is not only the plot (���qu��� gui�� !N!), It is the atmosphere, the tension, the trepidante rhythm, the harshness, the

hardness and the performances, magnificent interpretations. A whole meeting of quality in the direction, in the

acting work and in how to keep such a complex history. It is time for the recognition ofmyths

Leonardo DiCaprio's, that does an excellent job, and that thus falls definitively of the list of ���dolos of

quincea���eras. Jack Nicholson is like a fish in the water doing what he likes best: to be a perfect goat, at

his ease. And in his measurements. Matt Damon demonstrates all his skills (once again) and confirms why he is someone

to consider. And if that were not enough, the sideline is splendid: from Mark Wahlberg to Martin

Sheen, everyone makes this film is (or should at least) be remembered for garnering so much waste. of

talent. Perhaps this is the Scorsese who was waiting for the Academy to give him one (his first) statuette. And if

it does not turn out that way, one of the greatest injustices will have been committed. in the world of cinema. This is

yours, Martin.

" 1

" The film gets one out of the meditative cinema, thinking that perhaps, like Jules Verne

in his books, what Cuaron tells us is not as true as truth

After his appearance (N (as director), in the last installment of the adventures of Harry Potter, Alfonso Cuar���n,

directs this film of futuristic ambience, which makes revolve our consciences, starring

Clive Owen (who since "" Closer "" has begun to amaze me), Julianne Moore (in his usual line, always

ascending) and Michael Caine in the role of grandfather "" colgao "" Rolled in London, in places I know well for

having been there for Honeymoon, and giving the picture a dirty touch, almost 3rd World, the film

gets one out of the cinema meditabundo, thinking that maybe, like Jules Verne in his books, what

Cuaron tells us is not as fíbula as truth, without a doubt, many of the things that we contemplate on the screen

do not leave anyone indifferent, immigration, fear of rejection, political conspiracy. In short, one of those films

that seem to pass from tiptoe and that however, and I go back to what my father said, "" leaves poso ""

inside.

" 1

" Planet Terror is the new delirium of one of the most personal directors that has given theindustry

Hollywoodin recent decades. That is, to fully enjoy it, you have to let yourself be immersed in theworld

fantasticthat emerged from the prodigious imagination of Robert Rodr���guez.

There are no good times to look for something original and different in a cinema that in the last few years hasus

saturatedwith new versions, remakes, sequels, prequels or any other term that defines a galloping

shortage of ideas. However, some filmmakers fight against it and continue to bring fresh andproposals

innovative, such as Quentin Tarantino or Robert Rodr���guez and his Grindhouse project. Admittedly, it is at

least ironic that a project that emerged as a tribute to a type of outdated cinema is one of the most

innovative and original proposals of the year. Robert Rodr�'s cinema ��guez, although at first sight it seems the opposite, it is very

personal, and of course it does not admit medium term, or you love it or you hate it. The plot of Planet Terror is

nothing special, it is a terror in which a strange group of people fight for their survival against

an army of zombies infected by a virus. What matters in Planet Terror is not what tells the story

but how the story is told. And it is that Rodr���guez is a true master of the narrative, a filmmaker who

perfectly masters the language and the cinematographic tempo. The film is a delirious frenzy from beginning

to end, and it has some truly surreal moments that will provoke multiple laughter in the audience. And it

is that between all the blood, v���sceras, dismemberments, shots and explosions that contains the tape hides

a subtly macabre sense of humor. It is true that Rodr���guez has a hand in some scenes, but

all the geniuses have their excesses, and he knows in what occasion he can go over the line and in which do not. But

before all this, and to open your mouth, the audience will be able to enjoy the madness of Machete's false tr���iler,

which Rodr���guez intends to turn into a complete movie.Planet Terror is the new delirium of one of the

most personal directors that the Hollywood industry has given in recent decades. That is, toenjoy it, you

fullyhave to let yourself be immersed in the fantastic world that emerged from the prodigious imagination of Robert

Rodr���guez.

" 1

" Paradoxically, The Scream 2 is the culmination of the process of Americanization that in recent years has

been subjecting Hollywood to Japanese horror films. ��s, to which they had resorted as a desperate measure before the

ideological exhaustion of their prolific but vulgar writers.

Americans, aware of how tiresome their teen horror films become, were determined

to find new forms, new ideas, new concepts to incorporate intoin other parts of the world

their worn out machinery. At last they found what they were looking for, and they did it on the other side of the Pacific Ocean.

Japanese horror films became the new fashion of the big studios. The first adaptations that were

made of success films in the country were quite reliable, and they achieved a remarkable success

(remember, for example, La Se���al). Later, and with that nationalist incontinence that characterizes the

first world power, they were, progressively, Americanizing the scripts, the plots, the tempos and if it is

neglected, the very same Takashi Shimizu, director and director of the original versions and maximum responsibilityRolls

for the West. In the end, the result is that they have achieved that the new versions of

Japanese films do not differ excessively from the genuinely American products, and thathas been lost to a

the freshness, the capacity to surprise and to impact,great extent, and all, the characteristic

and own ambience of the Asian giant. That's why the Scream 2 is a very bad movie, in which the photography is

mediocre, the interpretations, saving Sarah Michelle Gellar, poor, and the repetitive special effects.

To all this cluster of disproportions joins an almost non-existent soundtrack and that when it appears it does it

only to warn you that something is going to happen in the next seconds, depriving ��� to the spectator of the

few shocks that per se could cause this new disproportion of the Hollywood industry. Bored

" 0

" Monster House would have been very good as one of the Amazing Stories of the Spielberg of the 80s, but not as

long as this century.

The main reason to see Monster House (2006), or La casa de los sustos, as it has been titled in

Spanish, was the credit of Steven Spielberg in the production. After all, the fabulous animated film

Shrek was produced under the signature of DreamWorks, when the company was owned by Mr. Spielberg. And with that

expectation ahead, Monster House is just so regular. The story is about the house of a cantankerousneighbor

oldwho comes alive and wants to end all life in the neighborhood. And for all forms of

life we ​​refer to the three pre-adolescents protagonists, because apparently the animators forgot that

in a neighborhood live more than three people.The humanization of the house is great, that will not take away credit. And

I suppose it would have been much better to see it (hear it) with Kathleen Turner's original voice, but I got to see it

folded. The character of the macabre elder, Mr. Nebbercracker, also stands out. But the creatures. Oh, the

creatures (yes, those of the poster, the protagonists, the heroes). They seemed bad to me, forced and

unfriendly. Hardly, if one does not identify with the heroes, he can taste the film well. Monster House

would have been very well as one of the Spielberg's Amazing Stories of the 80s, but not as a long of this

century. . Above all, coming after the very successful releases of Cars and Neighbors Invaders, fences that

were very high.The other executive producer of Monster House is Spielberg's sidekick, Robert Zemeckis,

who has to his credit pel�� Very good things like El Na���frago or Forrest Gump and other very bad ones like Gothika or the

House of Wax. So both names in the credits, although extremely promising, canlead

alsoto disappointment. Nothing is guaranteed in the 7th. art.

" 0

" Excellent film by Yimou Zhang, who returns for his best fueros after a somewhat uncertain and

irregular stage.

Excellent film by Yimou Zhang, who returns for his best fueros after a somewhat uncertain andstage.

irregularTerrible history, narrated in the manner of the great classical tragedies, where his charactersno

havepeace and tranquility, having to face so much to his own inner demons as well as to the danger that

his closest relatives would enter. Yoimou achieves an extraordinary film in terms of its formal packaging, with

a beautiful, magni ��fico use of lighting and costumes and exquisite make-up, which take us to

an extinct world where political quarrels and ambitions were the bread of every day. But Yimou does not stop

in achieving an amazing formal plasticity, but manages to fascinate through a story a thousand times seen,

because, certainly, is not more than a culebr���n, with their loves, hatreds, secrets inconfessible, etc, but shown

with a formal bro, emotion n irrepressible and great performances, especially by his wonderful

actresses. In this sense, the admirable Li Gong achieves, once again, an antologistic interpretation embodying

a woman victim of misfortune, but capable of fighting with all the weapons of Those that disposes. People

in the hands of their inexorable destiny, who can not escape from their fate, however they try.dry

Bitter anddialogues and portentous direction in the scenes of struggles and battles, with wonderful moments, like the

magnificent final battle. A battle that not only has nothing to envy, for example, those of the much

vaunted "" 300 "", but, obviously, far exceeds them in intensity and imagination and formal brilliance. Inot

dothink there is any doubt about this point. In short, that in my opinion "" The curse of the golden flower "" is

a great film, which does not become a masterpiece, example, due to some falls in thepart

central, of its rhythm, but which shows the cinematographic singularity of Yimou Zhang, who hasus

delightedagain, although it also left the show us some elements of the worst of the human being.

In this sense, the end of the film is totally conclusive and lacks, I think, a moral.

" 1

" The return of Hannibal the Cannibal, popularly known among us as An���bal el Can���bal, hasus

leftcold. A remarkable boredom, sprinkled with blood curds, which ends up leaving a bad taste in your

mouth, honestly.

The return of Hannibal the Cannibal, popularly known among us as An���bal el Can���bal, hasus

leftcold. As everyone will know by now, "" Hannibal, the origin of evil "" tells, precisely, how

the famous Doctor Lecter became the monster that we have all known and feared in the cinema, with the

face of Anthony Hopkins. Why did we expect something important from this movie? Well, mostly, because in the

script is printed the signature of Thomas Harris, the fictional father of the character, which predicted a good

development of the plot, a logical origin of the character and an abundance of that can mitobal myth that so good and

so bad times has made us enjoy and suffer in the cinemas. And the thing starts well, counting the death of the

family of Lecter in World War II and , later, the vexations suffered by his sister and him

by a group of Nazi sympathizers. His escape is well and synthetically told, as well as his arrival in France,

where he starts a contradictory relationship with his aunt of Japanese descent, played by the attractive Gong.

Li, who only wins in beauty and magnetism with each film. All this first part is very well

narrated, it is interesting and can be seen with a lot of interest. But after. And then! After the episode of the

butcher, very revealing of the future hannibalian character, everything goes out of order and the film is trivialized,

becoming a stupid and improbable history of revenge that only relies on truculencias and

chorradas.El trip to the USSR and the episode of the cabaña mark a turning point that converts what was

an interesting and worthy film. A film that was abounding in the keys of a series as interesting as that of

Hannibal el Can���bal, in a masquerade of death and destruction quite idiotic, badly told and worse

resolved.The yawns arrive, the looks at the mobile to see the time, the roars of the guts asking for chicha and

the uncomfortable movements in an armchair that already punctures. It begins a remarkable boredom, sprinkled with curds

of blood, which ends up leaving a bad taste in the mouth, sincerely. A pity, in short, to see how the

Laurentis, holders of the rights to the character of Doctor Can��� bal, are ending with the credit of

the series, in an attempt to exploit that chicken of the golden eggs to which its last stains are smelling

of rotten. More and more, in short, a disappointment.

" 0

" Scott is a rookie in romantic movies: there is no depth of characters, or situations, or

even a fairly consistent and original argument.

When I heard that Ridley Scott was preparing a "pastry" movie, it seemed quite strange to me. It is not

a director who works in that genre (to say practically nothing), so he had severalopinions

previous, clearly contradictory, ranging from the esc���ptica ?? can it be a daring turn to recover

from the stick of "The Kingdom of the Skies ??", until the rotunda ?? this man goes descabezao?. What made me doubt in

favor of Scott was the presence of Russell Crowe, because after his masterful interpretation in? Amind

wonderful? , and his outstanding role in "Cinderella Man", both by Ron Howard, made me think that he was going to repeat

the feat. But, of course, we are not talking about the same director nor about scripts of alevel. After

similarthis experience, it is proven that Scott is a rookie in romantic movies. In? A

good year? there is no depth of characters, nor of situations, nor is there even a moderatelyargument

consistent and original: an expert on the stock market, addicted to work and the city, Max Skinner (Crowe),

inherits a country house with a small I saw him in France, specifically in Provence, of a deceased uncle of his

called Henry (Albert Fenney) whom he has not seen for a long time. At first he decides to sell it, but

as he spends more time in it, he goes to meet the people of the place, especially a girl (Archie

Panjabi), and different events are happening that are logical that does not discourage for not destroying the film

definitively, it arises with more force the idea of ​​keeping it. The history sounds familiar to you already, is

not it? Well that is precisely what happens to? A good year ?; that one has the sensation of having seen it

before, apart from lacking the depth of which I have spoken before. Everything is very predictable and even

some details are incoherent; and it is not necessary to make much effort to guess, almost at the first, what will

happen in the next scene, even what will be the end. The only two moments that work very well

in the film are the uncertainty that the viewer has, for about 30 minutes of the footage, to know which

of the two girls that are within range of the film. protagonist will be the one who will fall into his arms. And, the bucolic years

spent by Max as a child with his extravagant uncle Henry, wine lover, in the country house, who are

remembered through? Flash-backs? ? As for the first moment, the uncertainty is resolved quickly. And we enter

the typical relationship in which the girl goes from hatred and initial indifference to Max, to a minimum interest for him

but without going over, until to reach passionate love. You see it, more of the same. The second moment does not last many

minutes. It would have been a wise move to dedicate more time from the film to that past, because Fenney's chemistry with

the actor who plays Max as a child, Freddie Highmore (? Charlie and the f� Chocolate factory?), It is magical and

engages. I was left wanting more. Regarding the performances, everything revolves around the star,

Russell Crowe. He carries the weight of the film, which is a wise move if the actor in question had played a

role, but as it is not so, the tape loses its bellows in many minutes. . His performance is not mediocre, butis

commitmentrequired. The rest stand out Fenney and Highmore, who as I said before, build two characters

that marry perfectly and transmit the feeling of love and admiration between the two that Scott wanted. In

short, a good year? It is a film that could have arrived more in spite of his sobado argument, but that

has remained in a Sunday TV movie that can be seen. With this criticism I fulfill a request of Eva, a

work partner. By the way, Crowe honors the title of the film, because the man is seen from? good

year?

" 0

" No order, Scary Movie 4 is the worst thing that has been released in our country so far this

year

David Zucker is one of those directors who were marked by some t� Success stories in the decade of the

eighties (Land as you can, Catch it as you can). Committed to continue on the path of comedy, his career

has been diluted and deteriorating to the point of offering us a mess of the caliber of today's premiere in

Spain. Scary Movie 4 is not even a movie, it's just a succession of parodies of other tapes like

"" The forest "", "" The war of the worlds "" , "" The grudge "", "" Million dollar baby "" ym���s. Degenerate humor,,

vulgarvulgar, devoid of originality and full of histrionics is his only pretension. His cast is full ofuntalented actors

outdated and, such as Anna Faris, Regina May and the infumable Leslie Nielsen; others like

Shaquille O���Neal or Carmen Electra can not even be called actors. The so-called adolescent terroralways

hasbeen the source from which these films have drunk, as they ridicule and vampirise them to create

grotesque situations from the original scenes. Without order, Scary Movie 4 is one of the worst

that has been released in our country so far this year, and another insult to the intelligence of the viewer. It is a

gigantic size and although it starts a smile at the beginning, as thepass

minutesbecomes unbearable and boring. The only incentive to go to see this aberration, which does not even serve to

kill time (its eighty-six minutes seems ten hours), is to spend time with the cool air

conditioning of the rooms , or in the company of friends, to laugh about and not with the film. Sopor���fera

" 0

" A new boast of privileged dominance of the description of characters through a narrative paused

in appearance, but of stormy emotional decline.

After surprising our own and strangers with that excellent thriller called "Lantana", shot in

2001, five long years have had to elapse until the Australian Ray Lawrence has had the

opportunity to demonstrate again his worth in the cinematographic realization, in this case recovering thetone

dense and complexof his previous work to take it still far away, if possible, in a new boast ofdominance

privilegedof the description of characters through a narrative paused in appearance, but of stormy

emotional decline. Stewart's story, Carl, Rocco and Billy, places these four friends in one of their

routine weekend fishing gatherings, in which, by chance, they discover the lifeless body

of a half-naked girl in the secluded river of the semi-desert landscape. Rtico that serves as escape to their routine and

sad lives, a place in the which escape from your daily chores. The consensual decision to leave the

body there waiting for his weekend return, unleashes an aerated reaction not only from family and

friends, but from the community of abor Australian genes. Nobody understands the reasons that led these four

friends to ignore the fact and continue with their leisure weekend alien to the moral dilemmas that their

decision assumes. In his work as a director in the film in question, Lawrence it shows to have a difficult

virtue that few current directors possess, to grant to its calm staging and pending of close-

ups with the reactions of the personages, a fantastic look, replete of double senses andfeelings

hiddenunder a mara�� �a of contrasted emotions. Sometimes a staging and anarrative pulse

classicdo not go hand in hand with the personality that a filmmaker can have in the final product, and the work in

this wonderful film, by Lawrence, is worthy of all recognition. The film takes place in a slow,way,

almost hopelessprobably for the new moviegoers, who are full of extreme sensations, as they are oblivious to all thefashion

prevailingin the current times, but this is not the case. ��ril at the time of arriving with your message to the most experienced

viewer in this type of narration. That extraordinary capacity that the film possesses to transmit

always the sensation of restlessness remembers that one of David Lynch (always so revered at the time

of showing the most hidden part of the human soul) , in which every person, has its history, its past in the form

of a constant threat, which sleeps dormant to re-emerge some day, but in the form of real and tangible threat, if

emotionally and destructively internally. Throughout the film, Lawrence shows us the daily life of

a small Australian community, through silences in transcendental conversations, lost looks in

search of an emotional and spiritual liberation that compensates for the internal bitterness that all of us breathe. each of

the characters in the film. That fantastic look manifests itself on the screen in the form of an invisible threat,

giving the sensation that at all times something is going to assault us with extreme virulence, with an air of bitterness.

From the first to the last character in the film, they give the sensation of hiding things from their past, suggesting

that behind each door of each of our houses, a sad story hides apart.Mension aside for the

great acting cast that knows how to endow each and every one of the characters with their own personality, without being

engulfed by that transcendental tone of the cinematographic gaze of its director, Gabriel being Byrne and Laura

Linney, a step above the already great cast, with a sublime performance in its subtlety, a

wonderful recreation of a marriage in crisis, with those emotional reproaches that sooner or later come to

light at the least opportune time. It is also clear, how successful actors' work would be impossible

without a guiding solvent, and in this case it is not less true than the script by Beatrix Christian (based on a

short story by Raymond Carver, title "" So Much Water So Close to Home ""), a gradual and surprising

description of the day to day of these unsuccessful characters, is careful to detail, resulting in It's a

story that begins brilliantly and ends in a sad and hopeless way (despite the spiritual and

metaphysical final shot), a jewel we are going. Through such a wise direction, gui���ny At the acting level, thereferences

obviousof this wonderful Australian film can go unnoticed at first sight, but it is evident that

this mixture of intimate drama and aboriginal mysticism, clearly drinks from the cinema of one of the most prestigiousanti

filmmakers born of���podas, the essential Peter Weir of his first works in his native Australia,

"" Picnic in Hanging Rock "" and above all, "" The Last Wave "", with the theme aborigine in the background in both cases. If there is any

element that prevents this film from reaching a�� Mayorn higher level of quality as a cinematographic piece, it is

precisely the change of register in certain passages of the film, that although they are not unsatisfactory,

perhaps they required some variation of narrative rhythm, in order to be more effective, the alleged knocks of

effect, which here are diluted to create a uniform tone throughout the story. Theso outstanding

film isthat it reaches the soul of the characters, who in some isolated occasion forgets what themeans

narrative pulse. A lesser evil than in any case, does not prevent the enjoyment of such an interesting film. In

short, a film absolutely recommended, intimate mix and mild social denunciation, camouflaged in the form

of racial thriller, which will be a real delight for those that we still love the narrative and thecinema

classic, the one that opts to tell us little stories in a slow way and more aware of theeffect

emotionalon the characters that does not give effective blows of effect, or free gui���n turns. Probably the

film is misunderstood by a sector of the audience raised in the most accelerated montage and current narrative, at the

risk of being considered "" slow "", something nothing more far from reality, because the film stands out

above the average of recent films, regardless of their nationality. A work completely

recommended, multi-awarded (although without reaching the level of repercussion of its previous, and essential,

"" Lantana "") fairly in various certifications. A small great film that is remarkable and essential.

" 1

" A kind, sincere and funny film, but at the same time hard and macabre, capable of moving from a smile to a

laugh easily, a story of some successful losers.

In its simplicity resides its beauty, many say that it is a film more about dysfunctional family seen a thousand

times, but Pequena Miss Sunshine has something more than the It makes special, something difficult to explain, but thatyou

catchesuntil the end of the movie. I insist that Peque���a Miss Sunshine after watching it leaves you with a certain

feeling of Deja-v��� and that it may resemble many films that we have seen with Previously, but it has

something special that makes you spend really good during the whole duration of the film, a pleasant enough time

that with the end and the passing of the minutes is a sensation that increases and after seeing it I firmly believe that it is

due to its peculiar characters that make up the Hoover family, a mother who fights because everything is perfect

within the family nucleus, a father who is dedicated to selling self-help methods being a total loser , the

guy who tried to commit suicide, the adolescent son who was disgusted by what is around him, who hasas his greatest

Nietzscheand who does not speak to achieve his goal, the grandfather who gives the heroine and maintains a peculiar and

charming relationship with her granddaughter, which is what e will be presented to the beauty contest in a crazy trip in

which all the members of the family will be involved. The film is very attractive aesthetically, with

a very colorful photograph and an elegant address in the debut of the couple of the new directors

Jonathan Dayton and Valerie Faris. The actors who give life to each and every one of the members of the family

are great, highlighting above all the role of the little Abigail Breslin and a brilliant Steve Carrell. It

is a kind, sincere and funny movie but at the same time hard and macabre able to go from a smile to

a laugh easily, a story of successful losers. A kick in the mouth to thedream

American, to the desire for triumph and the cult of beauty, a song to normality and a film thatus

remindsof the subjective nature of something like ��� success or triumph.

" 1

" An impressive film, magnificently shot, and whose recognition was late in arriving. Spielberg in its

purest form.

During the first two weeks of July of 1916 the coast of New Jersey, a place where many

people chose as a vacation and in which an incipient tourism industry was being created,

terrified by a series of shark attacks that resulted in four deaths and one injured person. The

wave of panic was such that that summer remained in the North American collective unconscious. between 1974 and 1975, the

United States, and very soon the world, would feel that atavistic terror again, although this time the only

victims were the pockets of the spectators and The true nature of the white shark. In the early

70's the writer Peter Benchley was coming up with a story about shark attacks. His editorhim

encouragedto write a novel on the subject, so that said and done, Benchley returned with a book without title. They were

shuffled many names, some rimbonbantes, others sloppy, titles like "" Stillness in the water "",

"" Leviathan rising "" or "" The jaws of the Leviathan "". With time running out, Benchley and his editor chose the

least bad: Jaws. The book was a great success, and the Universal producers, interested in the story,

took control of the film rights. Ics for $ 150,000. A few years later producer David Brown has declared

that if they had read the novel twice they would never have bought the story, because it was clear that it would be

very expensive to shoot . But the idea of ​​a shark terrorizing the calm beaches of the Atlantic loved it. The

agency with which they treated the Universal demanded that it be directed by a director affiliated with their company. The

producers, eager to obtain the rights of the novel, accepted. In a way, what happened

next is that the Universal broke up as it could of that poor guy, and set out to find a director of his

liking. Producers David Brown and Richard D. Zanuck, who had produced the first movie film

for a young and talented director, decided to put him in charge of the project. That young Jew had made

a television show where a big truck was chasing a poor guy in his car tirelessly. He seemed the

ideal candidate to take Jaws to the screen. His name was Steven Spielberg. Spielberg had read the novel and

liked it, and seeing the parallels between the story of Jaws and the story of the truck in The Devil on

Wheels, and not having No other project in sight, seemed to have nothing better to do. The writer

Peter Benchley made a first adaptation of his own novel, to the that Spielberg added some scenes.

For example, I wanted to present the shark hunter Quint in a movie theater laughing out loud while

watching John Huston's Moby Dick. Do you think something like that? It would have been worth seeing. But Gregory Peck, who

had the rights to the film, did not think it was a good idea, so the scene could not be shot. To complete the

story for the film, the script was reviewed by Howard Sackler, winner of a Pulitzer Prize and expert

diver. His contribution made Spielberg finish deciding to shoot the film. Sacklerrequested

specificallynot to appear on the credit titles since he did not have time to be in the shooting. Another

problem arose shortly after the beginning of 1975 a contract with the Syndicate of Actors about to expire

put the studio in a bind. The bosses of the Universal decided that no film would be filmed if it could not be

finished before June 30. With an unfinished wording, Spielberg put a few logical objections to the matter.

A new writer, Carl Gottlieb, was hired as a kind of "boy for everything", who would work in the

script, attend the rehearsals, help in the improvisations in short, it would be there for any

problem that might arise with the story. SPIELBERG was looking for actors unknown to the film, but the

producers insisted that it be done with a great name. Roy Scheider, who had worked on The French

Connection and was popular at the time, was chosen to play police chief Brody. For the role of

Oceanographer Hooper, and after discussing several names, Spielberg, on the advice of George Lucas, offered the paper

to Richard Dreyfuss. The actor loved the story, but rejected the film. In his own words, the reason

was that "he would prefer to see her shoot it, because the shooting will be a chore". Time after Dreyfuss attended the premiere

of his last film, The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz, and, after being horrified by his performance, decided to

accept the Hooper paper. Finally, for the role of hunter Quint, Spielberg went to Lee Marvin, who

rejected the role. They also shuffled names like Sterling Hayden (the godfather of The Godfather) or

Charlton Heston, although in the end the role was awarded to Robert Shaw, with whom The producers had just finished

working on El golpe. The other important roles were for Lorraine Gary as Brody's wife and Murray

Hamilton as Mayor Larry Vaughn, and it's undeniable that guy has a mayor's face! For thescene

fishermenon the dock, it was thought to have Joe Spinell, which would have been great, but in the end it could not be

. The next step was, of course, to get a shark. n. The art director, Joe Alves, began

interviewing special effects designers without great success. The guild people kept telling him that

making a seven-meter mechanical shark was practically impossible. Finally Alves found Bob Mattey, who

had built mechanical animals in the past and was retired. Mattey replied that he could do it, so

he got the job. To recruit the rest of the special effects team Alves made a search that he

compared with The Magnificent 7, little by little he was finding those he needed. A new problem arose. ��

when looking for suitable exteriors. The ideal place turned out to be Martha's Vineyard, a picturesque

and touristy place whose sandy bottom was up to 12 miles offshore, so that the mechanisms could

work properly without being I saw land from nowhere. That was the main reason for Spielberg to

choose that hamlet. However, the people there did not want a film crew during the peak season.

The people at the studios had to convince the village's main forces that everything would stay the same as

before the Hollywood people arrived. A village named Craig Kinsbury played an important role both

inside and outside the city. movie According to Spielberg it was the local version of Quint's character, and the directorhim

encouragedto participate in the film, writing his own phrases. In addition, it was the inspiration for phrases of

other characters, such as when Quint says "this is not like going out to fish for perch or cod." The shooting, which

began around the beginning of the In the summer of 1974, the unimaginable was going to take place, and problems arose

everywhere. Many had to be shot at sea, so placing the cameras, calculating angles,

preparing boats and actors was an odyssey, since nothing remained in place. , and they did not stop crossing ships

and sailboats on the horizon. Another problem was the mechanical shark. A large, complete shark had been built

(which Spielberg called "" Great white turd "") and two sharks bent to shoot planes from the left or

from the right. Although for the initial sequence Spielberg had decided to hide the shark so that only

the shaking of the victim was seen in what was a great success, the pure truth turned out ��� be that the shark

did not work. In the first test of the mechanical mu eneco in water the piece went to the bottom of the water and had to be

rescued by frogmen. As Richard Dreyfuss reminds us in the documentary Inside the shark,on the

the phrase "the shark does not work" was heardradios of the filming crew. In what is already astory

legendary Hollywood, the shark failures ended up benefiting the film, since having the monster

on screen all the time would have turned Tibur�� In a horror movie with monster to use. Following

the old axiom of the character of Kirk Douglas in Captives of Evil, people fear what they do not see. And Tibur���n is

a good proof of that. It was decided that it would be shocking to have images of real sharks in the film. He

contacted a couple who had worked with white sharks to shoot the scenes underwater. The

problem was that normal sharks measured 3 or 4 meters and were not as gigantic as in the movie. In

a pretty Spinal Tap decision a small cage was built and the Universal commanded a rather short guy

who did not even know how to dive to get inside the cage . The best scenes were shot when

a shark got caught in the cage and shattered it. As the shots were so good, and as there was no one

in the cage, the script was changed to take advantage of those scenes. At another point in the shooting, Quint's ship, the

"" Orca "", almost it went down, and while everyone was worried about saving the actors nobody seemed to remember the

sound technician. "It's the Hollywood class system!" While shooting was getting longer and the shark did not

quite work, the relationship between some team members was not very good. Robert Shaw and

Richard Dreyfuss could not stand each other, which resulted in their respective interpretations in the film. The tension

between Quint and Hooper was more real than it might seem at first glance. Robert Shaw was a charismatic guy,

not always easy to deal with, and his character was a guy unpleasant. While Quint, Hooper and Brody load

things on the "" Orca "", Spielberg asked Shaw to try to disturb as much as possible Lorraine Gary, who

played Brody's wife. In one of the shots to Shaw came to mind a poemilla, which in English reads as

follows: Here lies the body of Mary Lee; died at the age of a hundred and three. For fifteen years she kept her

virginity; not a bad record for this vicinity. When Spielberg, concerned about copyright, asked

where he had gotten it from, Shaw replied that he had done so. seen in a fast in Ireland. It was not the

only happy improvisation. One of the most celebrated phrases of the film, "" We're gonna need a bigger boat "", was

improvised by Roy Scheider when shooting the scene. It is practically already a phrase made in the USA, which

shows the great impact that the film had. One of the most famous scenes of Tibur���n was a mere product

of the gui���n. Neither special effects nor shark by means. It is Quint's famous account of the collapse of the USS

Indianapolis. The scene had its origin in a small paragraph written by Howard Sackler. Spielberg wanted to

extend the speech, so I contacted John Milius to add more phrases. Milius sent

Spielberg a lot of pages that were summarized. Then that part of the script was delivered to

Robert Shaw. The actor was also a writer, and his work included novels and a play. Shaw

rewrote part of the script, so the fabulous story of the USS Indianapolis was the result of the work of

three great writers. No wonder that for many this is the favorite scene of Tibur���n.Seg���n

lengthened the shoot, the "" department of special defects "" (as apod� �� Spielberg) wanted to stop filming

to perfect the shark and other effects, but the producers feared that the entire project would be canceled. With

all the equipment going up the walls, at a gala dinner Roy Scheider began awar

foodthat ended with food thrown up in the air in a pitched battle. of food between the

team. Luckily when it came time to shoot the final scenes the shark started to work, so thatcould be

the shark attackscompleted by splitting the boat in two and sub Going on top, and the final scene where it flies

through the air. For Quint's death, he had thought of a destiny similar to that of Captain Ahab of Moby Dick,

with Quint spearing the great shark and being dragged by lasla depths of the sea,

drowned. Spielberg did not like it and I changed it for the end that we all know. The shark flies through the air and

as it sinks we hear a strange roar that is nothing more than a dinosaur roar from an old movie that the

director had already It was used for the end of The Devil on Wheels. Many scenes on the high seas were filmed

camera-by-hand, although as the cinematographer says, the camera often relied on the legs,

arms or other parts of the body. Spielberg made sure to try always to roll at the same height of the water,

to give the sensation to the spectator of being basking in those bloody waters. On the other hand, before

starting the filming he made sure that the art director did not use the red color in any design. The only

red Spielberg wanted was blood. They are small details, which may seem silly, which can

reach the viewer subconsciously. In another big scene, while Chief Brody watches the beach sitting,

Spielberg wanted to have shot it in a shot cont� ��nua Finally, he elaborated the scene frompoint of view

Brody's, following a reaction-observation approach: while bodies of bathers cross in front of the

camera , the plane changes and we see what Brody sees and then see his reaction. A reallyexecution

brilliant. When the sheriff finally realizes what's going on, Spielberg turned an innovative

camera trick for Hitchcock in Vigo, advancing with the camera as it expanded. to the plane with the zoom. Along

with the montage of the veteran Verna Fields, whom the director called "" montage mother "", and who surely

learned some that another trick, is undoubted that much of the success of the film comes from its soundtrack.

The acclaimed composer John Williams, who seems to have been resting on his laurels for a long time, jumped into the

fame for his work in this film, winning a deserved Academy Award. Although when I first taught

Spielberg what he had composed, the director thought he was joking.score

Williams'has two functions: to accompany the shark ,N, as if in a certain way he will show his state of mind in each

scene, or if he moves fast or slow, or if he rises to the surface or moves away, and, on the other hand, announce theto the

presencespectator. With this, a double effect was achieved, because if we see the filmsoon

weassociate the presence of that disturbing music with the appearance of the film. creature, so that when it emerges

without previous music the scare is even greater. The composition of Williams has remained in the popular imagery associated

with horror films, as it was in his day the music of Psychosis. And is that if with that tape Hitchcock revolutionized

in his day the genre of terror by putting the figure of psycho in fashion, with Tibur���n Spielberg marking a before and

after in the movies with terrifying creatures, being copied ad nauseam. All the films of the

genre that have followed her are daughters of Tibur���n. The film, released in the summer of 1975, swept the box offices

around the world , and became the highest grossing film of all time until the arrival of Star Wars.

And not only that, it is also an impressive film, magnificently shot, and whose recognition is late in arriving.

As happened to Hitchcock in his day, the success of Spielberg's work among the public has reduced

credibility, but for me his best films resist the attack on almost any classics you can

remember.

" 1

" Long live Dante and Randall, but I'm afraid we will not see them again. Congratulations to Kevin

Smith, little crack!

The mill's question was, will it surpass the first after so much time and be considered amovie

cult? I imagine that many purists will say that not what and what, but the truth is that for more. In everything

as director, in dialogues and in secondary characters (Randall's brides, especially Rosario

Dawson is tremendous (fits perfectly on paper despite being a star) and the geek of the Burger).may

Bob's interventionhave been better for me, but hey, he forgives. The most remarkable thing is the same (and that's

the good thing) of the first, the conversations between the characters (absurd in most important, such as

pregnancy or war between the Lord of the rings and star wars). One of the best points of the movie is

Randall's explanation of the three movies of Peter Jackson, not to mention Dante's farewell. Jay and Bob

as always, to their own, remain exactly the same. Ben Affleck also appears in the form of a cameo (it was

irremediable). The best in direction is the beginning in black and white, as it ends with the first movie in

a moment and with quality, and the final, I do not wake it up but I know it's great! Long live Dante and

Randall, although I'm afraid we will not see them again. Congratulations to Kevin Smith, little crack!

" 1

" I take my hat off to DiCaprio who has been working very well (Infiltrados) in recent

times. A actorazo that shines as bright as the diamond around which the story revolves.

Diamante de Sangre (2006) is a film with unforgettable performances by Leonardo DiCaprio as Danny

Archer, an African mercenary of brilliants, Jennifer Conelly, as Maddy Bowen, a seasoned journalist who

seeks to contribute to a better world and Djimon Hounsou , like Solomon Vandy, a simple and good family man

who is involved in the civil war of his country. Truly, I take my hat off to DiCaprio who has been

working very well (Infiltrados) in the �� Last times A actorazo that shines as much as the diamond

around which the story revolves. I acknowledge being very ignorant about the multiple crises of thecontinent

African, of my own free will. I live in a country so full of crisis (Per���) that it anguishes me to know that in other

parts of the world things happen that are more terrible than those of my country and worse, that I can not do anything

thereon. But it's a selfish attitude, I know. Happily there are committed films like Blood Diamond

that help to make visible these problems that nobody wants to see. The action takes place in Sierra Leone, one

of the countries affected by the civil war financed precisely by the mining industry. The engagement rings

that brides of America dream of finance the death of thousands. "" In America, it's bling bling. But out here

it's bling bang "" Solomon Vandy is the proud father of Dia, a smart kid who attends school and who

has a promising future, until the rebel faction (Revolutionary United Front) He takes hisby storm

town. The mother and the daughters end up in a refugee camp, Dia is forced to join the rebel armed group

and Solomon is forced to work in a diamond mine for the rebels, where a good day finds a

rare pink diamond (much more valuable than common diamonds). That diamond will change his luck because he will be

coveted by all parties, including the smuggler Danny Archer, with whom he will pair and friendship

throughout the film. Another character that is introduced In the life and heart of Danny is the journalist Maddy,

who seeks to make a difference with her work. She will be essential to recover the pink diamond. Solomon

looks for his family, Danny looks for the diamond and Maddy looks for a good story. To achieve their goals the

three (unlikely friends) must join in a risky adventure. A highly recommended film!

" 1

" What could make Hitchcock feel so satisfied with a work like this? "When Hitchcock rod���" "Suspicion" ", he began to know what was going to be one of his Calvaries in Hollywood, the

producers, and not him, were going to make the key decisions of their stories. They would write the endings to him. He hadserve as the

hired Cary Grant tomercenary husband of an old maid, and Hitchcock could not shoot the ending that he

knew was convenient for that story, Cary Grant guilty, because Cary Grant was a star. "" The shadow of a

doubt "" is in many ways "" Suspicion "" but written from another angle. The same story but as if Cary Grant

had a niece who idolizes him and who is slowly discovering his dark past. In "" The shadow of a

doubt "", Hitchcock did not hire a great star, but Joseph Cotten, so he could leave the role of bad.

Uncle Charlie (Cotten) flees the police ���a, and decides to take refuge in Santa Rosa, a small Californian village where

her sister lives. His niece Charlie idolizes him, but little by little he discovers that his past hides something

murky. The police investigate him and an agent falls in love with her. The detective tells him that Uncle Charlie could

be a killer they call "the killer of happy widows." That explains why he did not want to hear the waltz when

the niece sang it, and also to tear off a page from the newspaper. He also explains the initials of a ring

that he gave to the niece. The police stops looking for him, because he finds a false guilty, but the niece wants

his uncle to leave the family , and the uncle wants to get rid of the niece. "" The shadow of a doubt "" is, according to

Hitchcock, one of his most magical films. A film for ���Our friends, the psychologists, our friends

the logical ones, however, it is not enough. The killer of the film is a tambourine killer, a

character without depth. What is the point of killing a loved one, a naive girl who poses no

danger, and who would end up giving a million clues to the police? �a? None, except to have the public in

suspense. To enjoy Hichcock you have to pay attention to its details and its plots, perhaps in its style, but you have

to close your eyes to your human beings. What could have made Hitchcock feel so satisfied with a work

like is? The teacher's favorite game, the "" who knows what "" is not squeezed to the maximum: The niece

Charlie, knows that Uncle Charlie is a murderer, the family does not know anything, the public suspects from the first

image, the police has stopped investigating the case. I think that Hitchcock could be stimulating the amount

of things he says without talking about them. The ring, the waltz and a hasty visit to the library of

Santa Rosa put the niece before an absolute certainty. But the niece does not talk about her, not even with her

uncle, she just says: "Go away." Two successive accidents make us think that the uncle wants to kill the niece,

but we do not see him act. Someone could give a plausible explanation that the uncle is innocent.game

Hitchcock'sconsists of the amount of things he is telling us, without showing any in front of our eyes.

Neither the dialogues nor the images show us what we are seeing: that the niece is in danger and that the uncle

is a murderer without scruples. ���ois Truffaut: I know that Shadow of a Doubt (the shadow of a doubt) is of all your

films that you prefer. I think, however, that if all his otherunfortunately disappear

films, Shadow of a Doubt would give an inaccurate idea of ​​the "Hitchcock touch". On the other hand, Notorious would

leave a more faithful image of his style.Afred Hitchcock: I should not say that Shadow of a Doubt is my

favorite movie. If I have manifested myself sometimes in this sense, it is because I realize that this film is

satisfactory for our friends, the best of us, our friends, the logicians.Fran���ois Truffaut: . and our

friends the psychologists.Afred Hitchcock:. Yes, and our friends the psychologists. It is, then, a weakness on my

part, because if on the one hand I pretend not to worry about plausibility, on the other hand I worry about it.

I'm only human at the end of the day! But, surely, the second reason is the pleasant memory I have

of working with Thornton Wilder. In England, I always had the collaboration of the best

stars and the best writers. In America the same thing had not happened and I had received negative comments

from some stars and from some writers who despised the type of work that interests me. It was therefore

suddenly very pleasant and satisfying to discover that one of the best American writers

was willing to work with me and take the job seriously. [.] With Thornton Wilder we had worked in

a very realistic way , especially for everything that conquer the city and the scenery. We had chosen a

house and Wilder feared it was too big for a small bank clerk. After an investigation we

discovered that the guy who lived in that house was in the same economic situation as our

character and then Wilder was satisfied. When we returned to the city, before the shooting, the guy, so

happy that his house was in the movie, had painted it. We were forced to paint it all over again,

dirty, and of course, when the film was finished, we painted it all over again. Franjois Truffaut:

Shadow of a Doubt is, with Psycho, one of his rare films in which the main character is the bad guy and the

public sympathizes a lot with him, probably because he is never seen killing the widows .Afred Hitchcock:

Probably, and also an idealistic assassin. Be part of those murderers who feel a mission ofin them

destruction. Widows may deserve what happened to them, but it was not their business to do it. In the film

, a moral judgment is posed, is not it, since Cotten is destroyed in the end, even accidentally, by his

niece. This is equivalent to saying that not all the bad guys are black or all the kids are white. There are grays

everywhere. Uncle Charlie loved his niece very much, but not as much as she loved him. However,

she had to destroy it, so let's not forget that Oscar Wilde said: "We kill what we love." François

Truffaut: About Shadow of a Doubt there is a question In detail that worries me; In the first scene of

the station, when the train arrives from which Uncle Charlie is going to descend, there is a huge black smoke that comes out

of the locomotive's chimney and, when the train approaches, It darkens all the and���n. I have the impression that it

was a deliberate thing because, at the end of the film, in the second scene of the station, when the train

leaves, there is only one A little bit of white smoke.Afred Hitchcock: Indeed, for the first scene I had asked for a lot of

black smoke; It is one of these ideas that one gets very upset about without being noticed, but here we were

lucky: the position of the sun produced a nice shadow over the whole station. �ois Truffaut: ��� Thissmoke

blackcan be translated as ��� why is the devil entering the city? Af Afred Hitchcock: Yes, of course. In the

same order of ideas, in The Birds, when Jessica Tandy leaves in her truck after having discovered the

farmer's body, she has received a real shock and, to preserve this emotion, I made smoke come out of thepipe

exhaustof the car and also dust of the road this contrasts with the peaceful scene of his arrival: the

road slightly humid and without smoke in the tube of escape.

" 0

" Classical cinema in the 21st century: Expiation is an exemplary and passionate love of a wonderful book (Ian

McEwan). Once again we see literature and cinema holding hands. Time ago ...

There is a predictive cinema: one advances in front of the plot, discusses reasoning that the characters

always reach later and gives the resolutory key with amazing ease. It is not that one is a prodigy or that he has

seen so many films that talent and necromancy have twinned their causes for our benefit.

There is another anonymous, disconcerting film: one is disoriented and can not find a point in the plot from

which to regain interest. Experimental cinema or p���simo cinema disguised as experimental cinema. Then there is thecinema

good, the inspired one, in which one contemplates the serene harmony of classical proportions and is

certain that years later You'll remember when you saw the movie, with whom you enjoyed that enormous pleasure and what

a silly face (the face you admire intelligence and beauty) we stayed when the darkness

disappeared and the people, overwhelmed, happy, abandon the seats. Expiation rummages in the Christian concept of guilt.

It goes slowly (perhaps excessive in its prosaic and almost exasperating start) in the lives of those who

grew up around a lie and how that lie conditions their existence to the point that they can not escape

their infinite Destruction capacity. Fascinating from the point of view of raising thebuilding

formidableof his argument from a simple premise (the idle and boring life of ateenager

high societyforces her to formulate an entirely false testimony) and a commendable plasticity, Expiaci� It

is a love story. Tal vez una poco ortodoxa, pero amor (al fin y al cabo) es lo que mueve todos los

peque���os nudos argumentales que McEwan y Hampton (autor de la novela y guionista del film respectivamente)

they set out to offer emotions, a huge flow of them, emotions that muddle a deeper study of

the hypocrisy of the society that portrays, but even that is forgivable in view of (almost, already explain to me)

satisfactory final result of the film. The English aristocracy can not stand the heat: even a commensal comments

that the haze exasperates the character and encourages to lose the bonanza of the inmates. This rise in temperature

detonates the convoluted and precious plot: the absolute softness of those who have everything requires sometimes

new toys that engulf their boredom. The rich girl accustomed to inventing worlds (from the very beginning

we see the eminently literary nature of history: pure metaliterature) can not resist the

temptation to write in reality instead of in the invisible limbo of the blank folio. What his naughty

prose gets is that an innocent (a kind of lackey, a lower caste member) carries the guilt of

sexual abuse. That statement aborts what could have been an extraordinary love story between the

accused and his sister. At that time Joe Wright begins with his temporary pirouettes, his intelligence and also

his more than sensitive sense of music, which takes over the tempo of the film and marks with concise noises of the key

to type the shocks, the connection between what is happening and what happened and that, in

some arcane way, governs everything the fringes of history. Without exception. The guilt kneaded in the spirit of

the girl, secretly in love with the man she destroys with her unhealthy childhood, is the guiding thread: everything is

allowed to caress by that slowly macerated atonement, given of quiet hatred, swayed by pain, transmuted

into a blicic instrument more in that Second World War that serves as wild props. typically English

mel���drama does not affect deeper meanings: Atonement moves away from the picturesque picture of customs to the

Return to Brideshead or the James Ivory tapes because what it wants is to make the spectator see (the reader,

first) a very simple purpose: we live on our backs with our sins, we grow with them and they bury us.

The only difference, the element that the child of delinquent imagination stipulates as an antidote to pain is

literature, pure fiction, writing as a handle on the one that abyss the infinite sadness. That's what

the writer of success Briony Tallis does: revive her condemned in the ever fluffy realm of

imagination. There, safe from wars and injustices, from mistakes and excesses, she lets them grow up in her little house

next to the beach and there, in the book that grows inside her, is where the writer erases the scene that

dynamite his capricious and hedonistic adolescence, ���sa in which the future lovers recognize their idyll together with

a fountain, in a Victorian English garden of packaging and smell at��� and gallant conversations. The politics of this

image sustains the whole later story. In some way, that moment chains the lives of many people.

We learn in Expiation that destiny is a goon bug, one capable of silencing the splendor of a life based

on whispers, at lev���simos tics of chance. We also learn that romance is allowed to contaminate tragedy or that it is

perhaps impossible to separate the passion (a brief moment of ardor in a library in front of the eyes

burned by the curiosity of a child) of the fatality. All Atonement emanates fatality, fatality andmisery

moral. The impossible happiness becomes fatality. This story of redemption is supplied with a

formidable budget, how not. It is not enough that it is a good film but it is forced on me. That vor���gine

of the industry is what recreates one of the most fascinating scenes that these eyes have seen on a

screen in a very long time: the beach of Dunkerke, the neat and baroque and delirious camera sweeping through an

amazing landscape, that of the devastated soldiers, the crazy ones that look at the horizon and sing hymns that

twin them in tragedy, that of the acrobatics of his destiny that mocks the death doing some laughs in front of

the sea while everything around collapses, literally. And this visual baroque is not (in addition) gratuitous:

everything we see, that lavish guignol, pushes history towards where its creators want, contributingmaterial

usefulso that what waits for us is m��� s intimately assimilated. There is no happy ending here: it is not possible that

there is. Betraying the spirit of McEwan could pull an extra spectator (word of mouth is sometimes atempered

bad-weapon) but the preciousness of the story is its final stretch, the triumphal entry of a

rapturously full Vanessa Redgrave, who explains how her novel (the one we have seen on the screen in the

last hundred and some minutes) is a farce, an invention altered to atone the guilt and sin and the weight of

all the demons that eat your heart when you know there is no way to return it to the state of innocence in

which it was given to us. It is not a masterpiece. Here comes the corrective that I impose on myself so I do not lose sleep

tonight and sleep. It is not because the narrative material is so magnificent that its conversion frames

generate irreparable losses. There is also a moment of disconcerting geliness. Fr���ay astute, so it seemed to me

the film when it had passed its primorosa and fundamental first part. That coldness is appropriate, it fits

like a glove to the purpose that guides your simple vocation of a love story. Truncated love, broken love, love

turned into melodrama of pink novel, but the bottom is what matters, the awesome fresco of the

human condition. O��� in a radio talk show, one not too willing to withdraw charm from the blockbuster, that

Wright sin of artificial. I do not get to much, although I try hard. I see artifice in everything that is fiction.

Inevitably. There is a lot of beauty in the movie. My prose needs an inspiration that I do not have now to

stop the doubts of the kind reader who believes that I overdo it and that I am simply selling personal emotions

in excess. Atonement has the sumptuous elegance of classic cinema, part of a simply magnificent book (

Ian McEwan's novel) and has enough industry support for nothing to burden it and, however,

something separates me from considering it the jewel that it probably is. Maybe David Lean is in charge.

" 1

" The best celluloid plasmaization of what happens in our bed when we close our eyes, essential

and recommendable when we can not.

It was one of those movies with which one has a kind of personal fascination, and yet, he does not

dare to watch it out of fear, prejudice and other stories, in most cases. �a of the criticism that described

the film as "" Martian "" word that stopped the desire to see it, I finally added value and

said , come on let's see if I agree with the great majority, and began your viewing, my opinion can not be more

satisfactory. I had never seen on the screen a a very effective and effective way to translate into images something as

complicated as it is "" the language of dreams "", and that is what an immense Gael Garc�� says �a Bernal at the beginning of the

film, the dreams are composed of random thoughts, reminiscences of the day, mixed with some

memories of the past, love, passions, emotions, and all those "" io "", the music heard during the day, things

we've seen and also something personal, with these guidelines Gondry, for the first time without Kauffman, builds us

a romantic comedy �ntica (to use) where the guidelines to follow have nothing to do with what we have seen

before and that mixed in a mix, reality appears and dreams, holding hands. It is easy to view it and

to contemplate some other dream that we, the suffering spectators, have had at some time, accompany

Gael the French Charlotte Gainsbourg and Alain Chabat whom many will remember as Julio C ���sar in the

films of Asterix.Resumiendo: The best plasmalation to the celluloid of what happens in our bed when we

close our eyes, essential and recommendable to the most not able.

" 1

" You see the influence of Amanece is not little, and that kind of absurd humor that deals with an

abusive tendency to look at the navel, which is the biggest failure of this film and so many others from the recent Spanish

cinema. ���ol. Why was the section of acknowledgments on credit titles invented?

Stendhal could see this film calmly and without palpitations since Svensson's syndrome is not a

majestic work of art that would have made him lose consciousness. Kepa Sojo premieres in the feature film with a

mindless film, composed of: colorful characters, rock-and-roll situations, metachistes, all the

movies that have been seen, the music he hears and his colleagues. Because this film reeks of school, as if when he dreamed

of making a movie at a bar, he would have sworn to all the capacity that he was going to give them a piece of paper.

Apart from running bullshit like this, Kepa wants to make it clear that he has seen a lot of movies and subtitles.

I tell you these? Gui���os ?, tributes? and parodies: Psychosis, Welcome Mr. Marshall, Hunter's night,

Ordet, A true story, Thelma and Louise, An Andalusian dog, With death on his heels, The husband of the

hairdresser, Requiem for a dream ? And if you've enjoyed all these movies, just like I wonder when

I hear Garci crumble the George Cukor films,? Why do you do a long do you do this? In short, the

movie is a road movie where stories are intertwined on the road from Madrid to X���tiva: a man

looking for the woman of his life, others who thought they had found her and are going to get her back, a catal���ptico, two

rappers, two cocks, Two truckers, an old man, a pop group, a churrera ?. With some parts and well it is

true that the film has moments of pity as the dialogues of Nacho Vigalondo or the performance of Secun de la

Rosa-to see if He fails to live up to his name, he is a first-class actor. The cast is full of other

familiar faces: Lluvia Rojo, Fele Mart���nez, Adri��� Collado, Eulalia Ram���n, Pepe Sancho The soundtrack features

Nosotrash and La casa themes blue and is another success of this tape that is light and passes soon. In this

? How big is my cinema? de Sojo is the influence of Amanece that is not little, and that kind of absurd humor is

treated but with an abusive tendency to look at the navel, which is the biggest failure of this film and so many

others from the recent Spanish cinema. ��ol. Why was the section of acknowledgments on credit titles invented?

" 0

" The whole story is absurd, and the characters are completely unreal. Neither scriptwriter nor director was

very clear what they wanted to tell.

I do not know why, I only have to see some critics that try to convince me that "" The devil wears Prada "" is a

good movie, fun, with good characters and an interesting critique towards the world of fashion, when it

's nothing like that. Absolutely. To begin with, the whole story is absurd, and the characters are completely

unreal. Screenwriter Aline Brosh McKenna has tried to adapt Lauren Weisberger's novel by removingaspects and

importantadding others who have no head or tail. Just to give an example: Let's say that your

work partner is a disgusting being who insults you and continuously despises you. Let's say that you really want to

take a business trip, that at the last moment you get sick and that your boss orders you to go in his

place. Would someone feel guilty? But what kind of 'moral dilemma' is it? Come on man. Do not you know

anything about your work? The solution is simple: wear designer clothes and everything will go much better. Suddenly you will start

answering the phone with confidence and you can even look at your companions, who until thenyou

despised, over your shoulder. The truth, I do not see very clear that supposed 'critique' of the film.

And it is not that it is the opposite; it seems, rather, that neither scriptwriter nor director was very clear about

what they wanted to tell. Obviously, I do not think anyone thought that this was going to be something very intelligent, but it

is not especially fun either. Many other comedies of this style go a long way. Really,

I do not get to understand all those opinions that praise her. For some reason, seeingon the screen is

'swan transformations'always entertaining, and Meryl Streep and Stanley Tucci raise thequite a bit

level, but that does not save the final result of "" The devil wears Prada "" , which is flat, predictable and

simplistic. Better spend money on the book, which, without being a masterpiece, is, at least, much more

consistent.

" 0

" One of those stories that are revitalized over the years. Then, its failure in thebox office will

Americanonly be the anecdotal data that usually surrounds the great works of cinema.

"" Memories of China "" that brings us closer to an exciting story dating back to the 1920s. In it, Somerset

Maugham resorts to its unconditional fixation on unrequited love and the inexorable punishment that

befalls reprehensible behavior. A film of high technical and artistic quality. A tribute to

romanticism within an essential title. But, what little seriousness !. The film is ruined at the

box office and the American producers attribute it to the assembly of the Chinese. Why not blame thedirectly

American public? It is possible that while others only notice a heartbreaking love story,

they feel alluded to the popular outcry that adds to the unanimous cry of: ���To your home,pigs

imperialist! still, why not accuse Norton, the only architect of the political dimension that theacquires

plot?. In the cinema of the last times it is dangerous to show "" the barbarian invasions "". You only have to look

at Los Fantasmas de Goya, in its problems to find a distributor. Even the inks could be loaded

against the synopsis offered by the producer, the trailer that sells it and the label " "cinema

romanticof the time" ", which condemn it to the tedious culebr���n that it is not. Fortunately, it has nothing to do with the

soporific works of soporiferous James Ivory. As the reproaches that come untimely do not make sense, the

Cleopatra of Mankiewicz's philosophy failed miserably. that the Chinese will participate in the coproduction-,

we will run a thick painted veil and we will analyze the aspects that make it, in spite of everything, in antitle.First

essential, there is an interesting raw material , the novel by W. Somerset Maugham.

This author has been taken to the cinema in twenty-four occasions, being, perhaps, Human Servitude his mostwork

significant. The same that John Cromwell turned into a masterpiece under the title of Captive of Desire,

while discovering Bette Davis as "" the bad "" of the seventh art. On paper, The Painted Veil is a radiography

of feelings that perfectly dissects the true motives that nourish and preserve love.

Secondly, we manage to save all the obstacles that come from the adaptation of an obsolete narrative,

to turning it into a very elaborate guide of impeccable structure, which also has a remarkable and

select narrative rhythm. In this sense, we work in the style of the best classical writers, those who

wrote, reviewed, supervised and rewritten without rest. In this way, on a material of the scriptwriter

of Philadelphia, another excellent writer intervenes who, systematically, refuses to figure as such in the

credit titles. His mission is to expand the scenic spaces and break the emotional secrecy of the

initial story to the glory of the film, away from sugary contemplations that lead to m� It's the burden

of boredom. The indisputable piece is Edward Norton. The third fundamental pillar is

found in dialogues, as intelligent as they are attractive, perfectly constructed, once again, in the most pure

style of the classics. Only the authors of the decades 40-50 were able to maintain the attention of the

spectator in long scenes - sometimes, entire films - that developed without major events, so

only with two characters confined in some claustrophobic place. Those responsible for this film are not recreated in

such situations, but they know how to be successful when they raise them.the largeproductions

Followingclassical, the presence of two great stars is required. While Norton-actor performs a

discreet performance, Naomi is sublime. She demonstrated her best dramatic record of 21 grams, hypnotized

The Ring and convinced her to wear the clothes of the early twentieth century - size 34 - in King Kong. Undoubtedly

, the best actress of the last generations to embody the romantic heroine to whichgave life

Greta Garbo and Eleanor Parker. Both are surrounded by a successful cast of secondaries, of which

Liev Schreiber stands out. The fifth attractive element is extracted from a correct direction that elevates the various

technical aspects to the category of characters . Thanks to some planes of the filmmaker, the viewer will

experience the need to travel to Mei-Tan-Fu, even with a knife. For its part, the Dryburgh photograph

incorporates, at all times, the threat of the polluted river. Not forgetting the enveloping soundtrack by Alexandre

Desplat, the evocative piano, or the inclusion of that beautiful song: "" Il ya longtemps que je t? Aime. "", Which

frames the climactic scenes of the film. The point where we nostalgic will remember the end of that

"" I had a farm in Africa. "" Maybe "" China is not a place for a woman "", but it is Surely this is one of

those stories that are revitalized with the passage of years. Then, its failure in the American box office will only be the

anecdotal data that usually surrounds the great works of cinema.

" 1

" In short, we could say that The final trick: The prestige is an excellent film that

mixes with magic and style varied themes and that, in addition, enjoys some interpretations absolutely bright and

a gui���n that deserves everything.

At the end of 2006, we had the "" luck "" to witness two films with the theme of magic in

between, called Scoop and The Illusionist. After these simple entertainments, the people (including myself,

of course), anxious, were waiting for the premiere of Christopher Nolan's last film, The Final Trick: The

prestige. And here is my criticism of the film, which without a doubt, I enjoyed it as if it were in

full magic show. Memento was released in 2000 and achieved a huge success. And is that its incredible

originality left anyone who saw it speechless. Before this film, Christopher Nolan had

directed Following, or the same as a rookie film experiment (with good reviews, that's it). Two

years later of the success of his second film, Nolan directed a brilliant film -which nevertheless did not surpassone-

the previouswith Al Pacino and Robin Williams as protagonists. It was titled Insomnia and its distressing atmospherealmost

and thatperfect staging made us come to the conclusion that this young director was, without a

doubt, a prodigy. In 2005 Batman Begins premiered, which was another disproportionate success (after

being a hair ignored Pacino). I must admit that it is not a bad movie, but it could have been much

better, more personal. But for staff we have The final trick: The prestige, the last tape of the director,

which is supposed to be, without practically any failure, his second best film after Memento. The final trick: The

prestige stands out basically for its originality, both within the story and in the atmosphere of joy.

It could be said that this peculiar way of telling and setting stories that Nolan has is totally

personal, or at least it seems. That dark and dark environment, the atmospheres that seem to trap you,

the narrow alleys that seem to have no way out and those characters so characterized by their failures that in

one way or another are rewarded or, those seeking revenge . Here are examples like Leonard Selvy, an

amnesiac man who tries to take revenge on the man who murdered his wife or other characters like Batman or Pacino

in Insomnia, who rather than take revenge, decides hide a fact that if it comes to light will be harmed. In Thetrick

final: The prestige issues to deal with, mainly, are envy and rivalry, among many others. The

protagonists, after passing a stage of friendship, by a terrible consequence begin to hate each other until they

reach unsuspected limits. This would be the main subject of Nolan's work. Although, as I

said, this is only the main one, because there is, in this magnificent film, a series of subjects so extremely

delicate that, if they are not treated with such delicacy, they can tear down the film. ��cula. But luckily

Christopher Nolan (and his brother Johnatan) have managed to create this fascinating and complex story in a

formidable way, bordering on perfection. Topics such as madness, wisdom, common sense, perfection and

overcoming, triumph, intelligence or the same prestige make the film ��cula is complemented by

details and facts which benefit the complexity of the story. On the other hand, I find thathas been

this final trick so apparently dazzlingsold in excellent condition. As you may know, the original title of the

film is The prestige, something that does not leave this "surprise" ending in sight, but I believe that

the main motto of the film, apart from "" being attentive "", as Michael Caine tells us at the beginning of the

film, in an absolutely incredible way (attentive to the image that appears then and remember it until

then you serve), is the simplicity of things or the apparent complexity ofall. The obsession that leads us

to complicate ourselves while, things that are really simple to see, we do not see them. So, more

than final gimmicks (which are not too many or better, they are predictable, Nolan's movie wants to show you

just that, and someone may be disappointed by the absence of such a surprise ending (unless you do not

guess it -totally, or partially- before it happens, which I doubt enough.) But that's not why the film is not

interesting anymore. the opposite! I at least prefer that an end is thought with reason and has

a credible conclusion that it does not appear a 90 degree turn which does not agree with anything. that the end

of The final trick: The prestige is unexpected. In addition to the script, the work of Christopher Nolan has many

positive aspects, one of them is the ambience. ��cula is located at the beginning of the 20th century, in London,

therefore the streets, the surroundings, the theaters and all the buildings have been de They are built

especially for the film, in short, it is not a film of modern magicians (although it hastouches

sci-fi) and therefore large-scale sets have been needed. ��o (and quality). Another highlight is the

great photography. Wally Pfister is in charge of creating unique sensations, totally overwhelming (and at

the same time hopeful). I recommend you to be attentive to the numbers of magic, where the photographic director can

be seen filming magnificent planes full of personality and above all, with an exquisite taste (look

at Hugh Jackman under the stage, simulating that they applaud him, with the light that comes out of the woods,

maybe it is one of the sequences with one of the best shots). Then there is the editing and editing, of

which I can only say that they deserve, at least, a nomination Premion prize (Oscar certainly not, since

the nominees have already been announced). And finally, to say that the soundtrack of David Julyan is formidable,

because it adapts like a ring to a finger to the footage. Attentive, above all, to the final theme, totally exciting.

After mentioning all the technical aspects, it would be unfair not to name all the interpreters that appear

in the film, since they bring a greater density and depth to the story . First of all, to name the

two protagonists of the film: Hugh Jackman and Christian Bale. Two authentic teachers of the interpretation

that, curiously, in this film is where they shine more. You should pay attention to the intense dialogues that

occur in the final part and also in the penetrating looks that are made between the two. And within the

secondary, all luxury, I would highlight Michael Caine above all. What to say about this actor? Well, here, despite

not appearing too much, offers us a brilliant interpretation, endowed with intelligence and above all, common sense

. The female cast is not that it is too extensive, but it is true that both Scarlett Johansson and

Piper Perabo play two key characters of the film, so it makes them more important, then. Finally

, highlight the appearances of David Bowie and Andy Serkins in two other roles that also have a lot to

say in the story. The final trick: The prestige lacks important faults, so we can say that

almost reaches the master. That it does not arrive perhaps because of the excess of details that make the film empache with

so many of them and is a bit overwhelming (in a more or less positive sense, because at least it is appreciated to enjoy

such a formidable gui���n, although it has its excesses). In short, we could affirm that The final trick: The

prestige is an excellent film that mixes with magic and style varied themes and that, besides He has

absolutely brilliant performances and a script that deserves everything.

" 1

" Fren���tico guignol of all the vices of Tarantino, amplified, turned into a delicacy for gourmands and, of

course, garbage for en���migos of his cinema.

Perhaps the verbal incontience of the Death Proof protagonists makes us lose sight of the truemechanisms

cinematographicof the film: its revivalism that predates the exploitation of the seventies and the

double programs of casposo and greasy cinema. , unprepossessing and, above all, self-parochial and with an irrepressible desire

to mock his own seriousness, but Tarantino, the old enfant terrible of the cinema, handlesbudgets

looseand the presence of the capitalist Weinstein. that this trash-movie is not a fiasco and, in addition to

feeding the ego of its author and its name, make cash, which is a noble exercise that Hollywood never despises.

There is no Death in proof to series B, although all its dynamited footage transpire B series for all its

dynamited pores. Tarantino goes to what he does best: the paroxysm of linguistic, ironic, shameless and

machine-gunned by a Greek chorus of heroes (heroines in this case) intoxicated for tequila, bourbon,sex

fast, impossible-riding cars and the hedonistic pleasure of violence as aforintellectuals

pleaunprejudicedand simple parishioners - victims of impact scenes and mutilated legs in the middle of the asphalt . And

he orchestrates it with the talent of someone who has enjoyed filmmaking to such an extent that it gives undisguised tribute, that

carousel of malicious curves and roadside bars illuminated by the addictive neon ofbeer brands

renownedand the very well-founded soundtrack of the jukebox of the time, capturing the spirit of the Stax label or the

whole batch of Motown classics. At that sweaty and procacious rhythm Arlene / Butterfly (Vannesa Ferlito)

marks an audacious lap dancing that can not be overlooked without a reverence.narrative merchandise

Tarantino'sdelves into the predatory capacity of a non-conformist, fetishist and nullified by the

mediocrity of mass culture, which sells consumer artifacts for universal tasting, films

that have been smoothed by edges so that they can be embedded in all cultures of all countries where he

is supposed to make money. The insolence of Tarantino is to pursue this goal without being noticed in

excess. The aging of the color, the worst quality of the sound, the roll jumps, the gray tones, the

burned frames and even the false black and white that later becomes color in the second section of the tape are

gui��� you go to a cinema that is already dead, discredited by the very abundant quality of its

proposal, but that has fed the cinephilia of many of the directors who are now considered

essential and who, over time, do not get angry in divismos and in unnecessary ombliguismos, they will be

considered classic. Death proof is justified by that distorted variant of the cinephilia of its creator, but it

reformulates action films, suitably nostalgic and packed with cinematographic citations - from Russ

Meyer and his Faster, Pussycat ! Kill! Kill! to the fundamental Point limit: Zero of Sarafian, going through the

cannonballs of Gone in 60 seconds of Halicki or the masterpiece of the car chases that is Bullit, the

Steve McQueen film that put Peter Yates in the nomencl���tor of directors of cult of the seventy -. Not

having seen Planet Terror prevents this review from completing a total tour of Grindhouse, the doubleof

operaRodr���guez and Tarantino that should have been viewed in a single session. n, but that themachinery

European distributionhas preferred to leave and, in the split, double the income and generate a greater expectation.

The erotic component amplified in the first part of the tape wanes in the second, but the whole tape is

swept away by that obscene look of voyeur cult. The very character of Stuntman Mike (A formidable Kurt Russell

who leads the way that Travolta once enjoyed in his role as Vincent Vega) is a genius of the controlled

perversity of its author: a psychopath who would have made the delights of Cronemberg, a murderer who destroys

women with his car as a relentless weapon. The populous number of pictures mimics memorable moments of other tarantino

tapes. There are times when we can believe that we see a scene from Reservoir dogs or those

sparkling dialogues, illuminated from an unhealthy fascination by the black series, that make Pulp fiction

an absolute masterpiece. Mike Stuntman's hunting pieces, dismembered on the asphalt, charge in the

second part of the film new life with a thug truncheon of female warriors, directly extracted from the

bestiary of the inevitable Meyer, which does not allow that they are coughing or that a nutty with a cracked face

spoils their games. But do not dethrone the end of the symphony. The viewer is oblivious to what Tarantino

describes, who does not agree with that juicy list of references cin���filas of series B or Z or blaxpoitation or

giallo or whatever this man cabez���n has seen in his youth not enjoy the same as the spectator

c���mplice, nothing prissy at the time of getting bogged down in low budget products, blowouts ofscenes

patheticand provocateurs like few when it comes to expressing sex, violence and fast cars. He is the

perfect recipient of this author's whim, excellent in his daring, perhaps swollen by minutes to be able to

constitute himself as an individual piece and be able to be exploited outside the United States. a

classic Tarantinian double session (Pulp Fiction and Jackie Brown). Opportunism, commercial vision, impudence, but

opportunity for the new public to attend, in the first row, at home, huddled in the favorite armchair, to the

delirious imagination of this teacher.

" 1

" Just as Soderbergh wanted to imitate the classic Casablanca cinema with Good German, Tarantino falls into

the same mistake and wants to pay homage by skipping many of the elements that characterized those works.

And besides, it's boring.

After this director had given birth to one of the biggest games of modern cinema in two parts, now it

turns out that he gets into the doldrums for those films with little budget, crushed in innumerable projections and with

insane arguments. But just as Soderbergh wanted to imitate the classic Casablanca cinema with Good

German, Tarantino falls into the same error and wants to do a tribute skipping many of the elements that

characterized those works . And besides, it's boring. Because paying homage and having nostalgia for those works is not

making "" your movie "" adding motes and stripes with the digital effect of the turn, putting up signs of missing cachos

and using special effects that at that time were impossible. Soderbergh wanted to do something similar, but

except for the black and white, the rest of the film looked like a thriller any of the ones that take place every

day. ���Camera movements? Perfect "The" "chroma" "or" "funds trick" "? Impeccable Andscenes

sexwith a treatment that at that time did not suit. That is to say, a decaffeinated tribute and with the chip

of now. Tarantino, along with his friend Robert Rodriguez, have wanted to do the same and get in

trouble, although not exactly when writing the script. Choose an unjustly undervalued actor

like Kurt Russell and put him on top. And then a lot of very good girls to see here and there and action scenes

with special effects of the first order. And that's it. The first part, Rodriguez's, I have not seen her.

But Tarantino's yes. And it's the worst 2 hours invested in these weeks. Blah, blah, blah, jijiji, jejeje,

tonter���as here and there, a joke ending, conceptual and stylistic barbarities about themovies

old, one part turns black and white, another has no specks, the other many and evenfragments

lost? Yes, what seems a fact is that Quentin has spent a pipe surrounded by beautiful girls and drink

with the money of the unsuspecting that they saw Kill Bill and that now it will return to leave the rooms with this insult.

And Quentin sure tells every dollar or euro with a loud laugh.

" 0

" Von Trier jokes about the cinematographic process, labor relations and appearances in a

hilarious film, with absurd dialogues, strange characters and situations crazy.

I guess there's no better time to talk about "" The boss of all this "" than the worker's day. The last

film by Lars Von Trier released in Spain revolves around a company whose owner decides to hire

an actor to pose as the true mandam���s, since He has hidden his position from employees. And

this time is not a great drama of those to which we have the director Danos, but quite the

opposite. I do not remember having said so much in the movies in a very long time. Von Trier jokes about theprocess

cinematographic, labor relations and appearances, possibly in a much more autobiographical

way than I can appreciate. And it does it by means of absurd dialogues, strange characters andsituations

crazy. A risky gamble, which could have led to a stupid movie full of typicaland easy

jokesjokes and that, however, ends up being a funny comedy. ���sima with numerous unexpected twists.

Between the actor's obsession to turn each of his sentences into a historical interpretation, the boss

cocoon with a look of bonach���n (and voice of Peter, of "" Father of family "", in the Spanish dub), the cries of the

Icelandic businessman and the rarities of the whole office, "" The boss of all this "" does not have too much to envy to

the comedies of the Coen or Woody Allen. Of course, Lars Von Trier does not stay calm if he does not experiment. I already made

it clear with the dogma in "" Idiots "" or the scenarios of "" Dogville "" and "" Manderlay "", among other things. On

this occasion, there is someone who can be annoyed that the director has the audacity to interrupt the action with his

explanations about the narrative structure of the comedy in voice-over, or that he forgets voluntarily of the

camera, which gives rise to those curious framings. To me, personally, I like these little games, which break

with the monotony of the image and give a fresher air to the final result. It is very probable that "" The boss of

all this "" is not valued as it deserves and goes down in history as a minor work within thefilmography

director's, lost among his great and profound dramas. Not that I look like bad movies, but when I've

seen Emily Watson, Bj���rk and Nicole Kidman play the same role of "poor defenseless guy before the

cruel and powerful society", I can not help Start thinking that Von Trier is a bit of a burden, that he only knows how to

shoot the same thing over and over again and that his main objective is to demonstrate his mastery when it comes to making thesuffer

spectator. Jobs like this make you not lose hope that you are capable of much more.

" 1

" Words, concepts and idea work, but images are wrecked, which are not capable of

transmitting the sensation of loneliness, emptiness and existential anguish told by Bukowski

��� Is there someone out there who has not read Bukowski yet? Big mistake. Because Charles Bukowski is one of the

great writers of the last century, one of those geniuses who, with his stark prose and his stories full of

sex, fights, bets and alcohol, raised that realism to the highest point more piggy than merely dirty, so loved

many American writers of the eighties. And yet, if you see the adaptation of some of their

stories that shows us "" Factotum "", it will come out It's somewhat disappointed in the cinema. Starring Mat Dillon who

is aging with great dignity, as we had occasion to see in "" Crash "", in this case onlyeffect, work

the words written by Bukowski, put intoreally well mouth of his alter ego, the wild and unclassifiable

Chinaski. Words, concepts and idea work, but images are wrecked, which are not capable of

transmitting the sensation of loneliness, emptiness and existential angst told by the author of books as excellent

(and explicit) as the own "" Factotum "", "" The machine to fuck "" or "" Erections, ejaculations, exhibitions "" . The

photograph is too perfect, the atmosphere is too clear, there is too much light. Why not miss the

fascinating, murky and dark "" Barfly "", starring emotionally agonizing Mickey Rourke and Faye

Dunaway? The fact is that the film is fine , has bright moments and conceptual images, very suggestive,

as when each of the two protagonists takes turns vomiting in the v ,ter, while the other is sprawled

on the bed. There are dialogues and Kafkaesque situations, there are abductions of dirty and cruel humor and, in

general, you do not get bored. But Bukowski deserves much more than just "" not getting bored. "" The best thing about "" Factotum ""

is that voice-over that talks about life, literature, commitment to creative radicalism and, at the same time,

perseverance and effort. for the important things in life: writing, fucking, drinking and gambling. A

film that, beyond its frames, makes it very desirable to re-read the intense pages written by the

author and invites to revisit that glorious "" Barfly "" of Barbet Schroeder.

" 0

" Matador has been one of the surprises of the film season. The Matador was one of the surprises of the past film season when taking a repeated theme and

telling it from a new perspective with a lot of black humor, Let's accept it is the best kind of humor that

exists. One of the biggest surprises is to see Pierce Brosnan play the same kind of roles he has been

doing for a long time but from a totally new perspective and it is one of the best performances of his

career. In the film Brosnan plays Julian Noble a hitman who is in the middle of an

emotional crisis, accustomed to being alone and not having a home, the whole weight of the years suddenly falls on

Julian causing this depression to affect his work. In Mexico Julian meets Danny, a guy whose fate has gone

from bad to worse after the death of his youngest son who is in Mexico trying to urgently realize a

business to give the lost stability to your marriage; Both of them start a small friendship and even Julian

confesses to Danny his profession.Time later when Julian is definitely unable to do his job his

bosses try to liquidate him, so he turns to Danny, the only friend who He has never had to help him

do one last job to save his life. The grace of the film is in the relationship of the characters and

the dialogues some of which are quite memorable, Brosnan he does an excellent job detaching himself from

the image of James Bond, tell me heretic but for me he is the best James Bond that has ever existed and he did not share

Connery with that toasted Julio Iglesias guy who shouted "cancer" to the skin"". In short, the film is entertaining and

fast, although it is not of the Scary Movie type of humor but is more oriented towards dialogues.

" 1

" Ca���tica Ana is a very embarrassing mistake for the home cinema and a negrisimo point in the career of thedirector

Basque, who will have to improve a lot in his next film to win again the please your public.

Julio Medem, one of the most important directors of Spanish cinema, one of its most recognized authors and

creator, among others, of; "" Earth "", "" Lucia and sex "" or that beautiful film that is "" Lovers of thecircle

polar"", gets, with its most recent film, "" Ca���tica Ana "", to exasperate the viewer with a completelytape

self-congratulatory and compromising, since it will expose this film and its figure to the fiercest critics of the

place. The Basque author has shot a film extremely inherent in his person and his environment. Almost awhim

private. The story of Ana, an Ibizan girl who moves to Madrid to share her paintings and learn

art and who will start to suffer shocks that will remind her of her previous lives fromsessions.

hypnosis���s of this story, Medem has loaded its cosmic universe to the maximum. He has taken his obsession for

symbolism and metaphor to the greatest possible degree, and everything to tell a story that is discovered empty

and incoherent with every minute that the footage advances. . Start "" Ca���tica Ana "" as an exaltation of the hippie andworld

modern. As an ode to the creative commune, to the young free and ind���mito and to the "" buenrollismo "". However everything

sounds artificial, unbelievable. The dialogues maintained by Ana and Linda (Manuela Vell���s and Bebe) are impossible.

Of three conversations, two are metaphors or with important ���nfulas, something that may look good on

paper, but it is unthinkable that they have left the protagonists. And that Manuela Vell���s strives

to recite. What de Vell���s, to be his first film, is worthy of praise. His delivery to Ana's character is

commendable. It appears in 99% of the scenes and deals with guarantees the different interpretative nuances that

demand a role and a character that is not, at all, easy. In the antipodes of the interpretive effort

we find Bebe, fatal and pasota in her role as friend and counselor of Ana.It is precisely that air of

importance, self-importance, that pretentiousness, what weighs down on "" Ca���tica Ana"". Each movement, each moment is

overloaded, each scene endowed with a transcendence that prevents naturalness, which avoids any glimmer of

emotion. There is a scene in which Ana says not to look for depth in her paintings, but to bet on

simplicity. Just the opposite of what Medem wanted to do with "" Ca���tica Ana "" But where did he take us

"" Ca���tica Ana ""? Does this story require such a degree of abstraction? The fact is that "" Ca���tica Ana "" isshown

finallyempty. It is of little use that we bother to unite the pieces of this regressive puzzle, full of fades

in black and striking landscapes, of hypnosis and reincarnations, of parents, women, conceptual art and sex and

gratuitous nudes, "" Ca���tica Ana "" is only the story of a misplaced, impulsive, sojourner and

rebellious girl. The simple story of an aimless hippie that Medem has raised to the category of God in which she

has summarized her vision of feminine power. Too much artifice for so little. "" Ca���tica Ana "" isworst work

Medem'sto date. Directed erroneously to an immature public. A continuum of irrational moments,

forced sequences and shoehorned (the story of Lluis Homar, the crappy cameo of Antonio Vega, the most

pure style Caetano Veloso in "" Talk to her "") where only highlights the beautiful photography and locations, the

music of Jocelyn Pook (the composer of "" Eyes Wide Shut "") and the debut of Manuela Vell���s.Thesequence

finalof " "Ca���tica Ana" "is the living image of the Spanish film industry; politicized and lacking in good taste.

A shameful and shameful sequence. Ugly. Whimsical and unnecessary. Not even his presence within the

plot has a minimal justification. That Medem, one of the standard directors of thecinematographic scene

national, has shot a sequence like that, is something truly worrying and evidence the very serious state

of health of our cinema, which is very difficult to defend. A film ending so vulgar and inopportune as to

punish the Spanish cinema on its knees, facing the wall, for about 12 hours. "" Ca���tica Ana "" is a verymistake

embarrassingfor the home cinema and a negrisimo point in the career of the Basque director, who will have to improve a

lot in his next film to win again the favor of his audience.

" 0

" To the spectators who see Spider-Man 3 without the bandage of fanaticism blinding their eyes, they will be a

dull, boring and excessively long film.

Evil that weighs us, there are never two without three, and in the cinema this maximum is fulfilled strictly, exceptcataclysm

box office. And as the Spider-Man franchise has generated ping���es benefits for its producers, it took

too long to perge���ar the third installment of the saga, which will be the last (not by lack of desire, but because

Tobey Maguire has already said that it will not return to put on meshes). The invasion that the Spanish billboards suffer today

can only be comparable to the one we suffered almost 200 years ago at the hands of Napoleon and his Grande Arm��� and.

We planted that face and we won, but it is difficult for the ara���a man to stop his feet. Sam Raimi offers us the

darkest film of the saga, in which the internal conflicts of the hero multiply, at the same time

that they increase in that strange triangle (r���anse of Bermuda) that form Tobey Maguire, Kirsten Dunst and

James Franco. In short, the Hollywood fashion of the day, which says that in a film of action and pure and simple effects

must introduce human and dramatic elements to demonstrate its depth. And of course, with such

arguments, Spider-Man 3 manages to demonstrate that it has the same depth as the J caudalcar river flow. The

script has as much development and progression as a communist on Wall Street, and all its characters are

flat encephalogram. As if that were not enough, to achieve such a large effect, we have to make a filmtwo and ahours

lastinghalf, that is, sixty minutes longer than any human being will consider. �a rational.should be

said in favor of the tape having a couple of good sequences, and a reallytechnical

impressivedeployment,but despite her showmanship, fails to fill the void clamorous argumental.A

ac We're fans of the Marvel, Spider-Man 3 will love it. To the rest of the spectators, who see the

film without the bandage of fanaticism blinding their eyes, they will be a dull, boring and excessively

long film. What a pity that next to the box office of each cinema there is not a chiringuito that sells insecticide and

kills-flies, because it would be a real pitch, and a relief for more than a disconsolate spectator .

" 0

" James Foley has traditionally been synonymous with monoton���a. This movie is a perfect example of that.

With an excessively simple argument, more typical of a telefilm than a desktop, and with the only incentive of

an important cast, it arrives in Spain Seducing a stranger, the �� Last film directed by the monotone James

Foley. The story revolves around a journalist (played Halle Berry) who decides to investigate the unsolved murder

of one of her childhood friends. Through the internet, and with the invaluable collaboration of a

hacker (one of the series is already coming with almost all the movies), locate one of the suspects, a

multimillionaire who gives life the nefarious Bruce Willis, who could be called the man of the three faces.

Namely: a happy, another tantrum and a third wildcard for the rest of your statements nimo.Y from

here, what montep Everywhere, messages filled with the classic moral and American morals andcarousel

unbridledof topics. Halle Barry, who seems to have recovered her lost splendor, is very comfortable in

this type of roles, and this is evident in the naturalness that she conveys in the interpretation, while the

t���bido and emaciated Giovanni Ribisi, who plays the computer pirate who accompanies him, continues to demonstrate that he is

one of the actors called to mark a time. From Willis, better not say anything. Perhaps it is due to the presence of

the first two that the film, with a mediocre script overly supported by scenes of sensuality and

few narrative resources, is not soporific , and at least serve to entertain. To look for any other type of

aspirations in it, is to waste time.

" 0

" Here, if you want to get soaked with this terrible dullness, come, feel, get rid of a stomach like a hangar

on a Boeing 707 and let it stain, literally , of dark, smelly and pasty shit.

Yes, I admit it: I've dropped like that. I, tanned in Jean Renoir, in Fritz Lang, in John Ford, I attended the

ceremony of unconsciousness and I lost the peak of my life to check, maybe this is the last time ,

to what extent can the human being be degraded for the sake of commercial demand. I admit that the savagery of the

sketches has its point of hilarity: they remind me of the videos that were first, or as they were called, that

enlivened the family dinners and that were nourished by brainless babies. (for splitting the chrism, not for having

little intelligence, come on) and acn��� boys who were recorded while splitting a replaceable memberJackass

to benefit the community laugh.is a f Formula of success of the MTV that probably

has its place in accelerated audiences, bourgeois of the cable, ��� lives of strong sensations since their lives are

sufficiently gray and flat, so devoid of emotion. n, that they need this artificial attachment so that

their adrenaline does not die in their organic recluse and they feel, between stupor and other people's disgust, a plus of

adventure, an excursion (in sill ���n, with the remote control in your hand and the screen lcd full 1080 to all

pixel) to eschatology, that is to say, pontifical shit as an artistic expression. In this thread of things,

Jackass is not cinema: it is not a film ���cula, but use its mercantilist machinery and its process ofinvoicing

industrial. This Johnny Knoxville, father of this bastard son of domestic entertainment, hasideas

clear: he is the smart guy who has seen in this nauseating challenge of the feats of the absurd a method f�� Easy (

the more criticized, the more amortized) to fill the current account and create in the quinceañera market (oh,

I think I've been extremely short) a treat fully addictive of imbecile laughter and

chabacaner���a amplified to its maximum power.M���s: it is also not noticed that those who record this desprop���sito

have any idea of ​​c How to operate a camera or how to mount a movie. Everything is frayed, badly finished: it would

seem that my cousin had returned at eighteen and, on his shoulder, had recorded an afternoon of

crazy things in the town square. Something like that. Amateurism with millionaire sponsor: exploitation in halls around

the world. If a hook in the cheek or shower with leeches is stimulus for a spectator,

then Alfred Hitchcock has died, Francois Truffaut has died, dead Ernst Lubitsch, Clint

Eastwood has died, Steven Spielberg has died, in short, all those who have contributed to the cinema being an art and

convincing the unanimous opinion, among its followers and addicts, of that life can be, yes, kind reader,

wonderful. If you want to soak in this terrible dullness, come, feel, say (I insist) of

this magician like a hangar on a Boeing 707 and spotting, literally, dark, smelly and pasty shit.

(He had to see it to be able, calmly, to write about it: here is the sad function of thefilm critic

responsible)

" 0

" What the critics serious call a fascistoid movie, with all the reason, which advocates the eye for an eye, to

carry weapons as a right to defend themselves and go to the mountains and distrust the federal government.

What I expected before going to the movies, basically what I found, a movie in the style of the

action and shots of the 80s, where the protagonist, disenchanted war veteran is called to

fulfill a mission for his country, betrayed, and decides to take revenge for having killed his dog (literally, in

jest, but literally) fighting a corrupt system and full of incompetent . Up there, perfect. A

hard, very hard protagonist, who injects handmade serum by himself, who releases verylapidary phrases

entertaining, that enamors the girl, with his look (he did not give her time, so it would be by his look? , or

by the abdominals, to deny it) that is finding secondary characters that are so exaggerated, are very

funny, and above all kill their enemies easily. And that is the biggest flaw in the movie. In the 80s to

see how Governor Arnorld eliminated twenty bad guys per minute was fine, but in this post-Bourne period,

the truth is that I prefer to see something more realistic, and already with a good gui In the end, what

serious critics call a fascistoid movie, with all the reason, that advocates an eye for an eye, to carry weaponsoneself

as a right to defendand leave to the mountains and distrust the federal government. But that is not all. If you

've stayed in that, boy, I'm afraid you're a left-leaning, you do not think much. Why? Well

why to find a film that so clearly criticizes the Bush administration, the bigcorporations

oil, the international hypocrisy, how we treat Africa and the countries Poor people, and because the American army and

intelligence services are at the service of the big corporations and their interests, we have to

go back to Syriana. Intermingled with the macho discourse, we constantly find pearls of wisdom,

especially in the mouths of the bad guys (who are very, very bad), making it clear that we live in a world where the

globalized unbridled capitalism allows Rumsfeld to say in public that they did not invade Iraq for oil and

not be lynched. Finally, after this, we must make an alliance between Izquierda Unida and Montana'smountaineers

anti-federal, but now.

" 0

" Gore movie politically correct that defrauds by a rather simple and unattractive plot Covered under the mantle of Tarantino Presents comes a tape from the director of Cabin Fever that tries to

transport us to the dirtiest human instincts via a horror film very well filmed but

with a very weak guide. We are facing the second film as director of Eli Roth, inspired by

real events that arise from a conversation with his friend Harry Knowles (webmaster of

Aintitcoolnews.com). We were talking about the sickest things that could be found on the Internet. Something that

went beyond the usual deadly skateboard accidents or those two Japanese girls

throwing each other in the mouth of each other in a bathtub when Harry gave me a link to a website where for just

10,000 dollars, in Thailand, anyone willing would be able to accompany him to a room, give him

a loaded pistol and to give him another human being to kill him. "Roth had the revelation of creating a film

in which three students begin touring backpacks until they unwittingly find themselves victims of

a dark business that consists of in torturing a human being to death for a large amount of

money. After a day talking with his friend Quentin Tarantino, Eli ended up telling him about his new approach to

film. cula Tarantino apparently "" went crazy "". "Quentin is a lively person, and I have never seen him so

excited about anything. He said something like:? You have to write that script! It's the most fuckingidea

terrifyingI've heard for a scary movie in a long time! Leave aside all with what ests now,

and get to write that Guin but you. "" Inspired by Tarantino's enthusiasm, Roth TURN OFF the phone,

cerr ��� the mail, locked himself in the office and started writing frantically. "" I called Quentin every two or

three days, when I got stuck at some point in the story, and he calmed me down and told me I was on the right

track or it helped keep going ", recalls Roth. "It was incredible to have someone like him as a sounding

board. I found myself writing twenty pages a day. I could not stop. "" Finally, it can be said that Eli has

created a politically correct gore movie in which the marketing and distribution of this create in the

viewer some animáis that remain defrauded before a fairly simple and unattractive plot. The first

half hour reminds us of the American Pie films, the feminists that come out are the only thing that is saved from this

first part since they are a real gift for the eyes. The scenes of tortures are very small and hardly

spend all their potential, and most of the scenes announced by the official posters do not appear in the

film.

" 0

" Excellent sample of current black cinema. It will be, without doubt, one of the films that are on the short list for the

next ceremony of the ���scars of Hollywood.

Excellent Ridley Scott film that, although the tape is custom made, achieves a very interestingChronicle

Harlemof the late sixties and early seventies, when the heroine entered � in the country and with it the

great corruption all levels, which made American society falter.gets a fascinating

Scottportrait of a time and two antagonistic men, the best professionals in their own. He does it thanks to a

rich script by Steven Zaillian, who always departs from the ordinary, and in a light direction, with a great

editing, brilliant interpretations and an energy narrative bright, clear and concise. Although it lasts two

and a half hours, you do not even know, being entertained at all times. There is not a single plane of more and the

dead or uninteresting times simply do not exist.A trhiller of gngsters and police, which

delights the most demanding spectator. Perhaps there is some politics in the ethical plane, if one looks for it, because it

is true that, despite the fact that the prologue can not be more clarifying. about the personality of the

protagonist, at all times he gets, if not the sympathy, the admiration and respect towards his person.

Being a very dangerous criminal, which did so much damage in reality, this fact may constitute something negative.

But at the moment I think that things are clear and nobody is deceived in this aspect. As for his

short epilogue, which has been said, it may be true. It could have been cut perfectly, but Scott and

the screenwriter have shown it to, I say, we can see that the progress, whatrepresented in his

the protagonistprofession, appears in all its fierceness, past almost twenty years. An irony, or

simply an evidence. "" American Gangster "" will undoubtedly be one of the films that are on the short list for the

next ceremony of the ���scars of Hollywood.

" 1

" Boorish, heavy and predictable. A very considerable waste, where in the end you can glimpse

in the remote intentions of going back a flight, but that fails miserably. The 'Scary Movie' of

psychological thrillers.

Batter of questions: In 'Number 23', what is the fundamental? What gives the tape meaning? The obsession

of Jim Carrey's character, ���no? Well, the -horing-gui���n fails miserably when it comes to portraying

with a minimum of realism and seriousness the obsession of the protagonist, and the whole story in general. Everything

exaggerates and takes it too seriously, so much that it ends up being quite laughable and looking like aparody

Scary Movieof films by Fincher or Lynch, and other psychological thrillers. It also lengthens it too

much, to the point that after ONE HOUR, absolutely nothing has happened on the screen.like those of the

Scenesdog in the middle of the road (and the braking!), the suicide of a woman and Jim Carrey crouching in the

act, of an old man being killed (why did he kill himself?) or a thousand and one Conversations, dialogues and

situations without meaning, incoherent, with too much moral and childish and empty words, not to mention

the hundreds of super-ill-treated and carried away until the l��� limit on the number 23, they are already part of the

honorable and legendary range of chemical and / or embarrassing sequences of all the history of cinema. In the

databases it is clear that this film is of suspense, but this one seems to be on vacation in the hundred tedious minutes

the movie lasts. If the main mystery of the film was well planned and well resolved, it would have been

a less dignified entertainment, but not even that, because the suspense is the most decaffeinated (��� Truly,

someone was really in suspense?) and typical, and, moreover, the pace is almost non-existent. And then there is the

end, that of those who are so fashionable now, the "" final-recapitulation "", of those who go back to review

all the details of the plot, not it's going to be that we do not fully catch the twiststurns of this taaan guide

andworked and polished. Gui quen that seems to have been written by Iker Jim���nez or, if you hurry me, by Pete Doherty.The -

more anecdotal - participations of Jim Carrey and my Goddess Virginia Madsen (I'm sorry, it's that this

woman has me madly in love), who thought they were smarter to accept suchroles

undesirableas those they interpreted in 'Number 23 ', they do not help at all.Barrid���sima, heavy and foreseeable. A

very considerable waste, where in the end you can glimpse in the remote intentions of going back a

flight, but that fails miserably. It would have been a curious short film. but no. With the permission

of 'Ghost Rider' (���qu��� grande!), One of the worst movies we have seen in 2007.

" 0

" The idea of ​​the film is not at all bad and could have given for something more than for a painful direction

of Patrick Lussier, the person responsible for this mess, which gets, at some point, boredom and

fatigue.

To begin, say that this film has little to do with its predecessor, that film starring

Michael Keaton that was already somewhat loose, which, were not many expectations in front of this

sequel.A man sees as in a restaurant and for no apparent reason appears a stranger who kills awith a

woman and his songun and then commits suicide. Without being able to overcome it, he will end up committing suicide, but he will be saved

at the hospital in the last minute. After this NDE (near death experience), he begins to notice and seethings

strange, and discovers that he is able to predict the death of a person through the aura he sees in them. Soon he will

start saving lives on the verge of death, which will make him feel much better, but what he ignores is that

every life he saves brings terrible consequences. The idea of ​​the film is not all bad and could have given for

something more than for a painful direction of cheap telefilm full of cheap and leftover effects,

unable to create tension or interest. Durantes during the footage. Patrick Lussier, is responsible for this mess,

to abuse the fright easy, and foreseeable at the same time, with the appearance of ghosts and bloody faces when

he wants, getting, arrived A certain point, boredom and fatigue. A shame that a dire

direction for a guide that if it had found a better director could have been something correct, but

that does not go over mediocre. I suppose that the participation in the project of two rising actors like Nathan Fillion,

the unforgettable captain of the Serenity, and Katee Scackhoff, the intrepid pilot of Galactica, has made this

sequel I ended up debuting in cinemas, instead of direct to DVD, which is where it belonged.

" 0

" An insult to the viewer, a disproven plot and shot by a couple of guys who, having no idea how

to shoot an action scene, decided to shoot it from 20 Different angles.

"" Crank "" is one of those movies that could be commented with just a sentence or two; even with a word or

two. But before doing so, I'll put you in the background. I went to the cinema with the best of predispositions,

waiting for me a film of pure evasion in the style of "" The Transporter "" . A film to enjoy without more, with

the right cinema and history to make it entertaining and an actor, Jason Statham, who has a certain charisma for

this kind of roles. Nothing more. That's what I went to look for. What I found was an insult to the viewer, a

disproportionate plot (although the premise, without being original, was at least interesting for an action

film), shot by a couple of guys who, having no idea how to shoot an action scene, decide to

shoot it from 20 different angles (blessed digital cameras) to be able to dizzy to the public. Since they can not

offer movies, or the bad one, they offer a videogame. "" Crank "" has some of the most embarrassing scenes I've

seen in a movie theater. An ideal film for those who see the cinema with only one hand or with the brain at medium

gas. I know we all do it sometime (the brain, I say) but this is too much. In short, taking what

I said at the beginning, "" Crank "" is a real mess of the that it is better to flee. Final rating: 0 out of 10

" 0

" Extraordinary comedy that has transcended all the times, with Marilyn or without her. This popular comedy gave Hollywood one of his most important images emblematic: Marilyn Monroe wearing his legs

in Cinemascope as a result of a naughty air. Interestingly, this appearance, the most promoted of the

film, was vetoed by censorship for what was not seen by its first viewers. In any case, they

enjoyed an extraordinary comedy that has transcended all ���pocas, with Marilyn or without her. Richard

Sherman is a married man who spends a summer in solitude while his wife and son go on vacation. The

scrupulous but imaginative Sherman wants to behave well and spend the days quietly, until he meets his

new neighbor, the irresistible Monroe. Sherman suffers the delicious torment offaithful to such a

remainingtemptation. The funniest monologues Billy Wilder has written: the superego and the dreaming side of Sherman

constantly confronting each other, drawing him away or drawing him closer to his neighbor. Enamos in love with him. In this

film, Wilder slips a comment about the marital institution of the time and its brittle yearning to

be unbreakable.

" 1

" This film can be forgiven for its faults since it has many exquisite things and, at least, it is for

children, which is no longer always the case in pel��� animated movies. And it's definitely in good taste.

Ratatouille is a spirited sensory game. Pixar plays with food mixing very realistic effects that

come to be organic. The food looks tasty enough to make you hungry inside the world of the film that is

completely caricaturesque of chatty rats and some ghostly illustration. What is best played in

this movie are its silent, comedic moments well used. But even so I'm afraid it's the

Pixar movie of more articulate sermons and morals. It does not compare to the cunning used by Finding Nemo to tell

the story and present its characters. Alfredo Ling���ini is a very clumsy young man who aspires to be a garbage collector

in the kitchen until he meets Remy the super-gifted rat of good taste. Remy's gifts of good sensehim

makea successful chef from night to morning and, even being a regular at the movies, he leaves thecharacter

mainquite flat. The only character that has a deep moment of change is the culinary critic

Anton Ego. Far away my favorite character in his stylized darkness with huge dark circles and super long fingers. That

comes to reveal us about the critics no more than that which has always been suspected: that the enjoyment of pointing out the

bad does not take away the taste for the good. this film can forgive his faults as it has many

exquisite things and at least. It is for children, which is no longer always the case in animated films. And it's

definitely in good taste.

" 1

" Not for a movie we are going to massacre the Spanish cinema. We do not do it with others who also delivertrash

similar. The Spanish cinema is raising its head, but then comes a title in this guise and bends ...

Model of minimalist criticism or short or reduced or reduced to four main ideas and three secondary ones that

redound in the same idea: the film is bad. It takes all the life the good one of Antonio Gasset with its wonderful

days of cinema so that now they make a film with that title and, above, be bad with greed. He does not have anything

that deserves to be considered good: he lets himself be carried away by the cinema casposo, simple to the na���fy brute like a

kick in the noble parts that he has been accompanying us for a long time, and that still (A (from time to time

) emerges.It is bad, it has already been said: very bad without kindness that diminish the opinion. Shudder of so terrible: it will be

that they liked in previous films (Days of soccer, The other side of the bed and company) and here ��� they wanted to

curl the curl, in short, to discuss the squareness of the tomato and the breath of the statues. As this is going to

become, more than in a criticism, in a review of a contented or furious spectator, in a warning: do not go, do not

waste your time in the cinema with a crude history like this one. Take your children out for a walk in the parks.

Stay with friends and ramble on about the goodness of Bus's policy. Establish a solid pact with your common

sense so as not to get carried away by publicity and perpetrate similar blunder. And if it's a film

of what they want, if it's really that, I have a tasty bunch of fleshy grapes made frames.

Now I think of Apocalypto, which I do not know if it still resists on the billboard. Or Lolita de Kubrick, with thatnuance

ambiguousof meat and a lot of desire to be perverted by a professor of Germn Literature. I say I. Not

for a film we are going to massacre the Spanish cinema. We do not do it with others who also delivertrash

similar. The Spanish cinema is raising its head, but then comes a title in this guise and the crouch .. Oh, and

how ...

" 0

" The movie is good, but whoever expects an adventure movie in the style of "" Santo "" or the "" Bourne Case "",

precisely with the same actor, will be disappointed. De Niro points out ways, however we will have to wait for

new events to see where he can go.

Robert De Niro takes us into the dark world of the CIA, with the novelty that he does at the origin of this powerful

espionage agency, which for years controlled, derived and put presidents in half the world. The context is the

end of World War II and Postwar. The actors are Matt Damon and Angelina Jolie in addition to thehimself

director, Robert De Niro. Although it is a spy film, it is not a spies movie to use, since we

are in the beginning of the CIA and this activity was not as professional as it is today. ��a, and we see scenes of

family life, unthinkable for a spy in the modern world. In fact, Matt

Damon seems anything but a spy, I do not know if in those early days of the CIA they were really like that, but the truth is

that it seems to me. It's an official who spies. Although the truth is that this is the idea that espionage gives me in

Spain. But the image that is given in the movies is always much more of a hero, especially in the USA Not to mention

that his relationship with Jolie is impossible to believe, too fri�� � too distant, too unbelievable

not to die for her. on the other hand he has too ridiculous scenes, like the one in which he appears transvestite.

For me, the film is quite good, highlights the anti-Castro operation of Bah���a de Cochinos, or rather

its failure, which also marks the storyline of the plot, since it is thought that it fails because of a blowArtfully

that must be found., the recreation of the London of the World War or the Berlinappreciated.

of the postwar period isThe important actors that appear in secondary roles are: John Turturro, Alec Baldwin,

Billy Crudup, William Hurt Tammy Blanchard, Michael Gambon and Joe Pesci. The movie is good, but whoever expects

an adventure movie in the style of "" Santo "" or the "" Bourne Case "", precisely with the same actor, will

be disappointed. To be his second film as director, De Niro points out ways, however we will have to wait for

new events to see where he can go.

" 0

" Filming with capitals, one of those that can bring the classics closer to the public. If we also

dress it with the politics of its director Elia Kazan during the witch hunt, and with Marlon Brando more handsome

than there could be, we already have it all.

The cinema has a special magic as we already know, but if we stop to see what hides behind

each film, each director, each actor, surely part of that magic disappears ���a. Many actors have

been despicable, the best shootings were hell and the directors have not been better. Luckily what

we have left is his work. In this film, film, rather, it is a reflection, even a redimiento, of

its director. It shows us how an informer is good and that we must fight for what everyone considers fair.

Respectable, but opinable. The film is about a former boxer Terry Malloy (Marlon Brando) who loses hisfight

key, so he is condemned to work for a gangster who has control of the port. It's important in the

world. Eliminates without any taboo any stevedore who wants to denounce, so Terry has to be

involved in a murder. From knowing the sister of the victim, and a priest fighting for

freedom, begins a process of transformation to overthrow the empire that has mounted the underworld. There was a

time in the that the actors had expressiveness in their faces, their skins seemed tanned in my battles and their

gestures allowed us to glimpse a wealth of life. This movie is one of that style. Each of the

characters, up to the most secondary, has importance in the argument. We want to know more about them

and we quickly realize that they represent real people. The port environment is very successful,

with a very good photo. Marlon Brando acts like the gods, and that which has him difficult next to such a

good actor. And the plot has everything, everything you need to be one of the best movies of all time

. Resuming, filming with capitals, of those that can bring you closer to the p��� public act to the classics. If

we also dress it with the politics of its director Elia Kazan during the witch hunt, and with Marlon Brando

more handsome than it could be, we already have everything. To buy the can of the Fnac, that does not contribute anything, but it

looks good on the shelf.Besitos.Moments for the memory: \* The initial scene of the jump of the pigeon. \* The

end, with a Marlon Brando finalizing what began La. \* The conversation with his brother in the car. \* The scene

in which he enters by force in her room, to show her his love. \* The harangue of the priest in the port \*

The struggle to work, humiliating the workers if necessary. \* When he enters the loft and discovers that

his admirer has killed all the pigeons.

" 1

" Electric assembly, fast-paced guide and the support of music to create an atmosphere of suspense and speed

that nobody has been able to match

This movie is � considered by many, others (among which I do not include myself) prefer Psycho, as the

best work of Hitchcock. What is clear is that it is one of the largest and the most representative of its style.

We find all the elements that define it: an electric assembly, a fast-paced guide and the support of

music to create an atmosphere of suspense and speed, that nobody has been able to match . Hitchcock was

criticized in his time for his "" commercialism "", but for those of us who understand that cinema, in addition to a form of

artistic expression, is a way of entertaining, the heavy filmmaker is an absolute genius who deserves to be

vindicated. It is one of the most commented movies on the Internet of all his production, so I do not want to give you

the tin repeating data . The only thing that surprised me is that no one mentioned the scene of the aerial fumigator

chasing Cary Grant, so I'm going to pay my particular tribute analyzing it. Interestingly, perhaps the

most famous sequence of this famous film, thought out coldly, has absolutely no sense: ���Thenot

bad guys dohave a better way to kill the protagonist who shooting him from an airplane? They are in the middle of

nowhere! They had it to egg! Accepting that they are not very intelligent (or very megal���manos) and that they have decided to

kill him with a machine gun from a plane in motion, why the first time they pass over the poor

Thornill does not shoot you? and it's more. Why do they have such bad points? Four times they pass and they are not

capable of hurting the good one. And to end the pile of crazy things, why does the airplane crash against

the gasoline truck? Was the pilot and the machine gunman drunk? On the other hand, watching the film iseven notice

so hypnotized that you do not, and do it, you do not care. It's only interesting to know how Cary Grant will come out of

this. There's the magic of Hitchcock.

" 1

" A gratuitous offense to a youth that already has quite a lot of problems, and that does not deserve to bea

stigmatized bypanic of state subsidies.

Before a title like this one, and with the initial scenes, one could well imagine that it is before a film

that revolves around the world of boxing. Nothing is further from reality. A hit is a social drama that narrates the

experiences of a group of girls who, faced with the vicissitudes of the lives of humble people, decide to

engage in berthing jewelery and other stores All an example. With a simple argument, diffuse and weakly

assembled, the film is developing with difficulty, dragging towards an end that is neither expected nor

left to wait , because the closer you get, the less it matters to a bored spectator. By giving a detestable image

of the humble and young people, the film uses all the possible topics, probably because the person in charge of

making the gui In this production he is very far from the world he intends to portray; It is the only explanation

I can find for so much gratuitous offense to a youth that already has enough difficulties to get

ahead without having a subsidized and panic-ridden state to stereotype. Nothing to argue from the point

strictly t� Technician of the film, while in the interpretative aspect, the correction is thenote

predominant. You can not make a much better basket with these wicks. Then you will say that Spanish cinema does not

triumph because of the distributors, the spectators, the cinemas, etc. Of course, it is the easiest thing to do, because

much harder for these mouth-blowing progressions would be to recognize their inability to connect with the public and

tell them real stories. interesting, and not canned garbage written with the sole purpose of collectingaid

government.

" 0

" Apart from one of those immortal movie characters, The Legend of the Indomitable has given great scenes with

wonderful dialogues, those iconic images that can reach the popular subconscious.

Essential.

Cool Hand Luke. Go, dude. During a poker game he is able to take the bet to the limit without having a

good hand. Not even a couple. How many would be able to fight with empty hands? That's the same

question asked by the strongman Dragline. But as good Luke says, Yeah, well, sometimes nothin 'can be a

real cool hand. And that behind that "" nothing "" hides an unbreakable self-confidence.is not an easy guy

Luketo understand, and lives in a world that is not prepared to accept someone so extra ���o. It

destroys parking meters because it has nothing to do on Saturday night. And for that reason society condemns him to spend

two years in a hard prison. Something smells rotten in the judicial system. Do not follow leaders, watch your

parking meters. Luke represents total individual freedom, at all times and in all circumstances, even if one's

own physical integrity is in danger. It does not accept any imposed rule, be it from society, prison, or from thethemselves

criminalswho share a conviction with him. According to the normal procedure someone like Luke would have gone through

many hoops to gain the trust of thugs like Dragline. But for someone like Luke that is unthinkable.

He prefers to do things his way, and will force Dragline to fight with him. Dragline will give him a sovereign

beating, but that will not make Luke give up. And the blue-eyed young man knows that by overriding the advantage of fear

veterans have, they will have no choice but to give in. Luke's personality is so overwhelming that

Dragline will be carried by her like a branch in a flood. "Why did I run away if I only hadleft

two years?" "Good question, Drag. Rules, rules, laws, repression. civilization, in short. The legend of the

indomitable tells the story of the clash between authority and freedom at all costs, the primary andfeeling

selfishof doing what you want at all times. The struggle between the law and Luke is ruthless and prolonged. At

all times the guards will try to bend the prisoner's spirit, to make him one of them. And Luke will continue to

shake, inventing a thousand tricks to escape, to make it happen to the defenders of the law. His

companions almost see in her a divine being, and few will be the times when Luke shows his weak points, his

feelings. When she sheds tears, real tears, for the death of her mother, it seems that the last link

that Luke joined with the rest of the world has been broken for forever. Maybe Luke learned "Plastic Jesus" from his

own mother, being a child. But the law knows no feelings, not in a prison like that. Luke

will be locked in a punishment cell to prevent him from fleeing to attend the funeral. It is the declaration of

war of the State against Cool Hand Luke. With a free and independent spirit like his it is terrible to

see him in the mud, begging the guard not to hit him more. For those who admired his uncompromising will, it

was as if a myth were falling apart. But, after all, a man is only a man. The repressive authority was

perfectly symbolized in that mirror glasses that look at the world coldly and mechanically. It is a resource

that has been largely imitated, but that within the story of The Legend of the Indomitable have a

special significance. Do not divert attention every time they leave. ���Record���is how do they end? That smile of

Luke. indomitable until the end. With a story and a script (Donn Pearce and Frank Pierson) so exceptional a

film like this can have many interpretations. I believe that The Legend of the Indomitable values ​​individuality,

almost primary freedom, the fact that being different does not have to be bad, and that self-confidence

can work miracles. A scene as unforgettable as the bet of the eggs is a clear example.

"Have you ever eaten 50 eggs?" Of course, nobody has eaten 50 eggs, it is impossible. But for someone

like Luke, wanting is power. Apart from one of those immortal movie characters, The Legend of the Indomitable has

given great scenes with wonderful dialogues, those iconic images that can come to penetrate the

popular subconscious. I speak, in short, of great moments to remember. The mirror glasses, the 50

eggs, the ditches, the prisoners working under the blazing sun. That stunning blonde who is dedicated to

make all prisoners warm while soaping her car (wonderful Joy Harmon, who was discovered by

Groucho Marx in his TV show You Bet Your Life, and ended up working for ���lm�� Later). With this

film director Stuart Rosenberg left a model to follow for the subsequent prison films,

especially those that take place in "" farm prisons. "" Well, how? not to refer to that malicious smile

Paul Newman in maximum state of grace, or that great and enterprising actor who is George Kennedy going crazy with

the girl cleans-cars that does not stop call Genoveva. God, sometimes I think I could talk about this

movie for hours! Or at least for the duration of a couple of beers. The legend of the indomitable,

indispensable, to say the least. To finish, a question: Do you think the picture that Luke sends is real or is it a

montage?

" 1

" Once all the characters have been presented and the adventure has begun, the viewer is

caught in a Russian mountain of emotions and adventures that, if you forgive me the typical , will delight

young and old.

There was a time in my childhood when I went to the movies without fail every time a film produced

by Steven Spielberg was released. At that time he was very involved in the process of realizing the films he

produced and it was (and is) inevitable to see his "" touch "" in films already classic as "" Poltergeist "", "" Gremlins "", "" The

Secret of the Pyramid "" or "" The Goonies "". I do not know the degree of involvement that Spielberg and his mostdisciple

outstanding, Robert Zemeckis have had in the production of "" Monster House "", the first film of Gil Kenan, of

which both are producers executives What I have to thank them all is that, for an hour and a half, I

have relived those happy days of my childhood. And I can not find a better way to describe the

film than to tell you that it has quite from the spirit of Los Goonies but with more touches of terror (at least, more

than I expected), with the logical technical advances ( the film was shot by motion capture

) and adapted to the current time and the possibilities of animated cinema (amazing how to

move the camera throughout the movie) ��cula). On the contrary, it could be argued that the premise is somewhat simplistic (three

boys who discover that one of the houses in the neighborhood is actually a monster willing to devour

anyone who approaches him) and that takes a pel denm���s of the necessary thing, for my pleasure, in entering fully in

matter. But little more can be attributed to him. Because once all the characters have been presented and the

adventure has begun, the viewer is caught in a Russian mountain of emotions and adventures that, if youme

forgiveElis the typical, they will delight young and old. It's nice to see some children characters thatnot

areinfantiloids, that are funny without being funny and that inspire tenderness at the same time that you laugh with

them. Even the dubbing of the film is good (for once). In short, the film is a joy for the

senses, fun, entertaining, visually amazing and has a good script. If that's not good movies, I

eat the hat.

" 1

" Essential drama that unleashes in the viewer the most basic sensations. Nothing that can write will

get that no reader is able to approach the emotionality that evokes. To see once and not

martyrize more.

I have a hard time commenting on this film, to begin with, I do not know what to say by way of introduction. Those who already

know me know that I am easy to use, so I do not know if the story I'm going to tell you will illustrate or not,'ll tell you

but Istory. The last time I dared to see this whole movie I still lived with my mother. I was

sitting on the couch, my eyes swollen and red, and my mother came up to me and said, "Why do you like to

suffer?" It is one of those phrases that remain in your memory recorded forever. I do not know if it was because of that, but

I have not been able to see it ever again. The film tells the story of Oskar Schindler, a businessman without

scruples, who sees a filin in the invasion that makes Germany of Poland at the beginning of the Second World

War. As he has contacts in the upper echelons, he obtains a factory in the recently invaded Krakovia. Once

there, after having "" hired "" a party of Jewish workers, he begins to realize the atrocities that

are being committed and decides to devote his efforts to saving as many prisoners as possible. As I said

before, I do not know what to say, given that this film surpasses me in all areas. Like all of them, it has its

detractors who seek in its lack of truth its greatest point of support. Well, I do not care if the movie is

based on real events or not. It does not matter, I think it is above the facts. The emotionality and

feelings that get them out in the viewer, in this case me, can not be described with words.

That feeling of extreme anguish, that suffering for people of fiction based on real people, that

joy for the small achievements, that emotion, that indignation Porn by the events, that compendium of feelings

few films manage to transmit them. Resuming, essential drama that unleashes in the viewer the most

basic sensations. Nothing that can write will get that no reader is able to approach the

emotionality that evokes. To see once and not martyrize more. I do not have words.Besitos.PD: Fuck that I

have suddenly cried so suddenly.PD2: It says an urban legend, that I do not know if it is true, that it recorded in full (

except for the red coat) in black and white because of the excessive cost that it had to record it in color. Moments to

remember (or not): \* The scene of the showers, when you do not know if water or gas will come out. \* When Oskar takes a child

to explain that he needs them to polish the bullets inside. \* At the end of the film, the final thread in

which the Jews give him farewell and he, excited, wonders how many more people could have saved with

that car, or with that jewel. \* The scene of the I kiss the Jewish girl. \* The moment the Jewish architect says

that they are building the building badly and the commander kills her, to immediately tell his subordinates to

do what the he had said it. \* The corpse conveyor belt. \* Even though it is inside the previous one, it has its

own impact, the girl in the red coat, who only leaves two. Sometimes it burns on your retina. \* The

"" snow "" on Krakovia. \* The "" game "" of the commander firing with the telescopic rifle. \* The moment you

discover that the trains with men and women they have separated. \* The last sequence, in which survivors and

children of survivors put stones on the tomb of Oskar.

" 1

" One of the most surprising and original revisions of the aforementioned myth that can be seen as it

delves into the different dimensions of the myth with a praiseworthy regenerative and introspective intention, putting

question many dogmas and characters of a doctrine and a theological scheme that governs the

consciences of millions of believers.

The figure of Jesus Christ has that power of fascination that transcends generations and cultures and is like an

object of veneration and philosophical reflection that lends itself to many readings, revisions or manipulations according to Lasn

the beliefs or mental schemes of each individual or society. This cross-cultural value is not something exclusive to the

Galilean born in Bel���n, but it is a trait of the archetypes of human knowledge and adventure, from the

great founders of religions to the heroes who have starred and motivated the rich mythological baggage of

humanity. Jesus Christ is a myth - with a supposed historical basis, on that subject there exists and always will be a

great controversy - whose characteristics evoke both the human and the divine in a social environment of changes,

uncertainty before the future, crisis and revolution at the height of the Roman empire. And from there a wealth of

nuances that, well taken advantage of, can be a good material to make cinema majestically, because it allows to approach the

sacred history from different points of view: Jesus the man, Jesus The god, Jesus the revolutionary, the

prophet, the religious reformer, the madman who cries in the desert, the executed. We already saw how Mel Gibson

wasted his time limiting himself to elaborating a mere visual illustration of the public text but adding

a montage with the �� Only purpose to emotionally manipulate the viewer and perpetrate tricks for themorbid

freeand thus be made interesting in order that everyone talks about his film. In the case of "" The

Last Temptation of Christ "", we find one of the most surprisingrevisions on the aforementioned myth

and originalthat can be seen since it delves into the different dimensions of the myth with a praiseworthyintention

regenerative and introspective, putting into question many dogmas and characteristics of a doctrine and a

theological scheme that governs the consciences of millions of believers. Believers, but it must remain very clear that

an artistic object is not more or less valuable in f unification of its rebellious nature or itsmessage

transgressiveaccording to ideologies and other phobias and collective filias. If someone esteems or appreciates

Scorsese's film as an "anti-Catholic" work, it will be in error, since its function as a piece ofart

cinematographicis to play and delve into all the metaphysical or interpretative possibilities that arise

from the mythical criticism, proposing an approach in which the figure of Jesus unfolds into two

alternatives that are two ways of interpreting (or of situating) their archetypal condition, counterposing them to

configure their multidimensional archetype profile, which is a splendid metaphor that dissects

the eternal inner struggle, the struggle between the carnal and the spiritual, the earthly and the celestial. Therefore, the

film focuses more on developing the philosophical aspects than on showing a Jes���s of Nazareth "" son of god ""

to use. It is a film of a great density, very far from the demands and commercial needs. In the

political-social we see a Jesus of Nazareth, a carpenter who builds the crosses that will serve to crucify

Jews, placing the character in a controversial position in the social level, from which a gazeis derived

devoid of all conventionalismfrom the traditional idea of ​​Jesus as a faithful follower of the tradition and the

collective identity of the Israelis. In this order of things, here the Nazarene is not a mere reformer of

tradition, but also an "outsider" who, under a profile of spirit Restless, he raises doubts about his own

identity and the identity of the culture to which he belongs. The meaning and nature of concepts such

as that of mesos, reign of God, liberation of Israel, spirit and body are approached through adiscourse

dynamic, in which each character represents a different prism or a critical reinterpretation of the meaning,

purpose and essential value of the figure of the messiah, the messenger of God or whatever. He tells us, incidentally, the

initiatory journey of a warrior in permanent struggle with himself and with others. Jesus Christ loves Magdalena

but rejects conjugal life in pursuit of a transcendent mission. It is the same image of the hero who breaks all

ties to focus his life on a greater goal. The sharp point of the case is that here the family is

shown as a burden on this way to the higher, contradicting the Christian and Catholic tradition that

places the family on a podium. unavoidable for the correct structuring of society and moral good. See

how the Christ deceived by the demon disguised as an angel is the one that symbolizes the passivity and stagnation of

old age; the family is the burden that ruins any pretension to reach God and to move the foundations of

humanity. This is one of its most provocative aspects and a theme that refers to the hero who destroys the ties

that bind him to the earth in the sense of stability and the conservatism of family life . The great

men, those who really manage to contribute something to civilization, sacrifice many things to reach

the sky of myths. The complexity of the discourse gives much more, we leave it here . The rest is purecraftsmanship

cinematographic, the usual sober and spirited pulse of Martin Scorsese (not great, it must be said) in the

service of a reflexive and autocratic vision . In that split of Jesus, lies a self-denying

dialogue between social convention and the savage freedom of the foreigner in his land and dissident of

all and of all: the Jes���s who Overcoming death (even if only in the sphere of popular belief) gives

humanity hope and meaning. The Jesus who stays at home with the woman and the children, ages,

symbolizes the defeated and alienated senescence of the problems of the world, the oblivion of dreams and ideals. Heaven

and earth, body and soul, and an autocratic Christ in the middle of the crossroads, taking advantage in this way his

immense archetypal flow to show us several edges about the problems of humn, the religion

and philosophy, and that is a great artistic achievement. Let's see the words of Nikos Kazantzakis, author of the book on

which the film is based: "" The double personality of Christ, the suffering, both human and superhuman, of a

man to reach God, has always been a deep mystery for me. My main desire and the source of

my ventures and misadventures since childhood, has been a relentless and cruel battle between spirit and flesh. And

my soul is the fighting field where those two ej� ��rcitos have been found and fought ""

" 1

" The second incursion in the cinema and with real actors of the adventures of Mortadelo and Filem���n is settled with

a result very similar to that of its predecessor, he is not able to endure the type for an hour and a half without getting

tired.

Our two most famous agents will face this time a great problem of drought that affects the whole

planet, which also does not stop suffering attacks to contaminate the waters. Bacterium invents amachine

rainthat turns out to have the opposite effect, makes the water disappear. The evil Botijola is after the

attacks decides to kidnap the inventor and get the machine to advance the purpose of their

plans, wipe out all the water on the planet so that everyone has to buy their drink called

botijola.Nueva delivery, second, of the adventures of Mortadelo and Filem���n transferred to the big screen that does not

differ so much, aesthetically and visually, from its predecessor. The cartoon effect is present in the film with the

intention of transferring the visual universe of Ib������ez to the cinema, which, as it happened with the film by Javier

Fesser, is very successful and even improved and much more spectacular. Unfortunately this turns out to be the only

point in favor of the tape that suffers from the same evil of its predecessor, a long elongated guide that does not

hold the level during the hour and a half of footage. Repeat the same characters that we had already seen with the

only change of actor in Mortadelo, this time played by Edu Soto, that although better actor, we must

admit that he gave more the hit like Mortadelo Benito Pocino. In any case it is Pepe Viyuela in the role of

Filem���n who carries all the weight of the film and Mortadelo only dedicates himself to make gracietas all the time, and

some of them of the m��� s silly, another big problem of the gui���n, has some of the most ridiculous and embarrassing gags

that I have seen in the last times. Apart from some very successful special effects , in his favor we

must say that Miguel Bardem has included many details that any reader of comics of the couple will

recognize, even many of the gags have been literally crossed, although as I said, not all

produce the desired effect and what on paper makes grace on the big screen provokes foreign shame. The second

incursion in the cinema and with real actors of the adventures of Mortadelo and Filem���n is settled with a veryresult

similarto that of its predecessor, an aprobadillo thanks to its achieved special effects and its visual tica,

but with a GUINY gags may be that have improved. The question then that worries me is if

Mortadelo and Filemon really are able to hold the type for an hour and a half without getting tired, the

answer to date is no, maybe in a new installment, if it works At the box office, I can say the

opposite.

" 0

" Martin has known how to bring the ember to his sardine and, based on an alien idea, has put into images

much of his obsessions, desires, internal demons, philias and phobias.

"" Infiltrados "" is a great movie by Martin Scorsese. And with those eight words I would already be told everything. But,

as the butcher would say, let's go in parts. "" Infiltrados "" is the update, the westernizing remake of an

oriental movie, "" Infernal affairs "", which, I think , they are happening on Canal +, but we have not seen them yet, so

we can not compare the original product with its North American version. Personally, I do not care

where the inspiration of a scriptwriter-director arises at the time of writing-filming his film, as long as

Do well and be interested, involve and excite both what counts and the way it does. In the case at hand

, of course, Martin has known how to bring the ember to his sardine and, based on an alien idea, has

put into images much of his obsessions, desires, internal demons , filias y phobias. "" Infiltrados ""

is a great movie that lasts two and a half hours, is filmed with luxurious means, but very well used and

has a cast of actors to take off the hat . A cast headed by the sober and

excellent Leonardo Di Caprio and Matt Damon, with the counterpoint of the always excessive, unique, wonderful and

unrepeatable Jack Nicholson and the counterweight of the very measured, solid and perfectly characterized

MartinSheen, Mark Whalberg and Alec Baldwin. A great film that tells many things at a devilish pace,

although it has a bump in the middle of the footage that weighs down the story a bit and, therefore, does not

allow us to face the great masterpiece that is We were waiting; He is missing a point to celebrate the

return of Martin's hardest and greatest, the best film director of the last decades. As much as it has been

written, "" Infiltrados "" is not up to the level of "" One of our own "", the zenith in Scorsese's filmography,

and, I think, neither to the height of "" Casino "", more complete, more resounding, better achieved. That's right, "" Infiltrados "" is,

undoubtedly, a film by Martin Scorsese. For its theme, for the visual treatment of the images, for

its camera movements, for the characters it has created, and, especially, for the impressive

soundtrack that accompanied it. The movie, which has songs by the Rolling Stones, by Roger Waters, the Beach

Boys or the Allman Brothers, has found its best musical finding is the impressive song "" I am shipping

up to Boston "", by Dropkick Murphys, a band as wild as the film's hardest sequences, which

mixes the celtic-festive air of the bagpipes with a phrasing punk to which groups like Rancid, the Pogues or the

Clash would not put a but. I still have a lot of things to say about "" Infiltrados "". As I write

about it, the strength of many of the powerful images that Scorsese has shot grows. So I'm going to leave

topics for a second review. Like the shocking end of the film, which connects directly with here another

majestic ending of "" Taxi driver "". I keep some reflections on the figure of the double and the loss of

identity and others, which some could define as heritic, about the undoubted influence of television

series such as "" 24 "" and "" The Sopranos "" in this excellent "" Infiltrados "", both in the form and in the background.PD.- Do not

stop reviewing the four songs that the Dropkick Murphys have posted on his Myspace site. Pure

Dynamite! Start with the cinematographic "" I���m shipping up to Boston "". and go on

" 1

" It is a weight tape and a lot of quality, and it shows us what no one tells us when these things happen in

real time.

Many will not agree with me, but in my opinion DiCaprio (Infiltrados) is recovering the

credibility that cost so much, and how fast I lost in some of his previous films, the

quality of his work in this film, is merely indisputable, as he has come to accustom us

lately, he fills the screen without giving us a single crack in which we can doubt his interpretation in

this great film in which Edward Zwick (The Last Samurai), has wanted to tell us about the events that took place in

Sierra Leone at the end of the last century during the civil war that broke out there, with the mines of diamonds

as a background. Hard film where there are, in which apart from being cataloged by age, should also

do so by our resistance. Magicians, at least it's like I see the shock of seeing a child brandish

a It uses it with more hatred and bloodyness than if it were a trained murderer, without disregarding

the tranquility that arms are amputated and lives are seized during a good part of the projection. Apart from

trying to make us open our eyes regarding the suffering and doubtful origin of a large percentage of these

precious stones, the film also tries to give a cry of alarm to the sleeping Western minds of the

abandonment to which it is They have subdued certain regions of black Africa, and the problems that have led a country

to riches, to famine and to the desperate consequence of the fraudulent exploitation of them. It is

a constant film, which does not suffer at any time of ups and downs and in which there is no room for

boredom, I do not really know if I could make any differentiation as soon as to the work of the threeactors

main, since Djimon Hounsou (The Island) does a splendid and totally credible work, in whichgives life

Solomon Vandy, a desperate father, who struggles to find his family having been separated from her

by the guerrillas, with the help of a diamond dealer and a journalist, played bywinner

Oscar Academy AwardJennifer Connelly (Little Children), who does not disappoint at any time, despite

the scant appearance of his character. In short, it's a film that you can not stop seeing, the

reasons you will argue are as simple as that I can not hide my favoritism towards the race of what I believe

is a great actor who still has a lot to show (I speak of DiCaprio, and if you do not give time to time), it is a

weight and quality film, and shows us what no one tells us when these things happen in real time.

" 1

" New sample of American doing in romantic drama, governed by the same norms andthemes

typical

From its first minutes of footage, this new romantic drama "" made in america "" it specifically reminds us of

"" City of Angels "" and generally that "" modus operandi "" that the Yankee cinema has to tell us about

romances. Not even the fact of being directed by the Argentinian Alejandro Agresti, makes "" The house of the lake ""

have that something, that bit of personality, that differentiates it from movies like for example "" Message in a

bottle "" and successors. "" The house of the lake "" is a story of impossible loves. But in these times that are running,

the impossibility of love on the big screen has to have a fantastic touch. Nothing of love poems with

characters that are sought and not found by chance, luck and destiny. "" The house of the lake "", as italso

was"" City of Angels "" (with which it has numerous points in common) are stories of love withpretext

fantastic, a mixture caught by tweezers and that usually show gaps in their scripts to little that are

analyzed. Far is not being able to love for logical and credible reasons seen in "" Letter from an unknown ""

(wonder of the seventh art) or without going further in "" Lovers of the polar circle "" by Julio Medem, masterpiece of

the misfortunes of love. "" The house of the lake "" is the deb���t Hollywood of Alejandro Agresti, director of "" The

wind took that "" or "" The dream of Valentin "". He joins Walter Salles or Fernando Meirelles, directors of

South America who are hosted in the North to produce products of their industry. In addition, "" The house

of the lake "" is the reencounter on the screen of (some entered in years and some other kilo) Sandra Bullock and

Keanu Reeves, twelve a��� after finding yourself in a bus with no possibility of braking. The story told in the

tape tells us about two lonely characters (Bullock and Revees) who correspond to

each other through a buz���n located in a house on a lake, in which the two lived. The presumably witty thing is

that they are written at the same time but they live in different years, exactly two years apart

, which means a burden for their, more and more, more Increasing love. That argument is the argument used

to show us the love that Sandra and Keanu profess, and how complicated it will be that they can see each other. A

habitual maneuver of the American romantic drama, which seeks the quick effect on the spectator, of impotence

for the non-encounter of love. A plot excuse that is not, much less, original Hollywood, because "" The

house of the lake "" is another remake, in this case of a Korean tape of the year 2000 entitled "" Siworae " "and

known throughout the world as" "Il Mare" "." "The house of the lake" "runs without pain or glory throughout

his footage, with abuse of inconsequential plans accompanied by honeyed songs and with a constant feeling

of tragic victimization in its protagonists (especially in Bullock). There are abundant close-ups of Sandra

Bullock, which makes up a character as sad as it is not very expressive. The secondary ones are of little entity andand

participationwe find Christopher Plummer doing the same role he did four or five times each

year, in different films. A film that does not reveal a bit of personality. In addition, it is preferable

not to enter into the game of the space-time approaches of the film, because you will find in this way

numerous gaps of gui���n. Because you could not have Sandra Bullock known the location and status of Reeves in

2006, just by looking for your name in the phone book or even writing it in Google, since

this Is it a well-known architect who would easily appear in the search engine ?. Bullock,

on the other hand, inquires about the day on which the father died of this or other irrelevant information. That makes the tape can

stretch to the 1:40 minutes it lasts. Otherwise, in a logical way, it would barely pass the time of footage. "" The

House of the Lake "" is, therefore, a new example of American doing in the roman drama. It is governed by the same

norms and typical standards, regardless of whether its director is imported from Africa, Latin America or

Europe, which means that from time to time the large producers impose and need a film so that

Offer to the viewer.

" 0

" Definitely the rhythm of the movie did not like me at all, things are solved in a veryway

shabbyand of course the script leaves a lot to be desired.

The rapidity with which the events occur is dizzying, 1 hour and 48 minutes in which everything happens. We

learn that Jane was dead, Cyclops finds her, dies, we know new X-Men, we delve into the

story of the resurrected one, the war breaks out and they die "" for free "" two of the m� It's important icons of this

Marvel. definitely the rhythm of the movie did not like me at all, things are solved in away

very shabbyand of course the script leaves a lot to be desired. Well the effects as always and all theworld

Xthat fascinates us and attracts us, but I really did not like it because of what I explained before. Except

F���nix that is wonderful and all his performance is to remove the hiccup yyyy aaaaaah me love is the end of

Magneto, although some say it's his imagination and I'm deluded thinking that this nasty vaccine is not

"" eternal "" and its effects are over soon. Because we do not deceive ourselves �� Who would not like to be an X man? ummm

almost orgasmizo me thinking, a being so wonderful and unlike anything. I would also be upset if they tried to

change me (and does not the system do it already?), Without a doubt I would become a Magneto girl, I am with him,

I think that in this issue more than in any we see the bad "" less bad "" (mm brings me some reminiscence to V de

Vendetta, "are the bad, really bad" or are they a product of the environment in which they develop?) All

this leads me to reflect on the possible X-Men of our society, because there are. maybe theynot

dohave wings or fire, but they are distinguished from the rest by having something that makes them unique and special. If

however therealways someone who wants "" cure "them". Here nobody wants to be cured, we like the concept X, we like to

be different? XDDD

" 0

" Interesting at all times and very, very well worked This past weekend we went to see a couple of movies that are worth seeing, that is, each

in its own way. On Friday we went to the despicable Valle Incl���n halls in Santiago de Compostela to see a

new biopic of those that make the filmography of the actor graced with the leading role go down in

history in some way. Tightrope (Walk the line, 2005) is a good / great movie. Interesting at

all times, very, very well worked and very, very typical. although this is not your fault. Somehow

all the famous rock artists of the world musical universe have agreed that their

lives are all practically the same. They usually start with problems in their youth (a trauma, achildhood

difficult, a complex social circle,.), They end up triumphing thanks to their quality, frolicking with fantastical pictures.

and getting into drugs to end up leaving thanks to the willpower that they treasure (a few) or for their

passage to a better life (the majority). That's the life of Johnny Cash, Elvis Presley, Jim Morrison, and a long

etc. Personally, you can completely forget that it's a chapter in Johnny Cash's long biopic, the

film can be seen as a film based on no one's life and it's still a great job. Joaquin Phoenix

plays his role as pearls, Reese Witherspoon is also very well and the ambience of the film is great. The

work done by James Mangold is good, it's really worth taking a look. I do not think it takes

awards at the Oscars because it has tremendous competitors, but the movie is worth it. What I did not like at all

is that we listen to pieces of the songs, they never complete them and I do not like that. In addition, as I have been telling

time immemorial, Valle Incl���n cinemas are trash. This time 2 minutes from the end the movie was cut! 15

minutes after seeing how the lights were turned on and off continuously we were able to enjoy the last phrase

and for home. There was one missing phrase! Thus they spoil any film. (Esperpento Valle Incl���n suffered in

El Retorno del Rey, grotesque Valle Incl���n suffered in Spiderman 2, great grotesque Valley Incl���n suffered watching

El Bosque).

" 1

" In this suicidal and suggestive formal bet, coldness guides us through emotional spaces,terrains

swampyfrom which the director leaves with the help of a person who confesses in him. .

Feelings and painful memories, risky pirouettes with the camera and the assembly. Banderas has made a

difficult film but it is, that no doubt, his film. The most thorny roads are those that, once

concluded, give m��� s satisfactions. Thus, this new proposal, different and complicated to defend against the

purists. An escape from the conventional that makes the story of Antonio Soler shine brightly on screen

but sometimes lost between enso���aciones and details. Easy to argue, difficult to contextualize in

formal terms, the tape has in its first 5 minutes the best presentation card. A sequence

in a hospital, with many anticipatory elements, keeps us in tension to give way to a morestory

costumbrista, that of 4 friends who arrive at a pool. After the show of cortes���a, the filmmaker chooses to

straighten the path and erase all halo of realism. We do not raise the question of whether a filmmaker should make a

film for him, for the enjoyment of the majority, so that some with less ties enter into their world. We are looking

at the most personal film that an author can make, the one that crosses the field of emotions with the

maximum, always present, that looking back is painful .Impregna Flags to the picture sadness and

melancholy. They involve the imagined and therefore biased portrait: it does not allow us to see the whole, the planes are

foreshortenings, there are a lot of insignificant details and it plays with the framings. He works with sensitive material,

that's why his characters can get lost and with them the viewer - in existential anguish. Even so, it points to

optimism, since only they can count on sufficient courage not to face destiny, but to

live to the maximum, precisely because the capricious destiny is imposed when you want. It dominates the poetic accent without

the language being artificial. Translates metaphors into images, flees from costumbrismo, also from the action and

maybe small to spend footage in presenting the characters, but it's really not nothing happens and everything happens.

Like Pablo Aranda in his novel La otra ciudad, Banderas sets up his own city, with few references for

foreigners and few anchors to the time, they have enough with their inner and hermetic world, far ofevents

social and political. We know that it is based on Soler's homonymous novel, but from that only thesubsists

germ: everything is new in this quiet journey through a summer dominated by unrest. In this suicide and

suggestive formal bet the coldness guides us through emotional spaces, swampy terrains from which theleaves

directorwith the help of the confessor of who confesses in him. That spectator will have felt the viscerality with which he

narrates emotions, memories and enso���ations, achieving that the pinch in the stomach does not allow us to relax until

the end, 10 minutes where the swans sing their song ag Unique He is not in the shoes of revered authors for his

anti-cinema concept, so he will have to endure the comments of those who wait for the

typical generation film of young people who want to open up path. It goes off on a tangent and many will

thank it, maybe when a certain time passes: the poetic and evocative reflection will remain as one of those

jewels to which many turn years after I criticized her. And Banderas, the director, will continue in

constant search of his own path. You will see.

" 1

" Pretentious, bland and, above all, ridiculous. Cluster of unconnected ideas recorded at random. Absolute chaos

A waste of time and money.

How to continue giving opportunities to Spanish cinema after seeing films like "Ca���tica Ana" The film gives in its

unforgivable beginnings false hopes that we're going to see something good, maybe not as much as "" Lovers of the

Polar Circle "", but it's something remarkable. Nothing further from the truth. There comes a time when Medem is

completely out of his grip and, literally, puts Ana on a ship headed for the absolute cinematic chaos. The

film thereafter looks like a cluster of unconnected ideas shot randomly on a film roll. Within

these ideas we must highlight (negatively) those that allude to the American policy. I think that,

like most of the regular spectators, we are tired of seeing how the Spanish cinema limits itself to

criticizing, or rather criticizing bad. "" Ca���tica Ana "" earns adjectives like pretentious, bland and, above

all, ridiculous. The plot is an aberrant simple, producing a sensation of strangeness anddisbelief

suchat what is being seen that emerge even the desire to laugh of pure skepticism. Honestly, I do not think

anyone in their right mind is able to get into a film that focuses on the theme of reincarnation in such an

absurd way. In short, go see "" Ca��� Ana "" is simply a waste of time and money.

" 0

" Remarkable atmosphere, good work behind the scenes, but a soporific story that can only

attract the interest of enthusiasts of the music? country? or? bluegrass ?, unconditional and scholars of thecinema

Altmanor nostalgic nostalgia.

Ignored by criticism, public, and awards, the pitumatist work of the recently deceased Robert Altman is

an entertaining and nostalgic look at the last d� Ena in the life of a radio program, "" A prairie home companion "",

which is broadcasted live from the Fitzgerald Theater in Minnesota, before the building is torn down to

build parking lots.Two last moments, that of Altman as a filmmaker, and that of a space betweenwaves

radio, are linked almost by the whims of destiny. But the vision of the director of "" Crossed Lives ""

does not intend to empathize with tears and sadness, without extolling some characters, that despite the lack of

popularity or triumph Physical and economic, they will never cease to be free, even if they take away that small

space of their own. Without acting as a choral protagonist, stars like Michelle Pfeiffer, George Clooney , or the singer

Tom Waits (who had participated in "" Lives crossed ""), could not or did not want on this occasion to enter the

project. In contrast, others known as Meryl Streep, Lindsay Lohan, Tommy Lee Jones, Lily Tomlin, Kevin

Kline, Woody Harrelson or Garrison Keillor (the real presenter who had that show), and one of the

attractions of the movie. ���cula is to see them and to hear them sing, above all, themes? Country ?, or how their characters

improvise or repeat to the rhythm of the melody, the advertising slogans of the sponsoring brands. But,

despite the good weather that rests among the cast, the spark is very particular and rarely manages to

pass the screen to infect the spectator. A clear example is the character of Kevin Kline, called

Guy? Noir? and a prototype of a typical black cinema dedective who acts as a close observer of what is

happening, in addition to a kind of narrator, with interventions that contain jokes or reflections that

do not stand out precisely by its grace or ingenuity. From the first image of the film, that of the sky of that Midwestern United

States, where different radio programs that talk about the pricecan be tuned

of pork, about how they know best noodles or c�� How to save the soul, rarely shows the

interest. Only the scene in which the duo composed by Dusty (Woody Harrelson) and Lefty (John C. Reilly, one of the

best secondary of current cinema), tell and sing "" bad jokes "" manages to animate something the function ���n.As��� as

the curious presence, and in tune with the private dedective embodied by Kline, of a? Femme fatale? with the

sensual forms of Virginia Madsen. A blond angel and dressed in an impeccable white raincoat that stands in

the metaphor of the passage of time and death. Two issues in which it is easy to see how they also

stung Altman, and yet it portrays with benevolence and even beauty.setting, good

Noteworthydetriment and before the cameras, but a soporific story that can only attract the interest of music lovers

? country? or? bluegrass ?, unconditional and scholars of the Altman cinema or

nostalgic nostalgia.

" 0

" One of the achievements of the script is that everything is sustained not by the action scenes, but by the relationship of

the two characters in a linear way, slowly and without steps in false or cursiler���as.

Police thriller brought to the screen by Doug Liman and performed with good taste, faithful to the book and with

sustained rhythm throughout his footage. Adaptation of the first part of three, a novel by the renowned Robert

Ludlum recently deceased and also one of the producers of the film. A road movie set in

the streets of Par���s, in the beautiful landscapes of Prague and in northern Italy, enhancing with its landscapes an

excellent photo.The film tells us the temporary amnesia of Jason (Matt Damon) and the search for his own

personality with the help of Marie (Franka Potente) at first reluctantly, suffering persecution and

reencountering him with forgotten abilities -and very Useful- to discover your past. It is not a film of

common action, like the old tv serials, but in a realistic way and not very common to today's

prone cinema of spectacularity, having a healthy parentezco perhaps with the Mision Impossible series. With all

the ingredients in its proper measure and form: hand-to-hand fighting, spectacular pursuit of cars, duels with

bullets. All with sobriety, credibility and without rest. One of the achievements of the script is that everything is sustained not

by the action scenes, but by the relationship of the two characters in a linear way, slowly and withoutsteps

falseor cursiler ���as. In the manner of a modern James Bond but without glamor, Matt Damon does a good job

for the content, for a role of secret agent without overflowing and almost bordering on the inexpressive. Following the

analogy, the German Powerful (without the sex appeal of the Bond girls) demonstrates once again how good an actress she

is by being more than a mere partner of the hero. A final scene that surprises because it breaks with all the

aforementioned realism, but that does not affect a good action movie - less, that's it - but with good characters and

well taken , something scarce and to thank in these times.

" 1

" Little can be said about this movie, little can be said that is not known, personally it is not one

of my favorite sci-fi tapes, although I have seen it more than one trillion times.

Little can be said about this film, little can be said that it is not known, personally it is not one of

my favorite sci-fi tapes, although I have seen it more than a trill�� Den of times (the last one if the memory does notme

failin the film library of Madrid), but, always, as in those films that one sees one and a thousand times there is something to

reeodiscover, so taking advantage of this excellent new edition Enn on DVD (and van.) I take the opportunity to return to

to contemplate one of the most outstanding works of the cinema of our days. We find ourselves, as I said before the very first

edition of the film, this one that comes with a malet ,N, a figure of the protagonist's car, and variousmaterial

promotional, that for which the fans of the film (those who want their epitaph to appear that of

"." I have seen things that you you would not believe, attack ships in flames beyond Ori���n, I have seen rays "" C ""

shine in the darkness near the door of "" Tanhauser "". All those moments will be lost in time, like

tears in the rain .. it's time to die ", it's true that digital effects and music have been added (like if the

tape needed them), since it has aged (it is already 15 years old) quite well.Blade Runner has printed, its

style in hundreds of tapes, whether of the sci-fi genre, or any another g���ne (even in advertisements and

games), and maybe, like many years later, it happened with Matrix (do not call me a heretic bythem in a

joiningparagraph), ��� always there for your consultation, use and enjoyment. It is curious, even funny, to see the first

roles of people already consecrated in the cinema, from Harrison Ford, just out of the first Star Wars, until

Rutger Hauer, Sean Young. The only complaints I see, are that, to begin with, the marked character of the

protagonists (the everlasting struggle between good and evil, is shown in a very marked and precise way,

the good ones very good, the bad very idem), a slowness of development that is lost in both long shot, and a

very little entity of the villains, that if, they are very bad and everything you want, but they last less than

Darth Maul in Episode I of Star Wars (do not call me a heretic by joining them in this other paragraph). Leaving that

aside, mark the exce lens production design, careful for the time that was filmed (1982), as well as the

costumes and the decorations, in addition, the future that they represent us (now, in the 21st century) is not so outlandish,

and like in "" Son of men "" by Alfonso Cuar���na one has an air of a certain bad roll and

insecurity, thinking in what, thanks to new technologies, we will come face in the years

venideros.Especialmente striking is that, thanks to the network have proliferated nicks that have to do with the tape

rather , from Deckard, to Roy Batty, or the famous Nexus 6.

" 1

" After twelve years, the followers of the saga deserve much more than a succession No tringers without

meaning.

Together with the crystal, the jungle loses the ability to entertain; main objective - if not unique - of the action

genre. The specific scenes shot with specialists and the charm - in other scripts, irresistible - of

Willis - MacClane, fail to avoid the bankruptcy of a thin plot of cheap Americanism. After

twelve years, the followers of the saga deserve much more than a succession of meaningless threads. "How was

that phrase of Samuel Goldwing, unlettered and insipid Metro magnate?" "Last night I went to see Hamlet. It's full

of quotes. " It comes to my memory every time I get bored at the cinema, and that is an intelligent way to amortize

the more than one thousand pesetas that costs, is to look for "" appointments "" that can be remembered. There are two memorable ones: "" Or

you tell me everything I want to know, or I inflate you in your own house "", and "" You are going to put Yipico- Yei, son of a

bitch "". Let no one bother looking for more in such a limited jungle. Once again, thefilm industry

Americanonce again underestimates the viewer. After twelve years, the followers of The Crystal Jungle

deserve much more than a succession of unconnected thrones. No sense, much more than that threat of what the

fourth part tries to be and does not end up being. Neither more nor less than what usually happens when any script

"" is "" to insert scenes of the "" total chaos "" of Independence Day, without taking into account that it was never the

spirit of The Jungle, reinventing the genre of action. Ultimately, let no one forget that

Willis is a buddy ���ntegro and charming because the writers who invented John MacClane soit.Thanks

wanted, however, the scenes of action They are shot with specialists, unique tribute to

the original history of 1988. In them, they do not surprise the short shots and tricks that Wiseman includes to

convince of the skillful martial arts of the bad chinita, but the derogatory, xen���fobos andcommentaries

machistasthat the detective mythic of New York dedicates to him , now unknown. The script again fails, while

the scenes of blow and punch are replaced by a tireless dance of special effects of the latest

technology, which end up making cre���bles the Risky Lies of James Cameron. In the background,

Americans love being in danger, and their movies still give bad ideas to get it. Obsolete, but

bad. And the fact is that the story of the computer attacks and the certainty that "anyone, from a garage, with a

computer, can win the game to security systems, absolutely incompetent" "I already know them" masters

thanks to products such as network, conspiracy in dem, testing or recent e infumableoperation.

Stormbreaker Nor are the outbursts of cheap patriotism unknown to us; interpretation, perhaps, erroneous,

of the famous phrase of President Kennedy, nor here the one of Monroe that asked "" Am�� America for the Americans, "to

which we can only add that this type of cinema, also for them. It is a story without an identity of its own,

which, in not a few occasions, it is presented as a bad collage of typical genre frames. A story

based on a brittle script, the son of an outdated argument that fails to capture the attention of the

respectable. Between ridiculous digestions of sea breams, monologues patters and telefilm secondary actors, Bruce

Willis must feel like a new Marlon Brando, producer and star, who, with a face troubled, do not

hesitate to get your hands on a guide already unpresentable-to finish sentencing. Already the devil commented that, of

all his virtues, vanity was the one that satisfied him most; and with a statement like this: "If there was

someone else, he would let him do it, but there is not", the actor's pretensions are clear. Assaid

that genius, there can not be a good movie if there is not a good script. The Jungla 4.0 is responsible for

directly attacking the figure of John MacClane, seducer of the 90s, annoying in theareas

police, not to grant any premise that helps understand the purposes of his adversaries, nor the role

of his companions. Although it was not easy to resist the temptation to mention 9/11, to affirm that the end of the

USA is the end of the world, that the very best shooters are always on the side of the bad guys and the guardian angels

in the good ones, that the FBI have no idea, and that all the flights have to land to

avoid suspicions, it only manages to precipitate the death of a guild, that of the writers, who, in this

century, can not get out of their own incompetence.

" 0

" Painful sequel to the Spanish box office, there is no where to grab. I could not go to the press pass of this ���pelle? and as I understand it would have fit anyway, not

because of my size or my fatness, but because they were 4 monkeys to see it, now I took the opportunity to take a

look, and the truth is that I'm glad not having lost a morning in it, the tape, to say something, full of

cameos in the purest style "" Torrente "" (let's not forget that they share the main character), is a slop with aplot

nonexistent; It reminds me of when we were little and we started to play anything in the same

way. The Gui parecen seems written by a 2-year-old boy with a joint in his hand, and a liter of

Beer in the other, with a Wyoming and a Kira Mir��� m� ��s linear that the lines of the highway, and with Pilar Rubio,

which only knew by his appearances in "" The sixth "" as villana de turno.Ah, by the way, the film is the

p���stuma work of JL Coll, may he rest in peace, there in heaven, from the hand of the great Tip.

" 0

" It's not round, but, for me, it's a great movie, it shows that you can make good movies with little, and that the

really important thing is a good idea and quality people around to capture it .

Doing a memory exercise, I come to all the films of the Coen brothers, films different from

the norm, of varied genres, based on atypical places and with characters Variopintos. A different cinema because,

with its own stamp, for the good or the bad, the Coens are faithful to their origins and their films always have that

classic area that distinguishes them from the average of the american independent cinema (if you can callmovies

indiethose who make the Coens, maybe less budget). In short, a cinema, whose films are the most

cult, Barton Fink, The Great Lebowski, Death between Flowers and the great Fargo, are a good example of the

talent in the direction of these brothers ( although in the majority it is his brother Joel who directs and Ethan takes

care of the gui���n). Now, this February, we will receive his latest creation, the award-winning No Country for

Old Men, praised by American critics, and a very serious candidate to win the Oscar. to the best film (although

who cares about the awards.) In addition to his cast, we have Javier Bardem in a great role and that will

report no less recognition in both praise and awards. After seeing the close-ups, the prologue with

the voice of Tommy Lee Jones, comes to my mind The Three Burials of Melquiades Estrada, southern USA,land

borderwith Mexico, deserts. the picture is great, it impregnates you with the heat of the area, it creates

an uncomfortable land and that's how it makes you feel its direction, long shots, many silences and some characters

(so many) real how to take a tour of Texas. The plot is simple, very well linked, maybe a little

slow for the ordinary public accustomed to action even if it has a nonsense, and maybe it could be show

somehow more light and fluid, but then it would not be the Coen.The cast, first-order,mention

specialfor Josh Brolin, reborn as a serious actor, Tommy Lee Jones sensational, credible, thoughtful. A Bardem

who eats the camera like a ruthless assassin, a man with principles (even if principles are spent)

that makes you very afraid and produces an unequaled tension, ���ly your " "weapon" "clear. I would also like to mention

the actress Kelly Mc Donald, who does not appear on the screen, but I think she is very successful as the wife of Llewelyn Moss

(Brolin). The story is fragmented into three parts: the flight of Llewelyn, the search for the murderer and the

investigations of our police (Tommy Lee) and they alternate during the duration of the film, and as I said

before maybe not with the fluided that I would like so that in some moments the rhythm slows down. It's not

round, but, for me, it's a great movie , shows that you can make good movies with little, and that what is really

important is a good idea and quality people around to translate it, and the Coens, they get away with it,

because they have made another classic that is going to mark this beginning of year and you will have your reward in the advertising

campaign of prizes.

" 1

" Fatal weapon should be the typical film that should be prescribed by psychologists to patients suffering from

depression, because after two hours of laughter, who does not rejoice in spirit and spirit?

It is curious the case of Zombies Party, a film that when it was released in theaters went by without pain or glory,

but when it came out on DVD it became something It was a passing phenomenon and it became a

cult film praised by critics and the public. The combination of the English fine humor with the most pure parody was an

explosive mixture. Now Fatal Weapon comes to us (again the translation of the titles has crime), the new

film by those responsible for Zombies Party. On this occasion, they throw their darts full of irony and sarcasm

against the police movies and serial killers. In a year in which funny and intelligent comedies are

more rare than the ibex, the disembarkation of Fatal Weapon is a great joy for the suffering

spectators, tired of the jokes for brainless that Hollywood proposes. And it is that Edgar Wright, with his

scathing and ironic view of things, laughs at everything and everyone with a corrosive sense of humor that does not leave

you with a head (Sometimes, literally, and if not ask Tim Messenger). Fatal Weapon

has a rhythm so devilishly fast, that sometimes you miss a joke to be laughing at the

previous one. For almost two hours, the film does not offer a second of respite amid so much laughter, until

ending in a last twenty minutes absolutely delirious and surreal. Fatal weapon should be the

typical movie. This should be prescribed by psychologists to patients suffering from depression, because after two

hours of laughter, who is not happy? minimum and spirit? Undoubtedly it is one of the comedies of the year,

not only for its own quality, but for the lack of it in almost all others.

" 1

" The Night of the Living Dead, revolutionized the fantastic cinema and, in particular, opened the guidelines for a

subgenre as popular as the zombies.

George A. Romero, in his cinematographic debut with The Night of the Living Dead, revolutionizedcinema

fantasticand, in particular, opened the guidelines for a subgenre as popular as the zombies. Many have been

the debtor titles of the first film of the New York filmmaker. Currently, in theaters, you can find

a good example of it in 28 Weeks After.1968 was the year of the world premiere of Night of theDead

Living, although Spain came �� Pretty much later. The censorship did notof Romero's proposal

approvebut, finally, and disguised with the false label of Art and Essay, it ended up exhibiting in some of

our country's halls. Very few were the cinemas in which it was screened, because the so-called Art and Essay was

considered as something rare and very minor. Only a few chosen Spaniards (most of them

with beards, gafapastas and with a little macutito on their shoulders) enjoyed, in their day, the zombie cannibalism thatso

bothersmuch ��� to the vigilantes of morals and good national customs. It had been a long time since I reviewed the

work of Romero, until yesterday (at the request of one of you) I was forced to do so . I have to assure you that,

in his first viewing (when I was a child who barely shaved), I was impressed in a brutal way.

Now, I must admit that, for me, he has lost all the strength and vigor he possessed almost 40 years ago.

To continue assuring that The Night of the Living Deaths is a masterpiece, it seems to me of anfalsity

incredible. It is true that it is an original film, whose treatment, in its time, broke molds and opened

new frontiers for other filmmakers and for Romero himself. Looked at today carefully - due to its

pathetic realization, its caustic assembly (full of numerous failures of racord) and its most recent interpretations-,

more than a masterpiece has become a cult film aimed at the most trashy cin���filos. Neither

fear nor distract. Or, at least, whoever writes this, reviewing it again, became bored with sovereignty. There are

titles that age fatally, and this (although it is difficult for many to accept it) is one of them. It is indisputable that

its beginning, in which two brothers visit the grave of their father in a lonely cemetery, He has his grace. A

beginning that, by the way, and through different visions, has been honored on more than one occasion by other

filmmakers. The appearance of the first (and disastrous) zombie is achieved, despite the fact that, with the happy passage of

the years, now it is laughable instead of terrifying. The idea to lock up a few guys, in a house

besieged by zombies (which is more picturesque), and in the middle of a lonely forest - besides being a nice gui���o

to Howard Hawks' R���o Bravo, he has his wife; and more so when in this confinement there is a small sample of

the different social classes that populated North America in those years, without neglecting sex and race and, at the

same time, , turning the only man of color into a hero with firm convictions and a badly wounded child,

in a clear precedent of The Exorcist's Linda Blair (although in version) rabid and cannibal). The tension

accumulated with the situation that the film has been creating since its inception, completely collapses due to the

dialogues that begin to keep the accidental inhabitants of the home. True di���logos for biting,

repetitive, ridiculous and supported, at all times, by the actions that always promise (but never undertake)

their badly profiled characters. The weary stubbornness, of one of the protagonists, for hiding in the

cellar instead of trying to escape to safer places, or the exaggerated portrait that makes of a woman

touched by a strong psychic shock. Logically, they point to the casposo cinema. I should never see her again and keep

the good memory I had of her. Surely, because of that already mentioned premature aging of the

tape and aware of, at least, retaining its cult film label, Romero and the co-writer of

it, John A. Russo, now 10 a� ��os and with the excuse of celebrating the 30th anniversary of its premiere,

decided to get down to work and restore the work somewhat. They polished his image and that Russo, crediting himself

for the occasion as director, took out of his sleeve an additional prologue and epilogue, in which the figure of

a priest takes on a special role. Some additions that, by the way, still hurt the wear of The

Night of the Living Dead. This, and a few inserts with new zombies, is all that involved that more

than unnecessary revisit that went through the screens with more grief than gloria.A menci�� In addition, it is the one that

deserves one of the multiple editions on DVD that run on the original film (not its useless

update). Specifically is the one that Suevia Films put on sale before editing, themselves, a version

for collectors (little good, on DVD, you can expect from these people). The copy used is not

remastered because, !,generally !, they used a shot of a worn and battered VHS, full of grated and

grainy image. The dubbing is practically inaudible (unclassifiable noises and muffled voices are his trademark),

while his English band is unhappy with subtitles that, apart from being gigantic and poorly translated,

are completely out of phase with the original audio, anticipating the dialogs in a few seconds;enough

developed to let the viewer outside rbita.He been too bad with

Night of the Living Dead?You have to lose respect for the untouchables and the classics without blushing. To bread,

bread, and wine, wine. And this, did not pass the innovation and the initial surprise (which is already a lot!). To

get rid of the bad taste of mouth, right now I'm going to reconcile with the genre and review Dawn of the

Dead. ���Ah��� is n���!

" 1

" The film can be read, more than as the terrible and terrifying story of a murderer very, very bad,

as a reflection about the media and the role they play and the information Enn in a modern andsociety

hyperglobalized.

You can not stand in front of the DVD to watch this movie without thinking "" I'm going to see a

Fincher movie, I'm going to see a Fincher movie "" (emotion) n) or even "" I want to see The fight club / Seven "" (choose

your favorite). Well, that's a shit, because it's like seeing the new Wong Kar Wai and waiting Withto

lovelove. Or finish reading In search of lost time and hope that Proust has had time to write

something else. Conclusion: One should not be so demanding. So I'm going to forget about Fincher's past and

I'll remember Zodiac, at the most, in the context of the gen that belongs. Zodiac is a very good

police-thiller about crazy Yankees gutting people. The film, which is long, is true (and although

it is evidently cut everywhere and the "little" signs) then "" they pass faster than the

final credits) follows the story of a murderer "" serial "" (the series is not so obvious) along some

how many years you can not grab, basically, because you do not move under any patron or have any motive

to kill people. The interesting thing about the film, that does not stand out for revolutionizing the cinematographic language in

any sense, lies, first, in the constant tension generated not so much with the scene of suspense

previous murder but in a atmosphere of extra���eza that is not limited to the crime space but expands to the

whole film, even in its moments of humor and calm . And that also continues when you turn off theOn the

television.other hand, the film dodges all the clichés in which thesystematically fall

police / trillerson serial killers. First, the murderer is not an invincible genius-madman who commits

murders following a pattern that has more to do with quantum physics than with victims . The guy makes

mistakes, lies, shows certain weaknesses, banalities in his personality. He will be crazy, but he is human.

Second, I will not say subtly ruin the finish, not the detective is ancharacter

idealizedand justice and truth necessarily succeed. But neither does the crime triumph. The film

also avoids that typical structural bipolarity of the film. There is not a good and a bad: there is a supposed murderer

(maybe two, oslo a madman who claims crimes), a series of suspects that can not be discarded

at all, people which claims to be the Zodiac but evidently is not, the police, the press, a kid who is interested

in the case and wants to solve it, and there is a power struggle between them, and there are bureaucracies that suspend the

supposed justice or the possibility of accessing a supposed truth. And the story is taking different points

of view, which is very interesting because, adding the end (which I will not tell), everything contributes to a

very strong and quite radical reflection about the possibility of knowledge and the certainty of justice. The

film leaves a feeling of uncertainty (redundancy), of something that is diluted. The murderer may exist, or they

may be two accomplices, or he / she may not only have committed crimes but also adjudicate others that are

not they committed, oslo to have adjudicated unresolved crimes. The murderer may be only aorder

specificof discourses that gathers and organizes the knowledge, description and adjudication of a group of

crimes. The film can be read, more than the terrible and terrifying story of a murderer very, very

bad, as a reflection about the media and the role they play and the information in them. asociety

modern and hyperglobalized, or even as a reflection on the very idea of ​​truth (The film does not use,

as all of this genre do, one thing that is truth and It has a person and you have to

take it out, the truth is not an evidence that moves, that changes place between the characters, like a power, it does

not leave that tranquility to the spectator.) I mean, the movie It does not contribute to the paranoia that pursues these

Yankees of "" there are loose assassins everywhere "" but, on the contrary, it works as a criticism and a deep

reflection about what is going on. " How this phenomenon works and what place the different institutions occupy in it. Finally,

as a minor detail, I thank Mr. Fincher for avoiding the very easy and free scenes full of

blood.

" 1

" A pity that an interesting subject such as madness and ingenuity can become an effective

somnolence

Despite the expectation generated by this film (based on in the play by David Auburn, winner of

a Pulitzer), my personal opinion is far from most of the criticism. This boring drama is not

recommended to see at night because it is more likely that you will not get credit titles. Gwyneth

Paltrow plays Catherine, the daughter of a brilliant mathematician recently deceased (the veteran Anthony

Hopkins), who spent the last years of his existence imprisoned in a sporadic madness. Her daughter has a very

unstable character and she is afraid that this saying of "" in such a splinter "" will be fulfilled. " The film revolves

around the figure of the crazy mathematician and from his relationship with his daughter we came to "" know him ""

better. After Robert's death, Catherine begins a relationship with Hal (Jake Gyllenhall, best known for

her cowboy role atypical), who was an assistant to her father in life, who will help Cath to solve the mystery

about mathematical manuscripts of dubious authorship. The plot revolves eternally over the authorship of these

manuscripts: are they the creation of Catherine or her father? It is easy to guess the end. In short, it is a

pity that an interesting subject such as madness and wit can become an effective somn���fer.

Perhaps the director should have gone deeper into the psychology of the characters to achieve the complicity

of the viewer. Recommended for fans of Gwyneh Paltrow and for those who fear that something of theirsticks

parents.

" 0

"Highly recommended to remove some cobwebs of cinema too correct that we only realize

that we see when we taste films like this ..

Michael Haneke, since he made Funny Games I became one of the European directors that I follow with more

interest and this film became my favorite horror film. �culum can not think of

anything else to go see this Saturday in the Alphaville myths his new film, there were 5 minutes left for the session and my

friends of 8 and a half had not It was still open, so I preferred to pay 6 euros and then tell them about the movie.Say and done.The

room was at 50% capacity, something that surprised me pleasantly. And there were no people with glasses

of pasta, the film starts and it does it with a shot that if any other director uses could tend To the

instantaneous insult, it is a fixed plane, the credit titles are appearing as one who writes a post like

this on the computer (of the most original I've seen: fast, simple and fulfilling his mission). And then

the Haneke festival begins. Daniel Auteuil and Juliette Binoche, two heavyweights of European cinema, take out their

best weapons to please Haneke and the spectator in a new story of remorse and fear

floating in the air. and it can be played on VHS (and it's not like "" The Ring ""). What would you do if you receive tapes that

record from outside your house and show you how you get out and get in, how do you get into the car, etc?? Does

that pose a threat? And what is worse, who does that? Uncertainty can make us crazy. It is often said that

fear comes from what we do not know, but maybe we should be afraid of what we try to confirm or

know. Our mechanisms to search our past and search for a perfectly acceptable logic can

have terrible consequences (it seems a phrase for the great Hal Douglas, but he has his intr���ngulis) Anfilm

idealfor those who know that Haneke does not It has limits. An ideal film for those who want to be

surprised by the lack of conditions of films that end well. Or simply that they finish. It is

highly recommendable to remove some cobwebs from the cinema that is too correct, of which we only realize that we seewe

whentaste movies like this one.

" 1

" It seems a bad reality show that a director with a job, but without genius, has turned into a movie for the

benefit of his ego. It's not Cinema. It is a deception that aims to self-justify with the fashion of aEuropean cinema

modern.

Love, like loneliness, like fear, has its intimate, undisclosed calligraphy. In A Flame in my Heart,

one attends to the absolute sacralization of the impudent, of the metallic pornography of the soul escaped from his mind.

Tanner, the French director, the provocateur of this depressing spectacle of the human heart, has never been

characterized by a coherent filmography. He usually falls into the trance of falling in love with his muses (Mezyeres is the

last, but there were others) and he likes, like good French cult, to wear intellectual curls the bald evidence of

his cinema romo.A llama in my heart is pure pseudocultural formalism: it is a very long dramatic tic, a

spiral of emotions that, in free fall, struggle to avoid spreading on the sidewalk the v�� �burst sores. It seems

a bad reality show that a professional director, but without genius, has turned into a film for the benefit of

his ego. Above, the lady protagonist is not an actress: she does not act as an actress, she limits herself to letting herself go, to imposing

gestures without dramatic foundation, to expose a broken body in pain on the screen. Maybe the body is

the actress and we are bumping up, suddenly, with a new cinematic language. I do not know: I ended up

knocked out when watching the tape. His burnt black and white, which is not completely unpleasant, can already

provoke evidence of where the shots go in this web of lost worlds and Wells withfunds

foreseeable. There is not (I think) in this kind of medium term films. Either we adhere to it with the passion and

coaxing of a lover or we repudiate it with sa���ay and we warn of its inefficiency asvehicles

entertainment. Because it is not Cinema. It is a deception that pretends to be justified with the fashion of aEuropean cinema

modern, with borders of cult, which only delves into the rotten and takes the viewer, between drowsiness and

disgust, hast�� �o.This is a little gem to savor when the tiredness that American cinema produces overwhelms us

and we want, at midnight, strong feelings to go to bed with a well-stomach

lifted. Ah, the kind reader will wonder what comes (so bad) of my dedication, the minutes I

offered to see her and then write about her. , years ago, Jon���s, who will turn 25 in

2000. And I liked it. It was university time and then I had the eye of accomplice and the innocence to

baskets. Any night of these is replaced by 2. With subtitles.

" 0

" In short, perfect example of Pulp work that - from its intentions and from the idiosyncrasy of its own

resources - achieves greater harmony and perfection than other films traditionally (with the part of error that

it has) located in the Olympus.

We often come up against the dilemma between choosing cin���filos or cin���fagos criteria, between defining the cinema

as an art or as an object of entertainment as it comes and wherever it comes from. This ends up revealing itself as an illusion and a

sterile debate, because in the end, either from the cinephilia or from the cinefagia, any individual

who possesses the sensitivity and the due formation. can identify that something abstract that has all good

film: ll���me singularity, originality, significance of the narrative, packaging, coherence between the

purpose pursued and the final result. and vice versa, wherever it comes from, we can also identify the

products that are completely lacking in singularity. Big trouble in little china (1986) can be considered as

a jewel for the cynical palate that, very often, will be despised by the cin���fila pretension that imposes a

supposed law of good taste, dispatching with it under condescending qualifications when evaluating it,

since this baby of the series tradition byz, the aesthetics and the Pulp narrative. It is not just a film that, from

a successful casual tone, gets an honest entertainment, but we are talking about one of the

most genuine films that have been seen in the last three days. �� decades Directed by John Carpenter, it presents

a story of a simplicity bordering on simplicity (it is always important not to confuse simplicity with simplicity, but

in this case we are talking about an archetypal fairy tale in its foundations that follows a progression Den of

mischievous demystification of clichés) that brings together, with an unthinkable flaw, elements of myth andmagic

oriental, western mythology, police cinema and martial arts cinema, all subject to an

exposition of the story that walks between the sinister and the cosmic, being both a delirious adventure in an

underworld of passages, hidden cameras, magicians and creatures of the underworld, as a comedy of clearintentions

parochial, especially in the creation of the antihero Jak Burton, parody of the clichés and the iconography of the

references on which it is inspired . Because of the narrative que impetus that animates it, it is a remarkable example of action cinema

in that it expresses all the possibilities of its theme and the means used without leaving the sherd

for which it was conceived, that is, it offers a repertoire of cinematic virgueries respecting the laws of

the peer universe that contains those characters whose gestures - together with the burlesque tone in the dialogues - they

define the only type of possible look that could be applied effectively to an absurd story

completely, which is not easy. To create a versatile creation with great expressive qualities based

on an agglomeration of themes from the film, cinema and television - and to interweave different subgroups ���neros - is quite

a feat. Jak Burton (Kurt Russell) is the antihero born out of the mythology of the western, a cowboy riding

his truck, involved in the rescue of the girl, who will star in a scene very little seen in the history

of cinema (deconstruction of one of the greatest common places, and repeatednauseam) when, in the

adlast sequence, it refuses to give the farewell kiss to the girl of the film. In sum, perfect example

of Pulp work that - from its intentions and from the idiosyncrasy of its own resources - reaches greater harmony

and perfection than other films. traditionally (with the part of error that it has) located in the Olympus

of the classics of the seventh art, such as The Party, recently evaluated in this notebook.

" 1

" World Trade Center is a failed film that could have been a great representation of the courage and

bravery that several policemen had.

One can make a tear film, but nevertheless be minimally exciting, interesting to

the public or with rhythm. Well, it seems that someone does not know how to do it. This is Oliver Stone, a director who

has done a bit of everything: from intersant���simos political and political films (Platoon, Nixon, JFK, Commander),

films very, very pol�� �micos (Assassins born, Any Sunday), and even true clunkers (Alexander the Great,

Born on July 4). His last and awaited work, until now, is nothing more and nothing less than a film that

deals with a topic as controversial as September 11. But the bad thing is that he does not treat him like Paul Greengrass in his

great United 93, no. Manipulates the feelings, if it comes to touch, and turns whathave

couldbeen "" a story of courage and survival "" in a crappy, maudlin mess, with all the topics of the

superproudcciones North American and with a really pathetic ending. And the worst of all is that everything is based

on real facts, down to the smallest detail, so Mr. Stone can be even more ashamed. World Trade

Center, that's what it's called and I suppose you already know it, it tells the story of two policemen who werefall asleep

trapped for hours (we also suffer andwith them) and that By sheer luck, they could be

rescued and returned to their families. In the end, the topic was interesting, but I think it would have been more about

9/11 in general, without focusing solely on two lucky men. Well, first of all, this is my opinion, and

I think that if the topic had been treated well, it could have been just as interesting. The problem is thatnot

it hasbeen done as it should.Although everything has to be said, and is that the first hour of footage is incredibly

masterful, which shows the ignorance of the people, the tranquility of the city before the attack (very

well achieved with that shadow of an airplane and an image of the towers from below) and at the same time the nervousness that

is created when a plane crashes. Contran against the first tower. All this is perfect, also including the normal and

relaxed lives of the two police protagonists, both with their wives and happy children (well, Cage is not

quite right with his wife, which is then fixed , how not). Now, oncebegin to collapse

both towers, the film also collapses. I believe that even when they prepare themselves with the dresses with

oxygen and they come down with the elevator, the rhythm of the film begins to decay. Both the gui���n, the rhythm and even the

photo are decanted after this collapse. Can not Mr. Stone know how to balance a film? Well,

apparently not, since we are facing a totally unbalanced film. It has a guide of the m���st���pico and without

intensity. I dare to say that even in the most dramatic and most tragic scenes you do not get

goosebumps or get excited (which only happened with United 93). World Trade Center, apart from being a very long

tost, has several really pathetic failures. One of them is that handyman who has the director

coloring and polish it (a very common in cheap telefilms) in flashbacks. Even in thescenes

home, where women are all the time moving restlessly from one side to the other, they are contrasted and

colored in a way that seems to be engraved with a c De high definition digital camera. Besides, what the hell did

Maria Bello make up? It looks more like a mother of five children exhausted, a wax doll or a model.

Another huge failure, incredibly pathetic, is that of the appearance of Jesus Christ. To whom, tell me, to whom the

hell is it going to add a very, very badly recorded sequence of a guy disguised as Jesse with a bottle of

water? hand? However symbolic it may be, it is really unnecessary. When I saw her, I thought they thought they were

wrong with tape or something similar. And do not you think that later Mr. Stone rectifies, no, the image appears

twice. On the other hand, home scenes are not credables. Especially those of Maria Bello. How can such a

good act be so false? By God, who does not believe that this woman practically does not cry? �� and consoled her

son with that her husband was going to return to take him to a game of baseball or football? ���Well, maybe it's

true, surely it is, but I do not think it's right add it.For, that World Trade Center is a failed

film that could have been a great representation of courage and courage that they had several policemen. Do not

fall asleep, do not fall asleep, Nicolas Cage tells Michael Pe���a after several hours buried. I think this

tells the public, not your partner.

" 0

" Preceded by a propaganda device worthy of Goebbels, it became one of the mostblockbusters

disappointingof the last few years.

There is no doubt that the cinematographic version of Dan Brown's novel is one of the most anticipated releases

of the last times. The unprecedented success of the book, undoubtedly increased by the calls to boycott

from the most conservative classes of Catholicism, has motivated that the expectationimminent premiere

of the film'sreach unimaginable heights. If we add to all that the protagonist is Tom Hanks, the

end result is a product whose cinematographic value dwarfs the social transcendence that it

reaches. And I say this because The Da Vinci Code is a film that is well set, creates a certain aura of

mystery around its stages and characters, and at times it dazzles the viewer, especially the one Henot

hasread the book. But in general it is an excessively slow film, quite long (almost two and a half hours)

and that it is hard to pay attention to. Of the little argument that to say that it is not known, since it is a

faithful adaptation of the best-selling author of the North American author. Grosso modo, Robert Langdom arrives in Paris invited by

the curator of the Louvre, who appears dead in the museum surrounded by enigmatic symbols and in a

strange posture. From then on everything goes crazy and the protagonist, accompanied by the granddaughter of the murdered one,

initiate an adventure that takes them to where Dan Brown's fantasy wanted them to be. I would like to

emphasize this point because it seems that at times people forget that The Code da Vinci is not abook

history, which is only a novel. In short, I think you could have gotten a better product, and that it

will be a huge blockbuster at its premiere but that word of mouth will end up hurting you. Disappointed

" 0

" One is overcome by so much visual trick generated by computer and without having found any hint of

typical or emotion in a film that, precisely, should offer both qualities in abundance.

The cyclical premiere of a film based on a comic superhero continues to be very profitable for the cinema, but

such an overabundance can be pernicious due to the repetition of narrative schemes and styles in each new

delivery. Possibly, the reason that the adaptations are becoming more routine is at the origin of these

projects, conceived almost all as the beginning of a sequel that will bring many commercial credits. With

each putting of a hero of vi���etas one craves to constitute a franchise. And so, these deliveries about the

origin of the characters usually copy each other in their structures and contents. We start with the character

without his superpowers, explain the trauma? In case there is? by which they are awarded the same, and

then the story follows the predictable course of a hero who executes his antagonists and combats the evil. The

ghost biker follows this gui���ny to the detritus, for his argument , has preferred to take ideas from thecomics

recentof this character, developed in urban environments, and discard (less in a shy script of the

film) the first ones? top? comics recreated in ���ridos and lonely deserts. All the game that

this character could offer due to the ambivalence that occurs between the biker acrobatic Johnny Blaze and theentity

diabolicalthat he takes over, a hitman from Mefist� ��feles, it goes to the bottom due to the writer's lack of skill or because of

that commercial need to create a film for a public of all ages; I would bet without hesitation that this

mold-adaptations respond more to this last cause. Since the very choice of the cast, there is already a

little daring whiff in this new 'mainstream- comiquero '. Nicolas Cage, who lost his ass for sticking his teeth

into a superhero, is once again screwed and with the gestures of a junkie. Peter Fonda, lost

in the marabunta of American TV-movies, returns to the Hollywood universe to play Mefist���feles.

The rebellious son of American Beauty, Wes Bentley, who was also a missing movie, plays the bad guy as

the Devil's son. And the voluptuous Eva Mendes (a woman to remove the hiccups) obediently assumes the

role of the beautiful girlfriend of the hero of marras.As���, at the end one is outpaced with so much visual trick generated by

computer and without I found some epic or emotion in a film that, precisely, should

offer both qualities in abundance. This 'cine-c���mic' starts to bore me.

" 0

" Maybe you have some things and the truth is that it is not very well resolved but you have to admit that younot

dothink too much about it while you are having fun, for more than two hours, withentertainment cinema

good.

Although I followed it with assiduity, the truth is that I was never a fan of "" Corruption in Miami "" (the series). Even

so, the name of Michael Mann as director is, for me, more than enough reason to go to the movies so I went

to see "" Corruption " Enn in Miami "" (the movie) with the hope of finding a good action film but without

expectations of being in front of a masterpiece. Once again, Mann has not disappointed me. I will not go into

details of the synopsis because it is really the least. "" Corruption in Miami "", the film, could

perfectly be an episode of the series, since it begins with the end of a mission and, as qui��� n says, ends

with a mission without end. In such a way that, although it seems unlikely, it would not cost them anything to write the script

of a sequel to the film. It's not the story, I repeat, what matters here. . What matters is that we are

facing a film of more than two hours duration full of good action scenes, very well

directed, of which they look very few at the movies every year. There is also room in the film formoments

intimateand a romantic story in which Mann gives free rein to his capacity for visual poetry.

Some of the plans are truly beautiful, although they do not live up to that absolute masterpiece entitled

"" El Dilema. "" The actors are fine because they could not be otherwise. Colin Farrell is a good actor but if

you also give him the role of cool pimp, it's not uncommon to edge him. Jamie Foxx playing hard with his heart would

not have had a hard time to measure up, in the same way that Gong Li comes up with

just a hint of his talent to compose a mysterious and attractive character. The mythical lieutenant Castillo,

Edward James Olmos in the series, is here interpreted by Barry Shabaka Henley, a secondary actor worth

watching because he wisely takes advantage of the minutes appears on screen in his recent films

("" The Terminal "" or "" Collateral "", for example). I can not fail to mention the good role played by the always

great Luis Tosar, in a short paper, but enough to impress with its presence on the screen. There are

times when it gives authentic fear. An anecdote for attentive spectators: in a moment of the film, his

character appears reading in a newspaper (it seemed "" La Voz de Galicia "") a story about Amancio Ortega and

Inditex, in a clear gui���o to the Spanish public and especially Galician. You should not ask for more this film

but I do not think little bit. Maybe there are some things about it and the truth is that it is not very well resolved, but you have to

admit that you do not think too much about it while you are having fun, for more than two hours, withcinema

good entertainment.

" 1

" When we talk about a big cast (it really is) we accept sugar as a sweetener without calories, and we include

Cage in the praise.

It often happens that good intentions do not always translate into satisfactory results. On this occasion,

when speaking of good intentions, I am referring to the brave bet of the director and the producers of

El SeÃ ± o de la Guerra, wanting to directly address the international traffic of weapons. A project thatthem

forcedto seek foreign investors for their film, not finding US capital because it is

a political argument. However, it often happens also in movies, that, in many occasions, the grace of the

subject is not in what is told, but in the way in which it is counted, and in this story it has failed

blatantly the "" how "" to do it. A clear example in which an exciting premise is ruined by an

unfortunate script, an inadequate approach and an unfocused direction, which leave a lot to be desired.

It is useless to have been based on real events, such as the existence of military helicopters that were

sold as salvage material, the change of names and flag of ships of traffickers on the high seas, the

strange exit from the jail of one of the most powerful weapons mafiosi in America, or the looting of

Soviet arsenals, after the disappearance of USSR- , if they have not known how to take advantage of it. The story

of Andrew Niccol begins with a close-up of Nicolas Cage (absolute protagonist) giving explanations, that

nobody has asked him, about a life, that still is not known, it is not known who ; and has twoparts

distinct. The first of them, especially tedious and awkwardly narrated, is characterized by the appearance

of an annoying voice-over that serves as a guiding thread, and far from being a criticism of anything, it becomes the

manual of "" the perfect trafficker "", with an explosion of technical data on the M60 (favorite tool

Rambo I's) and the AK47 (true weapon of mass destruction) that is It may be of interest to those who run an

armory. A first part of which the only thing that seduces is the idea of ​​leaving the room. The deficiencies of the

guide (patents at all times) are appreciated, for example, in the incredible that results that a youngimmigrant

Ukrainianresiding in an American slum, without previously knowing the business, without contacts or

mentors, not only manages to enter the illegal arms trafficking market, but also He can move

freely around him without problems. It must be because the character of Cage has condensed the figures of

five different arms dealers, and perhaps, that is also the reason why Don Nicolas neither grow old

nor lose faculties. professionals throughout history. In addition to making the protagonist absolutely

unreal, the scriptwriter will endeavor, from the beginning, to emit supposedly ingenious phrases that

constitute unquestionable sentences. An objective that is not achieved either. I do not know what thethink

North American spectator canabout them, it is possible that they even mean something in that country, butvery little or nothing byarticle.

I am toldstatements such as those included in thisstory: "" In the world there is a weapon for every twelve people,

how do the other eleven arm themselves? "", "" The first time you sell a weapon is like the first time you make love : younot

doknow what you're doing, but it's exciting "", "" The bad thing about falling in love with the woman of your dreams is that this

one becomes real "", and others of character Similar aesthetics. The woman he falls in love with, by the way, will be one of those

trophy wives who are unaware of her husband's criminal activities, but who do not mind living better

than the Pope. And I ask, is this other real character? Of course, if so, this should be called

blind trust or excess of hypocrisy. When the naive wife finds out the truth, a burst of dignity willher

preventfrom "" failing as a human being "" but ... and until then? In any case, a position very different from

that adopted by another wife-trophy, the Traffic that, for my taste, had a reaction much more normal. After

the fall of the Soviet Union, the second part of the film is considered, much more promising than

the previous one, and in which the voiceover (which is still unbearable) gradually disappears. Let's say

that we are entering into a narrative that is much more conventional than what is left of history.

the performance duels between Nicolas Cage and Ethan Hawke, between Nicolas Cage and Jared Leto; a great proposal

of casting that spoils the director again, making work to such a splendid tr���os���lo to 10% of its

possibilities. When talking about a great cast (it really is) we accept sugar as a sweetener without calories, and

we include Cage in the praise. An actor hated by many moviegoers, who has not done anything decent since Leaving

Las Vegas; theory that is ratified with his last works not yet released in Spain, TheBiker

Ghost(which must be the version of Pirates of the Caribbean in two wheels) and the role of super hero who

plays in the last patriotic outburst of Oliver Stone on the Twin Towers. Something good also has

this second part, and that is that the director is already getting theof being a scriptwriter, and gets what he

hanghad intended from the beginning: write a strong statement in which Cage, prestigios���simotrafficker

international, indicates to Ethan Hawke, a faithful official of Interpol that "" Your boss is the biggestdealer in

armsthe world "". Of course, when talking about his boss he is referring to the antichrist, or what is the same, the

president of the USA Claro that. At this point of the footage, it is already very difficult to reconcile both parts of the

film. Let us remember that in the first, he urged to leave the cinema- and we think that the legend of the end "" Los The world's largest

arms suppliers are also the countries that are on thepermanent security council

UN's"" should have appeared right at the beginning, because this does not He would have subtracted originality from the story, and it

would have brought him wisdom. In any case, this is the sad story of a powerful argument that had the

bad luck to run into a director and scriptwriter who had to suspend the subject of "" Howare told

things"" . A pity!

" 0

" Vitally recital orchestrated by a mechanical saw, a deranged brain. Sometimes it is possible to separate the cinema as an artistic expression, regulated under the government of beauty or of the

critical thought and protected by sensitive creators, of the cinema as mere commerce, subject to the laws of the

market and protected by merchants. The financial gluttony, your desire to make cash can coincide with the

artistic ambition. There are many examples with which to demonstrate this assertion so blunt. The reader can

think of some. There are hundreds. As there are also thousands of absolutely condemnable clunkers that only

appeal to the metallic sound of the dollar or the euro and that are supplied with the morbid and the need of the human being for

spiritual foods frivolous, thin and perishable. In view of the frank deterioration of the inventiveness and

the original resources, the cinema - as a company - pulled out of proven successes, was advised by publicists and

sociologists and found the goose that lays the golden eggs with the happy idea of ​​adding a number to a profitable film.

Whatever your year of production, an argument does not end in the classic "" the end "" but asks for a

continuation, a second part that, if of giving substantial dividends, it would generate a third and so ad vomitum

. The cinema - like art - lost its aura of innocence and earned as a company unprejudicedly anchored

in the international port of gold and silver. Honest aftermaths save this fascination to think little and

live on the rents more in tune with the philosophy of television and its fragmented programming that with a

sense of closed unity and of finished work, inherent to the traditional and assumed concept of cinema.Where does not

finish this small story: the last treasure of these filibusters of stills has been the prequel, that is a

term of doubtful acceptance by our ���nclita and sapiente RAE, but that is already sounding to us all. It is

about looking for the past of what worked in the future. Serial killers with a childhood to discover.sagas

Galicianthat require a solid narrative explanation to appreciate more firmly the context of what we already

know. This vertigo dislodges the righteous spectator, who has to be provided with a plane and a flashlight so that he does not

get lost in the brazen flash of flashbacks, memories and stories lost in the limbo of the time he

must know in order not to miss the plot. what the designer is going to plug in. The cinema is born and is remade with

these skin operations that leave the skin smoother, but chemically more contaminated. Theor part

wizardof the fault is the wizard Lucas, whose monumental history of the galaxies has opened an inconceivable path

a few years ago, but difficult to erase and to which every film-maker in distress or any greedy producer of pasta

goes because the cinema, do not deceive ourselves, it is not always Art and sometimes it is left to grope for these matters

foreign to the true cause of its existence, which in another writing we will note that it can be In the subject

that concerns us, we have a prequel to a remake or what comes to be the same, an ancient history of a

modern history that is a copy of an intermediate history. And let no one joke: here it is about watching

the film and thinking little or even not thinking at all. And enjoy, if you can. ��� We enjoykilling

Texas, the origin? Half. The idea of ​​endowing a child with a psychopath is like looking for point G in a

pack of hungry lionesses. To pick up here the Tobe Hopper Classics of 1974 is an abuse. There have already beenversions

enoughand all affect what the first avoided: the trail of blood, the pornographic gore, the

explicit massacre with ulcers, amputations and other savages delivered by the mind of a beast without brain

with disfigured face and a stinking leather mask covering it. Weanimal with asaw

dress themechanical, we release it in the deep America (Texas, how much more the state, they all have shacks androads bursting

lostof tarados) and only the cattle are needed to decapitate, which is usually a fresh herd of

beautiful pictures with the hormones about to explode the tits and mantones of proven effectiveness in the

revelry. Everyone, we know, are going to die and we sit comfortably in the chair to assist in the cutting. The

proposal of this video store novelty (it is not something else, it should not be) is a scam because it does not hold anything

that it offers with sanity and a rational sense of the plot. Leatherface, the bichaco, the murderous murderer, is

born in a slaughterhouse and grows up next to some t���os that educate him in the tenebrism of a weak society, isolated

and turned into a parade of mental cripples who try by all means not to suffer in this world and,

above all, not to go hungry. In The Grapes of Wrath, when they went hungry, they would not travel the dusty

roads of the second looking for meat to accompany the broth in the midday pot. For here the family

eats guests and they cross themselves and ask God, as in the famous Tara scene, that they will never go

hungry again. Well, very good. Lately I can not help thinking about Freud when I watch movies. I imagine how he would rub

his hands with the bunch of brainless people that American society, portrayed in his cinema, has given to the world.

Or Korean. Or Danish. The cabronazo of the moto-sierra had to go through hard times in his tender school childhood. They will

laugh at the biggest thing. That he was later hired as a slaughterer in a meat company is already the patron

through whom his bloody existence will flow. It is already Ah��� the origins that are mentioned in the

title are over. Then there is action and brutality until the paroxysm: all the young people that the chance throws to the tragedy

finish boned, opened in channel, all counted without shame some, exhibiting a m� Ques that direct

contemplation of the crimes. I have never been a lover or even a friend or acquaintance of that genre called

gore.Me has repelled the abundance of leukocytes and the pure and hard vision of the visceral folds, but this

borders on the classification "" X "" and I have promised myself seriously not to fall back into these lapses. That there is good cinema

like to occupy a life watching one film after another without other concern than going to the service between pass and

pass and eating, maybe, and drinking or stopping suddenly to assimilate the seen and return clean of heart and ���ive

of stories. Dato cin���filo, that someone is: R. Lee Emery, a great actor and little seen, is thesergeant

porculeroof the metal jacket of Kubrick and here the man has his minute of glory when he recomposes on the

back of one of the trapped youngsters his discourse of discipline, authority and courage. Jonathan Liesban, who

directs this massacre, never better said, has classic material and films it with a trade. I do not enter into

considering the efficiency of a director or the degree of compliance of a technical or distribution team. I

do not go in because maybe there are no ridiculous bits or beginner mistakes. I even read that Liesban was an artisan and that

he has not been able to do more than he did. Everything is subject to the rigor of history: to the marathon of truculencias

that will make the delight of the amateur to the genre, of that I have no doubt whatsoever., right now I'm

Anywaypreparing something from Fritz Lang for after dinner. Or I go to the original of Hopper, so beaten in his day,

so devoted to the ferocity of criticism, that he did not understand the lack of psychology of the characters or the

harshness Medical of the counted. That was the beginning, and to take everything away, the original film - at least -

covered a worthy quota in the History of Cinema. This twist is unnecessary, but that seems to me already

said.

" 0

" A tape so loose and inconsequential, that it will make you yawn even if you have slept 15 hoursIntrascendente infantiloide movie that sheltered in the purest "" moralina Disney "" pretending to add tapes

"" superher ���icas "", is that the tape remembers, among others: "" The 4 fantastic "", "" X-Men "", "" Sky High "" and even

"" The Incredible "" Pixar. It is a pity that some beautiful decorations have been accompanied byeffects

special(CGI more than anything) rather simple, on the other hand, the originality of the script falls by its own

weight, (or maybe it is that everything is already created), even the ridiculous names of the superheroes that make up that

group ZP (���Tengr ��� something to see the president with the film? Jeje). The characters seem made thinking about

merchandising, a sale of mu���equitos, cups, shirts, etc. I'm sorry for Tim Allen, but a guy that

I liked, starts getting tired of tapes like these, accompanied once again by Spencer Breslin,

who seems to like to make a and again the same paper; by the way, I discovered Kate Mara that I

liked it more than the rest of the casting, a pity that Chevy Chase has returned to the movies with this

movie, by the way ��� Courtney Cox has had a chest surgery? In short, a tape so loose and inconsequential, that it will make you

yawn even if you have slept 15 hours.

" 0

" The return of this character was a huge challenge, requiring an almost divine touch and intelligence

but it is very clear that the objective has been fulfilled.

When I heard the main theme again (Improved by Williams its original author) I shrugged in the chair and

drained my bum down, I needed some privacy as the tears of emotion They did not take long to

arrive. Superman is the most imitated hero, revered and loved by all. The return of this character was a

huge challenge, requiring an almost divine touch and intelligence but it is very clear that thehas been fulfilled. The

objectivedirector Bryan Singer directs this director � with a lot of success X-Men, Star Trek: N���mesis, King Kong

(Peter Jackson exhausted by the filming had to ask for help because he needed to sleep and Bryan showed up inhelped

New Zealand andhim ��� directing a good little piece of film. Well, if it helped him), besides this director I

see everything he touches turns it into gold since he has directed some chapters of HOUSE , the famous television

series that is causing a furor at the moment in Spain, and most importantly, the actor. They could have

opted for any other proposal (like the SmallVille boy) but I think they haveon their

rightly agreedchoice. It has an identical feel to the disappeared Cristofer Reve, it is a real bomb, a man with the face of a

man, a man of those who approach you and you get sweaty. he's 27 years old (his birthday is on9

October), he's Brandon Routh. This guy (like all the beauties) has gone through without grief or glory for several television

series, Here I leave a link about> some of his sad appearances. It was clear thatarrive

Bryan Singer had toto be given a decent role. This is one of the cases of actors condemned to oblivion

for having a good physicist, we have already mentioned that vulgarity and normality are in the latest fashion, and a actor

of the real ones, of those of before, like this boy, he could only be where he is now, playing Superman. The

Coaching work is very good, because they have managed to make It's cre���ble to this superman. Look at how he

places his hands (let's say this guy has received classical ballet tables) when he's going to fly, how he interacts

with them, how correct his positions are, his attitude, he's perfect, a very good job on the part of the

actor. To be Superman is not only to be tall and handsome.More more, you have to know the character, how will he move? As I would

think, as a superhero is expressed physically, it is complicated, there is very good knowledge of the world of the cosmic and offreaky

course being very(that's why I do not get tired to say JAMES CAMERON I AM THE PERFECT ACTRESS TO PROTAGONIAR

YOUR NEW PELI "" ALITA, ANGEL DE COMBATE "", choose if you want any fool who surely does not know who

is the author of the famous Japanese comic Ens finally) and this guy was, he was an absolute fan of Superman and well,

that's the result, round movie. I only have 2 things to say not as good as the previous ones, the first one

is that the date of the trip seems to me very bad, that they had left it for October or they would have advanced to

May, but Julio.pat���tico, ah��� has failed marketing. The second one is the make-up, it's bad, but by

God, you can see the translucent powders, the eyebrow makeup of Superman.horrible.Bryan: Send that

makeup team away. the story and the script seemed very good to me. In addition all this topic is

linked intimately with the producer that I deduce to preferred, leaving the script open to assume future sagas,

because now that Superman has a son, now is when it is left Superman to bore.

" 1

" He is a domesticated Verhoeven, happy to return home and, like a novice, applying to please with a

luxury telefilm.

Paul Verhoeven returns after 6 years, and also the return of the Dutch to Europe. On the way, it

ruins some of the topics that we usually apply to films made in Hollywood, which simply follow some

guidelines, only seek to sell or limit the creative capacity of the author. dismiss this criticism saying

that "" The black book "" is a drama of intrigue, sex, love, loyalties and betrayals with Nazism and

resistance as a background, and as effective as it is simple. And although there are elements of the filmmaker, they are

much less abundant, risky, daring, provocative and nonconformist than you would expectAny

.of your work in the US contains more interest �s, except for the disappointing "" The man

without shadow "", that this work narrated with a neatness and formal beauty as remarkable as anodyne. His virtues are

limited to fulfill as entertainment, to discover a good actress, Carice van Houten, and a couple or three of

scenes and remarkable ideas, without which, would be a film as flat as the concept of terrifying globe

that our ancestors had. Survivors! Paul Verhoeven has returned to like, and not to be out of tune

with a history of espionage and passions that contemplates, from afar, Hitchcock in its horizon. It is

the sequence of the protagonist, a sort of mata-hari infiltrated in the headquarters of the Gestapo in the

invaded Holland, dyeing the hair of its parts m��� s dentimas de rubio to elevate her charms as a man-

eater; the presentation of good Nazis, because not everyone was in favor of the horrors of

Hitler; or the policy of including the humiliations that the population infringed on the collaborationists, fed up with

so much time of invasion and fear, once the contest ended. But its archetype is that of the nice paper

couch���, where even a barrel of human stool is so embellished that it looks like delicious chocolate.

Unfortunately,also is the idea that wars never terminarn in anspiral of violence and

endlessintolerance.And the need for survival, understanding with it the ability to adapt to the circumstances

but at the same time being true to oneself. Be in a more committed way, like Rachel, the protagonist,

om���s fr���vola, like her friend, Ronnie (Halina Rejin). But he is not the best Verhoeven, he is a domesticated Verhoeven,

happy to return home and, like a novice, applying to please with a luxury telefilm.

" 0

" A tape that starts being round and ends up being square. Lastly, Berry's good sense when choosing movies is very much in question, although the

Oscar-winning interpreter of " "Catwoman" "is in a fallen cape and connects failure with failure like someone who ties a long

cordon, this time, and joining another cordon to the strip, returns to do the same , accompanied by an already "" old "" Bruce

Willis, in estre Thriller, which puts all the meat on the spit at the beginning and the end is lost in a thousand and one

twists that do not matter to us and that end up being heavy, tired, unimportant and seen on more than one

occasion, so a boat soon comes to mind the film starring Antonio Banderas and Rebeca de Mornay

"" Never talk to strangers "" "that saves with this that brings us a thousand and one parallelism.Foley famous for the already

Jamesmythical" Who is that girl? that starred a young Madonna, here loses the roles as director, not

getting or print the rhythm that the feature film needs, or with the good casting that has, not doing the

minimum to get a good result the tape, skinny favor makes him the gui���n, that more than surprising

bores and stinks. Resumiendo, a tape that begins being round and ends up being square.

" 0

" American horror movie in the Japanese style about a vir ques that tries to steal the lives ofbeings

humanin order to have their own. A lot of fear does not give, but the idea can leave you thinking for

a while.

I'm going to venture with this movie, given that everything points to it being a remake of another Japanese woman who did not have great

fame in the West and who a clever director has decided to bring her to. The aesthetics and the theme is 100%

Japanese, with those white-faced bad guys who suck your blood. By the way, who has copied who? The

bad characters are the same as the Harry Potter dementors. The film is about a group of kids, of

those of ten bodies, with extensive computer skills. Total, that one of them, the one who knows more is

attacked by a nosequ��� that makes him turn purple until his girlfriend appears and he commits suicide. And the

thing continues like this, with the television warning of a new virus that is transmitted by the computer, by the palm

and even by the toasters. And reaching the end is not even God, because this must be a criticism of the

society in which we live, where the humanism of personal relationships has been lost in pursuit of

cold and impersonal computer relations. Or I know, he did not understand me. Nothing, this is hell. They say it's

a scary movie, but it gives three scares that are predicted by a chan-chan that takes away all the fear.

Well, I have to admit that if I'm the one in the first scene, I shit myself there, but from the seat I'm notHey, I'm sorry

a mere """". The plot is curious, with a virus that travels through computers and goes out to steal

life that does not have human beings. So, I would even say that it has a Matrix touch. The actors

are very good to see, but I do not understand how they do not come out naked or similar. As actors they are not a

big deal, they do not make me vibrate, of course. Resuming, American horror movie in the Japanese style about a

vir���s that tries to steal the life of the human beings for in that way get to have your own. A lot of fear

does not give, but the idea can leave you thinking for a while.

" 0

" A different film that is characterized precisely by it: for being different and daring, even, to

replace the final morality and to bet, instead, to ridicule a society that, like ours,

is based on the most aggressive competitiveness.

Competing on the billboard with another animation product of the characteristics of Ratatouille must be difficult. And more

so when the main character is a surfing penguin. Among the recent cinematic abuse of

penguins (The Emperor's Journey or Happy Feet, are clear examples of this) and how badlygenerally

surf movieswork in Spain. a, it is clear that Locos por el Surf has it tricky. If we also added

that, despite being a genre normally addressed to the children's audience, this is a product treated

too adult for some of their jokes they can be caught by the smallest ones.Locos bynaughty

Surf has ajoke towards reality shows and docudramas, which it satirizes in anway

ingenious. The falsity and cynicism of most of these types of reports are fully reflected in the

film. In it, a camera of a film crew, behind which an anonymous reporter hides, will observe

Cody Maverick wherever he goes and, interested in his character, will also bring the microphone closer

to his closest friends. In this way, your mother, your brother, your friends and your workmates will pour (or,

rather, spit on) all kinds of opinions and anecdotes about � ��l. And is that Cody is not more than a

teen penguin whose highest aspiration in life is to become a famous surfer. Nobody understands the sick

obsession of the palm-pecked youngster to get to the top of the pedestal. and least of all when it is a very

clumsy patoso.La camera will follow our seabird along the path that separates his

homeland, the Antarctic, of Pen Gu, a small Islaa tropical island where a world surfing championship will be held

, the Penguin World Surfing Championship. Once there, he will devote most of his attention to

analyzing the relationship born between rookie Cody and the once popular Big Z, an old and famous surfer who

all gave for died, and to which the cazallosa voice of Jeff Bridges, in its original version, gives it a

very special character. Because it is an animated film, it breaks molds with respect to other similar ones and, due to

this, it begins by shying away from the appearance of those very usual (and sometimes unnecessary) cinematic guides in this

type of cinema. And, even so, before the treatment of the student Cody with the old resurrected teacher, it is almost

impossible to stop thinking about K���rate Kid. His humor is subtle, excessively complicated at times for him.appearance

children's public, because even certain references to drug addiction (although somewhat covert) make an

during the footage. A chicken fond of surfing is placed by sticking its head right over one of

the whale winches, achieving a certain hallucinogenic and anesthetic effect each time the cet���ceo

expel a strong jet of water ; At the same time, the depressed and finished Big Z is a penguin addicted to

oysters: without them he can not go on. In order to carry out this proposal, Sony contacted

Ash Brannon and Chris Buck, two directors with extensive experience as animators at the service of Disney

and Pixar (before the union of the two houses). Looking for new nuances in the treatment of the image, they have

managed to distance themselves visually from the style of their most direct rival, the aforementioned and wonderful

Ratatouille and, unlike this, at certain moments, he showed Being spectacularly real, as happens

with the images that capture what the surfers know as "" the tube ""; that is, to pass right through

the hole of water that forms a gigantic wave. A sensation so well described and filmed that, although it is

about animation, it transmits to the spectator the same feelings that for sure run through the minds of those who

practice that sport. A different film that is characterized precisely by this: for being different and daring,

even, to replace the final morality and to bet, instead, to ridicule a society that, like

ours, is based on the more aggressive competitiveness. It is not a one-hundred-percent round title,

but his (laudable) attempt to distance himself from the avalanche of animatronics that is invading the screens, the

(sympathetic) narrative treatment as a fake documentary and its (applauded) critical tone, make this

a somewhat enterprising work. And is that good intentions always have to take them into account.

" 1

" Given this premise, people may think they will see a fast-paced movie (with sometraits

"Apocalypto"), but do not be fooled. On this occasion, the adventure, the battles and the epic have stayed

elsewhere ...

Markus Nispel presents us with an epic film, which could well resemble "" Conan the barbarian "", but that at

no time comes to the category of this. I must say that it is a remake, which presents the

experiences of a young Viking, who is abandoned on American soil and adopted by an indigenous family. After

Being accepted by the tribe, the boy grows up to become a warrior. One day their tranquility (and that of their

own) is broken by the arrival of a new hour of savage Vikings.this premise, people

Undermay think that they will see a fast-paced movie ( with some features of "" Apocalypto ""), but do not be deceived. On

this occasion, adventure, battles and pica have stayed elsewhere because weunable to

skin of the character (played by Karl Urban), or thrill to the facts that witness . One of

the few aspects that I would highlight is the photography, since Daniel C. Pearl gives the images andarkness

interesting(which can also draw many detractors), that manages to camouflage a little the shortcomings of gui���ny and

of the accomplishment, but that leave beautiful prints in the retinas of the spectator.

" 0

" Despite being wary of the great comic-based superproductions, this movie seems magnificent to me.'m

The truth is that Igetting a little tired of this clown-like fashion. screen. Not that, in

itself, I have anything against it, but these "" gusts "" (cat���strofes, giant and dangerous animals,stories

funny, etc.) make me a little nervous . ��� Creative problems or betting on insurance? I do not know, but it seems that they will

not stop until they have adapted everything adaptable. Anyway, it does not matter. In recent years we have been able to see,

to remember, "" Batman "", "" X-Men "" (1, 2 and 3, which is coming now), "" A history of violence "", "" The four

fantastic "", "" Spiderman "", "" Sin City "", "" Ghost World "", "" Hulk "" and a lot of m��� s. Some leave much to be desired and

others are quite good. "" V de Vendetta "" is the last adaptation I have seen and belongs to this second

group. In fact, it's one of the movies that I liked the most lately. Those who knew the c nomic do not

seem to be too satisfied with their passage to the cinema. That, in any case, does not surprise me, because

adaptations - whether of comics, books, plays or whatever - disappoint

fans of the original product. The cinema has its limitations and, normally, it is difficult not to leave something

behind, not to mention that everyone makes their own idea of ​​what the story is like and ��� This does not usually

coincide with what we see on the screen later. I had not read the comic, so, first, I can not comment

on ���ly, second, I It matters a cucumber if it is well adapted or not. I care about the film, and the filmme

seems magnificent to. As I said before, it's the best I've seen lately, and that I tend to be wary of

big blockbuster-based blockbusters. An interesting story, although, of course, it is not the most

original in the world: the reference "" 1984 "" is evident. Fascinating characters, a good performance and a very

careful aesthetic. The only thing I have left over are those little touches "" Matrix "" that you have in some moments - these

Wachowski must have forgotten that they were making another movie - but they do not even abuse that kind of

gimmicky resources . The story and the image are above the effects, something that for me is fundamental.

I have read in some critical places towards the film about the terrorism issue. Of course, it was clear that

that would happen, although the filmmakers (be it the Wachowski, be it James McTeigue, who is not very clear who

has the reins here) have made sure that cover your back The debate arises from the film itself

, the argument "they have made me what I am" is explicit and the explosions do not seem to affect

any civilian. On the other hand, it is that sometimes it seems that people do not know how to differentiate between cinema andlife

real, no matter how current the analogies of the film are. Well, criticism is always good, but taking

a film as if it were a "manual to live" "seems a little exaggerated. I do not tell you anything more about the

argument because I consider that watching a film without knowing exactly what is a pleasure. I'll just say that

the critics of the government, the media, the revolutions and the charismatic characters will like it.

Ah��� that's it.

" 1

" Not even the pocker's own games have rhythm, emotion or tension. So theresult

finalis a pair of twos? that do not arrive, not even far, to win this game to the indifference ...

In a film that, a priori, tries to approach us to the world of the p���ker, it used to perceive some type of

feeling. When he observed that the protagonist was "hypnotized" by the cards in his desire to win and play

at any price, he thought it might be interesting. But I was discovering that "" Lucky You "" crumbles like a

house of cards when little by little boredom consumes me. Curtis Hanson got me excited in "" LA

Confidential "" to the point of provoking forced reading of the book on which it was based (very superior, even,

to the film). However, on this occasion it completely departs from its good direction to leave us a

dull and boring film, without any surprise. So much so that any amateur pocker can come to

hate it and go to the petanque. Although at first, we can attract the story that faces two expert

pocker players, father and son, who are able to give up anything for the fact of winning, at 30

minutes of the film submerges us in a state of lethargy that extends to the final 120 minutes

of the film. And is that neither the father, played by Robert Duval, nor the son (Eric Bana) or even the girl in

love with the protagonist (Drew Barrymore) are able to convey something other than boredom. This

also helps both the long and meaningless dialogues and the boring soundtrack. Not even

the pocker's own games have rhythm, emotion or tension. So the final result is a "" pair of

twos "" that do not reach, or far, to win this game to indifference.

" 0

" We will not waste time explaining why and why. To say something, and so we are reassuring, Eragon

unabashedly copies clichés of other more successful productions, productions that also deserve the category

of classics in their � Scope

Frankly, it's bad but it's not that bad. What I say, is bad but up to some emetic dimensions. It's an

insult to the viewer, it's a bitch. Maybe what happens is that we get the nerve because the typical

fantasy genre is one of our two or three g� Favorite cinematographic genres. And I stress the

"cinematographic" "because I've always thought that the typical fantasy, if it's well done, has a greater power of

fascination represented in the screen than in the written letter. But no, but seriously, but

this. But this. But this. But what is that? Ye, for the donkey you're asking for pears to elm. It is a Christmas movie, a linnet,

one of adventures very much used to these dates of magic and illusion. Opportunistic product that lands

crashed at a bad historical moment. Let us underline the historical context. But, fuck, that the boy this blond

(actor, what disgust of t���o) that makes crumbs with dragons and nymphs has come after �s by Luke Skywalker and

Frodo Bols���n, two luxury characters for the fantastic-epic genre, authentic archetypes of theadventure

galacticas odyssey and metaphor of our lives, of good entertainment cinema, ostia. Because, come on, do notme

fuck with, neither Marc Hamill nor Elijha Wood were great actors, nor did they play particularlycharacters

complex, but how well defined and represented they were in an environment of ideals, dangers and profiles of a

splendid �ndida characterization and sense of the marvelous, that allowed even two flat characters like

folios to have fluency, the dimension of the real and a certain development throughout an adventure that goes from

point A to point B. (Later, more or less early, we will insert the tooth, under the all-encompassing vision of

"" Images and Words "", in George's saga Lucas and the trilogy of Peter Jackson, and I get chills just

thinking about the result. And how much we have left to learn). Hey, Eragon entertains, does not it? Shit. Why?

Because that is the worst of all, that even the vomiting bad entertains us. And it has a dignified end, after all

, what it's about is telling a story for children. But "" ET "" was not something of that same, and "" The

Goonies ?. Exactly, there comes tragedy. That one and the other are the same but of Eragon no one will remember in

twenty years and "" The Goonies "" and "" ET "", around thirty, continue to be sold as rosquilletas in the

successive editions and being reviewed with permanent joy year after year. Those were the times of goodcinema

innocent, for children and pap���s, but made with a heart the height of illusions and magic alive in everyone,

big and small. Today's children and daddies deserve the same. Eragon could be a more than passable

distracting work on dates of illusion, but such reluctance and lack of talent ... lack of.?. No, no,

it's the worst of all. That I do not believe that the talent is over. The effectiveness and skill of

James Cameron or Richard Donner, both endowed with a modest mastery of entertainment cinema, is not that

hard to achieve. Let's not talk about Spielberg, an individual with cinema in his veins who, in specific cases, was

able to elevate it to antol���gicas, m���sticas proportions, even. It is that, it is that, it looks like it has b���moles.

and I shit on you. What am I talking about Spielberg, Donner and C���meron? Nostalgia. We grew up with them and

thanks to their small jewelry of recreational and musical sensitivity cin���fila, today many of us love the cinema in all its

range or tour as far as quality is concerned, from Mel Gibson to Ingmar Bergman, from Roland

Emmerich to M. Night Shyamalan and everything they throw at us. Come on, we relax. And now seriously, "" Eragon ""

meets the justito in his role of Christmas movie, he lets himself be seen with pleasure, he has his good moments, I

dare say that is correct and honest because it gives what it promises. The uneducated viewercinematically

-speaking - is enough. But there is a canon established and known to all of us who love and suck Luke

Skywalker or Frodo Bols���n. I'm not evaluating Eragon based on stiff comparisons with "" The Lord of the

Rings "" or "" Star Wars "" (because such a comparison will be to stupidity). We are pointing out the difference between what is

well done and what is not well done in the field of fantasy and epic or sword and witchcraft or

whatever you want to call yourself. We are not going to waste time explaining why and why. To say something, and so we are

reassuring, Eragon unabashedly copies clichés of other more successful productions, productions that

also deserve the category of classics in their � Scope Behind that plagiarism there is no singularity. The guilt

we already know of who it is. "Stefano Fangmeier ?, that is dedicated to something else. ,La, to crack it.

" 0

" At last we see an Almod���var that portrays scenes from real life, without adornments, without extra���eza. A praise to the

woman of her house who in the background are the backbone of our society, regardless of who may be.

It's not that I do not like it, but I admit that I've always thought that Almod���var is an overrated director.

Particularly I enjoy more with Garci, Trueba or Julio M���dem, but as my grandmother said, something will have the water

when they bless it. And if we talk about cinematographic blessings, this manchego, almost as universal as

cheese, has them all. None of the great film festivals in Europe or America has overlooked his

work. The truth is that Volver is the film that I liked the most I've seen of �� He, who have been almost

all. And I think it has been that way because in this film he presents a real vision of the world. It is a story

that has greater credibility, and in which it has finally detached itself from excessivelycharacters

historicalthat tend to swarm through its films. Back is a film full of sensitivity, where women

return to be the pillars of the work that make arrests to apechugar with life and get ahead with everything. It is

a tribute to the Spanish woman of his house. ���sa that does not aspire to the cover of the Vogue magazine or to be

received by Zapatero. ���sa woman who is the one who maintains homes, families, who fights the d���aad���ay and who

seems to be very embarrassed zagal reconverted to yuppie ungrateful (and unfortunate). From the point of view

t�� Technical, impeccable. The silences that speak for themselves, the changes of plane, the short shots and theplay of

subtlelights where they exist. And of the interpretation, only praise. In my opinion Carmen Maura shines above

the rest, and possibly she and Almod���var know it, although the Maura is already back of everything and facing a

possible Oscar nomination, Pen ���lope Cruz sells more. All this without detracting one ���pice the interpretation of

this last one, that in spite of not being saint of my devotion for its habitual inexpressiveness, it realizes a work worthy

of praise. Perhaps this is Almod���var's greatest dream: to make Pen���lope Cruz convincing. Chus

Lampreave and Lola Due���as seem to be not even acting, it's natural that every gesture, every word,comes to them. Returning

every movementreflects everyday life. That life from which many want to flee desperately but to

which sooner or later we end up wishing just that, Back.

" 1

" Neither chicha nor limon���. He stays halfway in almost all his intentions. He did not want to read a lot of comments so as not to go to the cinema, but the ones he read and heard from behindscenes

theput me on Friday. on guard. And the truth be told, although he wished it were not so, Alatriste is a

film that stays halfway in almost all his intentions. It tries to be an ambitious film of

bloody and spectacular battles of the Spanish Golden Age, but it weakens in this sense; It pretends to be a hard

drama that portrays the lives of some valiant soldiers despised by some inept and accommodating rulers,

but hardly thrills in a couple of intimate sequences. His obsession with recreating the time because it is, and without

justification within the story, wears down the rhythm of the film, sopor���fera by moments. To all these

themes are added a couple of stories of impossible love, of which only a final sequence between

Diego Alatriste and Mar���a de Castro (a splendid Ariadna Gil) stands out. ). It is not a bad film, but neither, nor by

far, the great quality superproduction of our cinema that we all expected and some, as it is my case, we

wanted. Alatriste suffers, visually, from an abuse of postcards. Some scenes are authentic decals

in frames of pictures of the time, such as The Surrender of Breda de Vel���zquez. However, it is

conservative in the use of the camera and little daring in its assembly. In this aspect, the truth, we are still getting

several bodies from the Americans. And in a film backed by such a large budget, we could

expect much more in the use of cinematographic language. The choice of locations seems correct,

especially in the case of the urban scenes filmed in Baeza and ���beda (and I do not mean to sweep it for the land),

but the blic sequences are poor. It is to praise that affinity for verismo in the choreographies of the

struggles, bloody and cruel, but it would also have been grateful for more agility in its development. I do not know if it was D

elaz-Yanes himself who was in charge of filming the public scenes, but, in productions of this

type, it is usual that this function Sean be delegated to specialized directors. Be that as it may, the result

here does not convince. But if we consider the film as a character drama, like a sour portrait of an Empire

in decline, this does not fulfill its purpose either. They just give off emotion a couple of sequences and some

dialogues, raised as a? Tour de force? acting between confronting characters, they are quite flat and do not give

off the sparks that should. I have not read the novels, so I do not know if the adaptation is good or

not. But, as I have read, the main virtues of these reside in the development of some plots and

subplots of certain complexity, having structured the script as a biography of Diego Alatriste does not

seem very successful either. Thus, it seems that D���az-Y���nez, despite having put his best intentions, has made a

"copy-paste" "caític" of the five novels and the set of his gui���n is the most disjointed.And it is a pity,

the truth, because it involves some of our best actors. Although some shine brighter

than others, I stay with Eduard Fern���ndez in his role as courageous soldier, parco man and faithful friend of

Alatriste. Javier C���mara will also stand out as the Count Duque de Olivares, especially in a final sequence

in which, already aged, this continues stubbornly to recover the lost glory with a contumacy own the

alienated leader. Also outstanding are Ariadna Gil, as lover of the hero, and Juan Echanove, effective in his

interpretation of Quevedo. As for Viggo Mortensen, who undoubtedly started to build this

character of chiaroscuros, he had everything to be Alatriste: presence, intensity in the look, face of a hero

�� Typical, but all his work comes to a halt when he makes a bold effort to imitate an accent he does not

have. Hence, his phrases are a whisper that tries to hide his Spanish accent porte���o and an Anglophone vocalization. I

think I am not wrong to say that a large part of the p�� Cinfilo public put many expectations in this

film. Just take a look at some of the opinions that I link at the end of this comment. If I

add them, it is because I trust the criteria of those who sign them, and I am aware that their points of view

only respond to a single criterion: the love of good cinema. Now, confronted these opinions with those

of the conventional press, it seems that we have seen each other? Alatristes? different I do not say that

media criticism has agreed, but I am surprised by this unanimity of opinions that are so

positively favorable. I understand that commercial success can be wished for an expensive film produced here and inspired by

facts of our history, but the common sense, when it comes to assessing, should not be clouded by the desire

to lend the shoulder. Or, I do not know, perhaps we are wrong who do not see in this film neither chicha nor limon���.

" 0

" It was a long time ago that a film of this genre did not cause me such an impression as to make my body revolvie

against the armchair.

It was a long time ago that a film of this genre did not cause me such an impression that my body would turn

against the armchair, just like a child would ���a with his mother in search of protection. Specifically, the

last time that happened so "" bad "" was seeing the masterpiece of Amen���bar, The Others. By the way, let no one get

confused, even if the titles are similar, the stories do not look like anything. Getting away from the topics that

usually accompany these films and learning of the classics, the two directors (David Moreau and Xavier

Palud) have achieved a good product, highlighting an exquisite use of the camera and the silencios.Los actors

(Olivia Bonamy and Michael Coh�� )N) will transmit to us a long night of anguish that will take place in an

idyllic setting where doubt, terror and the instinct of survival will coexist. Surely there will be someone who,

after watching this movie, will not feel so safe in their own home.

" 1

" It is the worst of the trilogy that according to the collections of this will be transformed into quadrilogy. The box office

responds, and someone much smarter than I once said that "you never argue to success."

Now I know, I can talk. I have already seen it and, as I expected, it is the worst of the trilogy that according to the

collections of this will be transformed into quadrilogy. Ergo, there will be a fourth movie that will again produce

Sony Pictures in which it is not known to what level of participation will be Raimi, Maguire or Dunst, but I think

that Raimi considers This character is already his and he is sure to return to the battle, if not as director as producer,

but there is already talk of a script by David Koepp, which suggests that the fourth part of the adventures of " "The

Ara���a Man" "repeat��� as for his team. Would not happen in case of a change to this level, would it

sink? it's risky to say it because, fuck, James Bond has done quite well with his changes

throughout the entire saga. What happens is that Spiderman makes a mistake in this sense. James Bond things have gone

well for, among other reasons, his mode of gui���n, that is, all the stories that have told us about Bond

are absolutely independent, it is a saga, and as saga his movies work by itself. I do not

need to see before "" Only For Your Eyes "" that "" The Man with the Golden Gun "" to understand the story. The

films of Spiderman have a continuity quite risky in this regard. "" Spiderman 3 "" makes another big

mistake, its excessive footage, otherwise inevitable since the error comes back, and the duration is

a mistake that occurs by carambola from another, which is the one that resents the entire film and damage all its

structure at all levels. Raimi knew from the beginning that in this part Spiderman was going to face El

Hombre of sand; He also knew that, Harry Harry must be forced to continue in the saga and avenge his father,

now as an ultra-modernized Green Goblin. Then Avi Arad, responsible for the production of all the

films and coordinator of the Marvel company for all his adaptations to the cinema, told Raimi that he had to

introduce at once Venom, one of the characters with more popular heat by fans of

comics. Raimi was convinced only when Arad told him that people should see once and for all the dark side of

Spiderman and Peter Parker. This convinced Raimi that, with his brother, they started writing. Venom is a

character that does not have the sympathy of Raimi, and it shows a lot. Well, what I wanted to get to is

here, if you have counted well Venom makes Spiderman already have three enemies in this part. Three enemies!

Any screenwriter with two fingers of lights would tell you that this is crazy, because there is no way to structure it

well, to give coherence to the skeleton of the story. "" Spiderman 3 "" has no rhythm, stumbles and ,

sometimes, it stays stagnant because it has to change the plot. For this reason, Raimi needs more time

to close all those plots, which also does not do well. A film can not have more than one plot, it can

have as many subplots as you want, but never more than one main plot, and "" Spiderman 3 "" has three because, even though he

could turn his confrontation with Harry Osborn into something less important, Raimi and his brother give him

too much weight. At the technical level "" Spiderman 3 "" is more a chapter of a situation comedy than a

film. The sit? Coms work like that, with more than one plot, but the cinema is much more closed, you have to have

many things more in mind and not do what comes out of your noses , for this reason the films of directors

like Lars Von Trier or Julio Medem will never be good films, because the rules of gui���n are passed by the

eggs, and that affects their films, making them real tostones.Si Raimi had done what he originally

wanted, that is, face Spiderman with The Sandman and had become The Green Goblin

in subplot the movie would have worked much better, its structure would not suffer and its rhythm would be much more

kinetic. The box office responds, and someone much m It's smart that I (which is not especially difficult)

once said that "never argue to a success." It is true, and in this sense "" Spiderman 3 "" goes hell,

which we all expected. But if you think about it, whatever it was - this movie, we would haveanyway

gone to see everyone. The Spiderman franchise works only by its name, and that if you have to grant it.

" 0

" To say that it is the best Spanish horror film of the last few years is risky, but it is true that it

is one of the few that shuns the typical "" easy paths "": the authorial pretensions (on the one hand) and the

dandruff (on the other)

Since long before its premiere, and after its recent passage through Sitges (to which famous projection, unfortunately,

I could not attend), REC (2007) was wrapped in a halo of incredible expectations, perhaps exaggerated for something

that, in the end, It is an extremely simple film whose maximum virtues are precisely in the

literal of its proposal. Even so, it is surprising to see how something that started more or less as aproject

marginalof its two directors (Jaume Balaguer��� and Paco Plaza) has ended by becoming not only one of the

most effective horror films of this year, but also in the most forceful work until the date for both

filmmakers, whom Filmax should consider now more than ever. For those who have been

locked in a bunker during the last year. And I mean, I report that REC is basically a zombie movie

narrated from the point of view of a video camera that records the outbreak of the epidemic in abuilding

barcelon���sbesieged by the forces of order, and in which the bad luck has wished that the

two people in charge of a local program of tele-reality, together with the Firemen and a few neighbors. The

aforementioned similarities with films like Blair's The Witch Project (1999) are, at best,

superficial and limited only to the format: unlike what happened with the fake documentary by

Daniel Myrick and Eduardo S���nchez, REC does not seem to be assembled, but consists solely of the material in

Gross of a camera that registers a violent, "" real "" and visceral event in which the protagonist ends up being

not the beautiful television reporter the invisible camera "" Pablo " ", but the public that receives each and every one

of the vapuleos. If above it said that REC is a simple film it did not do it in a term pejorative.

Contrary to what happens in the film canonical zombies (I speak herecourse George Romero film)

tape Balaguer and Plaza boasts no second readings or interpretations of ning Tipon type beyond the

sample (sometimes in a humorous key) of the miseries that tend to seize humans under state of

siege. Both directors seem to be much more interested in the way in which the story is transmitted and in the

emotional effect it prints on the viewer, something that would not be reprehensible since the horror film is, in

essence , a genre of emotions, not of intellectual discourses (although obviously it can become much

more). Under this light, the film hits the spot: once the introduction of the supposed program has been overcome and

the escalating terror of the argument has begun, what is coming is one hour of the most intense that have been seen in

horror movies, at least this year. Of that I have no doubt. It is that in my opinion the greatest virtue of the

film: the ability to transmit that debauchery in the viewer for almost an hour and a

constant crescendo that, unfortunately , it seems to me that Balaguer��� and Plaza have not found the mostway

suitableto get out. The first uses its well-known formula for creating environments repeating even with a

scenario not too distant from the one used in his previous film, To Enter to Live (2006). The trick goes well,

but being an experience that mainly depends on the sensation produced and little else, I allow myself to show

some skepticism when it comes to repeat viewing, which is when you really recognize a great movie. ���cula.

I grant, that's it, that the tactics used to frighten the staff are very effective even though

we have seen them many times and even recently: certain images and moments of the film �cula (some of the

most chilling) we have seen them before in The Dawn of the Dead (2004) by Zack Snyder,

only that these moments are here. They are dealing with the filter of realism similar to war journalism. In

summary, I do not know to what extent it can be said that REC is one of the best Spanish horror films that have

been fact, but it is true that it is one of the most honest and least tricky and pretentious, and that at the same

time (this is the best no doubt) has not fallen into temptation. Go on the easy road of dandruff. The fact

that it is such a visceral and direct film can hurt (perhaps) your prospects in the future, but I can not

deny that it has made me go through very badly. And is not that what the horror movies are in the background?

" 1

" The forest of mourning is a beautiful film, with excellent performances and a beautiful

photo that, despite its extreme slowness, make it a true display of feelings and

almost visceral emotions.

Awarded in Cannes with the Grand Prix of the Festival and nominated for the Palme d'Or, The Forest of Mourning was

directed by Naomi Kawase and performed by Shigeki Uda, Machiko Ono, Makiko Watanabe, Kanako Masuda and Yoichiro

Saito. the story of Shigeki, an old man who lives in a secluded residence. There he

feels comfortable and happy with the other residents and with the staff that attends them. Machiko, aworker

socialwho belongs to this team, pays special attention to him, although inside her the losstorments him

of a son. To celebrate Shigeki's birthday, Machiko decides to take him for a drive in the

countryside. But the car remains standing in the gutter. The old man enters the forest with decision, and Machiko

has no choice but to accompany him. We could define The Forest of Mourning with two qualifiers that undoubtedly

they do absolutely justice: wonderful and exasperatingly slow. The usually documentary maker Naomi Kawaseus

tellsa tender story of acceptance and hope through an improvised initiatory journey that takes two

people, Machiko and Shigeki , to overcome their own ghosts and accept the death of their loved ones. Ofrhythm

terrifyingly slowdespite their 97 minutes of footage, always with camera in hand and with

practically nonexistent dialogues , one should take the viewing of The Forest of Mourning with Philosophy, if it does not

want to get exasperated. Once accepted his apparent monotony, before the viewer opens aexperience

truly unforgettable, with a strong sentimental load and interpretations whose symbolism can not

be qualified otherwise than as simply bright and sweeping. The director Naomi Kawase us

presents two seemingly opposite characters but who, in the deepest part of their being, share the same

burdens: Machiko, an introverted young woman who is unable to overcome the death of her son, and Shigeki, an

obsessed old jovial with his deceased wife Mako. Both are linked to a past whose tortuous

memory and feeling of guilt prevents them from moving forward with their lives, confronting it in different ways. In

this way, the young Machiko simply seems to ignore the memories, although she can not stop seeing her own

son in the figure of Shigeki, whose trauma has made him return to a kind of infantile state.

shows us through a daily relationship, without plot twists or apparent melodramatic resources and

whose depth lies, precisely, in its simplicity. So, scenes as seemingly vulgar as that of

the protagonist couple playing hide-and-seek, or eating sand���a, or the heartrending image of Shigeki screaming

desperately at the old man who does not cross the river, watching in Su her own son, no doubt will be recorded in the

memory of a server for a long time. The overcoming of fears and the acceptance of death, both my

own and those of others, are the main message of the film, which can not fail to remind me, above all in terms

of substance, that wonder of Kim Ki-duk called Spring, summer, autumn, winter. andthen, The

spring.Soforest of mourning is a beautiful film, with excellent performances and a beautiful photo that,

despite its extreme slowness, make it a true display of almostfeelings and emotions. It's

visceralyes, tons of patience. I give it a 7'5 out of 10.

" 1

" False, hypocritical and moralistic film that will need a lot of people from the north after 9/11, but here

the minutes are lengthened and the patience is shortened, with an insufferable film of war more.

Blic film describing on the basis of real events, the leadership of Colonel Hal Moore (Mel Gibson) at the

head of his troop, sent to Vietnam to fulfill a kamikaze mission, interspersed withrelationships

Their familyand their regret. Their director, Randall Wallace (Braveheart, Pearl Harbor) tries to show us

the most human side of the war - if there is any - together to the relations between the soldiers and their environment

without depriving themselves of the bloody combat scenes (which are not bad but they are not a big deal), and of the

innumerable low blows with which the more than two hours of this movie. All are brave, all are

good, all are great soldiers; all stereotypes of characters already shown a thousand times and in excess, these

last few years (Private Ryan, The Fall of the Black Hawk, Codes of War). The most accomplished is the look that is

made of the Vietnamese colonel, parallel to that of Colonel Moore, reflecting their similarities knowing that they are

both the face of the same coin. Although in truth, if one remembers and remembers the portrait and human profile of

the recruits of Born to Kill shown by Kubrick, om���s ac���, the lyricism of The Red Line Slim by

Terrence Mallick , This stops being original to become a school manual look. Another case is that

of Mel Gibson. Being a conservative fanatical puritan in real life, he chooses (or imposes?) Roles with a

strong religious connotation (Signs) that already at this time begins to tiring.With all theelements

triteof the genre and exaggerated to the point of exasperation: the black dies first, then the recent father, the

yanki flag fluttering in the foreground every twenty minutes, with an obvious, flat and, phrases of the

maudlinstyle: "" Tell my wife that I love her "" -of course, a second before dying-, make of this, a

fake movie, hip�� �crite and moralist that the people of the north will need a lot after 9/11, but here

the minutes are extended and the patience is shortened, with an insufferable film of war more.

" 0

" The Last Show is a vulgar film, from the mont, that is based on the failed premise of the portrait of some

equally failed characters, and whose only attraction is work interpretative.

For some years now, translations of the titles of foreign films have entered a

deep downhill. When the original title is not left, the translation is added as a subtitle, such as

Adaptation (The Ladder of Orchids), or if not, a "free" interpretation is made "and there are cases like the one of"

Save My Name ", whose American title would be something like Eternal Brightness of an Immaculate Mind. But in the

case of The Last Show, although the translation makes a perfect reference to the story that the film narrates, it

must be admitted that it is a detail of bad taste titular to the work p���stuma of Robert Altman. The film tells

the problems faced by members of a veteran radio program when the newsis known

of the station's closure. All appear counting their past glories and their miseries, past, present and

future. That is the main livelihood of The Last Show, because the initial argument does not offer many

alternatives. However, the portrait of the characters (some absurd and blurred, by the way) is

distant and cold, devoid of emotion. Being a human tape, the main flaw of it is that it

never connects with the viewer, does not make him part of the suffering and hopes of his characters,

but rather leaves him indifferent to what happens on the screen. The actors are the best of The Last

Show, among which the great Meryl Streep stands out in a new interpretative pirouette. It also serves to

prove that the teen film star and the tabloid Lindsay Lohan can aspire to

become a full-fledged actress if she continues the trajectory she started with Bobby and followed. with this

work. The Last Show is a vulgar film, of the mont, that is based on the failed premise of the portrait of some

equally failed characters, and whose only attraction is the interpretive work. The end point

of Robert Altman's career will not be particularly remembered, in a trajectory that is full of deep

ups and downs, and a little jewel like Gosford Park.

" 0

" It is still a master class in cinematographic technique, a work in which each shot is simply

perfect.

Hitchcock is, without a doubt, the most plagiarized director in the history of cinema. And of all his films,

probably none has been so repeatedly groped and "" honored "" as Psycho (1960), a film that

is a perfect example of what is spoken when it says "" foundation work "" " It would be too

long to offer here a list of all the films that have used it, especially those

belonging to the sub-genre slasher, of which the Hitchcock tape is clear precursor. It's one of two

"horror" movies that appear on the sacrosanct list of the 100 best American films in

history, according to the American Film Institute (which injustice), in which occupies the box 18. Although

time has diminished a little the disturbing effect that had in his time, it is still a master class in

cinematographic technics, a work in the one that each plane is simply perfect. But in his time certainly it

was not seen him as, since his production did not differ much from that of any product of series B. In fact,

Psychosis it was filmed in the same studios in which the Alfredtelevision series was made at that time

Hitchcock presents. His budget was quite moderate, and apparently the only one who believed in the film's potential

was the director himself, who bought the rights to Robert Bloch's novel ( on which theis based

script) and even acquired all the copies he could so that the number of people who

knew the end of the story would be less. Today we all know her: in a rapture determined to change her

miserable life once, the fatal blonde Marion Crane steals a considerable amount of money from her boss and flees to

California, stopping to spend the night in the secluded motel Bates , where she is served by her lone and

apparently harmless owner, Norman. The rest certainly already know, a history of transvestism,complex

Oedipusand mass murder. It is difficult to believe for our time that Psycho has caused such aimpact

bigon the public 1960, but it was like that, and for many reasons. What sometimes escapes us is that this

film was genuinely innovative in many aspects, from silly details (it is the first film wherewas

a toiletpulled) to decisions that changed the customs of the public (it was one of the

films that broke with the old tradition of "" continuous functions "", at the request of Hitchcock himself,

who I wanted people to know that Janet Leigh, the only star of the cast, dies in the first

half of the film). But above all, he gave the public of that time a burden of perversity to which he was not

accustomed, an idea of ​​the Evil that ceased to be caricatured or supernatural and that became part of

that which is m��� It is hidden in man: the unconscious. Hitchcock's film is undoubtedly the first

"adult" thriller that inspired the idea that horror could come from the heart of thefamily. During

Americanthe 109 minutes of Psycho we are constantly suffering a sense of danger,

crouching before the expectation of something terrible. When this finally happens, in the omnipresent and

hyper-parody scene of the shower with the equally unforgettable music of Bernard Herrmann, the impact is brutal.

But even beyond its dramatic and plot excellences, the film's main achievement is to have

managed to establish a style and a way of making cinema that dominates the Hollywood industry until

today. Hitchcock, a man fully aware of the power of the camera, polishes each sequence to perfection.

The shower scene, the nervous center of the film, is a clear example of that, with the water running in a

whirlpool to the drain where the blood (and life) of Marion Crane escapes. , until that long zoom-out

that begins in the eye of the victim and ends in the pile of money forgotten on the night table,

showing us that the motive of the crime has not the affliction of profit, but the dark corridors of madness. It is

the irrationality of Evil, summed up in the affable and even ridiculous figure of Norman Bates. The old enemies

of America are gone, the fascists of the Second World War were dead, and even the Russian Communists

seemed less dangerous than the horrors that could be unleashed deep in the heart. Deln of the country. If thisnot

isthe main theme of all the horror movies that will come in the following decades, someone will tell me.

But this is not what impresses most of Psycho. His public did not leave scared and horrified by his

erotic or violent charge, nor by the sociological connotations of his plot, not even by his excellent

performances. If anything is left of this masterpiece, it is that it is cinema in its pure state. Undoubtedly.

" 1

" A well-intentioned but failed film, in which Robert De Niro, despite placing the camera in

a brilliant way, has forgotten to give life to his characters. Or rather, the character; to Edward

Wilson.

It's been over 13 years for Robert De Niro, from the splendid A History of the Bronx, to move back into

a camera. Thirteen years that, in addition to continue interpreting, has dedicated to collecting specific information

in order to film El Buen Pastor, a film that, between Other topics, shows the

birth of the CIA. The film focuses, first and foremost, on Edward Wilson, a peculiar man of few words to

which Matt Damon gives life and for whose construction they have been inspired - in a very free- in the figure of James

Jesus Angelton, the true founder of the CIA. The inexpressiveness and habitual suspicion in the actor have

become the only traits with which to define the personality of such a Wilson, a cold guy, extremely

meticulous and (accidentally) machiav� ��lico.El Buen Pastor begins in April 1961, just after the

failed invasion of Bah���a Cochinos; a frustrated military operation, with a clear anti-Castro ideology and

orchestrated by the CIA; an intervention that aroused all kinds of suspicions in the mind of thepresident

American, at that time John F. Kennedy was recently elected. From this point, De Niro will

use (in an abusive way) the technique of the flash back to give a sober and extensive review of the existence of the

aforementioned Edward Wilson, one of the agents directly involved in the case. A lengthy and excessive review,

lasting more than two and a half hours, in which all kinds of events, both of your private lifeprivate life

and of your, will be included. actions as government esp.a a Matt Damon festival that will delight the mostfollowers

acrimoniousof the actor and, in equal parts, irritate those who? as a server - do not find the

trick to it. And there is not a single scene in which man does not appear; a detail, the latter,

partly quite logical, since everything that happens passes through the sieve of his gaze. But to my mind, and

due to his "" forced "" permanence on the screen, another actor with different interpretative resources would have

given more importance to the film and the character. It's clear that at least , to alleviate that overdose Damon, you

can enjoy the numerous squad of excellent secondary that envelop the protagonist of The Bourne Case.

Some of them very blurred in their roles; others too wasted; but all, from the first to the

last (except for an Angelina Jolie very unbelievable), fulfilling their work effectively.

Narrative delinquency is one of the determining factors when it comes to prosecuting a product that , without so much

unjustified time loss, it could condense in just a couple of hours' duration. A little more

nerve and agility would have helped your better digestion. And it is that lack of br��� and the slowness with which it faces

certain passages, are opposed, in part, with the amount of gaps, loose ends and episodes not very well

resolved that it is leaving throughout its footage. It is undeniable that De Niro, despite his praiseworthy efforts to

make the CIA's beginnings known to the viewer, has taken more care of the visual than the descriptive part. Taking into

account that the film takes place over almost three decades (from before the beginning of World

War II until after the incident of Bah���a Cochinos), it can be described as excellent meticulousness

with which he has taken care of the aesthetic details and the scenographic ambience. In this regard, it is not surprising

that Francis Ford Coppola's fickle figure is credited as an executive producer: everyone knows his

affinity, almost sickly, to pamper the final image to extremes unthinkable.Recelos and secrecy: two concepts

that define, to perfection, everything that surrounds the protagonist of El Buen Pastor; a well-intentioned

but failed film, in which Robert De Niro, despite placing the camera in a brilliant way, has forgotten to

give life to his characters. Or rather, the character; Edward Wilson, his almost unique character.

" 0

" Film about a distant future in which Humanity is facing giant bugs. Excellent

film of pure and hard fun, with very interesting moments, and with bajones of rhythm, which

make it a classic of cult.

Director: Paul Verhoeven.Duration: More than two horazas, but comfortably on the couch is treated agustito.Estreno:

January 30, 1998. Viewers: 664,288 human beings, but surely in We will have seen the TV all over the

world, at least one chunk. Movies like this remind me of the great game Starcraft, religion in

Korea. In fact, one of the scenes in the film is suspiciously similar to a video of the game. Although it sure

is a coincidence, since they are from the same year. Well, I also remembered Dune for a couple of little scenes, but they

are already very freaks. By the way, I thought it was a very interesting film from the point of view of

parity. They will understand why the film is about a distant future, in which the galaxy is colonized and

you can live on different planets. Humanity has to face the bugs, a kind ofinsects

giantthat are attacking us palautinely, massacring everything they catch (what come to be humans

today). A group of three friends decide to enlist in the army, to fight the bugs and in the process

obtain citizenship, in different bodies, with the promise of always being friends. Of course this is a cl�SICO,

unclassifiable nestled in science fiction with touches of humor parody self, romanticism that

sucks, gender equality, human superiority, extreme journalism, honor, duty and all this mixed with

equal parts Cutreces and great special effects. Touching the genius, without a doubt. Why do

I say about parity? Because it seems to me that scenes like the shower, all together and women letting out

mouth phrases worthy of the most seasoned albañil, or that the mandam���s of the human universe is a woman Black,

without giving importance, is a normalizing path of truth, without crashing and without stridency. I loved it.

Not so the performance of the girl who plays Carmen Ib������ez (the pilot protagonist) that between the hair of lacquer

that they have put him and the little that he gesticulates, it seems to me a horrible borr���n in this stupendous film. Resumiendo,

film about a distant future in which the Humanity is faced with giant bugs. Excellent film

of pure and hard fun, with very interesting moments, and with bajones of rhythm, which make it

a classic cult for my taste. Very original.Besitos. PD: The live news reports are great, very

acid, with a revindicative touch that I love. PD2: One doubt that I have, the oxygen of these

spacecraft, where they take out? I do not know if they are generating it on the fly, they load it on Earth or what. Because

if there is nothing in space, there will be no raw material to generate oxygen. And if they are taking it away from Earth,

there will be a moment that is not more. Ah��� that remains, as a reflection of the dayPD3: It turns out that there is a second

part (there is talk of a third) that I started to see and when I realized that all the special effects that they wereus

going to takewere not more than cuts of the previous movie, I had to remove it urgently. How can you

smear the memory of a great movie with such a second-party tru? Let's see if I see it and I can

criticize it at ease. PD4: Since this has lost its way, let it be known that this is based on a book of the same

name. Although according to the director recognizes, has not managed to read the tremendous pesti���o that is the book, so it

only has the name.PD5: Who has put that hairstyle to the protagonist? Thus we are left without ozone

layer.

" 1

" A convulsed work, open to many readings. The most obvious, its beauty, its way of telling a

story ...

The always reviled B series, apace of scarce budgets and creative pulse with the majors, which impose their

aesthetic criterion with a checkbook, he has in El desv���o (Detour) one of its peaks and time, thatjudge

implacable, has respected and consolidated it as a cult film. This road-movie (the term it was not yet

exploited) it was recorded in the amazing space of six days and cost the still astonishing figure of 20.00 dollars.

There are lost roads, sombre pictures of that profound America, so full offilm iconography

black, sordid motel rooms, women of dubious living and even German expressionism brought to the US

by a formidable caterva of directors who saw in Hollywood a vehicle to enlarge their art and make

history (Lang, Sirk, Wilder or this Edgar G. Ulmer, of fame minor). Not that the script is formidable. There is no

cast in a state of grace, as they say. The reason why this film thickens the list of

classics is its genuine rarity condition, its ability to make a film gem with wickerwork so fragile (

the money, the anonymous set of actors, the script of series B) at the same time as another film ofconditions

similarlike So dark the night by Joseph H. Lewis. Flashbacks , voice-overs and an absolute mastery in the

treatment of the abrupt landscape make Detour a convulsive work, open to many readings. The most obvious,

his beauty, his way of telling a story (everything goes through the sieve of Robert's eyes, the protagonist,

the pianist who goes in search of his girlfriend and stumbles, on the way, with a murder he has not committed and a

fatal woman, another, who blackmails him). Tom Neal, the actor who gives life to him, takes in real life the reins of the

B series and the black cinema since he was imprisoned in 1965 for killing his third wife.

" 1

" To walk around house, so we catalog this failed foray into the fantastic universe that pretends to follow the

trail of productions that ennobled the genre.

In a glimpse of sincerity it should be noted that his footage is not too long, something that eludes any

desire to leave the room. It is also true that we should not refuse responsibilities by leaving our little

companions alone, because yes, they become the only excuse to watch a movie. ���cula

reminiscent of Dragonheart and makes other second category shows like Dragons and dungeons.Care of

emotion but pr endiga in sublime moments lacking in content, Eragon does not convince because we have the sensation of

seeing something that they have already told us and, moreover, with more substance and better ways. We do not know very well who

and what has done it, but a constant d���j��� vu accompanies us in this work that is held with pins. The

filmmakers who debuts , and Stefen Fangmeier is, they seem to have confused great films withlandscapes

stunning natural, two or three stars of recognized name and a plot that, no matter how insubstantial,

because it will be enhanced later with the effects visuals and the scenes of struggle.23 years has Christopher Paolini,

the author of The Legacy, an unfinished trilog���aa���n whose first books have reached millionairefigures

sales. Eragon is the introductory volume and, judging by the outcome of the film adaptation, will

also be the first in a series of films. Surely the legion of stalwarts who have read the book

will flock to the cinema: the first time is guaranteed but it is risky to trust that they continue to support

a strictly commercial and We do not know if the young writer shapes his characters with the

same depth as the scriptwriters in charge of taking the words to images: 4have been needed,

professionalsso they would be able to display a ���logo of beings that respond to standardized patterns. The

main roles are no more than schemes in the service of a mock moraine adorned with foreseeable action at

all times. We had not said it yet: that we liked it. the work of Peter Jackson in front of The Lord of the

Rings and, not to compare, but how much damage has done to those who venture into the difficult genre of

fantasy.

" 0

" For almost two hours we will live again the magic of the orchestras of the fifties, the social change

of the sixties in the United States but, above all, the desire to live of a child who grew up �� could not exceed

fifteen years of age.

It is possible that many of those present do not sound at all the name of Bobby Darin. Also, it is very

possible that it will be difficult for us to place songs like "" Beyond the sea "" or "" Mack the Knife "". But, perhaps,is more

the following stanzafamiliar to us: I saw him pass by the corner of the old neighborhood, with the? Tumbao? What do the handsome men have

when they walk, their hands always inside the pocket of their gab? n? pa? do not know which one of them is wearing the

pu���al. Do you wear a wide-brimmed hat and slippers in case it's a problem to get out? Do I fly? Well, this

letter belongs to one of the various versions that exist in Spanish of one of the greatest successes of the popular

singer Bobby Darin, the youthful idol during the decade of the fifties and sixties and whose lyrics a��� We can

hear from the interpreters of the Robbie Williams category. The biography thathas interpreted and directed

Kevin Spacey(and that in the United States was released in the year). ��o 2004) not only brings us closer to the

real life of the multi-talented artist (he was also an actor), but also transmits to us extraordinarily the

quality of the same; and that has its merit, above all, when the soundtrack is played byhimself

Spacey(and I assure you that it has no waste, in fact, the paper earned him a nomination in the Balloons of Gold

as Best Musical or Comedy Actor). The film is exquisite not only in sound but also in sets and

costumes, masterfully recreating the atmosphere of legendary venues such as the Copacabana in New York. For

almost two hours we will live again the magic of the orchestras of the fifties, the social change

of the sixties, but above all, the desire to live of a child who did not believe I could surpass

fifteen years of age.

" 1

" Fesser and C���a create their own language, a style that is simply unique in the world of cinema: a

combination of visual extravagance that tells stories through a pr uso Basically withoutparagon

mounting.

There's a kind of movies that really scare me. All the films try to manipulate your

emotions in one way or another, but there are some that do it in a totally blatant way (rays,almost

you cansee the director approach with a knife): the music rises, the characters cry, the boy hugs with

the girl, everyone applauds yt���, bystander, you take out your handkerchief and start to fill it with snot, and come

snot, and come snot. Let's cite, for example, Love Actually, from which he left crying, but for other reasons

(basically, I felt as if I had just participated in a traffic accident and I had escaped of the

crime scene). C���ndida, and to begin with, do not leave anyone in doubt, enter directly into this

category. And I cal��� the film at three minutes: I put on the armor, I prepared to keep anface

impenetrableand even, I tried to force my sleep mechanism, to see if there were a couple of minutes there that I

could take to give me a little nap. I have to say that I have completely failed, my friends. For

our readers abroad (there are, there are, I swear) who do not know the background of this story, to say

that C���ndida Villar, our protagonist , worked as Guillermo's and Javier Fesser's cleaning lady, the

first of which is one of the components of the day of radiophonic comedians (among other things) known

as Foam. Over time, this woman has become part of the staff of the program conducting

film criticism (which causes the father descojone in the public, mainly because he is unable to say a

yes she names it well and she alone is enough and enough to turn the argument of a film by Adam Sandler into a spill from

the mind of David Lynch) Having said that: I do not care if you just returned from curing the

genital herpes in Mozambique: you could hardly have worse than this lady. A drug addict son. Another

son as a cop. A megachoni v porstaga for there lost. He resides in an official housing and

earns his living cleaning the tourist buses that swarm around Madrid, this discounting the cleaning of

Ms. Marquesa's apartment, and anything else that goes out there ��� No matter how twisted

things are, C���ndida always goes ahead with a little bit of popular wisdom, and another piece of motherly tenderness. She is

a simple woman who works hard, who earns her bread with the sweat of her brow and who has sacrificed herlife

wholefor her children. In other words, if you do not like her, congratulations, you are a son of a bitch. YC���ndida

is the fundamental pillar on which this film is structured, which is for the most part apainting

costumbristaof Madrid, which explains to you more or less how is the life of the good woman throughscenes

isolatedand that progressively develops a story between the woman and Pablo, a television announcer, alter

ego of Fesser, to which Uma Thurman in Beautiful Girls, you'll finish fixing your life and yourproblems

couple'swith your American girlfriend. It is clear that Fesser has many things to tell, but neither he nor his

brother had been so focused on explaining a story before, which greatly benefits the film, which

keeps most of the footage a good balance between comedy and drama, and never loses sight of the idea

that is counting, which is the world of C���ndida, populated by characters to which more eccentric (the neighbor, the

marquises, the doorman, and the list goes on to the millon, more or less) and, unfortunately, more two-dimensional. The

material, so good, so original, is spoiled from time to time by Fesser with completelymechanisms

unnecessary, like that soundtrack everywhere, with little songs stuck with shoehorn (it's a particular thing of

mine: jam���s would put a song during the credit titles, except that you are Woody Allen, or James

Bond), because you do not need it. However, what that the film loses in audio, it wins in video. This is the

first film by Guillermo Fesser alone, but you do not have to be a genius to deduce that these two, like

the Coen, work like one and trill, forming the most visually exciting filmmaker there is. in Spain (and Inot

dothink that on this point in question there are many doubts about it). Almod���var brings a personal view of the

world, but Fesser and C���a create their own language, a style that is simply unique in the world of cinema: a

combination of visual extravagance that narrates stories by means of a use practically without parang���n of the

assembly and in which we find multiple homages with wide angle to Spain. ��, to the boom of the 60s and the

neighborhood cinema of a lifetime. These guys look back, but they do it without anger, and when C���ndida expresses

in a moment of the film how beautiful Madrid is, we can not but agree. Because the film

expresses itself. And since C���ndida plays C���ndida, and Meryl Streep does not do that, well, to say that Mrs.

Villar nails the role of herself. It was not very difficult, after all. The same self-confidence that shows on the

radio appears in the same measure in front of the camera. Although they do not finish to me or puñeetera grace the

"" candidismos "", is the way of being of this woman and her system of values ​​what ends up winning to me. Failure of the

film is to be about to turn C���ndida into a mockery of cleaning, something that is

about to fall in many moments, especially when the good woman confuses the words (and that provokes the

laughter of the public, including some august academic em���ritos of the Spanish language) and Fesser is dedicated to

exploiting the fen���meno in each fucking Dialog line. It only works once: at the time of the monologue

(impressive: the whole film pales in comparison) and is, in my opinion, one of the highlights of Spanish cinema

this season and many others. It comes out so natural and so devastating, that Jorge Bosch, who

throughout the film has been wandering with a rather poor role, is descojona from within, he starts to cry, he

returns to re���ry and ends up making the contraplanos of his life. Solving life to others. As for the

rest of the actors, the truth is that quite well, especially Ra���l Pe���a (is the one who It comes out, on the other hand),

in the role of son yonkarra. The case is. I really did not care what happened to her. What I care about is how

C���ndida reacts, the only character-character in the movie, and a center of gravity around which

minor roles move. In any case, for me it is enough: I have paid to see this good woman and the

lady complies with more and the rest, well look, too. Then everything depends on how fussy you are and

how you have reacted to flagrant manipulation (understood as "I'll grab you by the neck until you

cry") from Fesser: If the movie has not reached you, the cl���max on the television set may seem

completely ridiculous (if you have done so. because you are going to cry an egg and a half) and the epìlogo in the United

States can be like the end of The Lord of the Rings. In any case, I insist: let go. It is a trip

that is worth it.

" 1

" No one better than Milos Forman knows that "the horrors of History are repeated? With a lot of frequency.

Something supernatural happens when Milos Forman is behind the camera. Suddenly, the viewer feels

like the protagonist of The Purple Rose of Cairo and is that, when he directs, the technical barriers that

separate reality from fiction , the screen of the stalls disappear. At that moment, it is no longer

strange to nod at the revolutionary discourse of Javier Bardem,return a smile to Stellan

instinctivelySkarsgard, or even that it freezes on the lips when looking at the eyes of Natalie

Portman.In reality, it is not necessary to be put "" a question "" to sign and affirm that in the difficult task of

transmitting, the Czech filmmaker has no rival.Gosmas of Goya it is a history of history, which could well

have been chosen at random, in which religious fanaticism and the tyranny of political rulers

encourage the military intervention of neighbors (or not neighbors) invaders who, in the name of Liberty

(attractive and recurrent safe conduct), commit all kinds of abuses and barbarism against the population.

It happened in Spain, and there was the king's painter to immortalize the facts; but, as thesays

director, the horrors of history are repeated, so it is possible that this argument does not convince in the

Juntitos States of America. In any case, we are facing one of those jewels that resist all

analyzes of gemology. The technical virtues of this film are innumerable and unbeatable, the composition of

the plans is spectacular, the aesthetic beauty is, frankly, impressive. Without resorting to

camera effects, it has been known to take care of even the most insignificant detail in each scene. The clear

heritage of Stanley Kubrick's pictorial mannerism is appreciated, and his obsession Porn by the excessive mime of the lighting,

settings, costumes and sets. Milos Forman's camera movements remain austere, and the

"shakes" to which he has accustomed us, overwhelming. The photography is excellent, the assembly

exceptional. But, perhaps, the main attraction of this footage is in the direction of actors, in their

memorable interpretations, which configure unforgettable sequences. Natalie's eyes, Goya's smile,

the reprehensible aspects of the personality of the genius, the extraordinary portrayal of characters, situations and

behaviors. It is important to indicate that each and every one of these roles is perfection, that even Mart���nez

de Irujo is believable and his wife, a madrile���a castiza. However, I still do not find theadjectives

appropriateto qualify the performance of Ms. Portman in her triple registry; and I am afraid that all the

flattery of the Castilian language is declared insufficient to do it justice. On the other hand, I do not doubt that

who will put the batteries from now on will be "" the photocopy "", his eternal imitator, Keira Knightley,

without being aware that the list It is already too high for posterity, there are valuable samples of

mastery, worthy of being studied in film schools. The interrogation to which In���s deis subjected

Bilbat���a; the conversations that the painter maintains with his muse, in which it is difficult to decipher whether the protagonist

is the deaf or his partner is silent; the translation that is made of concepts, effectively abstract, such as

Libert���, ���galit��� and Fraternit���; the popular revolts, the most absolute chaos. Above its immense

success, what is most surprising of this film is that a director of another nationality has perceived with such

clarity the Spanish essence , the mocking spirit of a people that continues calling "" the label "" to which many

historians consider who could have been a good monarch; and why not say it? to capture thattendency

ancestralof "" whores "", of those who continue to sell their services to the best client. Of course, in all cases, it

is gratifying that this historical episode has been told in the way it is done, making it

clear that this country was the object of an unprecedented plunder. Last work, Man On The Moon, we were told

about someone who made him laugh when he did not have a smile of his own. On this occasion, we are shown to

those who strive to appear normal when stability is non-existent, in a world that is falling apart,

at a stage in which public execution courtyards They sit next to the place where theare dancing

pasodobles. Demolishing, heartbreaking, moving, and with those eyes .. The Ghosts of Goya is another masterpiece

of Milos Forman.

" 1

" What a nice moral dilemma we have lost in favor of the fine casquer���a ... Seeing the posters that have made this film, I realize that the designers Their subjects

have much more imagination than the writers. By the way, in the sign of the guy with the chainsaw, as the

boot will call friends in the bar "" mu���ones "". Chico, do not take the chainsaw for the spikes !!! The

film is about three young people, two Americans and an island���s, who are on vacation in Central Europe, looking

of the earthly pleasures that life gives. Overall, they do not consider enough the tremendous women and

drugs they find in Amsterdam, who decide to go to Slovakia, trained by a strange guy with anose

sick, for women more beautiful than anyone else. a "" mounted "" jam���s. Overall, they march for that distant country (which

seems medieval rather than current) and stay in a "" Hostel "" (hence the name of the film , which is called

hostel or inn or youth hostel). And there, strange things begin to happen, like they are linked to some tremendous

women, for example. Well, this movie is a pretty big mess, which has been given a lot of publicity,

but it has four little things . The story could have been very interesting, especially if we look at the

moral dilemma from which this movie is born, you could let you kill for money? But as the director has focused on

the picadillo and the thick casquer���a, then we are left without debate. The characters deserve to die from the first

image in which they come out, although I have to admit that their general behavior is quite correct (with the

exception of the final absurdity). The picadillo scenes leave me cold, since I expected much more

disgust, and I have to admit that I was much more impressed by the birth of my baby. woman in terms of "" gore "" that the

simpler of special effects we have here. It saves you that good t���as come out, that ends up like we

like everybody, although the events that there are leave you thinking "" The director thinks we are

assholes? "" In short, well done picadillo , but picadillo without a good script that endorses it. If you like

gore, get on an internal medicine page before watching this movie. If you like terror, take an

oriental type "" The ring "" or something of the style "" Who can kill a child? "". If you want to give birth to a

movie, do not miss this one.

" 0

" An entertaining comedy and little else to see on a Sunday afternoon. Zoom tells the story of Jack Shepard, formerly known as Captain Zoom, Superhero who

lost his powers and that currently lives in oblivion. The arrival of a threat to Earth will cause the

government agency that deals with these issues to come to him to train a group of young people with powers

to combat this threat. Zoom is a family comedy, with all that implies, that is, loose andguide

predictable, jokes not out of tone, love story of by means and a typical outcome. The grace is

that the protagonists are young people with superpowers, a production loaded with special effects and a few

geeks. The movie also flies by as it lasts just over eighty minutes and its

prologue in the form of comic drawings explaining the history of which we started in the film is worth mentioning.

he stars in the film next to an aging Chevy Chase, who plays the role of doctor in charge of the project, a

rather funny and ridiculous role, but without a doubt the best role is that of Courteney Cox, in the skin of a scientist. �fica

lover of comics and the most geeky. Of the small group of the four children, the funniest is the little

girl with super strength and the one who caused most of the gags due to her power. Entertaining comedy

and little else to see a Sunday afternoon.

" 0

" My favorite. It is, for a server, the best bad movie in history. It has a something, a not-so-what, that

makes it very special. So friki is that a kind of greatness seems to emanate from it.

My preference. It is, for a server, the best bad movie in history. It has a something, a not-so-what, that

makes it very special. So friki is that a kind of greatness seems to emanate from her. I summarize the argument:

Doctor Malvedades travels to Torremolinos to resurrect a monster half octopus halfcalled

kingJoc���ntaro. Malvedades begins to hijack virgins for the ritual sacrifice that will resurrect the beast with the

help of some karate-like zombies but here he meets the opposition of some surfers cat��� licos

trained by the ghost of Maestro Miyagi, a spectrum played by Jess Franco. They will agree that

argument only occurs to a genius. Crazy genius, yes, but genius at the end of the day. It is the no more than the non plus

ultra of frikismo. Beyond K���rate a Muerte in Torremolinos is the unexplored.

" 0

" Great fantastic film that will delight all the followers of Shyamalan's cinema and

horrify its detractors. Their loss.

This time M. Night Shyamalan presents us with a story, a story with nymphs, fantastic animals, good and

bad. And he does it with a fidelity to his style that is worthy of praise. For a long time, the director hasus

been presentingwith impossible stories that we have seen before but narrated with a naturalness and

realism that has made them more believable than ever. He does not tell fantastical stories in a fantastic universe,

but tells fantastic stories perfectly embedded in our real world. His originality is not

in these stories but in the look that projects on them. In return he asks us only to believe and if

one is not able to accept his argument premises he should not go to see their films, in the same way that if you do

not accept that a man can fly you should not go to see "Superman Returns." As I say, the film is

Shyamalan in pure state and again the framing acquires a capital importance. But not only that, also what is

out of the box is chosen with great care. A typical detail of Shyamalan's cinema is to

show us a seemingly anodyne plane whose greatest mystery is just what we do not see on the screen. Nor is

the director, supported by a beautiful score by the usual James Newton Howard, missing his appointment with

emotion and there are a couple of scenes in which it is not difficult to drop a tear (om��� Yes, if you're an emotional pirate

like me. That yes, that emotionality is compensated with a humor that makes an appearance with more frequency than in

other occasions. Possibly this is a formula chosen to help make the fantastic tonemore digestible

of the tapebut it has made me wish to see what would unfold. Shyamalan in the most complicated of the

genres. It is not something that is usually mentioned but Shyamalan usually get brilliant interpretations of

his actors. It is true that Paul Giamatti has been dazzling everyone for a few years and does not need to prove

anything to anyone, but it is a joy to see him carry the weight of the film with a more complex character. expected

by the seen in the trailers. Both Bryce Dallas Howard, who has his eyes more than many other actors

with a thousand words, as the other side offer the best of themselves. Perhaps as negative points dir Quea

that there is some moment resolved with some precipitation and that in the background the script is something simple. In any case

it is not strange because we are, simply, before a story to read in bed (but ���qu��� well

told!). I count, by the way, not exempt from certain morals that surely would not like some but that I

find the most natural. I do not want to extend my comment too much (attention to the portrait that of the critics). Ethics

makes the film) so I'll summarize saying that I think it's a fantastic fantastic film that will delight

all the followers of Shyamalan's cinema and horrify ��� its detractors. Their loss.

" 1

" It is in the strongest points of the previous deliveries, where the tape does not resist the comparison with its

predecessors.

Again a sequel is released, again it is a third part of a successful franchise and again the

criticisms have been unanimously negative. With that background I went to the cinema to see it, thinking that I could not It would be

true that this year all (or almost) of the sequels released were so disappointing. Again I was wrong.

Can not it be said that "Shrek third?" Is bad because it would be a lie or an exaggeration. But

having two great movies behind him (�? �Shrek�? � and � ?? Shrek 2? � without looking

cool I think they are very good) one expects to maintain the quality in the gui�� ,N, grace and rhythm. But it is

precisely there, the strongest points of the previous deliveries, where the tape does not resist the comparison

with its predecessors. To put some examples, I will say that pretending that with a Couple of intimate scenes with

Arturo, Shrek discovers his paternal instinct is something ridiculous and, the bad thing is that it shows too much. In addition, by

dint of wanting to have two parallel actions (the adventures of Shrek and Fiona) both end up not having

enough entity to hook the viewer. I fear that this is due to an incomprehensibly littleworkmanship. Nor

(or bad)is the pace adequate to engage and, in fact, at times it is tiresome (the

beginning and everything that happens in the university city ). Despite this, it manages to go back a little flight and ends up

being entertaining (although by the hair). Maybe weighed in excess by that absence of rhythm and a

good gui���n, what more is thrown in missing in this delivery is the spark. That subversive grace that became famous and

that has created a certain school, has been totally lost and, although I do not think theyto me, I think it is

pay attentiontime to put the bolt on the series. And that is the repetition excessive of the elements that make aoriginal

work, ends up eliminating the originality and subversive capacity that gave it its value. A lesson that in

Hollywood they do not finish learning. Final evaluation of moonfleet.es: 5 out of 10

" 0

" Movie about the search for alcohol "" opens chochitos " "of three brainless American teenagers.

Very good start, very good final lyrics, a heavy result that leaves an aftertaste more than bitter.

I told my half-hearted clown that if he went to the movies to see "" Supersalidos "". He had a face like that to want to

send me to hell, but as if everything wanted to go out at once. Come on, a jam in the larynx, which when

untied was already on the way to the movies more than just Xuxa (who says the girl who is not with men because they do not use

the condom). And it is that to want to take a mother of family to a film where one of the first

words that they say is "" chocholechelandia "" is complicated. Very complicated. The film is about twofriends

pre-universitywho see how their high school life ends and they want to wet the churro before. They are not

exactly the student archetype of the football team player, but rather the prototypefollower

of On���no pajillero, as they prefer to say it. Even with those, the opportunity of her life falls from the sky, one of

the best girls of the "" insti "" who wants them to go to her party. And by the way, get alcohol. So

they have no choice but to resort to another friend, with more face of panoli even if it fits, that has a false

carn.No hab��� I read more than good critics of this film, it could well be for the bestial promotion,

but the thing looked good. And yes, the first hour was not bad, with millions ofwords,

vulgarextreme lumpiness, and even a moment for the history of cinema, which is when he takes out the notebook from the

drawings of phalluses. But from there, you get bored of having the "" dick "" in your ear, the "" cunt "" in your nose, and

the "" blowjob "" in your mouth, and you do not even know how to sit in the cinema. Luckily I had the whole room for me. And is

that a film of such long humor, it becomes desperate. Especially when this American teen humor is not

what it is that makes me more graceful. Luckily I could detoxify at home with one of Mariano Ozores, if not.

Resuming, movie about the search for alcohol "" opens chochitos "" of three brainlessteenagers

American. Very good start, very good final lyrics, a heavy result that leaves an aftertaste more than

bitter. I'm bored.

" 0

" Alatriste is a tedium, a medley of unconnected scenes and soulless characters. I only hope that the team will have

a good party during the shooting because I suppose that 24 millionhave been spent on that

euros will.

Last night we saw the highly anticipated, highly esteemed, very affectionate Alatriste de Agust���n D���az Yanes based on the work of

Arturo P���rez Reverte. The result? I could describe it as disappointment, although after having read everything I

have read these days, my dream to see the film had decreased markedly. But let's go in parts,

Alatriste narrates, no, it's not the right word, it shows, yes this is it, moments of the life of the captain Diego

Alatriste, a kind of soldier of fortune during the reign of Felipe IV and the condo de Olivares.

From thefirst frame of the film it can be seen that sta not going to be an adventure film

use, by the use of 1.85: 1 format instead of the usual for this style of production 2.35: 1. Come on, that in

its film projection the film does not fill the screen. D���az Yanes has said several times during the promotion

that this is not a movie of action but of characters. This phrase justifies the use of 1.85: 1, which

is more intimate and is used by directors like Spielberg (although not in his Indiana Jones saga) or

Shyamalan. The fanfare of Fox announces the beginning of the film, this is one of the good ones, that my

grandmother would say, I wish it were true. But no. Alatriste is not a film, it is a trailer, a greatest hits, a potpourri.

Narratively it is a null film, the scenes happen without connection, they do not flow, there is no cohesion, a

narrative. The film does not advance, it jumps. And the problem does not lie in having wanted to make the best of the five

books (other films have done something similar and do not suffer from this), but in not having written a script capable of

basting everything. Thus, the film is tremendously episodic, lacking in rhythm. This feeling does not help the

direction of D���az Yanes (also the author of the guide, by the way) who does not seem to shoot a film but filming

actors. Its realization is flat, there are no open planes, the average plane of the actors being omnipresent,

so that apart from the actors, little more is seen on the screen. Not one plane of gràa, just a couple of planes in

movement, the rest plane-contraplane, or even that. Really for an address like that, you do not have to spend 24

million euros, because, totally, no one is going to see them. An example, to illustrate to the reader, ofrealizations

similar, would be any telefilm of those that emit A3 at weekends and, even so, I dare say,

that most They are narrated with more imagination. Oh, but of course, this is a movie of characters, that's why

it's been filmed like that. Nothing to object except for the small detail that in this film there is hardly a character, the

rest are stereotypes when not simple sketches, or simply extras with phrase. Alatriste is a character, more

or less well defined, he is a man whose maximum is honor, and it is for many years, because the character does not

evolve in the whole movie. �cula, the rest are what they seem, that is to say: the child faithful to his master (Unax Ugalde), but

reckless, the faithful squire (Eduard Fern���ndez), the critical writer with the system (Juan Echanove), thewoman

calculatingbut with a good heart (Elena Anaya, in a character impossible to understand), etc. It is impossible to know

more about them than this and for that, it does not take two and a half hours either. The performances are not remarkable,

Viggo Mortessen has a great physical presence as Alatriste, but disappears at the moment he starts

talking, where he brings out an accent and a note from someone who is neither Spanish nor has this language as a mother

tongue (it's not for nothing, but ���the Americans would take, I know, Antonio Banderas to play Hamlet?).

Of the rest I will only highlight Eduard Fern���ndez, Juan Echanove (unrecognizable as Quevedo) and Javier C���mara

(surprising as the condeduque). Ariadna Gil, does not give the hit, his interpretation of El Perro del Hortelano

during a scene of the film is foreign shame for the anachronism that results. The technical sections are

correct, highlighting the costumes, the artistic direction, did not seem bad, but come on, you do not see much either,

so I could not say, although at least I know it conveys the decadence, the dirt of the time. The photograph

has very good moments (in particular a scene of Ariadna Gil and Mortessen, very beautiful), other regular and other

bad (the fight on the boat), besides it is not coherent and there are a couple of scenes that seem to be made by another

technical team. The music of Roque Ba���os is repetitive and lacking in strength, in addition he resorts to the

succided Spanish guitar. However, the sword fighting scenes are very well choreographed, and at least the

realization does not bother. However, the battle scenes are of foreign shame, luckily they are very

short. Special mention for the attack on the ship, which, as it has been filmed, does not disguise the

fact that it was shot on dry land at all. So awkward it becomes D���az Yanes.It's funny, the film as a

whole reminds me of Kenneth Branagh's Hamlet, not his full version but the Two-hour trailer that

premiered in Spain. Although it really only reminds me of that movie in the leaps of the narrative, in the

lack of fluency, because in all other aspects Branagh's film is far superior And that is also a

movie of characters, but shot in 70mm. We are closing, Alatriste is a tedium, a potpourri ofscenes

disconnectedand soulless characters. I only hope that the team will have a good party during the shooting

because I suppose that 24 million euros will have been spent on that.

" 0

" To see the singer on a movie screen, or television screen, will we buy a concert DVD? Of

course, it is the logical possibility. But, what if I want to see the man behind the singer?

Lou Reed is New York, New York, New York, whatever the proper name, you can tell Inever

'vebeen to New York, although I've heard Lou Reed. To see the singer on a movie screen, or

television screen, will we buy a concert DVD? Of course, it is the logical possibility. But, what if I want to

see the man behind the singer? In this universe of fiction and reality, appearance is confused

with disguise, by mistake, because an actor is the person of true, it is the liberated expression of the mask.

But, the talent to capture this brightness is not earned overnight. I think Wim Wenders dares to

undress the actor, or the singer in this particular case. On a Berlin street Lou Reed walked, dressed in

leather, as he would walk any day or night anyone. Unlike reality, he walks

led by a stage director. He stops in front of a man lying on the ground, a sunken person,

forgotten by all and by himself, Cassiel, the angel fallen from the sky of Berlin. "" Lev Go "", or "" ���nimo "", says the

singer to ���ngel. Perhaps the firmament that covers the German city is the whole of the European sky. It covers

all the history, the French, the Spanish, the Italian? It seems more and more absurd to differentiate the place? In

any metro station one can meet with Angels The film is called So Far So Close. And

each angle offers a different vision. He is waiting for an interpretation permanently. Why can not I be good

I'd like to look in the mirror With a feeling of pride Instead of seeing a reflection Of a failure to crime I do not

want to turn away To make sure I can not see I do not want to hold my ears When I think about me I can not be

good. Once again, the talent of the German director is enhanced by the presence of great soundtracks, for

example the "" why can not I be good "", "" why can�� �t I be good "" It's about taking a walk to a video library and

renting the movie. He already had his time in the cinema, everything has its time, as Daniella reflects, theangel

less human, and everything has its beginning and end. Exclusive qualities of reality, intended.

" 1

" A sublime masterpiece based on real events, halfway between the fiction and the documentary genre.

Almost three months ago a small great masterpiece came to us in the form of a Chinese drama: The Wedding of

Yours. Flaming winner of the Golden Bear at the 57th edition of the Berlin Festival, she reels off the hardships of an

average family in the huge and arid Mongolian steppe of northern China. Preceded by her �� International success, this

film that otherwise would be a minority, seems to have reaped great success in theaters, with full after

three months on the bill. No wonder, since Tuya, embodied by the actress Nan Yu, whose last work

we will see will be Speed ​​Racer, by the Wachowski brothers, and that has won international awards since 2001,

really It moves. A sincere woman who is overwhelmed by circumstances, who has to take care of her

family, especially her husband who was left uninvolved in an accident, receives the news that if she continues to

shepherd her flock. And carrying weight can end up as inviolate as he is. It is at that moment when he must make

the most difficult decision of his life: to divorce his husband and find another man willing to carry his

family and keep them all. This point of alien rotation to our society, the investment of the values ​​of

Maslow's pyramid, accepted so easily (it is the husband and his wife who encourages her to look for

someone else) one of the many elements that make the tape so appealing and attractive. It's about telling a life and

a situation without artifice, without drama, with that resignation and acceptance of those who know that if they do not

find another husband, or they do not continue digging the well until they find water, will die irremediably. And still, go

ahead without spilling a tear. A plot and a film that resembles the films of Zhang Yimou before

he fell into the megalomania of his last productions, more in the l�� Line of, for example, Not one less, or The

long way home. Tuya's wedding has a classic scheme of five acts and a simple and effective performance,

with a c��� It is more a witness than the omniscient observer to whom thehas accustomed us

current cinematographic panorama. Wang QuanAn manages to transmit to us the desolation of the enormous landscapes and to treat at

the same time such delicate subjects as the polyandry or a kind of marriage prostitution for the survival, and

that far from the American Happy Ending, and each time more European, reminds us that reality always surpasses

fiction, and that after the partridges they ate, life goes on, and it does not always have to be for the best (as

masterfully William Goldman narrates in his novel The Promised Princess). A careful setting and some

really close characters, many of whom are interpreted by true survivors of thesteppe

Mongolian, which brings realism, seasoned with a precious soundtrack, of those that are so much added

lately in the cinema, that not only do they not interfere, but enrich the whole, they confirm the synergy to

create a film that nobody should get lost, a sublime masterpiece based on real events, halfway

between the fiction and the documentary genre.

" 1

" Písima, a suspense film that starts well and finishes painfully. What could be the way they have lately in the movies, to decorate the movie? With music the louder and

heavier the better, this film, which drinks from a thousand similar films, 3rd work in the direction of Screenwriter David S.

Goyer, is one of those films, that sheltered in twilight terror, mystery and with a small dose of

drama, it looks more like a television telefilm than a "more or less serious" film. " ���ad���mosle that the tape takes to

start, trying to be transcendental without getting it, and trying even to plagiarize the box office and

Oscar "" Ghost "" without reaching this, or the sole of the shoes. In the interpretive plot we have

Marcia Gay Hayden (the only known one of a more than unknown cast), who every day is older and

spoiled a, well, the years do not go well for his already wrinkled face. The argument goes crooked until it reaches the

supine stupidity, and one ends, the hour and peak of footage, writhing in the armchair and waiting for the

credit titles. And look that I could have seen any other movie and I opted for it, send

eggs.

" 0

" It is not a film by Jack Black, but by Jared Hess, written and directed, so that his humor borders on

absolute idiocy, and may fall into disfavor in the Spanish public .

If I already said it, nothing good comes out of the hybrid Jack Black-Jared Hess. I do not want to apologize for

alcoholism, but a couple of drinks, two or three compadres and a lot of desire to joke are necessary to

endure the film from beginning to end. The director of the invention is also one of " "Napoleon Dynamite" ", and found

an unexpected boom after becoming the cult film for the" "losers" "nickname that have the

losers frikis typical of American high school film . That does not mean that it was good, and the bad thing is that Hess believed

it, giving him carte blanche for this product that is now presented "" Nacho Libre "", titled in anway

incomprehensibleas "" Super Nacho "", maybe looking for the morbid thematic superh���rose, which islacking

totally, and leads to a severe deception to the viewer. A simple summary : enter the cinema with a blank mind,

otherwise you will hate it. In a folio and a half the script fits, and the first 20 minutes contain at most 6sentences

complete, all the rest are grimaces and poses of the un-d���a-called comedy king , Jack Black, taking away that

verbiage that made him so well known. His throne wobbles in favor of Will Ferrel, who also debuts film this

weekend in Spain. I would like to know why the public decays. As we go, Ignacio (Jack Black) is

a Mexican village monk who performs the role of cook in an orphanage. His dream, however, is to be a

Mexican wrestling star, the one they put on Galavisi���n on Sunday afternoons, and that more than fighting

was an aut�� Classic circus With the help of a real shot, (Hector Jim���nez) will form the duo Nacho-Esqueleto,

catching sticks everywhere, but very well paid. While trying to impress the cajona nun

(Ana de la Reguera) of the orphanage, fight to get to the fight with the greatest superstar of the fight and

get money for the orphans. argument, simpl���nam���s can not, and that effortlessly fills the

entire footage of the tape. The best moments are given by the magnificent Hector Jim���nez, who only has teeth and

eyes, hence the successful nickname of Skeleton. They vollean it up and down, without Black's belly

can do much to save it. Atypical comedy can not, to see without complexes or pretensions. Do not

expect to laugh constantly, which is not one of those. If you do not cojeis at the beginning the grace, you will not do it in

all the film, and you will seem long like no. It is not at all the kind of comedy that Jack Black has done

throughout these years, and I stress, it is not a film by Jack Black, but by Jared Hess, written and directed,

so that his humor borders on absolute idiocy, and can fall into disgrace in the Spanish public. The pity is thatis lost

something fundamental: Black's efforts to speak in English-Mexican, which it is the only really funny thing about

the film. The dubbing will turn it into meat of "" manito "", "" andele "" and other mustache colecet. A

note: my wife fell into a deep sleep after 10 minutes of environmental musiquita psicod���lica-mexican, with

Black circulating on a motorcycle. I followed it to the end in an incomprehensible way for her. This is the

movie: you see how a stone goes to your head, but you do not take it off.

" 0

" A film about feelings that the only thing that made me feel was a considerable drowsiness. Have you ever thought about being unfaithful to your partner? Have you been playing at being someone's almost lover?

Did he finally decide not to do anything? Well, if you are married and have children, apart from being a complete, you

assholecould be the protagonist of the latest film by director Cesc Gay. Playing as Isabel Coixet and trying

To make a good film about deep feelings, the Catalan director has concluded a mediocre booklet

about the romance of some posh people who dedicate themselves to the world of Art, he directs film She films and she plays the violin. The

film tries to show how the feelings that we do not convey, those that we frustratedly keep

for ourselves, have the same importance as those that we expose to others. The problem is

when those feelings emanate from characters who, besides not being very clear about what they want in this life,

border on selfishness. As a result of this interpretation, the viewer may feel rejected by whatfeel.

the protagonistsMuch richer and more interesting is the intense relationship of friendship that we can observe in the

characters played by Javier. C���mara and Carme Pla and of which the director barely shows us some

remnants. Aside from the scant importance that the supposedly beautiful relationship of love gave me, the rest of the film's

components They also did not help me digest it. Slow, too slow (only the character of Santi

lightens some scenes), a little worked guide (when one falls in love with someone I understand that theflow

communicativebetween both is of vital importance and I say �logos that keeps the couple remember a little to the

"" m���tica "" series Upon leaving class) and, as a final finale, a desperate and unnecessary bite (that more than love

that seemed Ela Big Brother's Jacuzzi). In short, a film about feelings that the only thing thatme

madefeel was a considerable drowsiness.

" 0

" After the direct allusion to films such as Punto L���mite Cero, La Indecente Mary or Larry el Loco,memory

cin���fila'sdrags us towards titles of cult like Christine or The Devil on Wheels.

The excessive passion shown by the director of Tennessee, his proven cin���fila militancy and his

vast cinematographic culture, which ranges from series A to Z, transform a slasher of the seventies in

the attractive plot that will fascinate filmmakers like Carpenter or Spielberg. Death Proof is the contribution of

Quentin Tarantino to the Grindhouse project and a tribute to his own filmography. Ione of the

suppose thatdirect consequences of having premiered the two films that make up Grindhouse separately, and to

market these as "" normal products "" has been the avalanche of protests voiced by the viewers

about the "" bad quality "" of Planet Terror; which, surely, has led to the appearance of a funny ""note

company"" in some cinemas, according to which, "" the flaws that Death Proof shows are intentional "". It

would have been easier to explain, from the beginning, that both are part of a tribute to the low

budget films that, in the seventies, they swarmed through the American projection rooms. Once themade

warning is, it is important to know that the multiple technical deficiencies that accompany these productions, (Death

Proof and Planet Terror), do not detract from the final result of the same. The sound losses, the

striped frames, the intervals offered in black and white and the disastrous editing, are just a mere

anecdotal fact, and another of the many genius that characterize to two stories, in many aspects,

perfect. To seriously analyze Death Proof, it must bein mind that approaching Quentinfilmography

borneTarantino'sis not an easy task. Going into it, involves brotherly, irremediably, the difficulty with the

most absolute respect. Above his predisposition for the B series, his homage to thefilms

cheap karateka, his tendency to create apparently absurd situations and his obstinacy Porn for

drawing characters, on many occasions, unreal; There is a singular cinematographic wisdom, which

embraces all genres, and culminates in an unmistakable style, impossible to find in contemporary cinema. His

original way of directing, the inclusion of unstructured scripts, Scorsese's legacy; the recreation of

Kurosawa's impeccable stagings, and the obsession with details, make him a

risky filmmaker, with courage at the limit, only comparable to the one that always showed the same Welles. There is

no doubt that Tarantino is one of the few Great that remain. The bad thing about "" the Great "" is that, sometimes, they

allow themselves the license to spend a joke on the moviegoers and give them one of the those stories that can onlyviewed

bewith benevolence knowing the previous work of their directors. Remember that even Huston

took advantage of a Mediterranean vacation to give the SÃptimo Arte an unspeakable parody of El HalcÃ���n

MaltÃ¯s titled La Burla del Diablo ; and that this, just before releasing Los Bastardos sin Gloria, seemed like

the right moment not to shoot in earnest. Fortunately, that is not the case with Death Proof and, once again,

Tarantino once again shows his courage, to surprise, to revolutionize the tedious cinematographic panorama. It

begins as a typical film of bloody crimes, a slasher of the seventies, soon becomes the

attractive plot that will fascinate directors like Carpenter or Spielberg. After the direct allusion to films such

as Punto L���mite Cero, La Indecente Mary or Larry el Loco, cin���fila memory drags us towardstitles such

cultas Christine or The Devil on Wheels. If the "" Tarantino touch "" is applied to it, the success is

assured. The masterful definition of characters, some of them, drawn with only two strokes; thedialogues

endless, which only in the best classic stories manage to capture the attention of the spectator; the

profusion of details, which find their irreplaceable place in the resolution of the outcome; the continuous

gui���os to the lovers of the cinema, and to the Spanish spectators (recover the posters of films carried out

by Charo L���pez); Explicit references taken from Pulp Fiction, Jackie Brown and Kill Bill,

make Death Proof one of the best movies of the year. To remember, the filmmaker's commitment to

massages in the feet, the delight produced by the mobile phones, the incitement to read, the yellow

chill���n, the women in arms to take and the playback. For the glory of cinema, the filming of one of the best

car chases in its history. For his followers, the tireless search of volume two.

" 1

" Far from narrative "" Flags from our parents "" is a pure and hard reflection, and, if they want it with a

colloquial term, a brick.

The question was posed once by a friend in this way: if all the Madrid players were hired by

Barcelona, ​​what would you have to do? Would you change your team and do Barcelona? The answer is that the

players are not the team ���No? A photographer took six guys in his photo. Then, when the picture became a

cover, the whole country wanted to entertain the heroes. It was discovered that those who came out in the photo were not the ones who

put the flag, they were the ones who changed the flag the following day. Does that matter? Eastwood says a

damn. It's Kubrick's paradox in reverse. In "" Paths of Glory "", a battalion refuses to advance on the

Hill of the Ants and instead of shooting everyone, a war council is drawn to five drawn randomly. Is it

fair that these five unfortunates pay? Eastwood has become famous as a good storyteller with his latest films. But

someone has to say that he has made a stop along the way. Far from narrative "" Flags from our parents ""

is a pure and hard reflection, and, if they want it with a colloquial term, a brick. In "" Million dollar baby ""

there was plenty of reflection from Morgan Freeman who judged the protagonist with his voice-over; in "" Flags of our

parents "" there is more reflection and less history still. In fact, I am not even convinced by the reflection. He goes on to say

that what is heroic is not the photo or the list of the soldiers that really hoisted the flag: the heroic is the

real story of what happened. I believe that the heroic is nothing that this film tells, unless

"" heroic "" has suddenly become a synonym of "" media "".

" 0

" Misfortune sometimes hides under beautiful faces, blond hair in the wind and eyes of infinite blue.

Misfortune lives sometimes in large houses extensive gardens, where the blanket of autumn leaves hides the

lawn. The misfortune is sometimes a gleaming apple with a worm lurking inside.

Living among the intense scent of talent does not guarantee that art will sprout from your hands, eyes and mouth. The

fragrance of art is capricious, it dances through the air, it perches on a few people, it does not pass from parents to children.

But there are times that by surprise that intense perfume, which transforms the mind of the one he touches, traces a

small journey and just in a few meters, as an inheritance, fixes his destiny. Sof���a Coppola was impregnated and

the Virgins Suicide was her first demonstration of her intense and fragrant perfume of talent. Perhaps his first

success was to bring to the movies the great novel by Jeffrey Eugenides and to convey to the screen the melancholy

of the sunset that inhabits his pages. Misfortune sometimes hides under beautiful faces, blond hair in the

wind and eyes of infinite blue. Misfortune sometimes inhabits large houses with extensive gardens, where the

mantle of autumn leaves hides the lawn. The misfortune is sometimes a gleaming apple with a worm

lurking inside. As I watched the film I wished and did not want to be a neighbor of the Lisbon. I wished that Lux (Kirsten

Dunst) would make me hammer the heart by fixing her eyes on me, showing me hatred and eternal love. I wanted to be

invited to the unique and last party that took place at the Lisbon's house and dance by turning a sister,

her golden hair, her white dress. I approached with a shaky step and knocked on the door of hisoffice

father's(James Woods) and made an appointment with his daughter, as if asking for a piece of heaven. And challenge the powerful

look of the mother (Kathleen Turner) with the intrepidity that only a fifteen-year-old lover has. And, at the same time, I

wanted to escape the spell of those five girls, forget them, send them away. Because I knew that I ran the

risk of how those boys, neighbors of the Lisbon, of awakening me years later with my throat dry, my

heart pounding and my full mind of those already unreachable infinite blue eyes. There are beautiful dead elms

inside.

" 1

" With moments that would embarrass the very same Johnny Knoxville, Borat is a fucking as necessary movie.

A hooligan offense.

The personage of the year is Borat Sagdiyev, an enter���able Kazakh reporter who goes to EEU and U to discover the

american way of life and to apply it in his pa���s / village. Filmed almost entirely with documentary style, Borat brings to

light the (infinite) misery of the pe quea that surrounds him, (In Kazajist���ny and in EEU and U), to put the finger in a wound

while provoking terrible fits of laughter in the spectator, who is descojona by the unlimited ability of

Cohen to provoke and because he knows that people are (we are) like that, a fucking shit (as I already commented at the time

after seeing Dogville) With moments that would embarrass the very same Johnny Knoxville, Borat is a bitch as

necessary. A hooligan offense. A 8.PD: Absolute fillings in rooms you "" cool "", of those who continue to

project The faithful gardener or Munich, takes pelotazo.

" 1

" It does not get enough packaging to entertain us for just an hour. The plot is bland and

predictable.

A confusing and long story based on a classic console games sneaks onto the billboard. Only the

young people will be able to prevent it from sinking into the depths of oblivion, having made real merits for

it. Let the experts in videogames forgive me when comparing Silent Hill with Alone in the dark, although it is recorded

in the record that I only refer to the cinematographic adaptations. As a basic note, it should be mentioned that

the film starring Christian Slater and Stephen Dorff is rated one of the 50 worst films

in history. Already in his day we baited enough with her, so we will highlight some niceties of Silent

Hill. Part of the synopsis of the original product but the director (responsible for Crying Freeman and The Pact of

the Wolves) stretches situations, causing chastity. In the different installments of the game, characters of

diverse origin end up in the heart of a cursed district. The script, written by one of the people in charge

of Pulp Fiction, drinks from the same argument until it has been led back by the repetition of an insipid andplot

predictablesince about 40 minutes. It's hard to imagine the huge budget invested in the film,

necessary to recreate an abandoned city and combine real sequences with all kinds of special effects and

computer designs. Perhaps it is a disbursement to recover in the long term, since its responsible do not discard

the idea of ​​starting with this failed title a saga. Despite reminiscences of horror movies based on

legends, including witches, Silent Hill does not manage to have enough packaging to entertain us

for just an hour. The problem is that there is more wrapping in the form of disturbing atmosphere than

content, something that is not allowed in an action movie that lasts 127 minutes. Video games and movies form a

marriage as well matched as the c���mic and the big screen, although the second couple disappoints less. Of

the children of the first, which have been many (Tomb Raider, Doom, House of Dead, Resident Evil), Ithe

prefermost outstanding: Final Fantasy with Dr. Aki Ross, who gave birth to an excellent actress cybernetics

" 0

" Film about scammers who are involved in an international espionage plot. It is not

too recommendable, given that it is quite loose and humor is far from us. Only the pair ofactors

maingives it a point of interest.

Meeting of anonymous moviegoers, 9 in the morning. "Good morning, my name is Tito Chinchan and I recognize that. I like

Gracita Morales. "" The voice of this woman makes me a lot of grace, in addition it reminds me of my wife, who imitates

her perfectly and laughed twice as much. . The trouble is that I had never seen a whole movie of hers, and I certainly

end up dizzy. Although everything is allowed to the woman who said "" seooooorito "" with that rintint���n never

matched. The film is about a black man who has a microalga and kill him nothing more. You start the movie. Another

black takes the witness until she meets a couple of scammers with medium hair (Jos��� Sazatornil and

Gracita Morales). From that moment, we have a comedy of persecutions and shots with hundreds of girls in

b���-k���-n��� (which the great Saza would say) in the agon���a of the Franco regime . Smacks of moral relaxation by the four

costados.Tengo to sin so used to seeing these gems of films on Sunday morning alreadyup

accommodatesto see them with one hand under the cloth. Pity that in this the caudillo's censors still

did not allow the joy of the felpudiana of years later. The story is pretty bad, with an overacting Saza and

a Gracita without a cap that saves the footage from the wreck. It becomes quite heavy, despite being very short,

although it has nice moments. I'm just left with the idiot phrase "" your kisses must know chocolate "" of an

actor of great resemblance to Mart���nez el Facha while trying to kiss the exotic actress. Well, and when he

explains that he does not do drugs. Resuming, film about some scammers who are involved in a plot of

international espionage. It is not too recommendable, given that it is quite loose and the humorous points

are far away. Only the pair of main actors gives it a point of interest. It would be better to have called it

"" Operation B���-k���-n��� "". Kisses.

" 0

" Fascinating high-altitude film exercise that, without becoming the Masterpiece that many critics (

see the introito of the review) believe they see, becomes the best Summer film: unappealably.

1 The work of the critic is simple in more than one sense. We risk very little, and yet we enjoy

a position above those who submit their work and their person to our judgment. We thrive thanks

to our negative criticisms, which are fun when they are written and when they are read.2 But the stark

truth that critics must face is that, in general terms, the production of ���n average garbage is more

valuable than what our articles aim to point out. However, sometimes the critic really risks

something, and that happens in the name and in defense of something new.3 Last night he experienced something new, anmeal

extraordinarymade by someone unique and unexpected. To say that this dish and its cook put myto the test

preconceptionswould be tantamount to a gross underestimation, when the truth is that both managed to

move the deepest of my being.4 Before this event , I never hid my disdain for Chef Gusteau's motto:

"" anyone can cook "". But, I realize, just now I understand your words. Notcan

everyonebecome a great artist, but a great artist can come from anywhere. Anton Ego, the gastronomic

critic, for all that, even if only to see this character, you have to go to the cinema and enjoy for two

hours an exceptional animated banquet, a shamelessly commercial contraption, written and designed to

entice the children and youth audience, but covered with a page of honesty unquestionable adult It is not

enough that the animation techniques are amazing. Nor that the action cup a good part of the footage. There are

times when this reliable and predictable arsenal of cinematic benefits does not guarantee afilm

round(Cars, for that matter), but Ratatouille is a fascinating high-level cinema exercise that, without

becoming the Masterpiece that many critics (see the introito of the review) believe they see, it becomes

the best movie of summer, a time of weak favors to intelligent entertainment and habitually nourished by

pastries without possible defense (Next) or classical (by repetitive) artifacts of great acceptance and

less aesthetic integrity (The Fantastic 4, Harry Potter, The Jungle. ) All that sweetness lightness that is

attributed a priori to the films orchestrated for the benefit of the childish rite exists in Ratatoille.

She has the outstanding ability to marry in a harmonious and almost imperceptible way (and this is another point in her

favor), the universally accepted cartoon brush and the subliminal line of pale text, Well built and,

above all, didactic. It is the film that Frank Capra would have done if he had enjoyed these times oftechnique

impeccable. And James Stewart would have been thrilled in the chair. (Now the song of UB-40 takes on ameaning

new.

" 1

" Mediocrity, shortage of British ideas and ridicule, three in one for a decadent cinema that continues to imitate

all the bad things of its American masters .

I have always defended European cinema against the US for several reasons first, and most weightHollywood;.

is that I sincerely believe that is much deeper and full of ideas than and second, because

recognize I am one of those who are proud of their roots and I firmly believe that the fact of being the

most civilized continent should be noted in all cultural manifestations. Unfortunately, on many occasions

I find myself with films that have been built without any basis, resorting to the topics that are

rotting the American cinema and that they only seek, legitimately, that s ���, the box office and theviewer

carefreewho does not look beyond A couple of hours of vacuous entertainment. This is the case of ���lex Raider, an

absurd pseudo-child story of spies, with little argument, absurd and unfair gui���os to cheap comedy and

without me. The pretension is to parody the classic British stories of spies and action. Honestly, I do not think that

a film can be conceived more than a simple mockery of the novels of Fleming, Fortsyth or Le Carr���.

It is clear, especially at the beginning, the parallelism with James Bond, especially in the car scene.

Testimonial the appearance of Ewan Mc Gregor and repellent and hateful am not the disgusting can not protagonist

Alex Pettyfer. Poverty, mediocrity and vulgarity. Three in one for this casta���a pilonga that has crossed the English

Channel to bore even the stones.

" 0

" Perfect example of failed and unnecessary sequel. Those who enjoyed and laughed with the

first Manuale D'Amore, the best recommendation we can make is to stay as far away as

possible from its sequel.

In this life in which originality and innovation in the arts seem sinful, more and more people tend to

look for the simplest paths, going to the theoretically safe . In the cinema, that is transformed into remakes,

new versions or adaptations, and an endless list of sequels, prequels, spin-off. etc. The

producers, in their search for greater benefits with the least possible risk, try to continue to

exploit the goose that lays the golden eggs, but, what will happen when not of more of it? Manuale D'Amore has been

one of the coolest and most original comedies that have been made in recent years, I do not know anymore. It was in Italy or

Europe, and that made it a public success. Its greater virtue was that it recovered the spirit of the

Italian comedies of classic episodes, with four chapters that analyzed that mystery called love. Less

than two years later, Giovanni Veronesi offers us four new episodes, with no apparent relation to each other, except for

the connection of a radio program. In all honesty, Manuale D'Amore 2 is a perfect example of asequel

failed and totally unnecessary. This continuation lacks the grace and originality of its predecessor, and its

different episodes become empty and boring to a point that borders on boredom. The humor is scarce in the

tape, and the little that there is not of the elegance and finesse of the original, but that is crude, crossing the line of the

bad taste in several occasions. Veronesi makes a serious mistake, and is repeatedly leaving the comedy

aside and try to tell the story from a point of view closer to the drama tear than to anything else.

This glaring failure is noted in the first episode, but especially in the third, the most unfortunate of

all said by the way. Only the actors put some light in the abyss that is Manuale D'Amore 2, among which

Carlo Verdone stands out, not in vain considered by many as the heir of the great Alberto Sordi. Those who

enjoyed and laughed with the first Manuale D'Amore, the best recommendation we can make is

to stay as far away as possible from its sequel. This continuation is a comedy without grace, coarse and

boring, so we strongly recommend that you save the entrance, and enjoy the pleasant taste of mouth that

left the original.

" 0

" The Search: The Secret Diary is an entertaining film of unpretentious adventures whenever the

viewer decides to take it as a joke, because judged seriously, it has so many inconsistencies and barbarities that

there will be no Pora where to take it.

When we talk about an adventurer, a treasure hunter, we all remember the figure of a

man with a hat and a hat. Faced with that idea, we are now a Nicolas Cage who always seems to go

with a brush, and who is capable of anything without his studied tup��� loses consistency. Ben Gates returns,

and for all those to whom this name do not tell them anything, it is the main character of La Bsqueda

(luckily in Disney Spain they are aware that the title of National Treasure of the first part here will not

be I liked nothing). On this occasion our hero begins a crusade to return the good name to his family,

recover his girl, show how bad the character of Ed Harris is, all without getting upset or losing

that air so allegedly juvenile. The best thing to do when going to see The Search is with the mentality

of taking it for fun, in order to spend a fun time, rather than the film in Yes, for the amount of

barbarities he commits. Only the brief appearances of the character of Helen Mirren give the film moments of

real humor, more than all the antics of a Nicolas Cage screwed (regrettable discussion). with

Diane Kruger at Buckingham Palace). The most annoying thing about the film (aside from its riddled script

and bravado) is the patriotic exaltation it makes of values, history and American spirit, with

some esperp���ntic and surreal moments. It is already known that anyone with two fingers of forehead and a vase in

his hands can walk through the office of the Queen of England like Pedro for his house.The Search: TheDiary

Secretis an entertaining film of unpretentious adventures whenever the viewer decides to take it as a

joke, because judged seriously, has so many inconsistencies and barbarities that there would be no where to take it.

" 0

" Impressive film about Le���nidas, a Spartan king who stopped the advance of thousands and thousands of

Persians with only 300 soldiers. A masterpiece of ambientaci���ny and action, with so much action and struggle thattiring

ends up.

"" 300 "" is an adaptation of Frank Miller's comic of the same name, this is known to everyone. What not everyone

knows that this story was already shown in the cinema, at least once. The film in question is

called "" The 300 spartans "" which was translated into Spanish as "" The legend of Sparta "", and is the same as the 300 with

the proviso that it was made 45 years before. Although basically the films have the same development,

basically they are quite contrary. The original was based more on facts and politics, while the

latter is more recreated in the setting and in the fight scenes (which in the original gave a pelin of

laughter). It has generated a great controversy by declarations like the one of the Iranian governors, who consider it

a blasphemy. On the other hand, there have been voices that have drawn parallels with the current situations that

are experienced in the world. Personally I think both are absurd, this is a simple action movie

, which could well be developed instead of between Spartans and Persians, between Gamesianos and Venusians, given

that nobody can believe what happens in the movie. No one in his right mind, of course. By the way, the ending is very

Braveheart. The film is about Le���nidas, a Spartan king, who led his personal guard consisting of 300

men to face the troops of the Persian King Xerxes. Since they were in obscene inferiority, he

thought that the only place they could stop them would be in the Straits of the Thermopilas. On the other hand,

Sparta is torn between going to war accompanying his king or continue with a celebration of his own. In two

words "" impresante "" is the best way to define this movie. ��cula. From my humble point of view, the

best film set in history, getting us to feel inside a comic. The choice of

colors and above all the textures in hallucinatory. The fight scenes, as it could not be otherwise, are

creepy, surpassing all their predecessors (even the orcs and the lightsabers). These aspects are

brutal. On the negative level, the film was long. Even the first 300,000 Persian victims were good,

but from the dead I began to be a heavy burden. My half courgette got tired of

swords. By the way, you can not criticize the script of a movie that has as poster a muscular

Spartan with the spear in his hand on hundreds of enemies killed, since you already have to know what you're goingResumiendo

to find., awesome film about Le���nidas, a Spartan king who stopped the advance of

thousands and thousands of Persians with only 300 soldiers. A masterpiece of ambience and action, with so much

action and struggle that ends up getting tired.Besitos.PD: Of course, as soon as it comes out on DVD I buy it from my head, and

better if it is the extended and leave a thousand thousand more Persians dying for the cause. PD2: Almost better to be born only

Greek than Spartan, is not it? Mother more than a worse childhood. PS3: I forgot to comment on the

Spartan bodies, little mummy, it seemed like a parade of the gay pride parade.

" 1

" Attractive, witty, and surprisingly entertaining and fun; an excellent and ingenious portrait and at the same

time parody of the police cinema, far superior to the average of parodies that proliferate so much today and that

simply stay in a love and I can not.

Fatal weapon (Hot Fuzz): it is necessary to see, that pleasant surprise took me with Fatal Weapon. It's been a while since I've been laughing

so much and so at ease with a movie with these characteristics. Hilarious - from beginning to end - English parody of

intelligent humor full of references to the cinema of action and terror. He pays tribute and at the same time he laughs at them and

at themselves. What a difference with other parodies of the type Epic movie, Date movie, or Scary movie 4. While

they made you vomit and twist in the seat (thank goodness they do not spend more than 85 minutes), Fatal weapon is

glad to see it. I had read good things about her, but I did not expect to see the crazy and hilarious comedy that

was going to result. After the super smash that Edgar Wright had with his particular parody about themovies

zombiein Zombies Party, we now have the turn to parody the most American cinema (that iron��� because the

production and direction is English) with the typical police cinema full of explosions and pyrotechnic effects so

characteristic and hollywoodienses of this type of tapes. All the minutes of Fatal Weapon, distill English humor

on all four sides, both in the exposed situations, as in the archetype of the created characters,

all perfectly defined and interpreted. Accompanied to the script by the actor protagonist of this story,

Simon Pegg, both manage to form a perfect couple at the time of writing the amount of gags and jokes that

abound in Fatal Weapon, and that will elevate Eln the name of gamberrada at unsuspected levels. The film revolves

around an English superpolice that is moved to a seemingly peaceful London town. But much more

far from reality, the small town will become a box of surprises, with all kinds of neighbors and situations

of the most hilarious and eccentric. The director and scriptwriter, echoes all the topics and clichés of the

action genre to perpetrate one of the biggest pranks of 2007. Not only we will find the most English humor

, but there is also room for absurd humor (more common in the cinema of thecouple

Abrahams-Zucker) , jokes, gags, surreal situations, and parodies of other action tapes like They call him

Bodhi or Bad boys II. Apart from being a mixture of action and comedy, especially comedy, we have a good part

of horror film parody, Scream type and I know what you did. So we will see the thousand times seenassassin

maskedthat is annihilating the "" poor "" people of the town. And here is where the director aims a bit

; as we could already enjoy in Zombies party, Edgar Wright shows us the blood and gore scenes

as they should be; very explicit. In this way, lovers of the genre, among which I am without doubt,

we will see our concerns resolved with the murders that are taking place. Thus, we will have

our good dose of casquer���ay blood thanks to axes, dismemberment, stabbing andcrushing

various; all seasoned with a good chemical base. As for the script, full of eccentricities of

course, it does not make any water at any time, maintaining the expectation in the spectator despite the two hours of

footage that the film has. This is due in large part to the frenetic editing of the tape, remembering

at times (in English and frenzy) the works of the always controversial Guy Ritchie. On the other hand, everything

bad lies with those responsible for its distribution in Spain and the director of dubbing. In the first place, the

title in Spanish is hackneyed and a thousand times seen, HORROROUS. If the marketing manager wants to attract the

public with that title, he's ready. And then there is the painful dubbing that accompanies the work. If you have the opportunity

to see it in VO, do not hesitate. In short, attractive, witty, and surprisingly entertaining and fun;

an excellent and ingenious portrait and at the same time parody of the police cinema, far superior to the average of parodies that

proliferate so much today and that simply stay in a love and I can not. With a very equitable humor,

from some easy jokes to the most intelligent, biting and satirical humor they meet in Fatal Weapon; a

film that leaves us an excellent taste in the mouth. It seems that the tandem formed by Wright and Pegg is still

working.

" 1

" Semi-pornographic film about the life of the Roman Emperor Cal���gula, who devoted all his efforts to

vice leaving politics and sanity aside . To tune the zambomba without more.

Rivers of juice of life have been spilled during the thousands of viewings of this film, rivers that reach the

sea ​​of ​​life from which the Mediterranean was born. If when the god of mythology was cut

off, something happened like that, why can not this be true? Grumosidades aside, in the memory of my adolescent mind, the

pool full of "" little fishes "" that make my feverish imagination fly faster. Al lio. The film is about Cal���gula,

a Roman emperor who, seeing what he loved to be, killed his predecessor as well as unintentionally. Once on the

throne, he devotes himself to vice and perversion, winning thousands of enemies and the people who adore him. At the stroke of the

cipote, the movie goes by, but it does not have anything, but since people in balls come out in every scene, it becomes

very animated. Penthouse was the one who put the dough to make this semi pornographic film ���fica, that without having neither

feet nor head wins the favor of criticism (at least mine). The vice and the perversion of this gentleman,

that nothing else to start gives a little stick to his sister who is to dip bread and churro, makes us dream with other

times where the orgies were the bread of each day. My mother, Roman emperor, all day give him that I hit you. Look

Julio Cesar, who killed him until his son and without being all day pushing like a lion. Much more clever this

Cal���gula. By the way, what a crazy face this guy has. Resuming, semi pornographic film about the life

of the Roman Emperor Cal���gula, who devoted all his efforts to vice leaving aside the Politics and sanity

of passage. To tune the zambomba without more. Caligula, with your brown leather bag and your cushioned shoes

. (The first version of Serrat was this) Kisses.

" 1

" Woody Allen dismantles the intimate mechanisms of artistic creation. Masterpiece, deep reflection on

the fringes of art and the divinity of the artist ....

With Bullets on Broadway, Woody Allen is unpacked of sentimental loads (Mia Farrow dressed in a toga and

mallet) and joins new and joyfully to what he likes most and in what, with the most brilliant flashes,

his cinematic talent shines: comedy. This flows casually and nonchalantly through the

usual twists and turns of the genre, but Allen, in love with the roaring twenties, of his syncopated music and his ravenous

choreography of gross and unscrupulous mobsters and heaping loggerhead damitas beading, negotiates with the

viewer a subtle deal: I'll give a comedy to throwfew laughs, but t let me view

s intellectual strip about the whims of artistic creation. This is, in the end, what worries the

New York director, who recruits a spectacular cast (Cusack, Wiest and Palminteri, stellarly all) who

represent with astonishing naturalness a group of actors in the Broadway of those agitated 20, violated by the

cazurra interference of some gngsters more worried about some lines in a script than of a charger in the

leg. Woody Allen is metaprojected in David Shayne (John Cusack ) and although it is another face we, made

to see the face of Woody Allen although it is not, we do not need much to find the gestures that give it away, his

neurotic tics, his hypochondrial tendency to intellectualize the gags and their fragile territory ofinfluence.

aestheticThe purity and integrity of the artist committed to his work is seen as bare when aboss appears

mafia(the priceless and habitual Joe Viterelli) with the interested purpose of suffrag to the theatrical montage

with the right to have his lover (the reckless Jennifer Tilly) have his piece of paper. For nothing is out of what was

agreed by the mafioso, Cheech (Chezz Palminteri), his second, will be who supervises the rectitude of the work and

the dramatic demands of his boss, who become absurd, unfit for good gusto.Thisstory

plotallows Woody Allen unmask the frivolities of the artist and the idea that, as we

get to know his personality well, we acquire the true dimension of his farce, his imposture: in this

case with the Linnet and paid for s��� Shayne. The characters on Bala on Broadway are, inown opinion

Allen's: "" coffee intellectuals who spent their time asking questions of the type ��� Qu��� salva��� first,

the works of Shakespeare or the life of a stranger? They loved that their works were rejected, suffer and

even go hungry since that gave them the status of artists, but the truth is that being an artist is a

matter of chance, a happy accident of birth. Living as an artist is not the same as being "" This masterpiece

by Woody, the perfect vehicle to handle veiled pathetic historical situations or frivolous events

that lead to highly reprehensible behaviors or even criminals, once manifested the

enormous love of the author towards the scenes of the theater, the small eccentricities of the artist touched by the

numen, or who is believed to be touched by him. Woody Allen dismantles (now also n is said deconstructs it sounds more

hermetic) mechanisms cents of artistic creation, uniqueness and talent, way, deliver

his enthralled audience of believers a new catalog of great beings, always in the caricature, but

human and categorically categorizable.

" 1

" It's entertaining, you do not get bored, it lasts little, but it's a feeling of disappointment when you leave the

cinema, as if what you have been told is inconsequential, you forget about it night.

Imperceptible Crimes, this is the title of the novel on which this film is based. With this title, with

this director and with a good cast, we can think that, at least, we are going to see a good movie. If in my

previous criticisms he spoke of the seal of the Coen, Alex de la Iglesia has been characterized by giving hisstyle

ownto his films, something Dantesque, ironic and with a black humor. In this, his last creation TheCrimes

Oxford, we find a director who renounces his style and makes us a more formal film , trying to

catch the touch of intrigue of Hitchcock and English mystery film. Although some characters are

caricatures, it is a different Church, and that is the first major flaw in his film. I say first,

because it has many more, the second and very serious is the casting, Elijah Wood, Mr Frodo for friends, has the

same charisma as Jesulin in Cannes, expressionless, unbelievable, is passed all the movie with surprised face

(huge eyes, seems to receive a frying pan in the face), I open a door I'm surprised, I take the bus I'm

surprised, I open unyogourth.��� that scare! It seems good actor, for more information see LivEverything is Illuminated

Schreiber's, but in this film he does not give the type, and he is not the most appropriate physicist. In fact, when she meets

her female partners, Leonor Watling and Julie Cox have the same chemistry as Mel Gibson and Pantoja.

Leonor is an actress like the cup of a pine but her mission in this movie is to put tontorr���na Elijah, of

vase we go, the gui���n treats her very badly, and her Character is inconsequential. Something more important is that of Julie

Cox but her character is very badly explained by a guide that omits a lot of information. From day to morning Mr

Frodo has two crazy females for him, so he's worth it. On the other hand, if William Hurt is right, he is

having a bad old age (although not young either) but he is a sensational actor that gives credibility, and if you

see him dressed as Guy Fawkes (it makes you smile. Vendetta). The script is hasty, nothing explanatory, although all

the logical-mathematical thinking with references to Kessler and other authors, becomes interesting, can be

messy, and once seen the end, you think it could be much better film, maybe treating the film as a

succession is a good approach, but I think that turns things around a lot to confuse you and

then the result of the equation does not fit you. This kind of thing is only good for Christopher Nolan, and

any mischievous director could have done something similar to this movie, and Alex de la Iglesia is a great

director, so I think it should be more demanded by this film. However, it is entertaining, you do not get

bored, it lasts little, but it is a feeling of disappointment when you leave the cinema, as if what you have been told is

inconsequential, you forget about it that same night. Maybe the expectations were high but seeing the

director and the title of the novel, the next figure of the logical series would be a good movie, and thisnot the

iscase. ��

" 0

" When the projection of "The life of the others" ended in an unusually full movie theater to

be a German film, one of those silences was made so �� Unique and special that presage a

thunderous ovation.

When the projection of "" The life of the others "" ended, in an unusually full movie theater to be

a German film, one of those silences was made so ��� unique and special that presage a

thunderous ovation, in which we would all have participated willingly and cheerfully. if there had been someone

who broke the fire. Sacai said, nothing more appearing credit titles: "" is one of those movies that you

They want to applaud "". Effectively. The huge and lengthy film by Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck (Flo

onwards) not only passes in a sigh but, indeed, reconciles you with the good things of

life. " "The lives of others" "is an immersion, free to lung, in the reality of an East Germany very

close in time. When we hear about films about the Cold War, Checkpoint Charlie and thePhone

Steel, we are used to being in B & W, to have exciting stories of esp� ��as, persecutions and

action without truce. But the reality of Socialist Germany in the early eighties appears to us to be

much less glamorous and much more threatening and more technical in Flo's film. One word, one concept plans

on all the protagonists: blacklist. We are among the intellectual vanguard ofmodernity

German theatrical. And suspicions arise. Is it possible that Georg Dreyman, one of the great cultural icons of German

socialism, is as good, as pure and as loyal to the regime as he appears? The mediocre, to ascend,

use a very effective technique: sow doubts and spread shit on everyone around him, so that

the stinky layer of fog they contribute to create around him can mask his own disability and his

Bad smell. And that's what one of the captains of the Stasi, the fearsome German secret police, does: putunder

Dreymansurveillance. Let's see what happens. And so, the relationship established between the watchman, Captain Gerd

Wiesler, an official expert; and the watched and his girlfriend, a famous actress, start to be the most

contradictory. And changing. And ambivalent. And again contradictory. And fascinating And beautiful. And tràgica. And

many other things and feelings generated by the viewing of a fantastic and hypnotic film that tells us

of a past time, but that is there, to the other side of the remains of a wall. And in the consciences of

many, many people. Indeed, Flo's film has a lot to do with that other film, equally

fascinating, by Francis Ford Coppola: "" The conversation " " Both are formally austere, but of aand

significancetranscendence that show that cinema, without being boring, can be much more than a pastime or

entertainment for children. Without need of speeches speeches can be made a fascinating film of theses,

of which they make think. Without the need to throw viscera against the spectator, it can be achieved that the latter does not

blink for two and a half hours. Without the need for free pyrotechnics, shaking ofcan be achieved

neuronsin spectators who, when offered quality cinematographic products, respond and

come to see them. Come where they come from.

" 1

" It's a film that gets the opposite of what it claims, and precisely does not do any favor to

people with Down syndrome.

There are films that I call "" kamikazes "" or suicides. Are those that from their approach are destined to

be bad, that have the commitment of people who believe in it and above by their quality in the realization

sign their minutes of death. But they would sign it in an industry they called as such. This should be the case.

But the "" authors "" and "" festivalitos "" gives them awards and praises. This film shot entirely

in La Coru���a has a distant intention of making a tender and emotional portrait about two brothers, one of them

with Down's syndrome. And the truth is that the idea is original. And the actor, Guillem Jim���nez, is not bad at all.

But the intention does not count. At least in the cinema. The director's ability lies in getting laughter

trying to do something serious. He wants to make a portrait of integration and propaganda at the expense of people with syndrome.

Down, but not skimp mediocrity to write delusional sequences such as the Civil Guard, therush?

exhibitionist ita film that achieves the opposite of whatintended, and just does not doningn

favorPeople with Down syndrome. On the other hand, it is worth highlighting the poor performance of Marta Larralde, an actress

who is normally persuasive in a role that does not follow any pattern, which falls unfriendly, has a "" curve ""

defined or justified and maintains an incestuous relationship with his brother. Gary Piquerpimp

acting as a decent(not missing the acting and staging of the robbery to his bridal shop) happens without No grief or glory.

And I will not extend myself with the photo raf���a (it is not illuminated, but illuminated), the assembly, etc ... since I am sure

that there will be more than one person that would not want to be in the credit titles. One hour and forty-odd

minutes. A recommendation for those who are willing to see it: please, go with the predisposition to go to

see a bad movie that wants to be good (it has won a few prizes) and go with it ���ados. And to have a

good time, because of course you do not see a peli denunciation, but "" Rain man "" to the Galician.

" 0

" Cinema has never taken so much advantage of symbols, being able to transcend the field of

comprehension to envelop the grounds of the spirit. Without a doubt Dreyes is the filmmaker of the spirit.

This dan dels film is, like others I have seen of him, a criticism of intolerance, in this case

religious intolerance, just as Gertrud was a Critique of intolerance in love. It is anprocess

inquisitorialby witchcraft in which revenge and curse is shown, since Herlofs Mars implores for his

life the inquisitor, however, has much to hide about the witch. And his family. It says something about

Dreyer that is strictly true: he is the only filmmaker who has been able to reflect the same spirit. This

is the second time I've seen this film and once again I'm startled by the figure of the old

witch, so old and so fragile, with an absolutely kind face, which reminds me so much of of my mother, and

during the following scenes pleads again and again for his life, to the very end. It is not acharacter

goodexposed to evil and intolerance, it is much more: it is the same kindness and fragility itself, an

idea, a concept that transforms corporality and even death, which is timeless within the same story,

after the various viewings of the film or for the different viewers. It is a similar awe to

have seen a spirit, but one that did not inspire fear but compassion and a very deep pity. I feel

the need to continue talking about that spirit, that character not as plasma-like, which

could also be said of the female character of Gertrud. Herlofs Mars collides head-on with the

inhumanity of its inquisitors but does not explode with rage or despair, but faces it focusing on its

objective of avoiding fire. He does not believe in his monsergas, he does not accept them. The old woman is tough, as one of them says. And

what words she could use to praise the torture scene: not even the scene whereintestines are opened

William Wallace'sin Braveheart is so overwhelming. Both scenes are based on visual ellipsis. Here we see the

impassivity of the faces of the inquisitors while we hear real cries of pain in the room, as

if they were processing crude legal paperwork. And we know that she is such a frail old woman. And we see her

crying. By the way, those screams are so real in the version dubbed into Castilian, that there must be

something international and indescribable in this scene of physical pain. In addition, the old Herlofs Mars does not stop

repeat how much you fear death and the bonfire. It is a genuine animal fear, one that feels like itself

when it is said by an old imploring help and trembling from a cold that must be greater than what I could

feel in those rooms. peasant medas in which the story makes her shiver. And all this is not more than a

part of the story because then there is the second part in which a forbidden love breaks in with the

heartbreaking death. And here we have visual symbols captured with a success like never before in the cinema: never the

fields of wheat, the tall grasses of the meadows where the lovers walk or the tall, leafy trees

that are become their witnesses have been for me so close to my experiences. Never the cinema has taken

so much advantage to some symbols, being able to transpass the field of comprehension to wrap the grounds

of the spirit. Without a doubt Dreyes is the filmmaker of the spirit.

" 1

" Say after you have seen things that no one has seen, that beyond Ori���n burning ships rush

as tears of gods on earth burned out of despair. Or something like that.

1. A brief review of the genreThe cinema came to be born with Jules Verne, reading at the head of M���lies. The

science fiction, at least the more powerfully rooted in popular taste, came toborn with the film, although

the literature fantstica had delivered noble deliveries and space adventure spades beyond where

reach our ojos.El trip to the moon, founding film, authentic exercise of prestidigitacinflmica

to The tenor of the rudiments in use and the precarious possession of technical logistic, became a brief, but

imaginative miracle that revolutionized a way of looking that had not undergone transformation. Someone who had the

painting as almost the only valid reference element. This science fiction was made of pure B series chewable and

frivolous to engross a virginal public that is embebec���a with the magic sample of the fiction. Few

areas more credited to the narrative imagination and to the brilliance of the technique than thisscience.

fictionThe celluloid was covered with documentalism: it was invested in � of news in images. The cinema, as

entertainment, owes to the fantastic narrative almost all its primitive ingenuity. The need to set up a high-

end cinematographic show that did not seem ridiculous and to restore thepotential

giganticof the written arguments of the pure and hard literature, stopped a genre boom in its tracks. From the

founding movie film until 2001, an odyssey in space, from the master Kubrick, there is no science

fiction. No truly colossal, with a greater height of view, when other genres (comedy, adventure,

horror, thriller ...) had delivered undisputed masterpieces from very early opened therace

unstoppableof What we have called the seventh art. The gadgets of George Lucas downgraded the genre to

fun with popcorn: we had entered fully into the new era of film franchises. and the

money, for the first time, became the b���s parameter ico on which pivot���a the success or failure of a

film every time that science fiction required of that magnificence to evidence clearly and

verisimilitude the v��� Absolute riddle of his literature. Ridley Scott had made The Duelists and the vigorous and

rejuvenating Alien, the eighth passenger, who repelled the pulse of science fiction with fabulous efficiency. In

1982 he made Blade Runner.2. Electric sheep, divine shepherds. Blade Runner is the adaptation of the story by

Philip K. Dick "" Do the androids dream of electric sheep? "", Written in 1968. . Dick, Bradbury and Haxley

are the triad of cult authors in futuristic literature. The metaphysical reflections and the visual lyric of

the film is the legacy of the melancholy tone, almost bucolic, from the story of Dick.Blade Runner is a

pure mixture of science fiction and pure noir. The action takes place in Los Angeles, a city devastated

by the rain ���cida that a leaden neon lights with laziness. Detective Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford) seeks

replicants, mutinous androids who want to be human. What modern Prometheus, Dick (and Scott in the

prodigious expression of the story in images) refer us to the story of Shelley, to his Frankenstein emerged from

the hand of man, who wants to emulate God. Dekcard falls in love with a replicant (Sean Young, in the mostrole

importantof his atypical and disappointing career). The company of Deckard, to remove (eliminate) the droids in

rebellion, whose desire is to find Tyrell, his demiurge, his fantastic creator, the father in the shade, his Doctor

Frankenstein locked in his secret castle. One of his most unique works is Roy Batty, whorecreates

proverbiallyan inspired Rutger Hauer, whose subsequent career has also had nocontinuation.

dignifiedEvery movie fan (and no matter how old he always is) who has had the immense pleasure of having seen

Blade Runner) remembers Batty's monologue. "I have seen things that you would not believe. Attack burning

ships beyond Ori���n. I've seen C rays shine in the dark near Tanh���user's door. All those moments will

be lost in time like tears in the rain. It's time to die "". Remember his sacrifice, hisflight

redeeming, his recitative of William Blake, the English visionary poet. The Dutch actor brings anphysicist

immeasurable: in a way, Blade Runner is his face in the rain.3. The Blade Runner universe: the

mystical cyberpunk. The thematic complexity of the film damaged his commercial career. The almost thirty million

dollars that cost to draw the future and to rewrite the fantasy of Dick, his devastated city, his particular

obsession for the ���tica of the rob� Ethics, they did not have an immediate consideration. The film was thrashed in the

criticism of the time. It was hoped that the newly elevated Scott director would print a more agile rhythm, more in

line with a work of action, but Blade Runner is an inquiry. Den of first order on the nature of the

human soul and religion as the engine of existence. Android Batty seeks his God, who sacrifices

because he does not provide the metaphysical answers he demands. This thick consideration does not enter (or with

latest generation shoehorn) in the action film style book. Over time, Blade Runner

earned a deserved fame. He was able to present a series of moral questions that are now, two decades long after

their premiere, object of reflection in the cultural forums to use. The image of the death of the replicant Roy

letting escape a symbolic ��lica paloma is one of the quintessential cinematographic icons, in my very

modest opinion, of contemporary cinema, just as the scenes of Bogart andhave passed on to that collective memory.

RainsCasablanca airport, Cary Grant fleeing from an airplane in a deserted wilderness or Vivien Leigh

vowing not to go hungry again. Deckart's voice-over refers directly to Raymond Chandler, black cinema

of the 40's. The raincoats with long collars and the fan blades in the detective's office

create the illusion that we are attending a John Huston movie and that Bogart can appear at

any time, disenchanted with life and bored to see so much horror. Nor does the femme fatal lack, which is

the aforementioned Replicant Young. The possibility that the detective himself is a replicant, manifested on

occasion by Ridley Scott, delivers a more cultic object. Apocalyptic and Distinct, Blade Runner resists

multiple viewings. Film makers coincide in that there are classic letterhead films that are difficult

to pass the test of being seen continuously by the viewer. I have a good friend who swears

he saw Blade Runner four times in a row and found a different reason for joy on each pass. I

have myself as a declared fan. I have seen it enough times to hate it, but it has gained in size, in

artistic height.4. NewsThe Blade runner fanbase is in luck:is announced by the end of

a limited version of the albumNovember with a sound restitution more in keeping with these times of sophistication. Digitaln

digital.In 2007, Ridley Scott himself will take care of the design and contents of a Final Cut edition, which

promises to be a milestone in the commercialization of classic film DVDs. Basic We hope that Scott's review is not

as farrullera and unappealing as he did Alien.The price will not be abusive. I read that it will be around fifteen

euros and will not contain (for that future revision in 2007) any additional disc withexclusive contents

additional. Either way, you have to celebrate it in style. So make a tail, go to thevideo store

nearest, keep a rainy night to reverberate in that promised sound and chromaticTell us

restoration.after you've seen things that nobody he has seen, that beyond Ori���n burning ships rush like

tears of gods on the scorched earth of despair. Or something like that.

" 1

" Francis Lawrence completely misreads the message of Matheson for the benefit of a hopeful blockbuster

palomitero that loses all its charm in the middle of footage.

Here is the Christmas blockbuster. Directed by Francis Lawrence, responsible for the entertaining Constantine,

and starring almost entirely by Will Smith with Alice Braga, Salli Richardson, Paradox Pollack, Charlie

Tahan and with a cameo by Emma Thompson included, finally arrives on our screens the thirdadaptation

filmof I Am Legend, a novel published by Richard Matheson in 1954. The film It places us in

2012. Robert Neville is the last man alive on the face of the Earth, although he is not alone. The other men,

women and children have become vampires, and they are all thirsty for Neville's blood. During the ���l the

hunter, looking for the undead while they sleep, but in the night he must hide waiting for the

sunrise. The truth is that a server had a terrible desire to this movie, but seen the seen I have not been

able to feel more than a notable disappointment; not for the product itself, but rather for what I am a

legend could have been and is not. But, for better or for worse, in this blog has always defended the

unnecessaryness of having read a novel before the viewing of a film, and we will not makenow

an exception. With a duration of little more than an hour and a half, I am legend is divided into two clearlyparts

differentiated, along which we attend various flashbacks -not very fortunate in general- that

pretend to put us in background. The first half, undoubtedly the most interesting, is uniquely and exclusively

interpreted by a solvent Will Smith accompanied by his dog Sam, and in it Francis Lawrence delights us with

a succession There are spectacular panoramic images of a New York devastated and seriously affected by the

imperturbable advance of Mother Nature: buildings in ruins, abandoned vehicles, dirt everywhere.

The big apple is now a vetigio of the past, a ghost town inhabited only by Robert Neville, who

tries to maintain the code through habit and custom, either with a disciplined daily order, with the

search for a cure, or with the desperate interaction with her bitch, through the radio, or even with

mannequins, posing to blows of silence, various moral dilemmas of both the protagonist and our

own society. Unfortunately, as soon as the plot of I am a legend fails to delight with its approach to

begin to develop, the myth crumbles with agitated steps: on the one hand we find the terrible

disappointment that vampires pose, not because of their appearances - on the other hand, based on typical hits -

but because of their own digital reconstruction, far removed from the improvement of the CGI that we have been able to see

in several productions throughout this 2007. In short, they are badly done. On the other hand, thecrisis

identitythat should imply the irruption of Anna and her son in the so far mon��� tona vida de Neville

apen���ss��� is proposed to us, for the benefit of the persecutions and the rigorous shootings, that in spite of not being

totally bad rolled neither suppose any wonder, that without taking into account the diverse incongruities that

pose. As if that were not enough, the outcome of I am a legend -which I will notis splashed with

reveal-a hopeful moral pseudo-religion that, beyond being radically opposed to the original intention of

Richard Matheson, it is simply insultingly dogmatic. In short, a server would only highlight

the first half of the film, because as soon as Will Smith must begin to interact, I am a legend it is lost by

palomiteros courses that, in spite of being (relatively) necessary in all superproducci���n, raised of another

way they would have given foot to a completely different film and, probably, quite round. better,

bitch Sam.I give it a 6 out of 10, although if I were to compare the film with the original novel, the note would

plummet down to a 3'5 or 4.

" 0

" A labyrinth with two exits, in which personally, neither of them left me sat Isfecho? neither of them

is totally beautiful or hopeful.

In the beginning, fantasy and reality were the same, because fantasy was an excellent ally to explain

the world, when science still did not exist. Then when reality became cruel and intolerable,

fantasy helped as a hiding place. Like that secret and magical place in which one can take refuge in

black days and oneself. But? What happens, when you get to that world and it's just as cruel and violent, or maybe

more? Guillermo del Toro's new film, is torn between these two equally terrifying worlds; a Spain

after the civil war, but in which the hunt for communists was just as cruel and a fantastic,world

fantastic. And it is Ofelia, the little protagonist, who is between these two universes, after arriving in the

company of her pregnant mother to a military camp, where her stepfather lives trying to "" clean up her homeland

of communists. "" Ofelia discovers, in the middle of the forest, a stone labyrinth that they say has been there

forever, in which she knows the Faun and lets her know that she is the princess of a kingdom that lives below

the earth, but to return needs to face three tests and thus prove that his spirit has not beenVegas-

corrupted by mortals. But do not think that it is a Lasstyle tape. Crónicas de Narnia, on the

contrary, is not a film for children, which is totally clear in the first scene of the film, where

the girl lies on the floor , wounded and bleeding. It is clear that no child would like to be in a place and a

time like that, no adult either, but the escape that the Faun offers does not seem to be the best option. ,

since on the one hand he is friendly and on the other his mystery creates suspicion. This ambivalence is a

success because it is an excellent work of characterization and makeup, showing that behind it

there is a human working and that it is not the result of long hours of design. Poro by computer. The production is

excellent; the alternate worlds, they are surprising, although dark and dark, here nothing is beautiful, everything has

a somewhat twisted and bloody taste, even the fairies, to which we are accustomed to see them as

small good natured and friendly beings , here your flight is fast and erratic looking more like that of an insect

from which you have to flee. And that is perhaps the ambivalent and obscure spirit that prevails in the film, the one of

innocence that is tried to crush, the one of innocence trying to find its way between good and evil,

but in an atmosphere where both are mixed to such a degree that It is impossible to distinguish one from the

other.Del Toro has matured like his cinema, who since its inception has tried to bring the

different genres, horror, gore, fant�� �stico and the day of today has succeeded, creating an adult film, a dark

fairy tale, in which In the end you have to choose, if you keep the realistic part, with thepart

fantasticor a combination of both, and maybe it's even there , where the public loses a little footprint, not

knowing which way of the maze to choose. A labyrinth with two exits, in which personally, neither of the

two left me satisfied? neither of them is totally beautiful or hopeful.: This film was

PSselected by Mexico to compete in the Oscars, in the section of foreign films, however, I doubt that

the academy feels attracted by a tape as complex as this one.

" 1

" The Shadow of the Hunter is a masked thriller as a film of political denunciation, which after itsappearance

grandiloquent and pretentiousis found only a vulgar story, which does not interest or excite in ms

minimum

There are actors who seems his mere presenceenough to give a film packaging beyond the purely

cinematic. There are interpreters who seem touched by a magic wand, and that is the project in which they

participate, guarantee project. Although much more often the opposite case occurs, there are many actors and

actresses who ensure the mediocrity of any film in which they participate. Although it may seem like aphenomenon

paranormal, there are actors who seem to be drawn uncontrollably by projects of poor quality, and Richard

Gere is a good example. And that the last Donosti Prize (which the Festival of San SebastiÃ¡n has fallen under)

strives, but there is no way, a mysterious and inexplicable halo of mediocrity surrounds everything what he has done in

recent years. In The Shadow of the Hunter, Richard Gere is a seasoned war correspondent whowhen he witnesses the

loses his nerveshorrors of the Balkan War. Once the conflict is over, ourreporter

most talkativereturns with the sole intention of capturing one of the most wanted war criminals. What could

well have been a well-constructed and coherently constructed story of denunciation is transformed

into a meaningless run-and-run. In addition the film is anything but honest, and is that Richard

Shepard keeps key information to understand the motives of the character of Gere and does not release it well into

the plot. These blows of effect are characteristic of empty and contrived films, but at the same time they are

very pretentious. There is no element that hooks the viewer, who is also martyred

with the presence of Richard Gere and Jesse Eisenberg. Only Terrence Howard is saved, whom we hope to see away

from Hollywood subproducts like this one. The Shadow of the Hunter is a thriller masked as a film of

political denunciation, that after its appearance grandiloquent and pretentious is not more than astory

vulgar, which does not interest or excite in the least.

" 0

" A tape that, judging by its title, you can reject, and that, however, and by removing a good handful of

disproportions, you may come to like some and horrify others, especially dedicated to all those who

intend to get pregnant shortly.

For a while now, one is starting to know how to park the animadversity I feel towardscomedy

romantic(and that I end up seeing the force thanks to / through my wife's fault), and I try to value, in its just measurement

if it deserves or not the pain, sometimes I get to value only by the actors that take part in it, others by the

title; this film that brings us today has all the ballots to be completely rejected by a

pro-cynologist, but, as I am not, I have decided to see it. I think that whoever is behind the film Judd

Apatow, and the large group formed by Paul Rudd, Seth Rogen and Jonah Hill (excellent in "" supersalidos), if Adam

Sadler and Santiago are sure to put their friends, because Seth Rogen and Apatow ��� Can not they do the same? Accompanied

by the famous Katherine Heigl (from "" Anatomy of Gray "") I loved the multitude of current references that

appear on screen, from "" Lost "" to "" Munich "", passing through "" Spiderman "", the series "" Monk "", "" Brokeback

Mountain "" or "" Transmerica "" and "" Desperate Housewives. "" In one of the film magazines that I read monthly

they referred to this film as included in a new series of "" catlical tendencies "" where they demonstrate

that practicing unprotected sex brings dire consequences, as well as the politics of abortion and

something more than the film, it touches; that yes, to see in this film that plea is to look "" beyond "" and if there were critics

who saw in "" 300 "" a criticism of Bush and the War of Iraq, or in the most recent "" The strange that there is in my "" an

invitation to free will, here the only thing I see is a very gaudy comedy (inferior in its invoice to

"" virgin at 40 "") and little more, ah! Do not forget your excellent official page. Excellent appearances in

light cameos of director Harold Ramis, and actress Joanna Kerns (famous in Spain for being the mother of ""

Problems Grow "", Maggie Seaver). On the negative plot, to say that the film lasts too long (twohours and apeak are

longlongtiring), the part that takes place in Las Vegas is too much. It does not have the city of the casinos

enough promotion with the infinity of Teleseries that are developed there? His language at times

too feminist, especially a phrase that says the sister of the protagonist related to the great Opra and

that has in context Criticize = lose = change ���As my ex- was a scriptwriter of it? once again, andlost my enthusiasm

with that happy ending, we try to moralize, and educate the spectators in the genius of the experience of being

parents (for now I haveagain).

" 0

" Frankly I have not seemed so horrible, the truth is that it could have done much better These last weeks I read many negative reviews of this film. I went to see it this weekend

and frankly it did not seem so horrible, the truth is that it could have done much better withmaterial

both human and intellectualthat was available. But that does not matter, the film will fulfill its objective with a

lot of money. Today the duster is already seen a lot to the American industry, there are hardly any good stories but in the

end in the first-line cinema industry prevails over the artist. And it is sincerely seems

that the producers have tattooed that saying of "" Better bad known than good to know "" killing in this

way the risk and the classic tension that existed formerly when you discovered for the first time The characters

in which you walked blindly through the dialogue of the characters, excited and confronting you with great

pleasure to the unknown. The professor and famed symbologist Robert Langdon (Tom Hanks) is forced to go

One night at the Louvre Museum, when the murder of a conservative leaves behind a mysterious trail of

symbols and clues. With his own life at stake, Langdon, helped by the police crypt Sophie Neveu

(Audrey Tautou), discovers a series of amazing secrets hidden in the work of Leonardo da Vinci, secrets that

all point to to a secret society charged with guarding an ancient secret that has been hidden for

two thousand years. Together they embark on an exciting search that takes them to Paris, London and Scotland, as they

collect clues in a desperate attempt to decipher the code and reveal secrets that will make They are shaking the

foundations of humanity. It is a classic film of adventure, perhaps covered in great politics, but in the end

we must not forget that it is fiction. Special mention to the soundtrack that stands out remarkably. It is the

product that stands out above the worst videogame. Perhaps the sensation that I have escaped a bit

of commenting on the film or giving it depth to the analysis. It's true, I do not like to talk about movies that Inot

dolike. Even so, I think this will be the last one that kills cinefixia. By the way, they have already bought the rights

of Angels and Demons.

" 0

" On purpose, a film of adventures too showy, noisy and loaded with excessive special effects in

which there is not even intrigue .

The famous phrase "" Second parts were never good "" I find it simple. Yes, it is true that there are infinity of

second parts that are infumable, but there are others that, starting from a first good delivery, follow the rhythm

and quality of their predecessor. But as you would suppose, this is not the case of Pirates of the Caribbean: The chest of the

dead man. However simple that phrase may be, in this case it is true. If in the first part, The curse

of the black pearl, the protagonists were quantity of noises and visual effects, in this continuation they remain it

. Nothing has changed, simply the story, although it is already saying a lot. It is a film that is based on

a simple and absurd script (look at the fight scene formed by the trio Depp-Bloom- Davenport, they

look like clowns in a PC game). In the end, that again I can say that it is an entertaining tape but

totally empty (like the recently criticized The shadow of suspicion). It's a summer movie. Part of a

pretty attractive idea (a blood debt to an octopus man), but Mr. Verbinski has not been able to

take advantage of it. The tape is extremely long and, to finish as it ends, with an open end, it would have been

more appropriate for it to last much less. Although I do not say that this end is the worst of the footage, no. I could say that

next to Johnny Depp is the best of the film. The flaw is the following question: What is the use of making a

film so long that there is no sure end? I will not talk about the argument, not because it is simple, but because

I suppose that with so much publicity you will already know where the thing is going. I'll just say that the script seems to be

wasted, even if you do not think it's a great idea. It's uniquely attractive. What I can point

out is the fun, but too over-active, however much you do it for purpose, Johnnyacting

Depp's. It's a paper, a wasted hair, but at least it's original. Today we will find a few

characters of superproductions that imitate the style of a rock singer as in this case is Keith Richards.

I find it very risky. And at least there is a good evil (I mean his performance): Bill Nighy (the old

rocker of Love Actually). It has a very difficult role. It must be recognized that the villains of this

pirate trilogy have been very successful: in the first installment, together again with Depp, the one that stood out was

the great Geoffrey Rush; in this second, Nighy plays a nasty octopus man; and in the not yet released

third part the evil one will be, nothing more and nothing less, than Chow Yun-Fat. No onestands out from the rest of the cast

else. Both the bland Orlando Bloom and the beautiful, but sometimes deadpan Keira Knightley do not measure up. In

fact, a film of adventures too showy, noisy and loaded with excessive special effects in which there is

not even intrigue. Everyone knows what's in that happy chest, although at least it's not money (a verything

commonin pirate adventures). The money has been spent on production.

" 0

" What murder is more cruel? ���The individual or the social? In���dita until now in Spain, "" No Matar���s "" is one of the most important works of Kieslowski's filmography, both

from the qualitative point of view as for being the film that raised the recognition of the Polish director,

very limited until the explosion of his "" Dec���logo "". of the tenth anniversary of his death (Krzysztof

Kieslowski died on March 13, 1996, at 54 years of age, due to multiple heart attacks,

that already suffered time ago), Wanda Visi���n decides to honor the genius through the projection and re-release, on March

10, of his sublime and visceral work maesa.Aqu��� Kieslowski, instead of leaving us an ambiguous message,

as he usually does, tells us a crude and direct allegation against the murder. That yes, it contains

numerous symbols and metaphysical moments that are united with the rest of the "" Dec���logo "" and its filmograf���a, that not

all the world will manage to capture. And it is these intelligent gui���os that bring the true magic and value to the film.

Sparks of true genius, with a cinematographic knowledge based on a visual narrative language

that reaches a metaphysical level. As I said, Kieslowski here offers us his vision on the murder,

rejecting it completely. But not only speaks of murder from the point of view of the individual, also

speaks of the moral and physical murder of society and politics. For Kieslowski, life is something that

nobody has the right to snatch. and when he said nobody was, of course, nobody. No institution, no

complex, no similarity. There is not only a ridiculous Polish policy and its death penalty, but

also It is left in evidence to the whole society, to that world that has engendered violence and, therefore,

only gets the answer from it. But that same society, we, those who have created the monster

of the aggressiveness, does not know how to solve a problem that gets out of hand. And logically, the v���am���sf���cil

is to finish with him. Why bother? The same thing happens throughout history: those who have

created the monster are unable to control it. To solve the problem, the best way is to end it

, to strike it down. When something disappears, logically, it no longer creates problems. But that is not a morallyposition

acceptable. ��� If something creates conflict, what do we do? ���Do we eliminate it or do we do it on our part so that everything is

fixed? In "" No Matar���s "" does not question whether the defendant is guilty or not, that in Kieslowski is something

completely secondary. What is really questioned is whether someone has the right to decide on the fate

of another. That is why the figure of the "" judge "" appears so frequently in the filmography of thedirector

Polish. For Kieslowski, the punishment must be carried out so that the defendant becomes aware and can recover,

given the opportunity to be cured in a society that should be the true accused. If we impose a punishment

as revenge, the only thing we achieve is to generate more hatred, launch ourselves against our main ideology,

contradict ourselves. As the Polish director himself stated: "Never, from Ca���n, a punishment has

made anyone better or dissuaded from committing a crime." It seems that the most difficult, ad Today, it is giving

help to those who truly need it. For this reason, the simplest path is used, which suggests that our

environment, our society, has cracks on all sides. Everything has become dangerously inhumane and

automated. If the murder committed by Jacek is repulsive, so is the murder that is committed in executing

the conviction of the offender (precisely, Kieslowski, to show that brutality, resorts to filming Sinn without

cuts and without skimping on details of both crimes, which is not at all habitual in him and he does it so

that we reflect, so that we realize that an act is so disgusting and dehumanized like the other).

Nobody can decide about anyone's life, whatever the situation, person or institution. Life is not something

that can be played with two cards. As well, and more and more, a practicallysociety is being created

unrecoverable, where the da��� or not only is it done, but it has reached such a level that murderers and

delinquents are very difficult to reeducate, due to a succession of laws that do not look inside the

person, only they look at the event, without contemplations. Many will assert that trying to offer help

is sometimes impossible, that many people do not choose their choices, which are problems not linked to personality,

closer to an incorrigible psyche. and that can be an attempt, sometimes, too naive. In

these times, in part, I know it may be true. But the problem comes from much earlier. At atime

giventhey have not been given the opportunity to fix it, they have not had any support or understanding. And there comes a

point where, through loneliness or lack of sincere help, they lose their heads in an uncontrollable way.

But it is more than proven that (in a very high percentage) this type of actions (which, logically,

become unpredictable once uncontrolled) have an emotional and purely personal basis. Therefore, if

things are done as they should be done, and in due course, we could avoid such consummate and widespread ills as

aggression or (at good times, green sleeves), so criticized today, death penalty. And that is what

is being questioned by Piotr, the recently-licensed lawyer who will take Jacek's case. If, being as he was, in the

cafeteria, the moment Jacek tied the rope to his hand, he would have tried to convincenot to

himdo it. What would have happened? The crossing of lives of the three characters is not at all free, since you

can see that their volitional decisions and chance are intertwined in such a way that in the end they end up coming together .

They are close, but they do not look at each other. they are simply one more soul in the world, with no one who can hear their

prayers. So, there comes a time when Jacek is absolutely out of control. Not even the character of

Barcis (essential symbol throughout the "" Dec���logo "", as it will be the old woman of the container in "" The

Double Life of Ver��� " nica "" and "" Tres Colores ""), which crosses the road while working on a construction site and

forces the taxi to stop, manages to stop with his pleading look (in an existential moment that borders on

perfection). n, being able to feel in the flesh of the spectator until shuddering) to the already lost Jacek. He does not even

want to do it (as you can see, it happens much worse than the victim at the time of committing the brutal crime),

but he is faced with a situation without possible return. Because of this, from the beginning in the film, we see a

Jacek walk alone, with an existential void more than evident in his walk and actions, without knowing what

what to do with his life, already meaningless. We see a protagonist trapped by his past, who feels

miserable and guilty for the death of his sister. He has completely lost the meaning of his life, so

his subsequent reactions will be completely illogical and dangerous. He only observes a small light in his

existence, for which he is able to smile (the only smile we see of Jacek in the whole footage

is when he plays in the cafeter���a with some children, in a scene charged with emotion and sincerity): you will

"" return "" to life your beloved sister. But hatred towards his own person ends up destroying everything, and he is

forced to unload it against someone. And for simple reasons of chance (he is not a chosen one at all) he will be theKieslowski

taxi driver., in this sense, does not take the side of evil. What it does is show that, in our

society (and increasingly), it is not about understanding the "bad" of the day. The simplest thing is to turn against him

and get rid of him. The Polish director invited us to reflect on why such acts, to offer them

forgiveness, help and reeducation, in a world that has come to an end. point of absolute uncontrol, but logical

by how the events were happening in a society increasingly intolerant and dehumanized. As anmetaphor

exquisiteof it, we have the old lady of the pigeons, or the taxi driver himself. But more so are those people who

roam the world without looking around, not bothering more than their own ego. Thus, in thesection

technicalof the film, we have several very appreciable details. It is not gratuitous, it is not gallery, it is not

pretentiousness, but it requires the use of intelligence on the part of the spectator. During the majority of the

footage, a light sepia tone is predominant, loaded with expressiveness, especially in outdoor scenes (

although it is not as pronounced or as predominant as in "" Veronica's Double Life ""), in which we can

observe close-ups of Jacek, trying to to reach his soul, to understand the why of his actions, and

we can also glimpse a city, an environment, totally rotten, darkened to the maximum of the

photograph. trying to reflect the most obvious state of society and its people. An exceptional photo,

on the other hand, that tries to look at numerous objects full of a complex symbolic load , from the

cat "" premonitory "" from the beginning to the ropes, the looks, the voids and the silences. For this, Jacek, who

has only had the love and understanding of two people in your life, you are lost and aimless in the

middle of that nothingness that is society. Those two people would be the sister (already deceased) and the lawyer Piotr

(remember that, in the jailer conversation, Jacek affirms that he called him by his name, that he was really

interested in �� by ���l), who from the first moment asks about the meaning of morality in his work, about the

meaning of life and about his obligations as a human being.Piotr, who suffers one of the cases that

He fears, manages to understand Jacek's true background, spirit, humanity, and, once the case is over, he

asks himself if he would have done everything possible, if he had acted in the correct way Many will tell him that the case

was lost, that it was totally impossible to save him for any lawyer, that his fate was written. But he

knows that if that has come to be so it is due to some errors that have not been resolved, to somepoints

humanthat have not been paid attention to. And a person (whatever that may be), in the end, should always

be listened to and cared for. And that is the biggest mistake of a policy and a society totally

rotten, dehumanized and absolutely egalitarian. Thus, Piotr can not help feeling sunk. and even

guilty. We will not see it, but the life of Piotr will not be at all the same. And Jacek, who after his performance will

feel more lost yet, he will ask. What he has done, how he has reached that limit. And the answer

is very clear. Circumstances have pushed him, circumstances created by society itself, the only

culprit (if there is one). And that society, the one that has generated those murderers, will be the same one that will want to

solve their problem (let's not forget that they have created it) by the v���ar���pida. Sometimes, even , we can see

that Jacek or any other criminal, in reality, is not that far from any other person who walks the

world. By pure chance, they reach the point of crime, but. What if Jacek had notdrunk on the

gottenday of his sister's death? The taxi driver would not have died, he would continue with his normal life. and nothing would be the

same. By a single decision (which sometimes lasts no more than a second) the lives of several people change

completely. What if the driver had picked up the drunks instead of leaving badly? I could not

pick up Jacek. and the rest I think we already know. A small decision changes the life of a complete environment.

so I do not think anyone is different from anyone. There are times when you have to look at the

circumstances, not at the events. It is really incredible as a volitional decision, an act not always

marked by chance, it can lead us to the most serious of the hells, to the continuous loss of freedom,

although we are not always aware of it. Freedom, once again, is not only in question,

for Kieslowski the freedom drawn by society is not more than a lie. And in the end, we will not find

justification for our performances, as happens to Jacek. We will suffer the intolerance of our

environment, we will walk through the lonely streets, we will drive the taxi without knowing where to go (the taxi driver is

another one in the world, with the same loss of love and understanding Quen that Jacek and the rest, that's why he acts

so despicably). After all, we will become victims of our society. Surrounded by

rot that, little by little, is losing the sense of existence and that, without a doubt, is

becoming a problem without solution. Not to look at our spirit It is something that is ending with us.

And so, there are no murders that can be solved, everything will end in a succession of acts without

justification. because our life does not have it either. The silences throughout the footage, the lack of communication

that Jacek has suffered, everything is created in such a way that it invites us to reflect. Kieslowski, as I

said, does not justify anything, neither evil nor good, is simply trying to delve into the human spirit,

find its meaning and make us understand that the values ​​of life every time they sink further, and that, despite

a naivete and a desire for healing, everything is turning into a lot of shit. What society

really deserves. What we have ruined, we are not willing to solve it. And so, the whiting

bites its tail over and over again. until, finally, there will be no tail to bite. Kieslowski, so, may

look for something very complicated (not impossible), but I think that looking inside, to understand and

improve, is something to that we can all reach. Are we really willing? With the direction we are taking,

I doubt it, and a lot. The death penalty, which is criticized when some also apply it (although they are not

aware of it), is a creation of the same society, due to its inability to solve problems by

delving into them. The incomprehension, the lack of listening, the lack of solidarity (solidarity for the gallerynot

isacceptable), are issues that, apparently, we are not willing to address. Then, we suffer the

consequences. And the worst of all is that they believe that putting obstacles and amputating manage to solve thewave of

currentrot. And the laws go their way. A path that, sooner or later, will end up being as

impassable as a path of nails. For this, I will try to conclude with a symbol that introduces

Kieslowski throughout the "" Dec��� logo "" and that I have commented slightly. It is that of the actor Artur Barcis, who,

like the old woman in the container, tries to establish links between the stories and between the

most crucial moments of the stories. They are also a kind of person who tries to represent reality,

especially that of the Polish director. It could be said that, Barcis, is like a kind of witness, like the

conscience of the characters in the face of their despair , and that, after having to make a decision in "" Without End "" he

made an appearance again and again in each of the stories of the protagonists. "" Without End "" was the

first appearance of the actor, and the most important, since it shows us what situation he was in and whatto

it meanthim to take a decision, always curtailing their moral freedom. From there, the character of Barcis

knows the consequences of the performances, and shows himself in front of those who are going to make another vital decision in his

existence. As always, he always appears in the moments summit and in the most dangerous from the volitional point of view,

to show their knowledge about it. It's a kind of subtle support for them, but really hard to

understand. Nobody is totally aware of his help and his presence, no matter how much they observe him. They do not

understand their appearance, as happens in real life at times. It also appears, in my opinion, as a

reflection of Kieslowski himself, as a way of uni That allows us to accept his position, his position in life

as an observer of human contradictions. The Polish director never said anything about it, but I think

Barcis represented his own persona. Little more to add. I will simply stop to praise the interpretation

of Miroslaw Baka, totally correct. All the gestures, silences, looks. perfecto.Kieslowski and hisnarrative

visualat a level that borders perfection, forcing the viewer to participate in each and every one of the

planes. It is impressive the mastery that the Polish director possessed in relation to the cinematographic treatment of

objects, scenes and people. Sublime.Fotograf���a excellent, in addition to full of emotion, impressive and

melancholic music by the company Preisner. an unforgettable, essential and timeless work that demonstrates what

the true cinema is and leaves in evidence the rest of the billboard, no matter how many resources it has. "" No

Matar���s "" is oriented towards the "" Declogue 5 "" that Kieslowski created for the television of Poland in his day

based on the ten commandments. As a necessary point of support and understanding of the totality of the message that

Kieslowski intended to show us, it is extremely interesting and obligatory to view the entire series and

its filmography. Then we will see the links of unity and changes of direction based onexperiences

personal and human. "" Kr���tki film or zabijaniu "" demonstrates his untouchable mastery when it comes to delving into the

human spirit without asserting, closing circles or judging. Kieslowski's camera was always (and is) the best

example of an asyptic camera in search of questions and questions, so that we search with her the

answers, if there really are any. It was, together with filmmakers like Bergman, one of the artisans who best

understood the essence, humanity and spirituality of cinema as an art and form of reflection and expression.

Kieslowski with his death left the cinema without the eye that best knew how to portray the human soul. And, although many do not

realize it, the cinema has been very resentful with its loss. I doubt that any work that has touched the

topic that occupies us here has approached the m��� true to his genius, success and respect. Masterpiece.

" 1

" The first few minutes of A Luxury Enga���o do nothing but augur the worst of the disasters, but towards the

middle the film transforms and goes back to becoming an acceptable product of entertainment.

There are few cinematic genres as trite as romantic comedy, since they are films that are theoretically

simple to produce, cheap, and that generally work well in ticket office. Another thing is that the writers

repeat the same scheme over and over again and do not offer a small novelty. The fault is not yours, that at

least some try, but in the romantic comedy is all done. Jean (Gad Elmaleh) works as a

waiter in a large hotel on the French Riviera. One night he meets Ir���ne (Audrey Tautou), a beautiful gold digger

who falls in love. He manages to conquer it by pretending to be a rich heir, but when Ir���ne

discovers his true identity he rejects it. Jean does not give up, and to win her back she decides to invest

all her savings to try to keep it. The first few minutes of A Luxury Deception only portend the

worst of disasters, but by half the film is transformed and traced back to become an acceptable

entertainment product. The gui���n is not the height of originality, although if it had started from

the premise of the two fortune hunters, the tape would have won significantly. The chemical moments must be sought

with magnifying glass, although there are a couple of really funny scenes that are the exception that confirms the rule. The film

shows a flagrant lack of rhythm, fundamental in any comedy, although fortunately Pierre

Salvadori does not show signs of sadism by not recreating himself in romantic moments. As for the actors, Gad

Elmaleh totally eclipses an Audrey Tautou that performs a bland, anodyne and unconvincing interpretation.

In fact, it is easier to imagine Joan Laporta up in the Cibeles celebrating the title of RealLeague

Madridthat Audrey Tautou as a sly and seductive fortune hunter.A Enga���o Luxury is fortunately not the

typical romantic comedy, although it has most of the gaps of the genre, which could nevertheless

have been a crime. Fun and enjoyable.

" 0

" The Kovak Box is a remarkable intrigue film, which fulfills its perfection function, keeping the

public intigrated until the last moment.

The thriller, the films of intrigue and mystery have not been historically widely cultivated in Spanish cinema

, despite the fact that in the last few years ��� trying to remedy that. And most of these works

have nothing to envy to large foreign productions, since in terms of intelligence and originality they

are located far above. The Spanish cinema is losing its complexes little by little in front of other

cinematographies, and has demonstrated the ability to approach all kinds of genres and overcome the challenge. . Now, it

is the spectators who must forget the prejudices against the different Spanish films, and with

examples such as La Caja Kovak, the company should not be very complicated. Daniel Monz� Dirigen directs his third

feature film, after a fantastic story, The Warrior's Heart and a crazy comedy, The Largest Robbery

Jam���s Contado. The filmmaker proposes with La Caja Kovak a psychological thriller that does not take the viewer

as a fool, which, although at first sight it seems an obvious achievement, is worthy of praise today. The

sequence of the initial credits is a good sample of what can be expected from the film. David Norton

(Timothy Hutton), a renowned writer of science fiction, travels to Mallorca to give a lecture, but during the

course of his stay, he will suffer a terrible loss. With the help of Silvia (Luc���a Jim���nez), a younggirl

and spirited, David will try to discover the strange events that take place on the island, and whose

Responsible seems to be an old man named Kovak (David Kelly). Daniel Monz���n immerses the viewer in a

disturbing and labyrinthine story, and does not release it until the credit titles appear. The Kovak Box is

a film of intrigue and mystery made with the same spirit of the great classics of the genre, and is honest

with itself, as it offers what it promises, without any cheating . Little by little, the tape increases in

intensity, and at the same time, the atmosphere created by Monz���n becomes more agonizing, completely trapping the

spectator, leaving him without breath and total mercy of the swings of the plot. At no time does Monz���n resort

to the easy, the gratuitous truculence, the scares or the casquer���a. Special mention deserved the last thirty

minutes of The Kovak Box and its intense climax. Technically, the film is outstanding, as is thework

interpretativeof Timothy Hutton, Luc���a Jim���nez and David Kelly, who embroider their papers under the attentive direction

of the Majorcan. ��n.The Kovak Box is a remarkable intrigue movie, which fulfills its perfection function,

keeping the audience intigrated until the last moment, and it is an excellent example of the goodhealth of

artisticSpanish cinema.

" 1

" Without prejudice to the rest of Wilder's Masterpieces, this is one of my favorites. He has the quintessence

of genius, his bad temper, his cynicism, his stark vision of a society inevitably maligned by the

selfishness and pettiness of the human being.

All Wilder is in On a silver platter. Wilder manners, sagacious observer of the transcripts of the

human being and fine stylist of the writing of his vices. There is the Wilder in love with the p���caros and the

tah���res, the cheats and the cr���pulas, people of good living who sacrifice the routine of a routine life

in apartments of suburbs for snuffling the noses, even mildly and unsatisfactorily, in another happiness

different from that written in the manuals of urbanity and in the catechisms of any religion. A corrosive type,

a beauty in the style of his phobias, but a great activist in the cause of his disenchantment with society

and his misadventures. The rogue fauna that gorges the best moments of Wilder's films

spares no effort to make a delicate plate on a silver platter, a succulent sweet that will makelose

the spectatorstheir senses accomplices, already made to banquets of this Guise, and that will give the nephites an

excellent starter, we would say a slight bite that will be a feast when the Wilder effect, its cynicism, its

irony, its skepticism , strain into the bloodstream, flood cavernous bodies, walls of consciousness and

those brain holes where the capacity for astonishment crouches, as if asleep, beating effortlessly,

waiting for a bigger issue, a intelligent provocation This is what it is: black humor, lustful black humor

that deforms and recomposes nothing more and nothing less than a fundamental capital of mercantilist society, ���sa to

which Wilder puts so much effort in annoying: the insurance companies. The mobile Wilder dissects the moral misery,

but without overwhelming the staff with lucubrations and gray formulas of a dead sociologist. His scalpel stitches and

unravels the convoluted web of human relationships. A Hinkle (Jack Lemmon) dresses him well, but does not

make a bit of extra money. To the doctor in laws it smears him of the treacherous molasses of all thecharacters

execrablethat have populated his meritorious, in this field, filmography. The chosen actor could not be more successful.

The unscrupulous shyster who plays an enlightened Walter Matthau, cuÃ ± ada of the prudish Lemmon, signed

by grace, forms the absolute pair of the cinema. Just to see them on stage is worth the film. And

this was the first of nine collaborations. Walter Matthau was a fond���ny actor with a flabby expression, capablefrowning

ofand looking like a bulldozer about to chew on an ear. Come on, father, allow me

this fierce image. The actor spent a lot of time on the set: tobacco, one of his vices, along with the women and

the game (!!!) took a toll on his heart and a severe heart attack took him away ��� of the recording. Recovered, having

lost almost twenty kilos, forced to play sports and take care of his health if he did not want to see himself in the obituaries of

the glamor magazines and in the headlines of the press of the industry and, above all, to leave completely the tobacco and

the stress of the timbas and the skirts, Walter Matthau avinagr��� his gesture, empozo������ his dramatic arts and

abord��� the character of the rogue lawyer with a sort of internal aggressiveness that might not have existed

if the circumstances were different. For the benefit of the public, his performance was devastating. You only have to see the

original version and notice the gruÃ������ tone and the eloquent inflections of an actor in a state of grace and with an

exceptional libretto. All in all, the Spanish dub is formidable, as is often the case. Those who have not had the pleasure of

seeing it will perhaps consent to the strange idea that there is no humor in this bupera buffa of the hypocrisy and the bending

of the human genre: abandon it, configure your brain to attend a major parade ofsituations

hilarious(the visit of the doctor, the caretaker of the window.) Sentimental cynicism: Here is the brand of the house.

Billy Wilder always redeems his characters from excessive tragedies, excuses them with elegance for all the bad

milk that they have been inoculating them and that suddenly, almost without coming to mind, they drop in droves, in thosewaterfalls

semi-classicalas well Marcan brand of the house. In this film, there are many: there are tons of lines of text that can be framed,

situations worthy of Lubitsch's compositional talent and, of course, easily attributed to the genius of IAL

Diamond, a type of Corrosive ethics and mental agility for the theatrical comparable to Lope de Vega or Calder���n

de la Barca. Yes, I know, some purists of our sacrosanct literature are going to write some post condemning

my audacity. Say it: I have godparents. If there is something exciting about this mass spectacle that is the cinema, it

is the amazement, the bewilderment, the intimate wonder of the dislocation: one is ��� sitting in his chair, perhaps

eaten by the ethereal fever of not having had a good day of suspecting that tomorrow will be the same, and

suddenly the im� ��genes, those 24 frames per second, work the absolute miracle of faith in art. The

dislocation makes us sit in the chair, but the soul - that invention of faith, but exists for

these cases - rises in a cathartic, liberating flight and occupies the best place in the world , that of j���bilo, that of

momentary happiness. Yes, then the soul returns to the chair and The End warns us to turn off the DVD or

leave the pure and wonderful darkness of the room to face chaos and disorder, thatavatar

undisciplinedthat is living. I do not get pessimistic, even if it's Monday, and it costs me to string together ideas and express them

as is appropriate for the purpose of writing something about Wilder's On Silver Plate. Alex, in his

Antarctica, has also disemboweled his love for the master in the hidden face of this post. Complete this reading

with this one, and be happy, for God's sake, do not let life cause you more havoc than its course

and the irrevocable certainty of your sad final

" 1

" Thirst for evil is twisted, dark and tragic One of those films that you have to see before you die and all

that ...

For many, even for many of those who have not seen it, Sed de mal is particularly famous for containing

what, in the opinion of the understood in the technical watermarks of cinema, it is the best plane-sequence of all its

history. The camera, hanging in an imposing grée, plummets down to the couple formed by Charlton

Heston and Janet Leigh (Vargas and Susan, his wife) who walk across the border to have an

ice cream . At the time, someone puts a bomb in a car. What comes next is part of that History and should not be

taken lightly. I remember that I saw Thirst for evil a long time ago and it did not fill me like it does now. I remember the sweat. The

sensation of physical and mental stress: feeling that has not disappeared, continues and, if possible, amplified. Now

it seems more monstrous than before: its obscenity is spoiled in detail. It is also sinister: its evil occupies the

shadows that the characters are leaving in that border city between Mexico and the US (Los Robles). Orson

Welles is Captain Quinlan, a fat guy up to the caricature, primed by the hatred of his miserable life in a

disgusting corner of the world and eaten by a thirst for revenge not fulfilled ( His wife was murdered and he did not find

the culprit, Orson Welles reserves the most juicy role, perhaps Charles Laughton, who is one of myweaknesses

cynical, would have played it. It's the same as Marlon Brando in his last time, before he gave himself up,

I can not imagine anyone else ... Charlton Heston is the narc�� officer. Mexican politicians who just put

the capo of the border mafia behind bars and have just married the soda, inevitably bland, Janet Leight,

from here Welles mounts a disempowered guignol about corruption. Elny hatred and leads the plot through

the glassy eyes of the perverse captain Quinlan, which is still a Novelty.Sed of evil is twisted,

dark (almost all scenes happen at night) and tragic.It fascinates by the admirable photography of Russell

Metty, by the inspiring and already immortal m� The music of Henry Mancini (pure miscegenation of jazz, rock and roll and

Latin music) and the visual delirium of his expressionism. Quinlan's own character is already a fantastic

discovery: a tormented man, left of himself, admired by his companions, but perverse, in the background,

haloed by an evil rarely seen at the cinema. The role of Marlene Dietricht, owner of ahovelis fundamental

pianolain which a younger Quinlan was "an exceptional man", but the violent death of his

wife activates a mechanism of perfidy and of impressive atrocity: Quinlan is ruthless, hurricane, ferocious in his

lacunic movement through the scenes. As impressive as the initial contrapicado is the scene in which

Quinlan kills T���o Grandi, the other gangster on the billboard, in front of a narcotized Susan Vargas, lying on a

bed, mumbling, opening and closing dimly and dimly the eyes: the way in which gloves are stuffed and the

place where Welles place the camera so that we notice the cerniente tragedy, the dim light of the

room, the agonistic rattle of the victim. Everything contributes to Welles's magisterial teaching, to his

incorruptible talent for scrutinizing the root of evil, his vast dominion over human impulses. Not in vain did

Orson Welles go to Shakespeare as soon as he could. "" Cahiers du cin���ma "" defined it as "" the best

B-series movie that ever It has been done "". Perhaps, in spite of the excessiveness of the affirmation, there is no lack of reason: the

materials used by Welles are poor. The sets are minimal. Dialogs do not shine because of their genius. How,

from an irrelevant narrative or from a very poor props, the genius of a director is capable of creating Art.

Unhealthy art, of course, but one of those imperishable cinéphilic experiences, to which one comes from time to time

because he needs a vitamin session of cinema in its purest form. Eschatological, in some cases. Simultaneously,

Quinlan dies in a dumpster.

" 1

" It's not a melodrama and not a thriller, but it's about basing a very entertaining and honest exercise

in sociological research, a neutral analysis that delves into the sins of a broken society, pushed to

forgive with interest, to be convinced of the lightness of certain crimes so as not to spoil the modélic calm

of its appearance.

This modern vampire critic, based in an asyptic London, obviates the gothic component to the use and

romanticism of the book, but portrays the same pathologies: what is radically different is the dress with

which evil presents itself to us. Here it is given in full light and the contest of a single drop of alimentary

blood is not required. The object subject to suction is the entire personality and is exercised by a teacher about to retire,

harmless in appearance, cultured and crudely ��� cured in the observations recorded in her journals, about another

teacher who has recently graduated. n attached to a cloister, cute, young and, in principle, easily inducible to the absolute pleasure of

manipulation. Diary of a scandal progresses slowly but firmly on delicate budgets that,

in other hands, with other views, could have generated a vulgar telefilm of gaudy invoice with abundant

evidences of reality show in its naked footage. Going to a frivolous record on education in this

21st century, we can say that the film is a reflection of the slight morality that floods us: of how the

instincts are the engines of our actions, although in this case the young idealist and bobalicona (sober Cate

Blanchett) never seems to us bad everything, in spite of having contributed with its consent to a young

quinceañera to be trajine with repeated insistence in a burning here I catch you-here I kill you. Theblackmail

sentimentalthat the old teacher exercises on the new leads all the interest of the film: the disturbed loneliness

of the slightly lesbian teacher who is excited by the possibility of enslaving the will of her blackmail

allows a fragile advance of the story, nothing melodrama �tico, ballast perhaps for an interesting but in the end

very heavy voice off of the narrator omn���moda of the plot, the vampiresa, the happy demiurge of the tragedy that

his perversion has created. The magisterial Judi Dench recreates with astonishing naturalness an odious, ambiguous,

evil character by nature, surprised on the final slope of his life with the hymen intact and the bad milk cradled

in that homicidal gaze that drags during a good part of the film. open psychological drama does not

decay at any time: it raises discussions of wide social scope such as the sexual relationship with minors or the

sordid acquiescence of those who for one reason or another take advantage of this dysfunction. The scant scruples of the

young teacher at the time of being trajinar by the boy are no less scandalous than the permissiveness

of the teacher interested in the desm���n, which plays her letters with premeditation, always aware

that the game is written by her and she establishes the rules, the actants and even the duration. There is ascene

particularly significant: B���rbara, that's the name of the character he plays gloriously, we've already said,

Judi Dench, sits on the stairs of the inevitably English house where the tragedy has incorporated the

mother of the recently perverted student: this one goes to give a beating to the teacher inductor. The show is

sublime in the eyes of whoever has written all the lyrics of the work. These remarkable evidences of

good cinema and a stupendous story are lost when the film announces its twisted end, its renunciation to be sincere

with itself, because what it gives us, in payment more than an hour of attractive arguments, is a final result,

where everything is allowed to lead towards the meekness of forgiveness and where all characters recover, for the benefit

of an armchair, the tranquility, the inner peace from which they began. In the end we have the gray portrait of a

dark woman, afflicted in her unaccepted solitude or perhaps the truly remarkable is the ease with which we

divest the closest crimes of importance if in indifference we acquire some benefit, a comfortable

chair from which to contemplate the ruins of morality, the devastated silences of a society that is excessively

prone to tr emendismo And also another equally depressing portrait: that of the dysfunctional family (nothing to

envy the psychiatrists who are members of Little Sunshine's van) of Sheba, theteacher

young, of the that it could be built, with due dramatic refinement, a more than solid guide ofand

bourgeois pujasjinxes apparent to the rhythm sabros�� Den a calypso after lunch hamgurguesas with pink.

" 1

" Second part was never good and this is certainly not an exception. Stolen the surprise of the first,

is something very insubstantial, slow and heavy, that we try to get rid of the hast���o with a little casquer���a. To see

and be erased from the brain before reaching the parking lot.

After seeing the first, and leaving quite disgusted with the poor oriental who had blown his face, Imyself

toldnot to see the second part or pony. But as you know I have less word than those that come out in the

debates of the TV, because I've seen it. I know that, knowing the three scenes of disgust in whichwisely

I havecovered my face. A guy with the hairs of the gray eggs, playing dumb like that. In short. The

film is about a boy who has escaped from a kind of field of horrors, where people are

dedicated to pay money to kill people. Well, in the two scenes he begins to talk about threegirls

Americanwho are in Rome and want to go to Prague to visit it. In these they are crossed on the road a woman

with everything very well since it suggests a spa in Slovakia, where they will stay in a hostel. Uhhhh, what a

mess. Okay, let's see. Fear, what is said fear does not give. It gives much more drowsiness and boredom, given that the

little action that there is very slow and eyedropper. Except close to the end, the rest is a

pesti���o. Then there are those who say that this shows us the power of money and I do not know what else. I did not

hear about that. It happened to me like in the first, that the idea could be good, but the development is mediocre. And scenes of

disgust, there are, but as was warned, well I can not tell you whether they gave or not. Ah, the end is to split the

box to laugh, that tontez.Resumiendo, second part was never good and this certainly is not an exception.

Stolen the surprise of the first, is something very insubstantial, slow and heavy, that we try to get rid of the hast���o

with a little casquer���a. To see and be erased from the brain before reaching the parking lot.

" 0

" The film gives no respite to the spectator, manages not to mess it up in its exposition, nor does it circulate theinvestigation

police. We will feel a pleasant and adequate sensation of d���ja v���.

There is a before and after 9/11, and that sense of defenselessness of society in the face of disaster waspotentiated

thenby the phenomena of the tsunami and , for the United States, with the devastating effects of hurricane Katrina

in New Orleans. At least the first two disasters planned on Tony Scott's new film, Deja vu,

since the action takes place in the same place and a terrorist attack is involved. The reflection that the film makes

, before shooting itself clearly towards science fiction and temporal paradoxes, is what can be

done to prevent terrorist sabotage and, if that is possible, what responsibility one has towards the

victims. Not far from the plot of this film is what is for me the best novel of Orson Scott

Card: Watchers of the past: The Redemption of Crist���bal Col� .N There are abundant elements of contact not in

the temporal journey itself, but in the responsibility and commitment of the observer to the observed and all the

moral implications that this may carry with it. With a devilish rhythm, a magnificent staging,

a dirty photograph that shows us the streets of New Orleans that have not yet recovered from the effects of

catastrophe or the effects of Mardi Grass, without turning the camera crazy or doing the exaggerated editing tricks of

his last film with Denzel Washington, the little brother of Ridley Scott, that is provingand

againagain that it is not so small, is able to put the spectator in a crossroads of genres and, without solution of

continuity, take it by the hand and get it Do not get lost in the temporal paradoxes that it raises. The

storyline of the film is simple: a terrorist attack on a ferry loaded with sailors fromthrows

Farrapolice officer Doug Carlin (Washington) of the ATF (a government agency that I did not know). I have to talk

before, of course) to the investigation of the causes. A woman appears dead and tortured and burned on the bank

of the river, but an hour before the attack. It is then when a government research group, led

by a Val Kilmer that increasingly resembles Alec Baldwin, enlists Washington to help them

investigate, and show him alleged recordings of everything that It has happened in the city four and a

half days ago. Soon the viewer (and Washington, who is a lynx, the uncle), in understanding that it is not about

recordings, but that the cu���ntica technology allows to open a window to the past and see in real time, but with

that gap of four days, how the plot of the murder and the attack unfolds. Ironically, the

patriotic-religious freak who commits the murders is none other than James Caviezel, that is, the same Christ from

the movie The Passion according to San Mel Gibson, who has already participated in a similar film of parallel universes and

changes in the temporal line, that little great jewel frequently undervalued that is Frequency. The film

gives no respite to the spectator, it manages not to mess it up in its exposition, nor that the police investigation of thesqueaks

beginningwith the inevitable temporary trip that Denzel Washington has to carry out to the rescue in the last

fifteen minutes of projection. If you are not fond of science fiction, it will seem like a

correct movie and you may even be surprised by the end. Those of us who are already old dogs in the genre and love

above all the themes of time travel and the paradoxes that these entail, we will feel a pleasant

and adequate sensation of happiness. ���, and we will leave the cinema reflecting on how many times thehas traveled

good of Denzel Washingtonto the past trying to amend not only the terrorist's plan, but his ownfailures

previous, and without knowing it.

" 1

" Nothing surpasses this enormous work that draws one of the darkest and most terrible canvases of the

human condition.

Suddenly I thought that KUBRICK was resurrecting to rescue the cinema with his accustomed grandiloquence. After a few

minutes I realize that I have too much imagination because the director is none other than the idolized author of

magnolia PAUL THOMAS ANDERSON possessed by the spirit of the unforgettable filmmaker of the mechanical orange. .Nica.Pozos de

ambici���n breathes classicism on all four sides with all the features that will make it awork

greatwith the passage of time an essential title that shows that from time to time the cinema if it is an

art. A REMAKE of giant past of revolutions with the impressive DANIEL DAY LEWIS that returns after one of

its periods of silence after GANGS OF NEW YORK, sometimes I seemed to see in screen at the same MARLON BRANDO

as the British interpreter composes one of those characters with the entrances that the camera eats with the

force of a merchandise train. ���as.A mastodontic work from the portrait of some moved characters for

greed, corruption and lack of ethics where you enter a destructive dynamic where dementia takes over

all the characters in a descent into the underworld that takes you to the unorthodox end but really

scary.A rather austere photograph, although it perfectly reflects the lush landscapes, nothing is left of

this enormous work that draws one of the most important canvases dark and terrible of the human condition. Obviously

it is not cinema for all the public since it is due to recognize a quite dense work to him but if you enter in her you will not be

able to leave.

" 1

" Infiltrados can be cataloged as arrogance. Superb address, superb gui���ny and superb

interpretations.

If Martin Scorsese does not get any statuettes this year for "" Infiltrados "", I erase myself from the Oscars. The

magnitude influence that the director's films get, when he feels like it, have very few

equivalents at present. We can say that a director x made x good films. Scorsese confirms me

after seeing this film that is capable of being attributed the best cinematographic career of the last 50 years, and I am not

exaggerating at all. "" Taxi Driver "", "" Wild Bull "" and "" The Cape of Fear "" set the precedents in that

caustic and dirty way when shooting. "" One of Ours "" and "" Casino "" are two of the five points of Mafia perfection

next to the trilogy of "" El Padrino "". "" Jo, that night "" is an almost perfect comedy, and "" The Age of Innocence ""

taught us that it can also be romantic. Take all the best parts of this list and you will have

"" Infiltrados "", a film that I do not find any but. For the record that I have not seen "" Infernal Affairs "", of

which Scorsese has made a remake, or a version, or rather I do not know, because after seeing "" Infiltrados "" I have been

curious about his original Asi���tico , which I doubt have more similar to the base argument.

I have the impression that Scorsese has taken this film more than any other, so it remains a

mere anecdote. "" Infiltrados "" can be classified as arrogance . Superb address, superb gui���ny and superb

interpretations. From "" Gangs of New York "" I expected more, but I never got to like it at all. "" The Aviator ""

also failed in the set. That is why this film is so great, where you spend more than two hours

engaged in a history of police and thieves with the most spectacular personalities and charisms of the

last times. History is the best phrase for the Italian-American director's mind. Two guys who

finish the formation of the Boston Police, although one of them (Matt Damon) will use his post to alert the city's

biggest boss, Frank Costello (Jack Nicholson) , whom he sees as his father, of allmovements

body. In turn, the other (Leonardo DiCaprio), who comes from a damn family, must undertake the difficult

mission of being the mole among the ranks of Costello. Their works will cross over until the situation

allows for the unmasking of one or the other. Let's go for the main ones: Matt Damon signs his best performance in

his entire career, and I would like to give Bourne the personality and strength that he gives to hiscop character

corrupt. Scorsese has turned him into a man you admire with all your soul, because of the coldness with which he

treats his sneak job, and the persuasion he uses with his superiors. His final actions are according to

his soul. Leonardo Di Caprio is sensational, and finally you see the word "" Scorsese "" on his forehead after the

failed "" Gangs "" and "" Aviator "". Scared at times and uncontrolled in others, you can say without a doubt that

his best performance was the martyr tite. Impressive from beginning to end. Pay attention to thescene

shabby shop. Scorsese 100%. Jack Nicholson is another world. A piece of \*\*\* son of those that Scorsese is only

able to draw. Amoral, without feelings, without confidence, violent, sadistic and sarcastic. It gives the best

moments of the film, both dramatic and comic. I see him with the statuette in his hands, because there is no

actor who has left so much this year. It is worth the film just to see it. The secondary ones stop

being it to become authentic pillars of the action. Martin Sheen perfect, Mark Whalberg

unrecognizable extraordinarily and Alec Baldwin in the best of his life: how to beat up the dumpy cop on

duty. A pasote.Con "" Infiltrados "" the genre of gangsters comes to his canvas, and shows that the boss is

Scorsese. Unpleasant violence but you can not stop looking. Each pu���etazo on the screen is a

bite of lips in the chair, it is not known whether by disgust or by desire to participate t��� tambi���n. And the best, an

end of restlessness where you discover that the director does not have to be conventional. For what if it has

never been. Long live whoever touches him, the king is Scorsese.

" 1

" A free film, that squanders imagination, that is enjoyed in each of its frames and that does not

become a masterpiece only because it lacks a point of emotion. Paran to finish snatching the viewer.

You have to have the balls very well placed to imagine, write, draw and film a movie like "" The

labyrinth of the faun "", in which the most cruel, bloody and sinister reality shakes hands with thefantasies

overflowing, imaginative and unbridled. In addition, you have to have a lot of genius and a lot of talent to mix the Post

Spanish Civil War, the maquis and the Francoist repression with a fairy tale. and leave with the

challenge well.Guillermo Del Toro is a fecund, protean and homÃ ³ cico type, endowed with an insurmountablecapacitywants

imaginative and visionary, that flies free, films what heand almost always He does it masterfully.

From "" Cronos "", his wonderful update to the myth of the vampire and the fight for immortality, to this

"" Pan's Labyrinth "", Del Toro has left his personal imprint on such projects ��� We are like "" The backbone of the

devil "" or in products as supposedly commercial as "" Hellboy "" or "" Blade "". And all those films end up

leaving a nice and delicious aftertaste in the viewer. "" The labyrinth of the faun "" is a fantastic tour de force

that, from its sonorous and evocative title, It does not leave anyone indifferent. A car from the Falange is advancing,

barely, on a bad country road. A mother tells her daughter that she reads too many fairy books. When the

car arrives at its destination and the girl knows who is going to be her putative father. We all understand that your only

refuge will be, precisely, in that fantasy world that will open up around you. Because the character

masterfully played by the always brilliant Sergi L���pez is a piece of goat, a piece, as

we did not see on a movie screen. A cabron who knows he is, who enjoys it and who does not

have the least remorse for being so. The counterpoint, paradoxically, is in that threateningworld

fantasticin which, however, the small protagonist will find a more human warmth than the existing one. between

men.Barroco and, at times, bizarre, the on universorico universe in which the child is introduced will have consequences in

the real world of the one who flees. Thus, through the tests imposed on him by the incoming Faun, the small

"" will get "" that knife that will be essential to Mercedes, you will learn to flee from the bad guy of the film and,

with your innocence and determination, you will bring a ray of hope for the real world to be a little, just a

a little bit better. "" The labyrinth of the Faun "" is a free film, that squanders imagination, that is enjoyed in each

of its frames and that does not become a masterpiece if because it lacks a point of emotion to

finish snatching the spectator and causing the tears to overflow in the stalls. Although, well

thought, of having done so, surely Del Toro would have been accused of maudlin and gimmicky. In any case, this

is an outstanding film that confirms that when there is genius, personality and talent, everything

else, including budget, is secondary.

" 1

" I think that at the moment I can say, when they ask me which is the worst movie I've seen in my life, that

this honor falls on "" Mutants in the University "".

You have to fuck. Last night, the Omega man and I had a choice and we stayed with "Mutants in the

University", I suppose for the title and its horny sound. Go more horrible plate. Do not stop playing

songs (it seems the same always, by the way) during the 76 minutes of peli.Est��� ���montada? in anway

offensive, the actors n���, well, roll Troma putting faces on the fly. The best of all is that it has 2

directors !!!!! The story, which does not have, because it has neither good nor bad nor storyline is bland and there is

no funny joke. I think that at the moment I can say, when they ask me which is the worst movie that I have

seen in my life, that this honor falls on "" Mutants in the University ""

" 0

" A magnificent film that manages to transport the viewer to the decadent but bewitching London of the

late nineteenth.

In general, and although it is not very orthodox, I usually consider the presence of Michael Caine enough incentive

to see a film, and to presuppose to the film in question some minimums in matter of gui� Interpretane

interpretation. If we add to that, among the members of the rest of the cast is an increasingly

tanned Hugh Jackman, my interest increases even more. The final trick is one of those movies that one likes to see

with time, relaxed, and taking a gin and tonic, enjoying every scene, every dialogue, every gesture, and

above all, an ambience. It's very successful that transports you (in transport also helps the glass), the

old London of the late nineteenth, decadent and bewitching, while able to enrapture. To the already highlighted

grandiosity of its interpreters (we must not forget, though brief and secondary, the appearance of Scarlett

Johansson), and from its scenarios, we must add the absorptive capacity of a script. elaborated with care in the

details. But as nothing or nobody is perfect, The Prestige also suffers from defects. Starting with the

difficulties to clearly decide how to call it ���The Prestige ?, The prestige ?, The final trick ?trick

, The final, the prestige ?. This indecisiveness and complexity in the name, will cause that in the end, the majority ends up

referring to her like that film of magicians of Michael Caine, in which also David Bowie left (I

forgot to comment before the curious but little appearance of Bowie interpreting the mysterious Tesla). I would also

dare to say that It is not uniform in terms of its rhythm, which causes that at times the

interest and it costs work to maintain attention. The truth is that these details, especially that of their cadence,

make this a magnificent film, but not exceptional. In any case, one of those films that nobody

should miss. Although for tastes the colors.

" 1

" The guide tries to be nice and entertaining, but the only thing he gets is to sink. It's not worth it or

take it out of the video-club.

More known as "" Trust the Man "" ("" Believe the man ""), a title more in keeping with the film than this

translation. n. "" They and They "". Let's start: what are the highlights of this movie (something lazy, everything must

be said)? Julianne Moore (it's time to get a damn Oscar) and Maggie Gyllenhaal, that remains a

mere anecdote with Moore (who, by the way, only participates in this film because her husband

directs it.) In addition to Moore and Miaggie. What do we have left? A squad of children who fulfill their task without

shrillness (it is not a compliment), a bland and insipid address (what an eye Moore has when choosing a

husband.) And. The gui���n, the big culprit that the. pel. ���cula. (bufff, it has cost me but I have said it) it remains

in a stupidity the size of a temple. The main error of the script is that it tries to be fun. I repeat: he

tries, but he does not succeed. The most he gets is not boring. But of course, trying to be

nice and fun, the only thing he gets is to sink (and in some muddy waters, everything is said) in a

clustering of topics and situations that are forced and incredible (unbelievable). It's not worth it or take it out of the

video-club.

" 0

" How can you not forgive Antonio for making a failed movie, even if it's so pleasantly

failed? So, finally, maybe it will even wipe out the box office and everything.

We must recognize the value of Antonio Banderas: to make his second film as director not only comes to

Spain, when the commercial possibilities would be much greater in the United States, where It has been settled for

three decades, but also makes a very lyrical version, barely a blockbuster, the homonymous novel of a

poet, Antonio Soler, who for more inri he is in charge of the script alone, so that the poetic charge (sometimes

touching the cursiler���a) of the novel takes its shadow throughout the film. And is that, although it seems a

truism, not always a good book can make a good movie; in fact the experience comes to

say rather the opposite. In addition, the languages ​​are not even, and what works in a book (the voice of the

narrator, which in cinema, generally, is the most shocking: here is an example) He has to do it in

a film. It is clear what fascinated Flags of Soler's novel: the atmosphere of the Malaga of the

late Francoism, in the middle of the seventies, just the moment when �� He was about the same

age as the characters in the novel and the film, and he probably lived and knew the same places instory

which theunfolds. action of the book and the film. It is also true that the tone conferred by Banderas

(and his screenwriter Soler) on this "" The way of the English "", between the poetic and the on���rico, with

irisaciones aleg ���ricas (that initial scene, so atypical in modern commercial cinema), bathed in the omnipresent music of

Antonio Meliveo, with chords that are more reminiscent of jazz that to flamenco (better so: not always the cinema in

Andalusia has to resort to the jondo, although some people believe it), it is pure poison for the box office, not

accustomed to the p� Public to such licenses. Said which would have to say that "" The way. "" Does not hit

with the tone: the story that is told is curious, even if it is not precisely the originality does not go

. In addition, Banderas, which has had a budget (seven million euros) far higher than what

is known in Spain for a production like this (without known actors, nor complicated special effects,

nor mass scenes), it seems that it has become engrossed in the beauty of the images, and thus the film

turns out to be excessively precious, as if the director had taken pleasure in capturing a dreamlike flamenco that,

surely, already exists only in her mag���n and in those who knew her, more than thirty years ago��� you. All of which

should not be marred by the myths of the film, the story of a boy with a lesser heart, in love with a

girl who in turn is tempted by another man more possible than her boyfriend; it is also the story of his

friends, the son of the rich man who is forced to leave the girl he wants, and the son of the "" strip-teuse "" who

makes sex on a stage in London. It is also the story of the aspiring radio announcer, perhaps a

transcript of the novelist and screenwriter himself, Antonio Soler, although finally his radiophonic "" speechs "" remember

more of the Crazy Hill programs of the seventies. And in addition to everything, that, why not say it?

Antonio is the child of the eyes of the Spaniards, let alone the Andalusians. Wehis triumph in Hollywood

enjoyedas his own, as he did in the sixties with the success of Manolo Santana in tennis or now with

Fernando Alonso in motorsport. So, how can you not be forgiven for making a failed movie,

even if it's so pleasantly flawed? So, finally, maybe it will even wipe out the box office and everything.

" 0

" They decided to leave the movie as a panfletary allegation of suicide. I do not know about you, but regardless

of my opinion about euthanasia, there is nothing that screws me up that they manipulate me emotionally with aguide

cheating.

What mainly remains in the minds of the spectators is what the film tells: the story. And to

be more concrete, the story and its approach. Alejandro Amen���bar is a great director with a lot of talent, and I

must admit that from the moment he announced he was going to direct this story I was pleasantly surprised by this

turn of the theme. Up until now, the one I liked most about him was Abre los ojos, of course with a

much more original approach than Tesis or Los Otros.Pero Mar Adentro is his wife pel��� cula And it was a

success? One, because he chose a story and a real character in a political situation for Spanish society,

which would guarantee the interest of the national patrio.Tos, the good work of Amen���bar and the fact of joining with the

impressive Bardem is a t���ndem that can sell as well as Spielberg's -Cruise. At least within

our borders. Not only did it achieve unanimity of criticism and public, but it was also taken as areference

moralto unleash the pol? I eam the euthanasia and collected a multitude of awards for its great bill

(even the Oscar). But even so I consider this film a bad film perfectly made Why,

precisely because of the two previous points. First: I chose the story of Ramon Sampedro as the source of a

cause like euthanasia ("" set of m ��� all that produce a death without suffering, to shorten the torment

of the agon���ao of a very painful and irreversible disease. "" Great Larousse Encyclopedia). This "" character "" became the

leader of this cause, but in reality he wanted to commit suicide. In other words, he wanted an "assisted suicide". . Itnot

isa play on words. It was simply that. And it's clear that he, like Maggie in Million Dollar Baby, could

have committed suicide at any time. In a rude way, but he could have done it if hishad been real.

intentionIn this the film of Eastwood already leaves the one of Amen���bar in evidence (of attitudes). And if they already

begin to deceive us with the subject, badly we go. Second: precisely because of the good work of Amen���bar and Bardem they get

a manipulative emotional and conceptual work. I cried and I laughed while I saw her. I let myself be carried by the

heart, but when the lights went on I felt pissed. And a lot. Because if you fall into the logic of the film, you realize

that suicide is sold as the only alternative to the tetrapl���jicos. And it is just the opposite.

99% of people in the same situation is that the protagonist wantslive, so the case wasSampedro

so cacareado.Peroin the film comes perhaps someone in the same situation of the protagonist but with theattitude

opposite? Yes. A cure. Go for god (never better said). But could not be anyone who is not religious?

Someone like Ramon? No. The movie would end. So they decided to leave the movie as a pamphlet allegation to

suicide (with the added marketing of the new superstar Ramona Maneiro confessing that she helped him die and

accompanied his confession. Conn with books and spaces in the newspapers for your opinion). I do not know about you, but

regardless of my opinion about euthanasia there is nothing more Fuck me to be emotionally manipulated

with a cheat guide. And as I care more what they tell me I consider it bad.

" 0

" When did they kill Richard Nixon? It seems to me that this movie is already starting to take us ... Let's see, how did they kill Richard Nixon? It seems to me that this movie is already starting to take us. By the

way, does the Sean Penn poster look like one of those of the CIA charged with thwarting theplans

assassin's assassination? Ah, with his image flying over the White House, as if he were the archangel San

Gabriel. How they deceive us, really. The film is about a man who is to see it. He has everything and does not

lack detail. The film that has just been separated from his wife begins and she does not like that he goes to see her

by surprise (basically because he is a bit slobbering). On the other hand, he works as a salesman in anstore

office furniture, with a somewhat peculiar boss. Finally, he has a black friend who runs a mechanical workshop

with which he wants to start a business. So with these letters that have given him in life, a little paranoia

and wanting to change the world in a beastly way, Sean Penn spends 90 minutes. Exciting, is not it? Mother, what a truce

of Ortu���o. Fuck, the whole film is infumable. Surely there are many people who are passionate about this cinema

based on a man who is sick in the head and who does pathetic things more than they can not. A server of course

not. On the positive level, the actors are quite good, and Sean Penn is impressive, giving arecital

tremendous performance. On the negative plane, everything else. The script lacks interest for mortal philosophers.

The story does not hook, and you even feel sorry for the protagonist. In addition, you do not finish to understand

why it is so bad of the head. Come on, we did not like anything at all. Resuming, for the average spectator of

popcorn and flat encephalogram is not worth it and can burn the cinema. For the brainy cin���filos, lovers ofplots

convolutedand characters of perverse depth, perhaps they are interested. The family members of Sean Penn sure

love it.

" 0

" It is clear that I am not objective with Guillermo del Toro, but even so, I think I am in a position to

say that El laberinto del fauno is his best work so far.

With some filmmakers happens? not with many the truth, but from time to time the typical director premieres

that you know he will not disappoint you. I do not mean those who have done the great masterpieces of the twentieth

century - the same people who later dragged themselves into regrettable projects, because Hollywood is like that - and who let you

down again and again, perhaps �� because the degree of demand is too high. I speak more of that caste

of middle class artisans who normally maintain a constant quality level in all their films; In

my opinion, Guillermo del Toro belongs to that school of film lovers who always meet, who are capable

of dealing with a hollywodiense superproduction and succeed, and at the same time make room for

realizations m� It's personal. With the desire to have a good time and the confidence that I would not be disappointed, I went on

the opening day to see El laberinto del fauno, one of those projects More personalities that arise between

black vampires and demon boys. Filmed in the mother tongue of the Mexican and with euros and pesos instead of dollars,

Guillermo returned to the pseudo-universe already proposed in El espinazo del diablo, which rounds the Spanish Civil War

- either before, during or after- and that I had liked so much in his previous edition. Everything pointed to

a good popcorn session? What I could not wait for was to find one of the best fantastic

movies I've seen in a long time. The labyrinth of the faun is, above all, a story . A story

of love and death, of tenderness and violence, that mixes fantasy and reality as if it were a Martini with vodka

(not agitated) The combination of a dream world with the harsh reality is magnificent, throughout the

film we interspersed the fantastic journey of Ofelia (the protagonist child) with the rude struggle of the maquis against the

fascist regime recently. implanted in Spain. Both arguments intertwine and enjoy an amazing energy,

wanting in each case, as a spectator, that the action does not end to change the third. On the

earthly side a magnificent Jordi L��� The fish represents the typical archetype of the fascist and Francoist military. Recio and

strict, lacking any kind of scruple when the occasion requires it and severe even with their loved

ones; an authentic bastard who fills his belly with lamb while he decides to give a singlecard

rationto each family he is in charge of. The typical works perfectly, because every story requires a

"bad", and Captain Vidal is a perfect son of a bitch. Many of the hyperviolent sequences that he stars

give a great intensity to the story, intensity that I do not know until what point it would have been possible if the scroll

had spoken in English. One of the strengths of the film is the part emotional, concerns arise

throughout the film: you feel the impotence of the maquis massacred, you are aware of the suffering of

some characters, you let yourself be carried away by the magical world that runs through the girl and you come to claim revenge in more than

one occasion. Moments like the one starred by the stuttering guerrilla are simply excellent and make

the film triumph there where it was shipwrecked The backbone of the devil, that was a horror story that was not

scary, this time we ran into with a formula that is thrilling. A lot of the actors blame that,

among whom I would like to highlight the doctor (Alex Angulo) and the maid (Maribel Verd���), even

though this time You can not see her tits, which embroider her papers, being the Doctor, protagonist of

one of the most exciting moments of the film. The technical invoice of the film is really impeccable, at the

level of any Yankee production. The special effects are the best I've seen, mixingtechnology

digitalwith a handmade component of costumes, makeup and props. The faun?Doug Jones,

Who playswho played Abe Sapiens in Hellboy? Is especially successful and some creatures, like the one with

the eyes in the palms of the hands, are amazing. An example of know-how. On the other hand, the music,

composed by Javier Navarrete, also takes center stage as the film progresses, taking over

practically from it towards the end. Definitely, and having in account that I enjoyed a byproduct such as

Blade II thanks to the fat man's hand (especially listening to his comments in off) it is clear that Inot

amobjective with Guillermo del Toro, but even so �, I think I am in a position to say that The Labyrinth of the

Faun is his best work so far, and that it probably is not the last one. To finish I only ask

you to record is the moral of this story: and is that to obey, like that, without more? Does not have to be the right thing, at

least not always?

" 1

" Everything that encourages thinking about "Fiction" is unbelievable "without pretending". It is not All theMen

President's, but it is a bet, at least, interesting of the Spanish Cinema, in which there are nopeaks

patrioticor monologues chillingly ridiculous. �culos.

With an argument that surpasses the best American political trhiller, (what would have given Oliver Stone to be

Spanish!), This production of Mundo Ficci�� �n, focuses on the periodical investigations that uncovered a

scandal "" unprecedented in the history of democracies "", according to those responsible; who, curiously,

have called it "" Gal "". Gal is, in fact, a package formed by the story, the film and the way it was done, which

does not rule out the possibility of becoming trilogy, with what Paco Ariza could become more famous thanObviously

Torrente., if the Ariza said in the report that "there is much more" and that "" much more "" is not

counted in the film, it's because Melchor Miralles (a lovely gentleman where he is) could be preparing

the second part, Gal: The Endless Story. The report is broadcast for two consecutive days, prior to the

premiere and at the maximum viewing time, by an autonomic channel, and its goal is, b�� Basically, gut the film with

surgical precision. It has two fascinating moments, which derive from the lines of

investigation followed by journalists and that they are led to a revealing foothold, as well as to meet the

alleged lover of the peculiar public official. In the same way, Pablo, the director, recounts some very

interesting conversations that he maintains with certain politicians. I am inclined to think that the "" disembowelment ""

is carried out without ill will, presupposing that the whole country He remembers the ins and outs of the case, but forgetting

that more than twenty years ago there were many Spaniards who neither voted nor paid. taxes or read theenough

press, because we are not oldto do so. Of course, I also come to the conviction that knowing the silhouette

of the plot and each and every one of the details of the fund, it no longer makes sense to pay 5.80 bucks in the cinema. The

six million euros that have Invested in this production, they are translated into a modest film, with

certain dyes of television series, very bad photography and improvable atmosphere. We are, however,

faced with a well-told story, with an impeccably simple structure and a cinematic script loaded with genre

themes, which makes the mistake of insinuating a sentimental roll that, neither comes to mind, nor does it offer attraction

to the footage, nor does it add a pepper to the plot. Throughout the projection and, once again, because of the rip-off story

, my memory cin� ��fila flies to the Olympic Games of the year 72, reminds me of how the government of

Israel dissociates itself from the M comandonich command and forces me to think that the members of the Spanish secret services

do not have a hair of ready. Meanwhile, the historical memory shakes me when it is assumed

that Juanito, the minister, enters prison for being the organizer of the antiterrorist gang ... while I am

convinced (���qu ��� ilusa!) That it was because of an issue with the reserved funds. With a Natalia Verbeke, at

times, incredible and a Jos��� Garc���a cre���ble s� At times, the only protagonist is the building that appears "" seven

years later "", in an imposing foreground and retaining its true name; a curious aspect in a film in

which Pedro is called Pablo and Vicente is called Luis. It is not All the President's Men, but it is a

bet, at least, interesting of the Spanish Cinema, in which there are no patriotic peaks or monologues

chillingly ridiculous. �cles, very far from that "" That justice be done, even if the Earth opens "" of the

unforgettable JFK.El C���mo was made keeps me awake until four in the morning, but I must admit that it

deserves the penalty for the question he posed: "" What is hidden behind this movie? .. "" Of course, when

I start thinking that this is the C�� I say Da Vinci and that there must be some strange message that has been

overlooked, the voiceover concludes that "the only thing that is hidden behind the film is the desire

to overcome the success of Lobo criticism and public "". It is here where I understand that of the "honest subjectivity"

that Miralles talks about (a charm of a gentleman where there are), but I feel disappointed as cin���fila, because I

expected much� Most of it as a producer. In any case, I do not feel calm. Suddenly, when I see the

film, I think that any negotiation with the terrorist band is unthinkable, not even for the sake

of a peace process; that if there was a democratic government that minted, this can be repeated, if it is

not already happening, at this moment; and that those who were able to uncover the greatest scandal of this

country when all denied it, may be after the true clue of another conspiracy, however far-fetched it

may seem today. Everything that makes me think about Mundo Ficci���n is unbelievable, without pretending it. But as I love

cinema, what interests me the most is knowing that you have written about Gal who said that the last movie of Oliver Stone was

"" a telefilm "". Whatever it is, I hope your sincerity, because there is no longer Diario 16, which was the one that dismissed.

" 0

" Modern Times contains one of his best - or perhaps the best - beginning of any of his films.

Chaplin demonstrates in a few minutes, the alienation in which man submerges the industrialization and theuse

excessiveof the machines themselves.

Modern Times contains one of its best - or perhaps the best - beginning of any of all its films.

Chaplin demonstrates in a few minutes, the alienation in which man submerges the industrialization and theuse

excessiveof the machines themselves (it is even "" eaten "" literally by one of them). part of an idea of ​​the

clown after his visit and meeting with Mahatma Gandhi, fervent defender of the rights of man and one of

the most important crises in the US (1929), effects that lasted several years. A great moment of the film is the

confusion as leader in front of a demonstration, next to the various and successful prison scenes (the

use of the drug in the saltcellar is in���dita until that moment). Then Chaplin loses himself in anrepetition

incessantof his own gags, as if offering a worthy farewell to his eternal and silent character, condensing the

most accomplished sketches of some of his past films. Here are the adventures in skates,

drunkenness, the mechanical ladder, the smacks, etc; how famous they were in their shorts from the beginning. In the

end, he gives in to the pressures and makes the vagabond speak for the first time, making him say nonexistent words

--and with the horrible pre-recorded laughs in the background- in another mockery of the sonorous. Which I already did and with much better

sense in Lights of the city, in the initial scene of the speech. The typical Chaplinian end, heading towards a

destiny of freedom and without end, does not contribute anything more. It only leaves us the gui���o of the nostalgia of the repetition and

its registered trademark. Summary: Carlitos suffers several setbacks with the machinery of a factory. Then

protect a thief, go through a strike together, prison, setbacks in a big store and finally,

acting together in a cabaret.

" 1

" Buscemi goes a step further and shows us a concise and brief account of wounded characters, ofscars

sentimentaland emotions that sleep threateningly inside each one of us.

Of exemplary understanding of the world of cinema can be described the career as an actor of Steve Buscemi, an

excellent interpreter whose long career has been based on the role of strange character, orloser

absolute, which so well represents that fierce and disturbing physicist. Being able to change the register

from working to the orders of people like the brothers Coen or Quentin Tarantino, to do it in productions

destined for fast consumption (Michael Bay in the lead), without losing too much Charisma on the screen, is

extremely difficult, and denotes an overwhelming knowledge of the system which has welcomed him witharms

open. Neither art nor show, but quite the contrary, as some would say. After that brilliant career

as an actor (although I repeat, with films that are absolutely despicable that probably allowed him to pay his

bills, and something else), Buscemi took a step up a little more than 10 years ago, when he directed his first

movie. "One Last Cup" (Trees Lounge), a small story that stood out for being a candid coral portrait of

a series of losers and their trivial concerns. After this film success in his debut, he directed a

couple of films below ("" Animal Factory "" and "" Lonesome Jim ""), which have an impact on that portrait of the middle class

with few ���nfulas of greatness, and some episodes of popular series ("" Oz "" and "" The Sopranos ""). All this in a

period of little more than ten years, in which he combined that work with his usual, and almost always successful,

work as an actor. With his new film , name "" Interview "" (especially revealing and enlightening about the

plot of the film), Buscemi goes a step further and shows us a concise and brief account of injured characters,

sentimental scars and emotions that they sleep threateningly inside each one of us.

History shows us the routine and especially unpleasant task that Pierre Peders receives, a former

journalist of political events, come to less and with little intention of Pay special attention to the character

you are going to interview in a local elitist. This is Katya, an actress of horror movies b series and

TV soap operas, very popular and with the air of a diva, with that arrogant look that gives knowledge

recognizable and desirable by the legion of followers it has. After an unpleasant face-to-face, the dinner

ends abruptly and they set out to follow their path each one on their own, but an incident in the taxi,

makes Katya look at the obligation. It is moral to help Pierre and make sure he has not suffered damage, thisthem

leadsto the luxurious loft that Katya has, very close to where they are. Once there is when both

characters are discovered little by little, leaving aside the character, to discover the person who is

hiding behind such a superficial facade. In his work as director, Buscemi corr Una serious risk when facing

a story like the one that has dared to shoot, and it is none other than to findbefore a story whoserhythm

ourselvesnarrativeand dramatic progression does not depend on a start contrived scene or development ofaction,

physical focusing especially that dramtica progression in the level DEPTH it could reach the

relationship Personaln personal between the two protagonists of the story. That is, everything hangs by a thread but was able to

penetrate the emotions of Katya and Pierre, and the truth is that it has come out especially graceful of such a risky

initiative, brilliantly say a server. All based on an extraordinary gui���n, a masterpiece of

contrasted emotions, of subtle behaviors, so illogical at times as our own emotions

dictate to us. Some dialogues that become by own merits in the base of the story, and they do it with a

heavy dramatism increasing as the confidence between both characters, lost souls in

works where the From day to day, the effectiveness of the moment, carries with it an additional andpressure

suffocatingon many occasions. The acting work of both interpreters could not be left behind to be able to to extract

the true essence of such a laborious compendium of brilliant and profound dialogues (or failing that,

superficially ironic in other occasions). Even in that the film is victorious. And I say even that, because

while Buscemi's work as an actor is extraordinary, with a point of view in his actions full of

black humor, or even diabolically sarcastic at times, it was less predictable than an actress like Sienna

Miller, habitually confined to the role of vase girl of the function, worked so well, and knew how to

endure the interpretive duel to a great like Buscemi. While it is true that his work leaves the

sensation of greater brilliance, Miller does not clash in that emotional confrontation face to face with the character

of Pierre, which is especially remarkable for all those who We considered this girl just a

pretty face. In addition, the film has the great virtue of not staying in the personal history of these two

characters, giving rise to an underground iron��� a with respect to the world to which both have decided to belong.

Especially striking is the fact that the character of Pierre names Katya as little more than a slut

capable of getting what she used to be sleeping with men, which, considering the way thisjumped

girlat the fame, results from considerable ironic audacity. Or even that subtle reference to theworld

frivolous and superficialof the fame that grants the productions destined to the great public, being Buscemi

precisely someone who "" sold "" to it, in a boast of autocr���tica on the foundations on whichis based. It does

the world of the overwhelming cinemanot stay in that so successful production, being the most interesting point of

all the function (and precisely that word would perhaps be the most adjusted to the story, seeing that it is a

work close to the theatrical interpretation and the essence of the mockumentary), the confrontation between two minds

without the least sense of ethics. Starting the story as absolute antagonists, since one is a

cynical journalist and disenchanted with a concern for, supposedly, changing the world through political means

, and the other a snobby actress and more aware of inconsequential setbacks, or of remaining

spoiled wherever she goes. And finishing it as the reverse of the same coin, using both the medium in which they

work to give free rein to lies and half-truths, not being so far apart the positions of one and the other

as in the beginning. an.Quiz���s in the negative section would have to cite certain resolutions of the action in

the story, or the little credible decision of Katya to help the journalist (as long as one does not understand it in

another way when relating it to the end of the story) and take it home. And above all, that final with a

twist in which the tone of the rest of the film is lost a bit, which without being bad, could have

been more bleeding and less condescending, in my opinion. In short, a remarkable film, a strange case within

the predictable American production, a story that drinks from independent films and tells us about the

complex and tricky which is the human mind and soul. A remarkable film, withactors and gui���n

excellent, that supposes a breath of fresh air and the confirmation that some actresses, in addition to attractiveness,

possess something m� What to offer. Remarkable.

" 1

" It looks like a home movie made just to kill the cinematic bug of Duchovny himself

Tom is a son of a single mother who lives in Greenwich Village in New York, at the dawn of the decade of

the seventy. His best friend and companion of amusements is the mentally limited concierge of his institute.

When the slow but unstoppable step of the years turns Tom into an adult, our protagonist decides to

embark on a personal search that reveals the keys to his childhood and adolescence, with special

emphasis on inquire into the relationship he had with an enigmatic woman who was part of the

inmate population of a nearby penitentiary center. Through the answers he finds, he hopes to grow as a person

and thus improve his difficult relationships with all those around him and his negative social adaptation, in

general. Minor crimes belong to the genre that is known as generational drama, which aims to simply

reflect the difficulties of a person to assimilate the changes inherent in the arrival of adulthood.

David Duchovny, the celebrated Fox Mulder of The X-Files, is still heavily burdened by his character in the

fiction series, and fails to make the leap in quality that we have been waiting for for years. In this production he acts

as screenwriter, director and protagonist, in what seems like a film made simply to kill thebug

cinematicof Duchovny himself (he himself claimed that he had I wrote the script in a week). His friend Robin

Williams, once again, overreacts. And if to top it all, the female protagonist is his wife in real life, T���a

Leoni, because we are almost talking about a homemade movie. With all this, it is logical that in most of the

world has not been released in movies, but directly on DVD. But of course, Spain is different.

" 0

" The 13 Roses is an extraordinary film, which deals with an event of the Civil War without complexes, and which will

surely contribute to eradicating the fear of approaching similar stories in the cinema.

There is no more to read the newspapers or turn on the radio to see that sadly, in the Spain of 2007

talk about the Civil War, the dictatorship and the Francoist repression, It is political. Some people think that the best thing

is not to talk about the matter and forget, but who leaves History aside, is condemned to commit the same

mistakes of the past. And the cinema, except for a few exceptions (���Ay, Carmela !, Bicycles are for the summer),

has barely dealt with the Civil War, excluding of course the pamphlets made during the dictatorship.

Therefore, a film Like the 13 Roses, which will be harshly attacked for political reasons, it is very necessary, since

it tells a concrete fact, unfair and atrocious, but it does it with great normality and without any type of

revenge. Emilio Mart���nez-L���zaro offers a clean portrait of a cruel, barbaric and extremelyact

unjust: the execution of a group of girls for their political ideas or for having helped people with the

same ideology. But the Madrid-born filmmaker not only limits himself to a prison and judicial, but

crisisalso reflects the fear of the population of Madrid before the entrance. triumphant of the national troops. Among

all that fear, in addition, the old quarrels emerge, the opportunists and profiteers who only seek their own

benefit. All this is reflected by a Mart���nez-L���zaro who, demonstrating a great tact and delicacy, does not load the

inks in the repression during the first hour of the film. The tone of the film goes up as

the arrests of the protagonists approach and their subsequent imprisonment, until reaching an end full of

great emotion intensity. The effort to recreate that time has been titanic, from the costumes to the

digital effects all the technical aspects of The 13 Roses pass the exam with a note. The cast of the

film is simply spectacular, and although it is partly unfair, it is impossible not to fail to highlight its

trio protagonist, three of the most talented Spanish actresses of her generation. :N: Pilar L���pez de Ayala, Marta

Etura and Ver���nica S���nchez.Las 13 Rosas is an extraordinary film, which deals with an event of the Civil War without

complexes , and that will surely contribute to eradicating the fear of approaching similar stories in the cinema. It is a

film that of course vindicates and serves as a tribute to the memory of these young people who were victims of

a brutal and unjust repression. And the day in which a phrase like the previous one stops being political in this country, it can

be said with justice that society has finally overcome the trauma of the War Civil and the dictatorship.

" 1

" It was presented as an interesting proposal, but unfortunately we have found aproduct

totally differentthat as film leaves a lot to be desired. .

The G could be replaced by an M, since the new proposal by Miguel Courtois leaves much to be desired, and

has no point of comparison with his previous proposal. "" El lobo "" was presented as a very accomplished thriller,

well interpreted and with a very interesting theme, unlike this, "" GAL "" is presented as a

rather boring movie , misunderstood and with a theme that could have been much more popular. At the beginning,

the protagonist Carlos Garc���a, who, although being French, at the moment of bending, could have taken more pains in

the interpretation, intonation ny other vocal characteristics, since it seems badly bent on purpose, so at the

beginning we can not believe this character anymore. The same goes for Jordi Moll���, who tried to imitate Amedo,

has made him put the most serious voice, which has remained in a mixture of Torrente and Carmen de Mairena,

subtracting almost all the credibility to the character. I do not understand this decision, because if they characterize us just

as well they have done it and they give us their natural voice, or if they want a little more "masculine", "we will believe" We love the

character in all ways, without having to resort to something as false as that voice. Total that with the

pearls that you release and that way of saying them, you end up doing quite funny the character. Natalia Verbeke does not

achieve the approved. Unlike other films like in "" The method "", here is not done with the character although

part of guilt also has the gui���n, that has phrases stuck with shoehorn and that I do not know very well to which they

come. A clear example is when the day of journalists go in search of a labyrinth of the GAL, and in the middle of the road you

can hear pearls of the type? We must be close by, that must be the tree with the brand. ? Here it may not

sound bad, but on the screen it is really unfortunate, and more so when they take place in a general plane that

could have been left with the ambient sound, in addition to the fact that the dubbing and deepening more in this example, it seems

read without the least interpretative intention. Once these points are touched, we can continue to find some

"little gems" "They continue to make the story incredible. The best secondary ones like Mer������ Llorens, Mar

Regueras and Miguel Hermoso. In the case of Ana ���lvarez we would have to say that it is irregular, since in some

sequences it is very good and in others we do not believe it. In short "" GAL "" was presented as an

interesting proposal, and even more based on the experience of the previous cinematographic proposal of those

responsible for it, but unfortunately we have encountered a totally different product as

film leaves a lot to be desired.

" 0

" A masterpiece of the genre, that despite that cut in the footage, endures like a film full of double

readings, some of them very hard, and that could be valid even in our days with suchadoration

extremeto the cult of the body.

Born Charles Albert Browning on July 12, 1880 in Louisville, Kentucky (USA), Tod Browning was an

exceptional case during the prolific period of fantastic cinema of the 1930s, due to to the fact that, unlike

other colleagues in the profession, his obsession, which was almost unhealthy due to a bizarre cinema and out of all fashion prevailing at

the time, meant that he was always considered a Extravagance within the horror cinema. The critics

describe him as an introverted man, mani���tico and unpredictable, which avoided any glimpse of popularity to be

confined much of the press. At the young age of 16, Browning entered a traveling circus, guided by

the growing love for a dancer, which is a good example of the filmmaker's well-founded knowledge of

this world, which is so little rooted in the stable and traditional life. Between 1912 and 1914 he moved to Hollywood,

where he meets DWGriffith and that gives him the privilege of acting as an actor in "Intolerance", by thehimself

director. After taking part in several commissioned works, especially as a screenwriter, Browning directed his

first film in 1917, from that moment on, he started a prolific and rich career with an element in

common throughout his work, the manifestation of the abnormal in the field of the real. While it is true that

the thickness of his work was developed during the time of silent film (with room even for the legend, like that

film with the name "London After Midnight", which is nowadays ��� disappeared, but rumor has it that the one who owns

a private copy could become a millionaire when the rights on the work by the

proprietary producers expire), it is also true that it has been especially recognized and valued with the years, and in

an absolutely fair way, by his scarce incursions at the beginning of the sound film during the 30's.

Films like "" Dr���cula "" ( 1931), "" The Mark of the Vampire "" (1935) or "" Infernal Mu "ecos "" (1936) are nowadays

brilliant manifestations of the talent for the creation of great pieces of g�� Pornero on the part of its director.

But it would be "" Freaks, the stop of the monsters "" (1932), the masterpiece of his career, the film that would make him

pass to the annals of the history of cinema fant��� in particular, and the seventh art in general, where

Browning demonstrated his mastery of the dark elements (let's not forget that he studied psychology and was a reputed

collector of books on magic and occultism), to offer us a ruthless view of the human condition. Thesituates

plot of the filmus in the daily life of a group of members of a traveling circus, where

on the one hand we have the characters that interpret the deformed employees, in this case, dwarfs in most

cases, or cripples that lack elements of their body, not counting the typical bearded woman, the two

siamese or a person half man, half woman. And on the other hand, people, let's say normal, who are in

charge of the rest of the works that make up the elements of the circus, in this case, the strong Hercules, the

clown, the tamers or the trapeze manipulator, protagonist of the main base of the story , to pretend to

take advantage of Hercules, the fortune inherited by the dwarf Hans, with the intention of ending

his life to be free of all ties. A halo of disturbance goes through the few, but forceful , 65

minutes of the film. Browning introduces us to a world that, as I mentioned earlier, knew perfection

given his experience in real life surrounded by such peculiar beings. The fact of counting for the main

roles with real circus members, all deformed, considered fair monsters, and not only in

the film (the title that warns us about the treatment received by these beings in the reality of the time is

devastating), gives the final finish an extraordinary capacity for semi-documentary analysis despite starting from the

basis of a fictional account. As Umberto Eco describes in his last book, in the contrasts of life is

when each of these contrasts acquires true meaning, without the macabre, there would be no basis to

consider any element of our society as beautiful, in that eternal comparison is when we we

realize that the opposite poles are united by the hand, which is usually the reverse of the same coin. Throughout

the film, the deformed beings, or freaks as you will call them from this moment, show an enviable

sense of honor, friendship and even extreme education (quote the two dwarves, Hans and Frieda, and their

impeccable chivalry), moved by an inner beauty that instead manifests itself in the opposite way in

the more "" human "". The rest of the characters are shown as strong, beautiful and with anin their

unpolished appearancephysical aspect, but on the other hand, some of them hide the most stark evil in their interior. Browning

plays again with this fact, the duality between physical and spiritual beauty, implying that what

hides something beautiful, sometimes is more monstrous than any malformation. sica.Significant in this

sense is a punctual event in the film, the much discussed dining dinner between the dwarf Hans and the villain

of the story, the ambitious and unscrupulous trapeze artist who intends to marry to seize the money and then

finish with the life of so polite being (with the help of his herculean lover as I commented previously). It is this

humiliating demonstration of malice and contempt towards the group of freaks, the trigger for the behavior

of these beings to become twisted and macabre, united by a desire to survive before anyelement

external. But not in vain, subtly hinted by Browning as a virus full of evil that gradually seizes

beings apparently good-hearted, without being by chance the marriage commitment,

ie the clash between the two worlds, blur the line that separated that duality of physical orbeauty

moral, nothing is safe from evil, not even those of greater spiritual purity (cite as one more

example the innocent clown transformed into a vengeful lover). The whole film is full ofscenes

really unpleasant and discouragingabout the human condition, marked by an appreciation that without a doubtfelt

Browningfor the less graceful beings of our society , scenes like the beginning of the film, with the

humiliating attitude of such a ruthless woman when she drops her outfit so that Hans, being a dwarf,

puts it on, knowing that her small stature turns the situation n in little less than aandhumiliation

basevile, or the very scene of the dinner, causing a disturbance in the spectator that freezes the heart, they

clearly show that we are before one of the most cruel films in the history of cinema. Everything supposes a

constant moral restlessness that finishes creating a sensation of discomfort seldom reached by any

filmmaker throughout the history of the cinema. It has been commented even in a lot of analyzes the made to

consider the film as an advanced product in its time, full of a dominant modernity on theaspect

neat, clean and even superficially beautifulof the productions of the time, without also possessing a

happy ending that supposed a contrast to so much evil, as a collective catharsis of much of the cinema of the

time with respect to the turmoil that was happening in American society. That fact, although it is true

that I consider it unquestionable and gave it an air of cursed, misunderstood and massacred film in its

time, I am not convinced that it would imply a modern view of the conventions of the genre, more than anything because

no film has returned to that ground that Browning so well showed, or even films 50 or 60 years

later they have managed to travel through these dangerous terrains. In its absence, it has meant the contribution of a

great filmmaker to the history of art, and not only of cinema, being an exceptionally rare case of

timeless film, not because of the durability of its proposal (which also), but for not belonging to or adjusting to any

cinematographic movement or social gaze. It is an enduring, extraordinary film and a key piece

of the fantastic genre. �stico, not so much in its theme, but in what has always been called as thelook

fantastic, the way in which certain unrepeatable filmmakers knew how to give a staging to their

films that intuit a fantastic tone, even in films, or even scenes, away from the genre. Multiple legends

run through the film, starting with the fact that the film it was cut in almost 30 minutes, in which,

they say, Browning went even farther if Be on your ability to disturb the viewer. With an ending in

which it is said that the character of Hercules was deprived of his masculinity, ending up as a eunuch more, and not

being more than a dwarf in the body of a man. Also the mere fact of having forced Browning to add

a more optimistic ending to the character of Hans (although there is still one more elongated and optimistic that contributes

nothing remarkable to the film), perhaps to compensate for the terrifying scene where the final destination of theis seen

trapeze manipulatoras what he had always detested and despised, a fairground monster.

He also commented that only Browning could relate in the day to day with such deformed beings that populate his

film, being the only "normal" to be allowed to sit at the table with they, in a clear sample of thetone

mysteriousof this sensational film, which, despite being clear the sensation of cut film, where therhythm

narrativepasses in some sequence of the film with some inequality, has the ability to be

tremendously enlightening about such unique beings. It could be debated hours the legends that run

parallel to this film, which would only increase its aura of cursed film, despised in its time to

consider it grotesque and distasteful, but what ultimately remains is one of the more curious and unique

samples of fantastic cinema, possibly the film that has best dealt with that duality of the beauty of the

interior of the human being with respect to the physicist, all in a macabre and cruel, with even moments of a

black humor, like the scene of the dance of the deformed children in the lake, a tremendously hard and

ironic plane, touching the bad taste but without falling into it. Or without going further, scenes such as courtship by two

men to the Siamese, full of black humor taken to the extreme. In short, a masterpiece of the genre,

despite that cut in the footage, endures like a film full of double readings, some of them very hard,

and that could be valid even in our days with such extreme adoration to the cult of the body over

the intellect or the heart. Shocking and direct, cruel and emotional, the pure essence of good cinema in short.

" 1

" Balaguer��� and Plaza are a great goal to give the public what they want (videogames, reality,

morbid ...) and they have an accurate bad slob and a final stretch terrifying

21st century: leisure, as we knew it, has changed. People are no longer limited to watching shows,

to be the passive subject of the already obsolete audiovisual media. Instead, he has discovered the

interactivity of the videogame, and more and more consumers opt for this v���al���dica to pass the hours.

Jaume Balaguer���, Luis Berdejo and Paco Plaza, aware of this, have created 'REC', aexperience

cinematographiccloser to the reality we perceive today that the great majority of films premiered this

year. And this has double minded when 'REC' is a horror movie, zombie subgenre. Almost nothing. Thepanorama

initial, without credits, or music, or anything, immerses you in the experience at the first change: ���ngela and

Pablo, two reporters of the local TV program ' While you vd. sleeps', they cover one night of work in a barracks

of firemen of Barcelona. The first call of the night takes them to an old building where an old woman is

frightening, with her screams, the whole neighborhood. And in just a few seconds ���ngela and Pablo go fromwork

routineto witnessing a neighborhood patio apocalypse and fight for their lives (and their exclusive).great

Balaguer��� and Plaza'sbet on this "survival" cinematic horror is not the constant terror or theatmosphere

oppressive, but a tremendous dose of bad milk bathed in reality, and seasoned with scares of great caliber and

homage to the g�� �nero Although the proposal is reminiscent of 'The Blair Witch Project', the big difference is

its dark sense of humor and the review of all the common places of the subgenre: group of

colorful characters, dead that revive, blackouts, sloppy survival plans, lack of weapons,

isolation. there is time for everything in the eighty funniest minutes of the recent Spanish cinema, even, if

not, for the terror, which stops making intermittent appearances to settle permanently in the

shocking ones (and full of clichés, also) last twenty minutes of history. The absolute protagonists are

a splendid Manuela Velasco, giving life to an quengela that in other hands can I would have made 'REC' a

disaster, and Pablo, of which I speak later. The rest of secondary, except for some lessmoment

realistic, get you to enter perfectly in the joke that we see every day in the 'It's happening', for

putting a example.In the technical section, special mention deserves Pablo Rosso, director of photographycamera

and realand "" Pablo the camera "" in the fiction .N His excellent double work, technical and interpretative, is something that is

overlooked when analyzing the film, and it seems to me a key element of 'REC': you never see the character ,

so you're replacing the character. T���, bystander, you are Pablo, the camera, and you are always in the first line

of fire. Any video game enthusiast will know what I'm talking about. Among the other sections are

the impressive FX and makeup of Inside FX, which have the added difficulty of looking magnificent in the middle

of a sequence shot, camera on the shoulder and with an anti-cinematic light. Chapeau for them. And in thesection

negative, apart from the less spontaneous interpretative moments, I could only cite the drawbacks of

home video aesthetics: dizzying movements, flat planes or caustic sound. But it would be an exercise

in cheap hypocrisy to criticize these aspects, because they are elements that endow the group with the necessary credibility. In

short: Balaguer��� and Plaza have a great goal based on giving to the public what you want

(videogames, reality shows, morbid.) and they have an accurate bad baba and a terrifying final section. Goal fulfilled,

people. A 9.

" 1

" Promises much more, stays in much less, although yes, sows a basis of what could be thecinema

politicalof this millennium.

Thanks to a raffle in which only I participated, and I only won (Thank you, Miles & Mary, 50%, well

I know you read me) we went to see this movie , that honestly, I was waiting with some impatience and that, once again,

after its viewing, it left me quite cold, and that is, after the promising start of it, Reford, only manages

ara� Gently touch the surface of the conflict, a conflict that the US should begin to assume as "lost" and,

like Vietnam at the time, not be the world's navel phallus, and see, although with some disappointment,

as sometimes go with the Superman S to the chest, only happens in the movies. After this mini-reflection,

aloud; those who knew me (and here I go back to support something that Mary told me yesterday), well you know that I am VERY

little friend of politics and that maybe, I am the person in the world who least seems to be what I am, or think as

I think, but, at my almost 31 springs it is a bit late now to change ���no? And it is that, (and I repeat myself), in

Reford's film, all possible clichés of the story are applied, exaggerated in some moments, and

boring in others (eg, the character of Cruise comes to cause yawns in the audience), and, removing a

couple of details (the role of soldiers) and that all the texts of the film appear in Spanish

(blessed montages, hopefully this is repeated in the cinema from this film.), the rest of the film, although

excellently well directed, remains a bland experiment that could have gone a little better, but

it seems that, as Valdano said, Someone has felt at the time of filming "" Scenic fear. "" It is a pity that such

a compact cast, well-built, and carried under the baton of Robert R. lose in those

cliches that I said before, and that, when it seems that one is going to enter into a diatribe about the war in Iraq and

about this With the interest of Tito Bush and his henchmen,

the band stops in its tracks, leaving the spectators stunned and gaping at the audience. Finally, it promises much more, it stays in a

lot. less, although yes, it sows a base of what could be the political cinema of this millennium.

" 0

" An Invincible Heart is a film whose only reason for being is Angelina Jolie's brilliance, and she does not

even reach that goal.

Make a film based or inspired by a historical fact always has its risk, mainly the

policy that can cause if it is reliable or not. This happens especially to the films based on thefacts

most important and ancient historical. But Hollywood also brings to the big screen the mostreal stories

recent, some of them recorded in the memory of people, which must overcome a serious h���ndicap:

the p��� public knows in advance the end. An Invincible Heart recounts the kidnapping of an American journalist

in Pakistan in 2002, and he does so through his wife (the which incidentally has lentsupport

unconditionalto the film). It is a terrible fact, but unfortunately in the worldare kidnapped

dozens of journalistsand killed every year, so the case of Daniel Pearl is not very remembered outside the

United States. So, why have the international distribution of the film so insisted on

emphasizing the fatigued outcome of the kidnapping? Leaving aside such disquisitions, it is difficult to recognize

in an Invincible Heart a filmmaker as provocative as Michael Winterbottom. It is not that he is a saint of our

devotion, but it would have been very gratifying if this story had been approached by a look as

unconventional as his. Instead, the film is no more than a mere vulgar police investigation with

the family drama as a background. In the film you can sense the serious conflicts that caused the

tragedy, but you do not get to delve into them. The reason that this story has reached the big

screen is that it would provide a great opportunity to show off for its protagonist, but not even that is

achieved. Angelina Jolie does a good job, without fanfare, but it is not that her character has nuances,

depth, or emotional or dramatic development. An Invincible Heart is a film whose ��� The only reason for being

is the brilliance of Angelina Jolie, and she does not even reach that goal. The rest is simply astory

policemore disguised as a film of historical-social denunciation.

" 0

" The bad guy is more gay than his molars and the The roll of the hackers always smells a bit far away ...

The hacker roll always smells a bit far away. from the Hackers movie. Then it happens as in

my law class, that the teacher thinks that we are all criminals and that we create viruses and enter

into government systems. Ayy I'm off topic I just say that the bad guy is gay more than his teeth and

finally Yippie Ki Yay (Video with Spoiler careful)

" 0

" Do not disappoint in anything: it's what you expect, more or less. Those of us who were looking forward to the film

will spend a good hour and a half in the cinema seat. That's it, you're not looking for the "" why "" of things.

Look at it and enjoy it.

I come from the Press Pass and I have to say that the film has enchanted me. I was eager to see her, with

many expectations and she did not disappoint me in anything: it is what you expect, no more, no less. What is recorded

camera in hand is very good, and is the elementary movie to see the whole event from the point of view

that we want to give. It is a mixture of "" The Blair Witch Project "" and "" REC "" but exceedingly. In

general, the whole subject of the videotape is very well treated, the date is seen, recorded under "" the

film "", and details that give credibility to the subject (like those seconds of video in which you see what is recorded

below the current when you stop recording, rewind and see what you have recorded. I do not know if I explain xD). The

film keeps you in tension all the time (not counting the first 20 minutes when you are introduced to the

characters), thanks to the point of view of the camera, not seeing exactly what happens and when listening to those

sounds that leave you frozen, and that leave the protagonists ice cream. Protagonists who do it very well,

really. I have come to see the dubbed copy in Spanish and I have to say that the dubbing is not as bad as theyus

makebelieve in the trilers. Okay, there are a couple of characters and scenes in which the dubbing is not the right one,

but in the end they have worked hard on it. And let's recognize one thing: seeing this type of movie in VO wouldus a

costlot to recognize the characters, since many times they are not seen on screen. And if you have the voice

in Spanish and you put a face on them, you recognize them when you hear them. So in the end you appreciate seeing it folded,

and check that the dubbing is not as bad as we thought it was. Or at least I appreciate it. Another thing about

sound: soundtrack. There is not. And what makes me more strange is that it is not missed, at all. See that

music is a very important factor to create tension in a film, but in this we can see howis created

the same tensionbut without m� Ics, using other techniques. The monster? The truth is that it is fine, after

so many rumors and so many conjectures, the monster is well, and you can say, that it is clearly seen. And with the

little bugs, the same thing happens. Come on, that the movie is very good. There are only a couple of details that I did not

like, and that at least have dislodged me. And I warn you: BEWARE, SPOILERS! You do not expect to find ""

why "", since the film is only the point of view of the characters, nothing more. And with that the film, for my

taste, earns a lot. I mean that we are not told the origin of the monster, that we are not told what happens to the

monster at the end, that nothing, we are told almost nothing. And why? Because, I insist, it is the point of view of a

group of people who have found themselves in the middle of everything, and I, as a geek in the video cameras, and because they are

always recording birthdays, stays and other, I have to say that I love it. I LOVE. I love that that is

so and stay as it is. FIN SPOILERS! If you expected it as much as I did, the film will not disappoint you and you will

spend a good hour and a half in the armchair.

" 1

" In Ocean? S13 there are no experiments, nor Nouvelle vague chorras, nor jump cuts, nor private jokes of dubious

taste. Come on, that is not as scary as it was Ocean? S 12, the best in my opinion. Third parties ...

Steven Soderbergh seems to put an end to the adventures of the crew with this third installment (something you

never know, go know what you collect), more accessible (and therefore less enjoyable and evil) than the

second installment and with a more friendly tone and apt for all the public and minds. On this occasion, the team

commanded by Clooney and Pitt (because in reality they interpret themselves) will take revenge on an unscrupulous villain

who gives life Pacino on vacation too, why not, who betrays Reuben (Elliot Gould ) in a

multimillionaire business leaving him in a terrible situation? That's when the gang comes into action and

that's when we clearly differentiate the tone of the film, clear, accessible and direct, as in the first

delivery In Ocean? S13 there are no experiments, nor Nouvelle vague chorras, nor jump cuts, nor private jokes of

dubious taste. Come on, it's not as stupid as Ocean's 12 was, the best in my opinion. There's some good gag,

some flat "" made in Soderbergh "" and a permanent neckline by Ellen Barkin , but there are also dead times,

gaps and moments that are noted, as are the scenes of comedy, the worst of the trilogy.

The foundations of a simp? Tico trilogy dominguera with style but it is a step behind for

Steven Soderbergh, although many think that in the case of the adventures of Danny Ocean and his children this does not

even count as a resume.

" 0

" If he thought it was his masterpiece, why contradict it, no? Eyes wide shut becomes both an extra��� and accomplished final testament, from a personal and obsessive

director , as well as a fascinating film due to its psychological complexity, its schematic construction -

Kubrick's own - and its refined technique. high in photography, staging and soundtrack,

as in all his films. We are in the presence of one of his best films, the most personal, not only of his

last stage but of his entire filmography. It also loads its gray points: a quick difficulty of

understanding, slowness in some passages and planes, languid scenes and perhaps disposable in a vision. s

global. Problems - at some point - minor if you like. One is from the beginning, with severaloptions

readingon various topics related to the couple: jealousy, fidelity - and at the same time - differentlevels

psychic or psychological; real and dream moments. Complex characters we say, dual and a rare

sensation: to feel that it is an unattainable film yet with repeated visions. The narrative of the story is transferred

to oneself until we get confused - and never know well - when it is the moments of dream or reality. An

essay on human relationships centered on the most complex relationship of all: marriage. The title can also be

translated as "" Eyes closed wide "", analogy word game, which suggests a dream or

close your eyes to reality. A walk for two long consecutive nights in the mind of the hesitant

Dr. William Hackford, embodied by an envelope demanded but more than correct Cruise, squeezed by Kubrick

to the limit of getting a ulcer seg Chn chimentos of the shooting. A doctor stalked once and a thousand times

during that time, by his wife's confession of an unfulfilled desire with a man who leaves William in a

state of shock. A woman named Alice, incarnate and in an excellent performance by Nicole Kidman, making us

feel and experience the duality of her role as victim / victimizer. Sexual desire - always repressed - is ��

Packed in several feminine forms thanks to the story by Arthur Schnitzer -published in 1926, in Spanish

"" Relato So���ado "" - text influenced and with several points in common with the work of Sigmund Freud, that it was not by

chance that he was disciple and contemporary of Arthur. He stands out above all else in the film, the constant questionasks

oneif everything, part or nothing of this nocturnal trip belongs to the world of dreams. ���os own

protagonist. It is never truly unveiled, although coming from a director like S. Kubrick, reality is always

more surprising than the darkest of dreams. The blue tones in the confession scenes between the couple

-related the blue with the dream-, the red tones -passion, debauchery- of the dance hall, of the castle

where the org���a and pool table V���ctor (Sydney Pollack), give us a more accurate track.That is

why a sexual film, but always sex in Kubrick's films are related to the dark, the

dirty, the forbidden (Lolita, La Naranja Mec���nica, Barry Lyndon). It is one of the many traces of his work, one of

the most important. The soundtrack is excellent, minimalist and with classic themes, which seem made for the

director by the use that gives them: expressive, dense -depressive- and at the same time strong.An in���dita female look

The deal with the female characters - when there are them - almost always misses the misguided in this director. Eyes wide

shut differs markedly from its predecessors. The female characters guide the protagonist in the whole

film, constituting a primordial part and are the only ones, who truly know where they stand. The

pianist Nithingale, Will himself, the owner of the costume shop, they are erratic characters, clumsy and full

of doubts. On the other hand Alice, the beautiful woman of the org���a that saves her life -and that we will never know if it is the same one

that he saves first-, the widow who declares her love, the prostitute, until The girl / lolita of the

store, they have the certainties. Incredibly at a moment of his career, Kubrick thought about making a

soft / porno movie, with the t� Blue Movie's tentative title-mid-63rd-and for the few technical achievements he

saw at that time in those realizations. That this experience would have given us knowing its perfectionism

is truly unimaginable. The scene of the org���a in a magnificent castle, is in itself, a mini-film.

Oppressive, tense and beautiful, a taste rarely seen in that type of situation, excelling a cozy

soundtrack with a mantra of keyboards in liguous key. Not for nothing the password for entering the castle is

Fidelio - work of Beethoven - that deals with the subject of couple relationships and jealousy. A film with a

sim constructrica construction, that remembers the misfortunes that happen the protagonists of almost all its films. A

round trip for the sensations, experiences and final learning. Like Alex in The Mechanical Orange,

Barry Lyndon himself, Bowman in 2001, Jocker in Born to Kill and the crazy Jack Torrance in The

Shining. Acting actors The presumed-at first sight-bad choice ���n Cruise and Kidman as protagonists,

is denied by the film. We can not deny the attraction and the image in the public -and in Kubrick himself- of the

then couple and habitual protagonists of magazine covers. Kidman complies with his usual intensity, and even

seems, over the payo. Cruise holds his character with dignity and character, in an unusual role in

him, performing it in a register or neutral tone that favors the film, but instead his ex-partner, without

overflowing anything. We know of the excellent eye of the director for the choice of actors, whether stars or unknown, in

all his films. In short, Eyes wide shut is one of his most vital films. In spite of its

slow pace, where its mentioned obsessions reappear, and the perfectionism in grandiloquent scenes

highlighting and becoming, in a good sample of the best and the most characteristic of its cinema . Where it

incorporates a new and until the moment new vision: to express a feeling close to the feeling of a

human being more than that of a machine, in which was a cr�� The reiterative ethics of his cinema from La Naranja Mec���nica

on the part of the critics. According to the co-writer Frederic Raphael, he said in his book, "Here Kubrick "" He

does not leave it very well stopped - he only cared to film "interesting" situations "with the characters more than

psychoanalytic aspects of each of them. Before passing away, Kubrick himself considered that this was his

best film and in fact it does not sound exaggerated, always keeping in mind the memory of 2001 that lurks

immediately. And to tell the truth if he thought it was his masterpiece, why contradict it, no? A few

days after having projected the film for Warner Brothers executives, Stanley Kubrick - on Saturday,7

March, 1999 - dies of a heart attack. while he was 70 years old. Surely thinking of making

the eternal final touches to his new and last masterpiece. Undoubtedly, we will miss it for a

long, long time. "" Kubrick considered Eyes Wide Shut the best movie of his entire career. "" Julian Senior

(director of Warner Brothers) "" La People can misinterpret almost everything to match their

views. They extract what they already think from art. I wonder how many people have changed their minds about something

important thanks to a work of art. "" Stanley Kubrick

" 1

" I am an alcoholic. A junkie A homosexual I am a genius. Fortunately, I was able to attend an avant premiere of Capote on Tuesday, February 28th. I went with a little fear

because as I said above I still did not finish reading "" A Sangre Fria "" and I knew I was going to be present. Of

course, the film rebelled me some parts that I still did not reach, however far from making my

enthusiasm disappear rather catapult��� which eye ��� be able to generate that discipline in reading that I

still do not achieve.What I will recommend before watching the movie is reading "" Music For Chameleons "",

mainly the Preface and "" Nocturnal Returns "". In the preface Capote makes a synthesis of his life until that

moment where the following paragraph can be found: "" He started writing at eight, unexpectedly,

without the inspiration of a model. I did not know anyone who wrote. Actually, I barely knew anyone who

read. The fact was that only four things interested me: reading, going to the movies, stomping and drawing. Then, one day, I

began to write, not knowing that I had chained myself for life to a noble but ruthless master. When Godus

givesa gift, while delivering us a whip, and ste only aims at autoflagelacin. "" The

film could It would be about the performance of the code after the manifestation of the gift. And the whip, whichno

hasmercy, acts with an energy contrary and of equal intensity to that used in the exploitation of the gift. In

"" Vueltas Nocturnas "", which is a dialogue between Capote and Capote, he confesses "" I am an alcoholic. A junkie A

homosexual I'm a genius. "" His alcoholism is present in the film, it could be this. Or perhaps thetheme

mainof the film is his homosexuality. This is where the development of the character by

Philip Seymour Hoffman stands out. Not for having managed to make his Capote the most effeminate man I have ever

seen, but for that look. Almost at the beginning of the film Capote mentions the way he sees it. Yan and

treated him given his ways. Also about the helplessness that was always felt. And his longing to leave a

mark in the world since he knew that the desendencia was not in the plans. And that look kept all that and

was present at all times. Regarding "" .. I'm a genius "", also, the film could be about his

egocentricity that was not neglected in any moment. Except in the beginning scene, Capote was present

absolutely all the rest. Nothing happened to their backs. And if it happened, it did not matter. The weather was

even handled by Capote, no matter how close the death of the convicts was and it is there when

Capote loses control. When time stops depending on him. The film could be about this. There is very little

presence of music except at parties and sometimes where the protagonism was taken by

trees without leaves, where a t��� mido piano appeared. After the execution is when the movie accelerates

exaggeratedly leaving that feeling of "" was too short ""

" 1

" Fantastic adventures (so improbable) thousands that are) with the new hero Ben Gates, and his list���ssssimos

friends.

Second film adventure of Ben Gates and his friends, willing to put their lives in danger in order to

find the truth. Here is followed without major problem or search of any imagination , the wake of his

predecessor, turning out to be at the end a comic book of adventures, presumably realistic, but truly

fantastic given the little or nothing cre���ble that is all. No, I do not know He tries to look credible, but

nothing makes sense of the measure, and nothing is minimally accurate. The situations, filmed almost all at

vertigo speed, so much that as soon as the spectator has visual rest, they follow each other, I say, so that there

is no analysis of what is happening, being all a flood of planes after planes. Less than once

the camera stops and when the protagonist speaks forfirst time with the President of the United States. It is

the best moment of the film, because both speak, talk, say fantastic things, but

without overwhelming the viewer with many planes, strident music and impossible situations. Conjuto spends his

time without the slightest problem. It is an easy and superficial entertainment, much less accomplished than its

predecessor. It is not bad and the photography is beautiful, highlighting scenes like the famous Mount (Rushmore) of the

faces of Presidents of The United States, but lacks consistency to be remembered after several hours

of his vision. And among other things, for the ease in which good people achieve their goals,

however impossible they may be. Of so many ghosts the truth is that you end up a bit hart���n.

" 0

" I do not hide my admiration for the cinema of this man who, with just five films written and directed by

him, I think he has reached a fast author status with a cinema that, although it is not a dish of good taste for

many, it always offers a cin���fila passion that breathes for each one of its frames.

Death Proof is the env���s of the same coin that the t���ndem Rodr���guez / Tarantino has acted as a tribute to a

horror and action cinema that wasted originality and transgression in cinematographic times even

conservatives. With few budgets and technical, sloppy-artisan solutions, those pioneering filmmakers

made virtue a necessity and only ambitioned to give free rein to their gruesome imaginations. Sam Raimi,

Wes Craven, Cronenberg, Carpenter or Peter Jackson, among others, were some of the directors who were forged

in that school of ulcers and blood. Today all of them have recognized careers as filmmakers, but

their training started from those misunderstood and marginal tapes for their public majority coet���neo.Si

Rodr���guez was involved in Planet Terror of referencing the terror 'gore', one of the aspects for which the

Mexican has shown more reluctance in his initiatory films as Open until dawn, Tarantino has

decided to direct his tribute to the movies. ��culas of wild racing cars. Referents such as zero limit or 60

seconds, quoted verbatim in dialogues that Tarantino has put in the mouths of his characters, constitute the

base of cinefilia on which Death Proof rests. But it does not stay there. Because in Death Proof

the arsenal of common places of all his filmography comes back: like the long di entrelogos between colleagues on the most

absurd trivialities, the filming of scenes with af Den posterity accompanied by excellent songs (the

review of the soundtracks of his films reveal Tarantino as a great 'gourmet' ofmusic classics

Americanand as a lover of the morriconian scores) and the creation of extreme characters capable of

going from a state of relaxation to one of brutal violence without hardly worrying. And since he praisedwithout dissimulation

his cinematic preferencesor reproached without mercy the cinema he detests, Tarantino does not hurt in

garments by making several impious self-tributes with gui���os to his recent films like Kill Bill. For

example, great is the reappearance of two characters and mythical Ranger Earl McGraw (with the surly

and impassioned by the great Michael Parks) and his Son Number 1 (the son of Parks, James Parks). The slow and

crude analysis that makes the brutal crimes that are often faced is the best example of the

black humor distilled by the director of Tennessee. And finally, for Tarantino fans like

whoever writes, in Death Proof we enjoy again with interpretations-a transcript of the glorious past of

great actors like Kurt Russell (from whom Tarantino loves his first works with Carpenter, like Escape

from New York or La Cosa). In addition, and following the typical features of the women in his films, Tarantino

recreates a whole collection of diverse feminine characters: sexy, strong, chucky and determined. One could

say Tarantino's reply to the profile of the girl-Almod���var is that of a beautiful woman, with strongappeal

sexual, intelligent, and hard and sensitive at the same time. All the cast of girls-Tarantino in Death Proof, from

Rosario Dawson to Vanessa Ferlito, are excellent in their respective roles. In short, I do not hide my

admiration for the cinema of this man who, with just five films written and directed by him, I believe that he has

reached a fast author status with a cinema that, although it is not a dish of good taste for many,offers

alwaysa passion cin� ��fila who breathes for each of his frames.

" 1

" This film is a whole recital of cakes, mamporros, yoyas, tundas, collejas, sopapos and soplamocos in the

purest style "" all the public "", in which a deadly victim seems improbable and where there are no

malignant injuries or encephalic polytraumatism.

Two colleagues, errant ap���tridas racing competitors, win a mini-vélido in a competition, with such

bad luck that, without time to enjoy it, it disappears burned at the hands of a gangster of three to the room

they were trying to intimidate some carnies to get their business. What the mobsters do not know is that

our two protagonists, played by the insurmountable Bud Spencer and Terence Hill, are authentic

scholars in the clever art of dispensing indiscriminate blows, and that they intend to beat the copper with all the

gangs to recover his precious mini-vlid, that if, red, because "" if not, we get angry "".argument

Simplisticand linear, sympathetic and sometimes innocent development , for this film originally titled

"" Altrimenti ci arrabbiamo "". This film is a whole recital of cakes, mamporros, yoyas, tundas, collejas,

sopapos and soplamocos in the purest style "" all the publics "", in which a v� The death penalty seems

unlikely and where there are no markers or encephalic polytraumatism. The 1974and

filmdirected by Marcello Fondato, "" And if we do not get angry "" (title as classic as it is stipulated in its translation), it is

an icon of a type of extinct cinema: The "" comedies of hosts "" , with simpatico-delirious music,protagonists

handsome, co ugly but bonach���n protagonist, pretty girl, just cause and bad bad guys. It is true that this is a

film cataloged as childish, to which we will add the visual custom to the hard-core public of the public of

this incipient century, they make the current spectator, m� Beyond the frykand���liko-nostalgic, you may feel

disappointed after your viewing. It is more, I am the prescription with beers to tuti plen. Enjoy and drink in

moderation.

" 1

" Since the success of the card is proven by points, they should transfer this concept to other areas, such as the

cinema. Sad, sad, that a film like this takes place.

Since the success of the card for points is proven, they should transfer this concept to other areas, such as the

cinema. Since it is seen that anyone can arrive with a gui���no whatever under his arm, even access

to a help from the ICAA (previous recommendation of some friend) and direct a film, what less than the one who

perpetrated a fudge to remove a few points, and not let him direct two chestnuts in a row. And if it does,

remove it from the circulation. Cinematographically speaking, of course. All this delirium comes to the thread of 'H6: diary

of a murderer', the first opera of the young Mallorcan artist Mart���n Garrido Bar���n , who as in the web of

the film is indicated, "" With only 9 years he began to paint, and at 17 he already exhibited his first work in a

gallery ���a, which makes him almost a prodigy of the image. "" Long live humility. ": Diary of a murderer" was

H6released with a conatus of politics to renege the friend Garrido of the final assembly of the film, throwing pests of the

producers for not having included the 45 long minutes of testimonies of doctors, jailers and you will

know what more about the main character. From here I thank the producers in question to

avoid 45 more minutes of torture, because the film lasts 90 endless, dull, absurd, hackneyed and at

times hilarious minutes, m It's enough to get an idea of ​​the prodigiousness of colleague Garrido. The

argument is simple: Antonio Frau (hilarious Fernando Acaso) kills his girlfriend and spends fourteen years in prison,

after who marries a vase woman, inherits the pension from his aunt Encarna (insane the scene that he

dedicates to receiving the inheritance from his lawyer) and begins to do the work for which he has been "" elected "" by a ""being

superior"" (���Florentino P���rez?): kidnap, rape and butcher prostitutes, leaving everything collected in a

thorough diary, as he did at the beginning of the 20th century his � �� God, Henry Landr���.SPOILERS (as if someone

were going to see her) The first problem is the gui���n, perpetrated by Mart���n Garrido, Sr. Based on a character who

mistreats and kills his partner after three minutes of footage, he jumps to that same character fourteen years later,

turned into a psycho� ��pata that, he says himself in the voiceover, is called to be "" the Chosen One "" to

purify and sacrifice a few women of dissolute life. Did someone say "" character development ""? Why

, if you have already shown that he was a murderer at the age of 28? Then he makes it happen, again and again, for the same

situation: I attract I give someone something to eat, I kill him. Invariably, all of its victims go through this modus

operandi. At the third dinner, intimates you laugh laxly. But there's more: he marries it with a jamona (risible M��� Jos���

Baus���) of 35 tacos that leads to �� ���os throwing himself to a married doctor, and that by leaving his parents' house he is

willing to marry the east element when leaving the bag. The jamona also speaks in voiceover, has three

bed scenes and does not kill her. She lives in the pension with her husband and the tortured prostitutes withoutknowing

everanything, and her best phrase in the film is: - This pension makes me nervous system mala.M� Things: at

the time of film, a police inspector appears (interpreted, it is a saying, by the same MartÃn

Garrido, Sr.) of which we did not know anything, that also speaks in "" off "" and discovers the murderer thanks to aticket

planeof the first victim of Fernando Acaso (absurd Alejo Sauras , lasts three minutes and says six sentences). The

"" case "" is resolved to the first record they make in the pension, it takes a criminal mind already. And to end with the

script: the murderer, in the end, it turns out that there was devised a plan to become a psycho-killer superstar,

cover with the gains of the rights of his diary (half with his wife's ham) and go to

Venezuela as soon as they released him from the asylum. The chosen one was a patra���a! When he spoke in "" off "" with

himself, he was self-deprecating! A worthy twist of Bryan Singer, come on. Pat���tico writer and actor, this

Mart���n Garrido, Sr. And I have left for the end that artist, that "" prodigy of the image "", Mart���n Garrido, Jr.

Chaval, For my part, three tips from my humble knowledge of the medium: - When youthe frame, you

unleashusually get a sense of confusion, imbalance, madness (try to see 'Dogs of Straw', by Sam

Peckinpah, by example). But when you unhinge the frame in 75% of the shots, you get the feeling that you

were rolling with a tripod without a bubble, or drunk. - Rhythm in a sequence does not mean putting shots of

a tenth of a second in a conversation of the type "" have you worked hard? "" Likewise, if you are going to show the

number of five murders, five, of a total of 18 who made the element this, at least varies a little

the position of camera, that the third bored and a little.- If in the end you will copy others (Lynch, Fincher,

McNaughton.), Or try at least, do not go for the life of "" prodigy of the image "", man. We all

copied, but when we go to artistillas we feel sorry. Sad, sad, that a film like this is carried out. A 2,

for some time of one of the prostitutes and because least it would be notoriety.

" 0

" Try, somehow to have certain doses of drama, although they become a little embarrassing, and it

seems that at times the misfortunes seem to be primed (and in that way) with the protagonists, without

separating drama from cool summer comedies.

In the aftermath of the channel + I found this comedy (one more), light, starring a group

of actresses almost unknown and where the presence of America Ferrera very fashionable in the US

now stands out due to the adaptation Den of "" Betty the ugly "" and that peg��� the jump to the cinema with "" Real women have

curves. "" The argument and its approach is curious, although, it is too noticeable his novel transfer toscript

cinematic, well, that kind of books of "" separate stories "" and that so much like teenagers,

here materializes in a bland film but that recaud�� � at the box office a good "" pu���ado "" of $ giving rise to a

sequel with almost the same cast. Try, somehow have certain doses of drama, although they

become a bit embarrassing, and although, in all the houses are cooked beans, or, rather, problems we all have,

here it seems that in some moments the desgr Acias seem to be primed (and in that way) with the protagonists, without

separating the drama from the cool comedieta veraniega. In the end, although some people call it the 8th wonder of the world, I

thought it was "one of many". "" forgettable in the purest cinematographic style.

" 0

" Smells like bbc on all four sides. These small films are trampolines to fame: soft

entertainments without transcendent pretensions for a fed up public and perhaps of the bizarremachinery

plotof EM Foster or for a p��� alien public, completely, to her.

The greedy Victorian film run by Ivory in the cinema and by the BBC on television has an authentic

subgenre, smeared with the same excellence, adorned with the same exquisite furniture ,in the same

embossedcliched and corny, refined and strict, of fierce moral conventions. An enchanted April is not Return

to Howard's End or a room with views, let alone the fantastic Dubliners, but exhibits similar

aesthetic and formal patterns, and dives, like the ones cited. , in the most etiquetably British soul, corseted

in its colonial whims and its imperialism of t��� at five o'clock and table stretcherby pleasantturns

musicicatedsyntactic: the English, when they speak , are very yours and raise the adverb to levels of phonetic hysteria like

no one on the planet. An enchanted April smells of BBC on all sides: it is a youngest son, who has taken flight

through the big room. Nothing else to start we already know that it is going to have a clean, sober finish, a roster of actors

of the first order and a novelistic guide watered by some agile dialogues and formidably taken care of. AnApril

enchantedis also a reflection on the myth of the trip. Myth, on the other hand, inherent to the England of the

late nineteenth century and the beginnings of the twentieth. In the middle of the First World War, four women, touched by

different ailments, in need of similar therapies, decided to rent the Castle of San Salvatore, on the

Italian coast. They flee from their husbands, although they flee from England, which is a more punishing and fierce husband: they

escape the climate and the forms and the hackneyed showcase of protocols and figurations. The pompous andLondon

refined, gossipy, slanderous, makes those ladies of high status take the paradise of the Italian castle as a

bulwark of their dreams and their hopes and final rewards for all time (lost, miserably ) in

imagining it. In these rooms these four ladies live their marvelous April, their enchanted spring,

opening, if not, to love, to the salubrity of the sea and its miraculous effects in some lungs burned by the

fog. The roles are romantic: find the most standard acceptance and find the romanticism that populates the

entire film: in every little flash. Evil, however, does not exist. Everything in the place where it should

be: in the place where they tend. Everything conducive to the sudden discovery of happiness and theawareness

(immediate)of its loss. It is not necessary to be Ivory, who is already limping, to make a worthy product in this

genre so brit��� nico: Newell fully meets. The BBC gives formidable children, tan actors of val���ae impregnates

with its seal scenes, smells, sensations that remain, indelibly, in the memory of the spectator, whether or not it

is the son of the Albion phrida. small films are trampolines to fame: soft entertainments without

transcendent pretensions for a public fed up and perhaps of the bizarre plot machinery of EM Foster or

for a public alien, completely, to her.

" 1

" James Wan removes stomachams and consciences with his latest film. The last film by James Wan, director of "" Saw "" returns to fulfill the postulates of the group that themagazine

Total Filmhas given in denominating "" Slat Pack "". If you've seen "" Saw "" you know what trend I'm referring to:

extremely violent movies in which they test the spectator's mind withaggressive acts

explicit. Many of them have a scary character. Personally, violence does not appeal to me, but

I let myself be seduced by the plot of the film: any father of that crazy American society has the bad

luck to be with his son in the wrong place, at the wrong time and see how his challenge dies at the hands

of robbers. The result of chance is trapped in an immense web of violence and the descent intoleads

hellhim to face his own nature. Each time more animal, more and more similar to the

murderers of his son, we witness the brutal "" an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth "" between ���ly and the violent group of

assassins, until Only one can remain. To narrate this fast-paced story, Wan opts for the camera in hand in

most of the shots. Ian Jeffers signs the script, based on the novel by Brian Garfield, using

an overflowing imagination to make each murder more grotesque than the previous one.Kevin Bacon has some A

memorable moment from the interpretive point of view, such as when you say goodbye to your young child.

However,when it becomes "" Terminator"" the viewer has to make a remarkable imaginative effort to

crersele in these circumstances and starring those acciones.Gustar lovers of action, weapons and

images a little gores. If you are one of those who get dizzy with blood, better refrain from seeing it.

" 0

" He manages to show coherently and without superficiality completely different worlds, narrate tragedies without

falling into sentimentality and transmit tenderness despite all the imperfections and errors of the characters.

At last I have crossed out "" Babel "" from the list, it was time. And I loved it; undoubtedly one of the best movies

I've seen lately. Alejandro Gonz���lez Irritu's first feature film, "" Amores perros "", I liked it very

much -not so "" 21 grams "", which left me �� something cold-, but "" Babel "" overcomes all that. I understand that it is

quite long. I do not know, I'm flying by. The four stories had me completely hooked

until the end. The one in Japan, in spite of being possibly the least "triangle" and the one most detached from the rest - or

precisely because of that -, I was especially moved, in that way to portray a much less obvious drama. The

interpretations of the actors are spectacular. It is also the agility and, above all, the humanity with

which the director has staged that magnificent, but difficult, guidon of Guillermo Arriaga. Among all have

managed to show coherently and without superficiality completely different worlds, narrate tragedies without

falling into sentimentality and convey tenderness despite all the imperfections and errors of the characters.

For a change, I had to watch it folded. How does it occur to someone to fold this movie? I suppose it would have been

even better in the original version, but, in any case, "" Babel "" got that which is becoming increasingly

difficult as what the years go by I left the cinema excited, "" touched "", feeling different from how I had

come in and reflecting on what I had just seen. And for all that I recommend that you do not let it pass.

" 1

" A great movie that could have been round but will win in recognition over

the years.

Totally and unjustly forgotten in this year's Oscars, "" Bobby "" is notfirst film

Emilio Estevez'sas a director, but the truth is that nothing in his filmography to the previous one he foreshadowed something

similar. In the film, the evolutions of 22 fictitious characters are followed in the Ambassador Hotel, the eve of the

day in which the senator Robert F. Kennedy was assassinated . Obviously, this is a choral film in which,

of course, the interpretations are basic. If the director could not rely on his cast, the whole would

limp noticeably. In this case, fortunately, we attended a whole interpretive recital of the cast as a

whole. Cast, I forgot to say it, authentically spectacular and integrated, among others by Harry

Belafonte, Joy Bryant, Nick Cannon, Emilio Estevez, Laurence Fishburne, Heather Graham, Anthony Hopkins, Helen

Hunt, Ashton Kutcher, Lindsay Lohan, William H. Macy, Demi Moore, Martin Sheen, Christian Slater, Sharon Stone,

Elijah Wood and the director himself is daring to highlight someone among them but I would

have a wonderful moment starring Demi Moore and Sharon Stone in a hairdressing salon An authentic intepretative delight

to enjoy again and again and in which both show what they are capable of as

actresses. Of course, the other two legs of all choral cinema (and not choral, in fact) have to be the gui��� and the

direction. I have no major objections to either aspect. The script, by Emilio

Estevez himself, is full of nuances and manages to fully justify the intervention of all the characters while

, on the other hand, the firm direction gives him the the necessary pulse to keep us hooked and jump from history

to history without having the sensation of seeing parts of a puzzle. There is no greater achievement in thecinema

choral: to create a uniform whole from so many different stories. Ithat in certainsectors they

imagineAmerican ideologicalwill not have received the tape with pleasure and, certainly, they will be able to. To accuse of being

excessively idealistic. If one heeds the film, Bobby Kennedy would have been the president who, among other

things, stopped the Vietnam War and eliminated the social inequalities existing in his country. In short, it

was the panacea. It's not that I thought that things had not gone better with him as president, they could

hardly have done worse, but that unbridled optimism, in what he had done, that he distilled The length of the

tape was too innocent. But leaving aside a peccadillo of youth as innocence, this is

a great film that could have been round of having more scenes of strength, like the one mentioned

above, but that will gain in recognition with the passing of the years. Rating moonfleet.es: 8.5 out

of 10

" 1

" Entertaining, well done, without excessive action ... more than interesting. I have not read the book, as almost any adaptation, it will detract, but as a film it is more than a

decent story, balanced, with the right times between action and the feelings of loneliness of a Will. Smith

great in expressions, in addition to cuadrao.El who knows New York, hallucinate with the scenes of

ghost town.I do not need an explicit narration of qu ��� is what failed in the cure of cancer, and a

deeper flashbacks. Also something consistency in the zombies, who come to insinuate feelings (believed that

the leader was going for his girl). A story that is not lost in excessive action with very good sequences as

the of dogs and that keeps you interested and entertained from start to finish. It is worth the entrance.

" 1

" Technically it is a virgin, that does not decay at any time, but with one of the great pillars

severely damaged, that of the gui���n.

The film itself is a fat churrete, the story is the most simplistic, flat, stupid, repetitive and

inconsistent that has been seen in superh�� movies. �roes (which already tend to have some of these aspects),

emphasizes data that is understood more than enough and then left in the inkwell, or take for granted others

which are not so obvious. The cast is correct. and period. Neither Routh is Reeve, nor Spacey is Hackman, that to

begin with, but to continue, it seems that the protagonist always had in mind 'to look good' with the public

making an interpretation trying to look like Christopher Reeve. Spacey is magnificent, and the paper comeshim

tothat is not painted, but I think he is a bit wasted, he has only a couple of scenes in which hereallyme

hasconvinced100%. In section t�� Technique is worth noting above all the things that haveand for having the

happenedglorious and magnificent direction of Bryan Singer that gives the movie a perfect rhythm, some action scenes

(few ) fantastic and some wonderful images (perhaps with an excess of zenithal planes that I

love), without a doubt the best of the film. The picture is very good, with really impressive

images and more in IMAX. and more in 3D! and Ottman is quite successful from the hard test of comparison with Master

Williams, creating a very good score for the footage. In short, a film that technically is a

virguer��� a, that does not decay at any time, but with one of the great pillars severely damaged, that of the gui���n,

tedious, repetitive and simple until exhaustion. That's it, entertaining is a long time.

" 0

" A film of which I expected something more, ideal to watch on Saturday afternoon in your house after

resting the meal like a pig.

Entertaining film, ideal to watch on Saturday afternoon in your home after resting the food which

primed pig. Predictable but ingenious story in which there is nothing special that highlights it. Edward Norton

(The Fight Club) comes loaded with magnetism and charisma, next to a Jessica Biel (Blade 3) that

I love but that I see has suffered the syndrome of the copy. And what is this? well that this actress, who is a little

cheese and has artistic personality to spare, have done the task of characterizing her as Scarlett

Johanson, if you look at the hair, makeup, Expressions are a copy of the aforementioned

actress. Even I would say that it has approximately 4 CC of extra hydrogel on its upper lip to

accentuate the resemblance. And why will this be? Does Scarlett reject this role ?, or perhaps the culprit is the

new film by Hugh Jackman (Wolverine, X-Men) that bears certain similarities with "" The Illusionist "", Time

will tell us. In any case, is it a film I expected something more from?

" 0

" Drama with touches of humor, its ending is of such delicacy (with cameo of one of Murray's sons) that

it becomes the ideal possible.

One arrives late after some excellent reviews on this website, but the happy memory of this lofty

film by Jarmush, makes you want to write some lines. Slowly, parsimoniously, she takes her time

to tell us without haste, the love life and the misfortunes of Don Johnston, a man overcome by the long

list of defeated men played to order by a great Bill Murray. Solitary and loser, is the

classic protagonist of any work of Jarmush.For ex-girlfriends, with their limitations but that next to the

same Don, seem to live in a full Russian mountain. The female cast is exquisite, all good. Jarmush knows well

where the story goes and brings us together with a beautiful music (the soundtrack is exquisite), towards the disappointment

of a father in search of his hypothetical son, in a cold way. yes, but with the timming of the independent cinema in its

maximum expression.Drama with touches of humor, its ending is of such delicacy (with cameo of one of the sons of

Murray) that it becomes the ideal possible. Point and separate for Bill Murray. We see him repeat almost the same

character, a sparse, melancholy being, as lost as charming, in a kind of Buster Keaton revived. With

minimal gestures, tired, building his walk between the autistic and the unreal, Sof���a Coppola caught his psyche

in Lost in Translation (2003). Wes Anderson made us love him like Steve Zissou in Life Acuatic (2004) and in an

almost cameo in Los Tenenbaums.With Jim Jarmush in Coffee and Cigarettes (2003) first and in this Broken

Flowers (2005), where he amazes again with a kind of ornate Murray, never so bright and gray. We love him

in all those movies.

" 1

" It's not that United 93 is bad or boring but that it expected more from a director who is capable of doing

wonders.

It usually happens that when someone sets high expectations, you take a low, just do not

cover them, and this is what happened to me with the new Paul Greengrass movie. "" Bloody Sunday " It seems

brutal, of the best movies that have been made in recent years. And of course, with this precedent and the poster

full of reviews that make it the best film of the year? what happens, happens. This does not mean that

"" United 93 "" is bad, or boring, only that a server expected more than one director who is capable of doing

wonders. In the script there are two different parts: that ties to the interior of the aircraft and that shows us the

chaos that occurs in the rest of places, whether airports and control centers. And this is where oneme

seducescompletely and another does not. The refusal is the inside of the plane, which seems to me more forced and less

credible. The one that gives you the most film sensation, on the other hand, the part of the controllers, the heads

of the army and other comrades, makes you really believe that you are You are living that live, as it happened in

"" Bloody Sunday "" and it is a pity because of having managed to convince and maintain the sensation that you transmit to us in

the aforementioned locations, that we would find ourselves before the best or one of the best movies of the year.

Nevertheless it is a great and interesting film.

" 1

" While Under the Stars is a remarkable debut, the expectations created in its passage through Malaga and the

salivation of the criticism that has put it through the roof, make it happen as normal when you They create many

hopes: you are disappointed.

The trumpets sound but not the rockets. While Under the Stars is a remarkable debut, the expectations

created in its passage through Malaga and the salivation of the criticism that has put it through the roof, make it happen as

normal when you create much hope : disappoints you. Viscarret's film sketches a story oflosers

sympathetic- who do not fall sympathetic - adapting the novel El trompetista del Utop���a de Aramburu. An

Alberto San Juan who wants to give him a sponge and ten euros gets into the skin of a musician

who returns to his village, specifically Estella. to see his dying father and to scrounge the onethrows himself

who, especially his brother, an Ibarrola made of metal that makes impossible sculptures and

has few lights but a huge heart. San Juan between patxar���ny patxar���n is dedicated to making friends with the

daughter of his brother's girlfriend - a feral necktie -, which despite the little respect with which he

treats her, is delighted of life with his new uncle, who also gives him snuff. The story takes place between these

relationships and a drama that is intuited from the second frame. Although the movie -seemed it- is not so bad, it

suffers from a guide that outlines but not concrete and an excess of lyricism that although it is aesthetically

thanked, contributes little to the plot line and slows it down. In short: I got bored and did not get

excited despite the good intentions of the debutant. That yes, the realization is impeccable and the landscape and

landscape of Navarre are very well portrayed -although not all are such garrulous-. Another thing about Viscarret is

having a dusty atmosphere, very close to the western. The soundtrack is very good starting with

the central theme. Enrique Morente sings Stella by starlight with a tear that neither Tom Waits. And mention the

expected resurrection of Emma Su���rez, a great actress who works recently. And please, can someoneme

answer? Why is it that in Spanish films, in which more, they are so given to show the actors

mingling? PS: As I know that when not waves are made to a homeland you fall the god is ready christ

I am. That yes, I have been ben���vola because my two companions demanded me as little as six euros and they are not

going to let me choose film anymore m�� �s. Although now that I remember one of them v��� Welcome home and

inexplicably we are still friends.

" 1

" Shines by its handling of time: the feverish start with Gimme Shelter of the Rolling Stones begins

already where the abundant shots will go, spirited cinema, cinema with text, hypnotic cinema.

More than a film, it is a return, a restitution of the withdrawn confidence. Gangs of New York was awas

show as grandiloquent as itgimmicky about the beginnings of a city and the birth of its clans.

The aviator was a dramatic tour de force, a biopic, a skimpy hagiography of the glamor of a time and a

character. Infiltrados is a ribbon sewn with the remnants of all the previous cinema of the Italo-American master,

but the remnants are his and this time he has made a tailor with delivery, with very high flights and the

result is amazing. We are not before the masterpiece that was One of ours, that spoke of the same

thing, but it is the best tape, in my opinion, of this bland and puny cinematographic year. It shines with its handling

of time: the feverish start with Gimme Shelter of the Rolling Stones begins already where thego

abundant shots will, spirited cinema, cinema with text, hypnotic cinema. It also shines because Scorsese is a

fabulous storyteller: he has always been. What matters is that the events that make up thetext

literaryare the most explicit to the viewer and he is not thrown into a Russian mountain of

secondary stories that contribute nothing to the story itself, a Hong Kong trilogy about the mafias that swept

Asia. For this to shine, Scorsese does not abuse the soundtrack: it is limited to dropping songs without

it �� These are subordinated in excess to the images as he had done in Casino or in the aforementioned One of

ours or as Tarantino masterfully does. Powerfully calls the attention an Irish theme attacked by

a band of hardcore metal that sounds two or three times in the central part of the film. Theattention

primaryof the director is to start from a zone zero of the feelings, so he referred to it in the press conferences

that we saw on television. That zero zone of emotion allows a typical metaphysics, a disconcerting exercise

of absolute renunciation of any religious reference. God does not exist. It is not. He abandoned everyone and now he

looks at them from above, extremely attentive to the disagreements of all those types that his capricious hand has thrown

into the world.Scorsese is obsessed with violence in the human condition . Physical violence and also the

increasingly complex degree of semantic violence. All of his films (this to a very high degree) are

configured as vehicles for investigating that obsession. The end (which will not be here revealed) leaves everything

in its place and retakes the phrase that opens this fantastic guignol of truth and imposture.

"" Before "", says a voice in off at the beginning of the film, "" we had the Church, which was a way of having

us "". And now only the Mafia is at ease with her domesticated God, with her little demiurge, who is a

Jack Nicholson made a perfect, histrionic, supercharged ego bastard , hyperbolic, but convincing and

intimidating. The perfect father-in-law. I will not close this opinion without mentioning Leonardo di Caprio, a huge actor who

has already been recognized by directors like Spielberg or Scorsese, who require it incessantly. It would hurt to see in the

future those folders stuck to the chest of the adolescents of the Institute who exhibited, flirtatious and ladino, the

face of Leonardo when he was the king of the world. Now they have Orlando Bloom.

" 1

" The science of dreams has put its expectations in the presentation of animated frames that plasticize

the inner world of the character with imagination and optimism, but it does not succeed. Better, stun, bewilder

and exhaust.

Long live the disorganization! This proclamation pronounced by the somnambulist character that he interprets with solvency,

although the truth is that to be shy, one does not have to be the same Stalislavski- the Mexican Gael Garc���a

Bernal, it is not so It is a fleeting fragment that accompanies this stew of pseudonymic images that is the science

of dreams. No, it's something more, it's a declaration of intentions of a Michel Gondry released from the excellent

scripts that Charlie Kaufman had so far managed him with a genius more than manifested in the magistral

���Olv���date of m���! and in the inferior and deranged (but with a personal logic) Human nature. And in the

science of dream everything seems disorganized, like a collage stuck at random by a pastiche of frames

mounted without criteria. As much as Gondry wants, no one ends up believing the world more or less imaginative,

something that I even doubt the sleepers of the protagonist. On the contrary, the group proposal is

easily broken down, giving the feeling that one has attended a session of na���fs scenes (that is the

word: ingenuous), that for Of course, they do not end up in any port. Perhaps the director believed that by

presenting numerous dislocated images that represent the emotional world of the young man in love, the

spectator would leave the hallucinated cinema and shake palms in the air. It's not enough, Gondry, it's not enough. In fact, it's funny

that I ended up enjoying more of the woodyallenian character of the work colleague, a funny Alain Chabat,

than of the - at the end of the movie Anguish-Odyssey of the troubled Stephane. And it is more worth a goat

on a cliff than flying clouds. The science of the dream has put its expectations in the presentation of

animated frames that will plasticize the inner world of the character with imagination and optimism, but it does not

achieve it. Better, it stuns, it baffles and it exhausts. There are moments that raise the film, but what alasts

blow. As I have already said, Chabat and his di���logos are of gold, as arefirst enunciations of silver

Gael's. The asshole and geeky couple of companions is nice, serving as a counterpoint to the pragmatic Chabat.

Charlotte Gainsbourg - to eat her in the party scene, with that mini-sesentera - passes as if nothing between

dream and dream of her agilipollao ���partenaire? The rest is cardboard, paper mach��� and cotton. Who hopes to

return to the universe of ���Olv���date of m���! You will feel disappointed. Not even close to it. It would be like comparing

the cut and paste preschool with a Chagal.

" 0

" Simp���tica series B, throwing C (of crappy) in their di���logos and, above all, absurd (and therefore

laughable) funds and effects.

Simp���tica series B, throwing to C (of CUTRE) in his di���logos and, mainly, absurd (and therefore up to laughable)

funds and effects. The plot is based on a small but very interesting narrative by Ray Bradbury,

however his development is not round, it ends up entertaining, but it is forgotten with the same ease that is

seen. There are some moments of filling, with, I repeat, silly di ,logos, and more palabrer���a towards the middle of the

tape, of what I would have liked. Situations happen without passion and one contemplates everything with some

perplexity, not knowing if the story that is shown to us is taken from a serious or overtly humorous tone,

as it seems sometimes, that they take a joke a little. In the chapter of special effects, they are

pure craft, with computer work, maybe ���mprobo, but sing ��� It's not possible. It seems that there was not

much budget for filming the film and it is quite noticeable when using more of the trainable account

transparencies and an artistic design that mixes the good finds with authentic churros. As for the

interpretations, they are not remarkable, although you have to make a special mention to their protagonist Edward

Burns, who does it frankly wrong. Well, it's not bad that he does it, it's that he does not even act. There is more dramatic feeling

in the voice of his Spanish doubler than in the face, always impertinent, of the actor in question. It is the

same as talking to the girl who is about to be eaten by a dinosaur. In short, and on the positive side,

there are "" bugs "" curious and enough situations for the viewer to follow the story with a desire to see

how to finish everything. And not to be really interesting, because the truth is that it is something long, but because there is

a minimum of tension well achieved and the intrigue is effective enough not to disengage. Thing that

there are certain moments that seems to happen. In short, entertaining in general lines, but far below what

I could have given of itself.

" 0

" Too based on real events and they give us everything done. They even repeat it a couple of times in case wenot

haveheard. And that the spectator, who is not stupid, bores him.

The exaggerated histrionism stains this thriller, however, can work in the same way as The

Wolf, but only if one forgets the historical rigor. After that story about the infiltrated Mikel

Lejarza, there was another episode related to the terrorist group ETA that had to occupy itsframes

corresponding. An approach in GAL that does not meet the expectations created. The case of the well-knownGroups

Anti-Terrorist Liberationcomes sifted by the eyes of Miguel Courtois who works in the world of

evidence. Possible realities assumed as certainties and corrupted in turn by the torn personal endeavor

of Melchor Miralles, visible head of Mundo Ficci���ny and one of the artífices of the investigation period�� �stica of

12 years that brought the GAL case to the fore. On too many occasions, a good scriptwriter (Antonio Onetti) does not do

miracles. Watching the film one has the feeling that it is not equanimous, although at this point we know that

objectivity does not exist and less in the cinema, a field open to all kinds of subjectivities to be governed by the

principle of creativity. Without going into the substantial historical matter, you will see how it costs, GAL goes

into the journalistic profession: the one that is independent, the one that is tried to be manipulated, the who has

interests No one is free of sin. The plot starred by gunmen, brawny reporters, confidants and

victims who are also executioners comes to a video-clip rhythm, like a sequence that chirr�� Pora

above the others by dealing in parallel murders and luxuries paid by card. We do not leave behind

stereotyped characters to the maximum. At this point we do not fulfill what was promised and we fall into the similarities

with the story: an example, the always convincing Jordi Moll��� who here gives life to a being who remembers

Deputy Commissioner Jos��� Amedo, with the brazenness of Torrente and the leave of Jos��� Mar���a Aznar. He is the most caricatured of a

hilarious cast: Abel Folk gets into the body of Pedro J. Ram���rez; Jos��� ���ngel Egido works a character

halfway between former interior ministers Corcuera and Barrionuevo; the? man of the technique? gives life to the

parody of Felipe Gonz���lez - that accent, please - and the "erroneous kidnapping" is recounted? of Segundo Marey. More

achieved are the secondary ones that give life Ana ���lvarez, Merc��� Llorens, and Mar Regueras. But thecouple

protagonistweakens: you do not believe the affirmations of manual that releases the character of Verbeke and

ridiculous the gui���os of the enamored one interpreted by Garc���aA nobody escapes to them that detr��� s of this film

is a good part of the people who assembled the World of the 21st Century but the references are so clear that it is not left

free to the imagination. much less to the interpretation. It is too based on real facts and theyus

give it all to. They even repeat it a couple of times in case we have not heard. And that the spectator, who is not

stupid, bores him.

" 0

" It tells the concerns of the contemporary man, with abundant metaphors and unforgettable momentsThe life of Don, a Don Juan spent in years, has become a kind of stagnation, in a It expects

clearly anodyne. A man who has seen (and is seeing) how his life and opportunities escape, while he

remains aesthetic and parsimonious in his couch. Your life is gone. but he is simply able to see it happen, without

even analyzing the situations, assessing them or thinking a minimum of them. He is alone. Don feels lonely.

He feels that his life is nothing that can seem like it. But neither does he feel (worth the double meaning) to

think about it, to look for the reason of his condition. He is a totally empty and lost man, in which onenot

canreach see no hint of vitality or feeling. But that does not seem to matter to him. Actually, in

these moments, he does not know the meaning of importance. It is part of his sof���. The closest thing to anobject

aestheticthat simply lets itself be carried away by the inclemencies, by chance or by the cobwebs that the wheel of its

life can bring. Bill Murray, our private and insipid Don Juan, past inof time, fashionable and everything

the nickthat occurs to the most eager spectator, is immersed in one of those roles that only he can Hacera to

culminate with a convincing result. The character of Don is like a glove, I do not thinkdoubts

anyone. And after other similar jewelery like "" Lost in Translation "" (especially the film of Sofia,

with which "" Broken Flowers "" keeps certain parallels) or "" Life Aquatic "" , has seen how the celluloid has managed to

discover the perfect gap of the actor among so many unexplored aspects. For many it is already

pigeonholed, but it is totally true that there is no actor (at least in active) able to do his job

without doing anything at all. Good Bill is unique in showing off his inexpressiveness, but endowing it at the

same time with an impressive expressiveness, however much both cases are contradicted. That is, our

"" ghostbusters "" particular, from a time here (as many will think), the only thing he does to earn

his salary is to walk in front of the c� ��mara wearing his inexpressive facies and his static posture (almost to

the rigidity of the cadaver) to any corner, situation or moment, whether or not the feeling embodied in the

gui���n. No exclamations of any kind. And the funny thing is that it achieves much more than other "" academic "" actors who

use the so-used technique of books and / or courses. And it seems to me that there lies one of the weak points

of its detractors. They see that he, without doing anything remarkable, achieves inexplicable results. And that, certainly,

can be frustrating. With a single grimace (which,is not a standard bearer of any

incidentally,expression), a simple opening of the mouth beyond what habitual in his person or a simple turn of the head,

comes to communicate in a brutal way. Maybe it always communicates an analogous feeling (of emptiness,

vital habit, irony, apathy or pasotism), but it is something really complex. the head one of the looks of

Zissou in "" Life Aquiatic "", charged with an innocence and antol���gicas depth, that I doubt very much that no actor

(with all the gestures or words of the world) could equal , no matter how hard he tried. Bill Murray gets out

without hardly raising it. It's his way of acting. Maybe, for some, that could detract from him. But his

talent is there. In turning the ordinary and banal into extraordinary and profound. And, although I am aware of

many things that I have argued, am���, personally, I love it. Yes. I love Bill Murray. I love his

inexpressiveness. Is it so. expressive.As���, in "" Broken Flowers "" we see a Bill / Don who has ceased to be human for some

time. His vital neglect has already reached a point of no return, a moment in which, however much he does, nothing

can be achieved. And the problem is that he does not want to do anything that disturbs his banal and boring life. He is

afraid of the simple fact of thinking about it. Why look for meaning in things? It is better that time passes, that the

present acts, the past is left behind and the future. simply come.Jarmusch, so, braids astory

seemingly simple, which can be viewed with great ease, but which is loaded with a lot of sense, of

many of those issues that we sometimes raise, but sometimes we dare not analyze them.the

Whathappen istemible.Entre so simply and apparent banality, Don can glimpse a small hole in the

look and rethink their own existence. And, although your desire to live and feel something sometimesto

leadscrazy or absurd imaginations, you can rediscover yourself. Maybe he realizes that his life has been

ridiculous, that he is an indomitable asshole or that he has been wasting his time, but at least he will not let

things come as they are. The Kafkaesque "" Search of your supposed child is no more than an excuse to look for

yourself, to give meaning to a life that is lost and without direction. The imagination, the power of inventiveness, the desire

to make sense of things and search are things that give strength to the spirit before so much shabbiness and neglect of

a past. Therefore, it will not matter if the kid is really his son, what matters is the trip he makes.

Although it ends up resembling an abnormal, an idiot who returns to observe (impassive) how his life is an

absurdity. But, again, it will give everything the same. Or maybe not. The director of films like "" Coffee and

Cigarettes "", performs, in that way, what is his best work. The flavor with its logical touches of personality,

with those elements that differentiate a talented director and full of own ideas. For that reason,again

we seethat mixture between absurd / surrealistic and ironic humor and sobriety of a caliber close to exhaustion.

It is, apparently, a very serious film, but at the same time full of situations that will give rise to the

laughter, in spite of treating it also from a serene, parsimonious and ���cido.Tambi���n we can see

other classic elements of the cinema of the director of "" Permanent Vacation "". His accurate plans, hispauses

continued, his lack of dialogues (many times, unnecessary), the seemingly vacant and banal image, which

in reality is full of nostalgia. As an example, we have these repeated scenes fromcar trips

Don's, in which we are shown the elements that pass by or the places through the rear-view mirrors, as if

looking back, looking a pleasure lost in nostalgia. The same, to quote something, gives us to

understand the sadness of the past of a man who was the Don Juan par excellence and today is a Don Nobody. These

elements bring her closer to a "" road-movie "", with gears that could articulate it as a work of worship and,

undoubtedly, as the best film by Jim Jarmusch. His previous works are debated between genius and

irregularity, but none reaches the level of formal perfection of "" Broken Flowers "". A luxury and an example

of how to make a cinema different and sincere. All this seasoned with a great touch in the photo, by

a classic David Lynch: Frederick Elmes. And without forgetting the excellent musical choice, worthy of an

almost masterly success. As for the interpretations, it could be said that the rest of the cast is really

good, but it is absolutely eclipsed by the presence of Bill Murray. In short, we are facing a work of

very relaxed rhythm, with a calm flow, without bumps, that manages to get totally in the story and see it

as something natural, sincere and very credible . It is something real and close, despite the apparent extravagance

of its characters. It treats such a common theme in our times as the loss of the vital sense of a man who

thinks he has nothing what to offer, after being everything in previous times. Itthe concerns of theman

revealscontemporary, with abundant metaphors and unforgettable moments: the rediscovery of the new life (neither

very stable or happy, to put it in any way ) of his past relationships, sometimes bordering on

extravagance in his travels, or, for example, the terribly scathing gui���o with the appearance of the particular

"" lolita "" of Jarmusch. For all kinds of palates.

" 1

" The Simpsons: The Movie is full of the acid and irreverent humor so characteristic of the series, and

It has some truly delirious and surrealistic sequences.

They were born more than 20 years ago as a film strip in a popular American television show. Two years

later they became independent and the animation series and the longest running series in the history of

American television were born. . At this point, what can be said about The Simpsons that has not already been said? After

almost 400 episodes, the most extravagant family of Springfield makes the leap to the cinema in the midst of a great

expectation around the world. The Simpsons are already something more that a series of animations are already part of the

culture of millions of people, and many are already unable to imagine a world without The Simpsons. Homer Simpson

has become a true icon for several generations in the last two decades. What brings this

film that does not provide the series? Nothing new, which on the other hand was expected. The big question was whether it would be up

to expectations, and I must say that I do. The Simpsons: The movie is full of the acid andhumor

irreverentso characteristic of the series, and has some truly delirious andsequences

surrealist. And how not, there is always Homer, who with his clumsiness and stupidity will start the loudest laughter

of a public delivered. There is no doubt that it will be �� one of the biggest blockbusters of this 2007, and

possibly of all times. From here we launch a notice to sailors, the final credits titles

bring some very juicy surprises, and it is worth waiting a few more minutes in the cinema seat.

" 1

" A crossover of 2 typical characters, a bunch of guys wishing they were killed, aargument when

stupidyou could not. Would you need more?

If I am honest, the project did not call me the minimum, and I did not have an excessive curiosity about the

film, although it is true that this summer I dedicated myself to throwing eye to the Alien saga and that the movies

of Predator for quite some time that I saw, go exaggerate at least as 10 years. Undoubtedly,

making a "Crossover" (mix of two sagas) with two such emblematic characters of the FOX sci-fi cinemame

seemed toa sovereign memez and more once I saw that idiocy called "" Freddy Vs Jason "" that I had to put up

with a mixture of drowsiness and the desire to kill more than one. Well, here almost repeats the same formula,

seasoned with entertainment or action movies, you can call it both ways and it's almost the same,

so we have the Aliens if the Lieutenant Ripley, look, I've been missing you for the hour and 20

min. of footage and on the other side to predators. In the middle of a bunch of pigs you want to be

loaded as soon as possible, because they are simple, foolish and brainless when you can not, go to those that when they

are loading you say! SIIII FIESSSTA! because you see that they put silly tiparracos in this kind of movies,

there is never one with whom you feel more or less identified. A soundtrack that mixes in equal parts

the music of the two sagas, together but not stirred, that if. and a director Paul WS Anderson, who maybe the

best thing he has done in his life has been going out with Milla Jovovich, because his filmography stinks as much as my

socks after a game of f�� Indoor soccer.

" 0

" Hard Romanian film, which consecrates its young director Cristian Mungiu. He won the Golden Palm at theFilm

CannesFestival 2007.

Hard Romanian film, which consecrates his young director Cristian Mungiu. He won the Palme d'Or at theFilm

2007 CannesFestival and it's no surprise, once he's seen it. The film is excellent because the gui���n is made of iron, full of tension

intrigue, although it is of daily nature. It shows the Romanian social reality of the sad and long period of the

dictator Ceaucescu, where there were serious deficiencies of all kinds. In these conditions, the fact that a young woman wished toan

haveabortion shows the hypocrisy, injustice and cruelty of those who have power over the others. With few

characters, but perfectly defined, a study of them psychologically. Superb magic and some scenes, long, with a

fixed camera, that literally distress the spectators, like all those that occur in the hotel

room and the exquisite and difficult scene of the family meal, with the face of the protagonist and boyfriend

fixed, while the rest of the guests talk about ballad things. Maximum tense and impressive narration that

keeps the respectable in a hand. Very good film. As a personal curiosity, when the projection finished. n

the movie, in the past Donostia International Film Festival, three girls, already mature, said it was a

shabby movie, badly made and unpleasant. And in addition, bad. Finally, they were also from the specialized press. The

truth is, I do not know how certain people get into places where they have not given the littleknowledge

cinematographicthat they have, especially in this case, where they are related, as it happened. Ena in that time in Romania,

facts that threaten the dignity of women and their lack of freedom to decide. The fact that,

precisely, a women did not know how to see "" the cutrez "" of the prevailing reality, and that the sober realization,

lacking all artificiality, as shown, says very little of them, and I am not referring only to the

section of cinematographic knowledge.

" 1

" This is undoubtedly the most faithful of the adaptations of a c (mic (or graphic novel) to the cinema, and as

such, we must understand its Ethics, its history, its excesses and its shortcomings.

After having seen this movie three times (one for necessity, another for commitment and the last for

boredom) I think I can show you without fear to doubt in anything my sincere opinion about this new work

by Robert Rodr���guez, that after the shit of El Mexicano returns through the front door (it was not very difficult either,

because the original was already very good and m��� sa���n if the author himself co-directs). Leaving aside the politics

about the fidelity to the comic of 'Batman Begins' I think we can say that this is without a place to doubt the most faithful

of the adaptations of a c (mic (or graphic novel) to the cinema, and as such, we must understand its aesthetics, its

history, its excesses and their shortcomings. About the stories. what to say, you may like them more or less, they can

excite you more or less, but there they are, just as Frank Miller thought of them in his head A few years ago, they are exactly

as described in the comics and no extra concession is taken. the gui���n went out cheap to Mr. Rodr���guez.

Another aspect in which he did not know himself was in the storyboard. With the deficiencies that thecan have in

celluloidfront of the paper in subjects of color and contrasts, it can be said that the aesthetics in general, and the photograph

in particular, are really achieved, and the shots of the novels, here,

giving some concessions about the color of certain scenes and characters. A Mickey Rourke that makes of

himself, a Bruce Willis in a state of grace and a Clive Owen that demonstrates what he knows how to do lead a cast

with stars again and old glories that show his more hooligan and wild side giving life to the

sinful characters of Miller's novels. No one stands out from others in this cast of many

characters, because, deep down, and although it is not politically correct, we all like to be bad. To

finish, just point a thing to all those people who have not read the books. It may seem more like an adaptation

of a film, but I assure you it is not like that, read the books and check it out, because Sin City It is not an

adaptation to the use itself, but a simple translation of images of this populated universe, because Sin

City was already a cinema before this project existed.

" 1

" Oviedo Express is one of the coolest films of Spanish cinema of 2007, which adds in itself a series of

elements that seemed have been lost, like the magical realism or the surrealism

The Spanish cinema throughout this year has suffered great and serious ups and downs. It started off excellently at the

beginning of the year, something unusual, but soon after it suffered a drop in quality that did not

recover until spent the summer. It is in these months, with the premieres of films like Mataharis, The 13 Roses or

Seven French Billiard Tables, when the Spanish cinema improves remarkably. Oviedo Express is undoubtedly another t� Title

to consider in said recovery, and that is that Gonzalo Su���rez signs a great film. It is about that of a film

of difficult qualification and description, being perhaps the most successful, because it is also the It's ambiguous, the

dramatic comedy. The argument is simple, the arrival in Oviedo of a great theater company to represent

La Regenta is a small revolution in the city. Oviedo Express has a certain air of local comedy

, in addition to a tone of magical realism that reminds of Manuel Guti���rrez Arag���n, and even has

totally surrealist touches. Despite this, it is a fresh and original proposal, in which Gonzalo

Su���rez mixes with great skill antagonistic elements. The vision that Gonzalo Su���rez transports to the viewer is

a distorted vision due to the setback, sarcasm and irony in which no one is safe. That said, the film

reaches its moments of greatest genius when it focuses on the theater company and its components. The

tributes to Sidney Lumet and Billy Wilder, especially this one, are masterful. The interpretations are

all superb (even that of Aitana S���nchez-Gij���n), although it is impossible not to highlight that of that great actor

named Carmelo G���mez.Oviedo Express is one of the most important The freshest films of the Spanish cinema of 2007, which adds to

itself a series of elements that seemed to have been lost, such as the magical realism or surrealism. It offers the

viewer, in addition to having a fun time, a vision full of irony about the theater, culture,

politics and social life of a young girl. �a city.

" 1

" Among the decline shows the drama of lost beings in a very sad story really full

of bitterness with an open end to hope.

I always believe that our country is that of the blind in cinematographic matters, I do not finish explaining

why the British director SHANE MEADOWS recognized in half the world for his enormous talent, because here �� Nor do

his films premiere. His previous work DEAD MAN SHOES could be classified as a small wonder and a

reflection on revenge with a load of portentous violence. Although of course it remains

faithful to its style of extreme hardness comes its first release in our lares with the name THIS IS

ENGLAND with distribution quite poor as expected. The topic is not new centr��� in the SKINHEADS or

the so-called skinheads, addressed on several occasions by the cinema as ROMPER

STROPER, the mechanical orange, HOOLIGANS and many more examples of gangs or youth gangs that always They gave a lot of play.

Between this style Tivo mixing it with the English social drama is told brilliantly without

subtilizing a descent into hell by a young man ignored in society who only receives the love of theseAmong

criminals.the decadence drama is shown of lost beings in a very sad story really

full of bitterness with an open end to hope. The interpretations of the child prodigy THOMAS TURGOOSE

seen in the series innocent project and STEPHEN GRAHAN of the same series also seen in GOAL are really

portentous giving credibility at all times to the drama that their characters require. The photography, music,

Gui���n are practically outstanding giving us a set devastating that unfortunately will not have much

transcendence in our homes.

" 1

" Pretty girls half naked, lots of bumps and a scene of action every quarter of an hour. It complies with therules

basicof the genre at face value.

Agent 47 is a trained killing weapon from a young age to be the best hitman. In his last

assignment something seems to have gone wrong and his dejected target reappears as he becomes the mostperson

wantedin Russia and half of Europe. Hitman is a succession of scenes from action, shootings and persecutions quite

bored that have above that whiff to want to be a good guide that makes it even more despicable. But since

the action is to consume it with popcorn I can not throw to the ground the spectators addicted to the

cinematographic adaptations of Videogames (yes, another one). And the truth is that inside the bad is even

entertaining. Beautiful girls half naked, lots of banging and a scene of action every quarter of an hour. It complies with

the basic rules of the genre at face value. Let's be honest, a person who buys a ticket to see a

movie in which a bald guy with two trabucons comes out does not expect to see a tape of the nouvelle vage, and

I guess the intricate twists of gui���n are not their prime objectives so you are going to throw away

two hours demanding that people die in entertaining and violent ways without being given a touch of

creativity. and whoever has never wanted to see a flat movie to entertain himself that throws the first

stone against the potential and happy spectators that come to the room to see Hitman. They enjoy.

" 0

" Although it is not the style of film that is usually seen in these parts, I have to say that it is a

very good movie and that every time I like more animations. .N Highly recommended, although for children it may be

hard.

It must be acknowledged that the title of the film fully coincides with the film, not an apex is left. And I

can not think of any more introductory nonsense. The film is about a kid from a family of new rich who is

going to marry a noble family girl without a hard. Of course, these two do not know each other, although as soon as

they see each other, they are taken aback (slightly) and the wedding does not seem too bad for them. Due to the boy's own awkwardness,

he marries a corpse, which causes certain headaches for everyone. And is that you have to

see how bad they bury people. The type of drawings that Tum Burton uses in this movie I do not end up

liking. Go ahead that they are good, but uses colors and sketches too dark,

too electric, too dead. Maybe it's the argument that does not convince me, but the drawings do not

finish calling me. The love story that is seen in the film is quite moralistic, but I have to say that

I liked it a lot. The beginning, what is being the first 50 minutes, I did not finish liking. But the

final half hour is sublime, especially the last 10, which moved me greatly (will I be pregnant?). And

I closed it all the script, without failures by any side or anything at all. I like it. Resumiendo, that

although it is not the style of film that is usually seen in these parts, I have to say that it is a very

good film and that every time I like m�� Lass the animation ones. Highly recommended, although for children maybe it is something

hard.Besitos.PD: The bride drops her eye from time to time and a very funny worm comes out. Mola.PD2: The

parents of both are very well characterized. PD3: And the little songs that he sings from time to time are not bad.

""The pulse? Overrated "" Je, heh.

" 1

" Pixar stays true to its style and proof of this is the fast pace that the film has from the

first second.

A few days ago in the morning I went to the UGC Cin��� Cit��� cinemas in Madrid to see "" Ultraviolet "". Upon

arrival, my surprise and joy were capitalized when I discovered that there was a preview of "" Cars "", the new and very

much awaited Pixar movie. Unfortunately I did not have the essential invitation to enter. But here it is

that the providence in the form of a gentle, sympathetic lady with an entrance of more obr��� the miracle of allowing me to

see the film ( I have to highlight also the kindness of the film workers who gave me back the

money from the entrance). Once sitting in my chair and before watching the film I could enjoy the teaser trailer

of "Ratatouille" "", that on the big screen is a joy, and "" The Man Orchestra "" the rigorous short film that

Pixar always shows before his films and that deserves a separate comment. But let's get to the point . "" Cars "",

directed by John Lasseter and Joe Ranft (emotional homage to the late filmmaker during the credit

titles), tells the story of Rayo McQueen, a young and successful racing car that avatars of fate and

on the eve of his life's career, he is lost and trapped in a town on Route 66. I would like to point out

that the dubbing did not seem as scary as I expected hear the news about celebrities that would double

some characters. Finally said celebrities appear rather little and do not bother too much, although I

would have loved to see it in original version to enjoy the voices of Owen Wilson and, above all, Paul

Newman.Tem�� The film is typically quite typical: selfish and self-important character who falls into a different environment than

usual and has to learn to be better. Along the way he discovers the importance of true friendship and the

power of love. In the background, the typical song of honesty and the beauty of traditional life in the town against

the accelerated sophistication of the modern world (in this case symbolized by the world of racing). But there is

something that can not be denied to Pixar and is that each new production visually overcomes the previous one.

They are the world leaders in 3D animation cinema and it will be difficult for them to lose their throne if they have to compete with

pseudo films but lacking brilliance as "Neighbors" Invaders "" (see critique) or "" Ice Age 2 "" (see critique).

If in "" Looking for Nemo "", Pixar managers reflected as never before the marine environment have now decidedPixar

on the asphalt and racing, with equally brilliant results.remains true to his style and proof

of this is the rhythm Trepidante that has the film from the first second, which makes it one of the

most entertaining films of this year. There is also no lack of emotional moments, which are not sentimental. And

sometimes camera movements and images reach a beauty and a perfection that thrills on their

own. All seasoned, as it could not be otherwise, with the brand humor of the house and with the waste of

imagination necessary to create a world that is like ours but that is inhabited exclusively by

cars. It's true that it does not reach the viewer like other Pixar tapes. This may be because it is not so

easy to feel identified with a car as with a superhero or a fish (even if that sounds ridiculous) or to

that feeling. n of d���j��� vu who has the story. But all that does not matter because once the projection is finished,

one leaves the cinema with a smile from ear to ear and with the conviction of having spent one of themoments

funniestof the year. in a movie theater. And to raise your hand those who can boast of having released a

film like this in recent times.

" 1

" A C���sar Borgia unconvincing ... an amalgam of television series episodes, awkwardly united by

a deplorable montage.

It is presumed as the great dream of every cynical lover of the historical genre: a passage of our History

told by a filmmaker of his own. Perfect ambience, unbeatable actors, unprecedented technical deployment

and an elaborate guide. An attractive proposal, in which the only discordant note ventured into the lisping diction

of so peculiar Catherina Sforza. But, after all, a dream ... of what could be. It is possible

that, when leaving the cinema, some cin���filos remember that funny phrase with which the American

critics defined the work of the actor John Malkovich in The Dangerous Friendships of 1988: "" Their gait , more typical of

an inhabitant of Brooklyn than of a French aristocrat of the eighteenth century "". Saving the distances - if it is

possible - something similar could be written, this time, of a C���sar Borgia so unconvincing. A painful

performance, which owes a large part of its lack of brilliance to the strange linguistic licenses that, in many

moments, allow the gui���n, and that result closer to the slang of the movida madrile���a that to thelanguage

characteristicand own of the personages of the XV century. Even so, it is not a question n to tear the

garments? Still, if we take into account that aspect? the wardrobe? s ?? that is worthy of amention

prominent. For something or something, we are talking about a superproduction. Within a framework of incomparable

landscape beauty, having been shot in real historical spaces, fact that the cameras have not known to

exploit or transmit to the viewer, the story that remains remains true to the story of the novelist Mario

Puzzo. A new vision on the Gandian family, aimed at dismantling the black legend that, propitiated in

its time, fell on her for centuries. Good characterizations of the characters of

Lucrecia and of a discreet Juan Borgia are obtained, coming from a more acceptable performance. The lisp (and others),

typical of a quarry of actors who has not worked in theater ("" the mother of the lamb "" of the declamation),not

isenough for Paz Vega, in this occasion, shine with its own light, in opposition to the new look that is

thrown on Alexander VI, in which the accident rate, which is still attributed to the novel, is transformed into

caricaturesca majader���a In the historical field, the spectator does not have to fear. Those responsible for the footage

ensure that the various Italian states continue to keep their names (for example), and History its

essence. With the "perspective that gives the distance" there are numerous cases in which American filmmakers

created kings and non-existent countries. Recover El Cid from 1961, in which the advice of D. Ram���n Men���ndez

Pidal could not prevent Heston D���az de Vivar from taking the Valencia square "" in name of the King of Spain "", in the

middle of the Reconquista. In this sense, Los Borgia is considered a masterly and typicalclass

History. Encountered by "" typical "" here in the first hour of Monday, in which the tone of voice of the teacher,

monotonous and linear, made it fly the imagination, not the fifteenth century and a much more recent past: the last

weekend. A mental journey that was interrupted only abruptly when the tedious and tiresome voice raised the

volume. In the film, the turn that makes the drowsiness come from the "" desestructuraci���n "", decomposition of the

gui���n.No doubt that it is very smart to start tell a story about, practically, the end of it,

go back "" twelve years before "", move forward "" three years later "", go back to the point of departure and conclude. An invention that

worked for one of the Greats in One of Ours, Don Martin Scorsese, and that usuallycapture the

manages toattention of the spectator. Now, no matter how much overproduction it is and how much decomposition it is

proposed, every movie must have a beginning, a development with its corresponding "" heat of the moment ""

and an outcome. Trying to have too many starts with his later analysis, he only manages to give the sensation of

being attending the projection of an amalgam of television series chapters. ,N, awkwardly united by a

deplorable assembly. In the section of the surprises, what draws attention is to know that in the film there

is not a single battle ��� pica. The various battles are insinuated to the spectator with the presence of corpses

on the battlefield, with C���sar Borgia playing with his sword, or resorting to the old trick of the map, in which

a red line marks the unifying advance. Something similar was proposed to him in his day Stanley Kubrick to

relate Spartacus. An idea that the director discarded, because going to this narrative process would never transmit

the historical importance of an army of slaves that put in check the greatest political power known in the

ancient world, that of Rome. And that is precisely what happens in this work, which is not enough to understand

the fame of wise strategists, better warriors, and insolent arrogants that would foment the hatred and

envy of those who coincided in their walk It is not known where the Borgia Grandeur is. Although,

perhaps, the most surprising thing about the whole film is in the lamentable scene in which Lucrecia shows a

letter from his brother C���sar to the Duke of Ferrara, on top of a tower. An unworthy sequence of a filmmaker

who owes a small gem In the City without Limits. And this is the story of The Borgias, a product

intentionally designed to be profitable until limits unexplored still by the Spanish Cinema. When

"" How was it rolled "", the movie followed, and this will be the television series, with its annual reruns

during the next century. The Alc���ntara family already has a rival.

" 0

"The luxuries do not stay in the helicopter explosions and skyscrapers, the guide is another luxury. One way to enrich the fiction is the attention to detail. ���nero of terror accuses her as an excess

when it falls in the casquer���a, but the action cinema gains a lot when it goes into detail. Sa The Misionsaga

Impossibleis very similar to the James Bond but the golea in the details, Ethan Hunt entertains much more with

his robberies, kidnappings, rescues, escapades, and fights.It's not about the pleasure of seeing him win, it's about the pleasure

of watching him do it. Mission impossible delivery captures the attention of the public from around the world.The creators

know that they have to be at a great height to meet expectations, but so far none have been

defeated by the v�. ��igo, neither from Palma, nor Woo nor now JJ Abrahams, which some will know about the series

"" Alias ​​"". ���cula, each section, is woven with the same amount of ideas as a

full movie of another firm; and, probably, with a bigger budget. A chapter of M: I: III is like a

film festival of action. And it's shot with that great sense of sufficiency. The beginning of the film tells

how Ethan tries to rescue a spy from Berlin with an excess of means and adrenaline than in another film

of the same genre. It would serve to give us an end of apotheosis. But unhappy with the dose of action, the

pursuit of helicopters and bombs, the writers tell us that the rescued spy can die for an

implant that he has in the brain. This type of pirouettes, of "" harder yet "" accumulate the entire film.

It is as if the creators knew that the spectator has already seen all the possibilities of a count behind

a "" can not be saved from there "" and to complicate it they would say: "" That's not all " " Personally I'm scared to

think that it will be the cinema when Mission Impossible III is like a movie of action. The luxuries do not stay in

the explosions helicopters and skyscrapers . The gui���n is another luxury. And he has one of those narrative tricks

I usually complain about. But only one has, does not support history in rhetoric. And it's so timely. I'm going

to take the liberty of telling it: the story begins with a scene from the end; Ethan has to give the bad guy the

rabbit leg, because if he does not give it to the bad guy he will kill the woman he loves; and he has ten seconds to decide

what he does. The Holliwoodian cinema has evolved from the good guys who gave their lives for the good of

society, from the forties (Key Largo) to the bad guys of our days. They do the same

heroics but only for helping the person they love. Today, no hero dares to say out loud

that the guy is going to play for a high cause; Unless the hero is played by Bruce Willis, of course. Ethan

Hunt should take many as an example for the balance that holds between the two extremes.

" 1

" It's boring and predictable, and on top of that I leave an open ending to a sequel that I do not know if it will be done. The success of

the movie has not been the expected at all.

I really expected that a director like Stephen Hopkins, who made films as great as "" Predator 2 "" or

"" Fly through the air "" gave us a movie, even if it was something more effective. The theme of the movie is already

uninteresting, is something that everyone has heard about: the public plagues. On top of that they keep repeating it in

the movie, and that makes you bored, because they're continually telling you what's going to happen next, and

you know what's coming. then you think "" well, maybe it is in the way you tell me "", but neither, because the

realization of Hopkins in this film is absolutely flat. Hillary Swank does not seem to have much in the way despite

her two Oscars, it gives the sensation, maybe it's wrong, that she does not consolidate herself as a "star". " Even so, his

interpretation is the highlight of the film. He does what he can with his character, and gave him some interest.

Not even the special effects work, they are the most plastic. The blood is not believable and strange

strange sights. It is as if it produces in the spectator a vague discouragement that is not recommended in this type of films.

It's funny, because the FX makeups are in charge of the genius that made those of that film that is "" Abuerto

Hasta el Amanecer "", Greg Niccotero. You never know what the movie really is, if is about pests or about

looking for a lost child. Terror cinema resorts too much to the subject of children. you get fed up,

you get stuck with kids. Here the girl is the one of "" A Bridge Towards Terabithia "", with that face of "" the little cousin of

which announces Plystation a few years ago ... no I know if you remember it. It's boring and predictable, and on top of that I leave an

open ending to a sequel that I do not know if it will be done. The success of the movie has not been at all expected. Some years

ago horror movies came to us produced by Joel Silver, who regained his super empire thanks to the

trilogy of "Matrix" "" I recently founded a subproducer to finance terror films. "" House on Haunted Hill "",

"" 13 Ghosts "". none of them with much success except the pitch that was the first. If there is something that

can stand out, it is the moment in which an inpresionante amount of moths attack a house. It's amoment

pretty comicaldepending on how you look at it. It is a version with bugs of the end of "" Los Pajaros "" .. more like a

comedy than a serious movie. I would stick with that scene in a "Ghostbuster" type "eighties" movie, from

which we must wait for the third installment, this time without Bill Murray (shit !!!) and the magn ... ��fico Ben

Stiller replacing him as his son.

" 0

" Are all expectations filled after watching the film? I believe that yes, 300 is everything that

promised, action without limit or quarter, a fascinating visual and auditory experience, unleashed violence and

blood.

300 were the men that King Leonidas called his personal guard, 300 were the Spartans whohim

accompaniedon a suicide mission, 300 men delivered to their King and confronting each other. Des of a million Persians,

300 was the comic by Frank Millar and Lynn Varley and 300 is now the last film by Zack Snyder based on the

same comic, one of the most The most anticipated films of the year and one of the highest expectations raised since

you could see their trailers. Are all expectations filled once you see the film? I think so.

To begin with, and something that anyone who has seen images or the trailer already suspected, is that the visual aspect

is very careful and spectacular. The gray skies and the fields of dull yellow and parched are mixed and

contrasted with the semi-naked bodies and the red blood of the layers. But that's nothing compared to when

the action starts and the battles are happening one after the other, the violence is unleashed without respite, the

Spartans brandish their shields, swords and spears without mercy, and the blood of members ripped and bodies

crossed splashes the screen ac���mara slow in a fight of a cruelty as seldom has been seen

on a large screen. Everything is accompanied by a thunderous sound, another of the great successes of the film,

a sound and a music always consistent with the scenes, more guitar in the battles, and more calmed in

other pieces. The film drinks a lot from the comic on which it is based, with some scenes and dialogues practically

traced from the original, these are the best moments of the film, the Logras achieved. The meeting between

Leonidas and Xerxes is worth highlighting because of that verbal confrontation and that majestic characterization of theking

Persianwho almost looks like a giant and with a really solemn voice. There is no doubt that those who have enjoyed

the comic will find many points in common with this one. Anyway, the film takes its concessions and creates

new plots, such as the son of the captain and the plot of the queen in Sparta, both quite

dispensable. Gerald Butler is superb as King of Sparta, his look is scary and his screams make you want to

go to fight with him, I do not know what that will be the dub as the pass to which I have gone has been in VO and it is

tremendous, I hope that they do not with the dubbing. The one that is also spectacular is Rodrigo Santoro like

Xerxes, practically unrecognizable with so much piercing and of a height and almost divine presence.300 is everything

that promised, action without Limit no barracks, a fascinating visual and auditory experience,violence

unleashedand blood, but apart from all that festivities, what comes to reclaim the film, like

the comic, is the sacrifice of a group of men by the system of life in which they believe, by living in freedom

and not kneeling in front of a divine king, is the struggle of democracy against the dictatorship, a tribute to a

group of brave soldiers without whom Europe today would not be what it is. Of course, I do not doubt that this

film will be on the best lists of the year when it counts.

" 1

" Brad Bird has achieved with Ratatouille a film of honor matrimony. Cinema of 5 forks.Ratatouille is for me, without a doubt, the best movie of the summer to date.As���, to calz���n quitao,

I start this cr��� This is a risk with the apparent risk of confronting the opinion of many of you for writing

such strong words. But, my friends, there is no risk whatsoever for saying openly that this film is the

second best of the Disney / Pixar t���ndem, after "Toy Story"; its high quality can be appreciated with evident

clarity, with only the first 10 minutes of footage. And the most curious of all is that this feature film

does not stand out exclusively for its technical aspect. There remained those times in which we marveled

at the almost perfection of the digital molding of the characters that thesemagicians so excitedly taught us.

animationAll that is �� surpassed, because such is the expertise with which Pixar already represents, and in this

case, the human and mouse protagonists, superbly mixing reality and caricature, that we

completely forget that we are facing a work of animated art and we allow ourselves to be fooled by something valuable that

the film has: an absolutely captivating script. Let the one who goes to the cinema raise his hand without wishing that they would excite him

with a moving story, either because contain moments of fun mansalva, with laughter that

burst the t���mpanos of the public that there is in the room, or with tender moments worthy of being calmed with

tons of clinex. Ratatouille? It has ALL that, looking more for the sensitive side of the viewer, in the same

way that Disney has always done with its eternal classics. And the main cause of which we are

rendered before this spectacle is Remy, a rat with a special gift for the gastronomy that is not valued by

his cong���neres. Virtues such as tenderness, humility, generosity, going through situations of defenselessness to

be persecuted as the greatest enemy of any restaurant that prides itself, or having moments of euphoria

manifested by feeling like a chef of the first, they represent with so much emotion and dedication that there is no other way but

to fall madly in love with her. He is the typical sojourner and helpless character to whom we all take love in a

thousandths of a second. All his adventures are told with that Pixar's own ingenuity that he had lost

incomprehensibly in previous jobs: his bizarre arrival at the most important restaurant in Paris, the

Gusteau? s, which was run by the late Aguste Gusteau; the need to hide insidehat

Linguini's, a dishwasher that for various reasons becomes Remy's puppet, mistaking

him for the critics as a revelation n the kitchen, and so be able to have a means to cook without being

seen; the success that he can not enjoy; or the test of fire to raise the restaurant, after the death

of its founder and the nefarious management of the new chef Skinner: surprise Mr. Ego, the gastronomic critic mostEverything

famous of France.flows with complete harmony, intermingling extraordinarily those

touching and fun moments of those who spoke to you. Each of the characters in this story has a mission

that fits perfectly in the story, but it is worth mentioning Mr. Ego, a professional

culinary critic. I would be afraid of any chef who had the highest number of Michelin stars. Implacable, of

difficult satisfaction palate, gets nervous to the public with his ruthless articles of opinion. He had

never seen such a fearsome villain whose evil was based on the word. A clear pull of ears to the critics

that with their ego can destroy new talents, however rare (a rat) they are. That is why a sublime moment of

the film, of which I can not speak in an extended way, it is when at the crucial point of the footage they offer

Mr. Ego a very simple dish called? Ratatouille? for your tasting, and on which depends the reflote of the

restaurant. We will comment on the thread of this criticism, but during those wonderful 10 final minutes

I got the creeps. There are portentous scenes but like those last ones. For all the story I am

completely surrendered to the feet of Brad Bird who, with his work in gui���ny writing and directing, and

with the help of the equipalite team from Disney / Pixar, has achieved a Honorary matricula Cinema with 5

forks.

" 1

" A very good idea, misused that loses so much bellows that it comes to a complete stop, a pity, but

you can not ask for more a summer premiere of such ephemeral characteristics.

Well, well, now I come to understand the reason why "" Next "" has taken so long to be released in our

country, although it is true, that summer is the right time to this type of tapes, however, the film, a

story more of the mythical and famed (after death) Philip K. Dick is one more of many, and even, I would dare

to match it with another of the same author, "" Paycheck "" who starred the ineffable (not infallible) Ben Affleck,

hehe and without having prepared it I have left a couplet It is true, that the main idea is magnificent and that the

first act is masterly, leaving one in the chair, wanting more, however, the film that had

begun In a masterful way it hits a sudden braking, just at the beginning of the second act and becomes bland, at

times quite predictable, and simplistic in its final execution. Nicolas Cage in his line, I begin to

believe e that this man has a kind of curse towards the films he stars in, and that, no matter how much

my lady loves it, a project that this man touches, project that fails miserably and that is, this movie

has only raised 45 million dollars, a figure almost exhausts with the amounts that move today

, including box office and DVD sales in the States.Tanto Julianne Moore , like Jessica Biel are quite

normal, to the Moore you can see that she enjoys being "" out of the water "" (lease dramatic cinema) and Biel,

despite being the vase woman ( I'm waiting for you in a little house.) At times it seems that he thinks more about the

check he is going to charge once the job is finished, than about giving more packaging to his performance. Theeffects

special, I dare say that almost, one more character on the tape, are normal, quite simple, so

we're going to cheating, and the direction of tamahori quite excasa, this director was the one that brought us one of

the most loaded tapes 007 action? (I do not recognize). In short, a very good idea, misused

that loses so much bellows that comes to a complete stop, a pity, but you can not ask for more a

summer premiere of so ef��� mere characteristics.

" 0

" At the height of Jackass's stupidities. I am one of those people who do not see who falls, not only because of the low quality they have had since

Wyoming left, but because I really have a hard time seeing it; they give me attacks of shame on others. That's why

Borat did not call me anything in the first place. The idea of ​​a man pretending to be a Kazakh reporter

touring the United States with the idea of ​​ridiculing his country and the country visited was difficult for me. it was

funny It has some curious moment, like the confusion of a turtle with a dog, and other revealing moments

of a certain American way of thinking, like the declarations of the rodeo cowboy against homosexuals, or

that the sellers of Weapons and cars do not even flinch when Borat tells them he wants them to kill Jews,

anything to sell. But apart from that I would not like it anymore if the film were really a

documentary made with a hidden camera, imagine a camera rolling certain sequences reveal that everything, or almost everything,

is a complete farce. I am convinced that Pamela Anderson knows perfectly well what is her role in the film

before the moment of the autograph and that everything is ready, just like the supposed Jews that they rent a

room for you. Come on, it's a movie that I do not believe anything about and that is at the height ofstupidities

Jackass's.

" 0

" Sorry sequel where a group of soldiers are locked in a fortress, but the enemy instead

of being outside is inside. Byproduct encompassed in the B series, I doubt anyone likes to see it thinking it

is the second part of something.

Director: Phil Tippett.Duration: Long hour and a half, remember.Estreet: May 18, 2004. Today I saw

Ratatuille (as it is written) and at the end speaks a gastronomic critique. mico, commenting that after each creation, even if

you can destroy it with your sharp verb, there is a team of people who have worked for it. This is

very tender if you see it while mice play chefs and the family triumphs with love, but if ityou

happens towhen someone tries to get you a retinal cutrongo as a sequel to a fresh, ingenious and

gui movie Ocurn witty, you get mad and do not save in derogatory qualifiers. In addition, I'm not a paid,

criticso I say what I want. Ea.The movie is the continuation of its first part (it seems obvious, but it

could be a prequel, or a saltacuela, that is, I put the same name and do what I it comes out of the

balls) where the men are launching an offensive on a planet of bugs. Do not wait for spacecraft, or

movement, everything that has to happen happens in a kind of can fortress, and the ship that comes out at the

beginning is nothing but a scene from the first film. So sad.I'm quite outraged with this movie.

If it had been an original idea, without the name of a good film followed by a, I would probably

shticksee it with more benevolence. But when making a sequel it is presupposing that theis going to be followed

plot line of the first one. Not much less. In this there is a turn towards the B series, touching if you want the gore,

with moments of those that are not recommended after dinner (except that they make you laugh). It's about creating

a distressing atmosphere, that at no time curdles, with a lady-in-command, a girl who thinks she's rambo, a

rambo who thinks she's harry the dirty, a general who has seen many pelis del oeste, and other purrielas that do not make

anything more than an infamous product. Ale, I've already said. Resuming, unfortunate sequel to the great Starship

Troopers, where a group of soldiers are locked in a fortress, but the enemy instead of being

outside is inside. Byproduct included in the B series, I doubt anyone likes to see it thinking that it is the

second part of something. Cow's Cow.Besitos.PD: A girl sleeps while hundreds of bugs attack her,

millions of bullets shoot in her ear Nobody is surprised anymore. Do not touch me the palms I know.

" 0

" A recommendable surprise in the form of teen comedy, with some actors in a state of grace, somedialogues

funto the extreme despite relying on the usual themes, with multiple references to comedies of this

style of the 80's.

Normally one has some misgivings when it comes to watching a movie about adolescents withhormones

alteredand sex ions, more taking into account that in the vast majority of cases they usually

result in the end result of the greatest possible calamity. It is also true that a server tends to disconnect part

of his brain on many occasions and is able to enjoy even the primary instincts that involve

jokes sometimes even macho about sex, women or any other beauty that worries

most of adolescents and often portray these films.La only hope that housed to meet

before a decent product was who was behind this production, Judd Apatow, in this case asproducer,

which is They owe him modern comedies with enough interest, such as "" Virgen a los 40 "" or the one commented recently in

this blog "" Lio Embarazoso "" (of imminent premiere also in our rooms). Well nice surprise

that I have taken, because despite finding common passages of this type of productions, it

would be a mistake to be carried away by superficiality in this laudable attempt to endowwith a certain humanism

the charactersGreg Mottola, a

half-known director who has previously worked for television in various comedies, knows how to create the

almost perfect teen comedy for the times, that point of view. always seen the vicissitudes suffered by

some adolescents, treated from a realistic and fearful vision of adolescence (and I repeat, probably

influenced by that new brand in the American comedy that have already become the

productions of Apatow). Thick comedy yes, but always starting from characters with whom

any viewer identifies on many occasions. The story shows Seth (Jonah Hill), Evan

(Michael Cera) and Fogell (Christopher Mintz-Plasse), three losers, but not for that reason especially

schematized in a typical, precisely, at least not taken to the extreme, which find the opportunity

of their short life as teenagers to have sex or a couple before college when they are invited to a party

with the popular people of the institute, in exchange for bringing them the drink with which to satisfy so much teenager

left. Throughout the film, we will follow the adventures of these three friends to achievein any way

their goal, during a long night that remembers the one lived by Corey Haim in "" Papa Cadillac "", that popular

eighties film. All this starting from some dialogues that will probably be accused of bad habits, bad

taste, etc., but let's not forget, that although they are always considered that way in most cases, they do not It is toregardless

reflect to a large extent the conversations of every adolescent on foot,of who is concerned, realistic.

It must be said that in this particular case they are really fun and provoke the most sincere laughter in the

viewer. But it is not the only positive aspect of the film, since underneath all that rude comedy there are

much more serious aspects that run the risk of going unnoticed by the clueless spectator. The fear of

growing as a mechanism to internally combat the nostalgia of the youth represented in that attitude of the

two policemen (taken to the extreme, that is, almost close to the slapstick), or other fears such as losing your loved

ones as they grow up and undertaking a New life, represented in the film with the relationship of friendship threatens the

distance between Seth and Evan (both excellent in their roles together with the impeccable role of Fogell) and their

emotional final reconciliation. Mottola as director, the truth is that it isinconsequential

technically, it is limited to being tremendously conventional, without any hint of originality in the staging

, totally predictable, as following a mark of f��� factory without leaving its conventionalism nor

its marked guidelines. In short, a recommended surprise in the form of teen comedy, with actors in a

state of grace, some fun dialogues to the extreme to be based on the usual topics, with

multiple references to comedies of this style of the 80's like "" The Revenge of the novices "", "" That

exciting course "" or the aforementioned "" Pap��� Cadillac "", with more background than it seems at first sight, and a

certain humanism and candidness of the characters in many scenes that create a solvent, fun product and

that by his own methods he becomes the best teen comedy of the last years by far.

" 1

" The movie itself is a dreadful, boring and predictable firecracker without a single novel scene.

Well, you want me to tell you, my Dead Silence has scared me. Just remember that Donnie Wahlberg was a

sexual idol of young girls in the nineties with New kids On The Block and that his brother (Mark Wahlberg was a

nobody model of underpants and was called Marky Mark) and check how they spoil the bodies is

enough reason to start screaming in shock. Once overcome the childhood trauma and the death of themyth,

eroticI must say that what becomes the film in if it is a terrible boring and predictable firecracker

without a single novel scene. A boyfriend of ventriloquist appears at the door of a young couple (he should be

denounced for copying the Gabbo television of the Simpsons) and of course in less than two minutes there is a murder to be

carried �� our protagonist to his hometown to discover a terrible curse that he remembered

anecdotally as a simple children's story. From the moment you step on Ravens Fair for the first time. The

aesthetics, the direction, even the treatment of the film seems to be taken from a chapter of Supernatural (that

yes, without the two solid brothers going around the scene) and as such with 40 minutes we could have

ventilated this tape with something more grace and sense of humor. ��, now I know that José Luisgives me great pains

Moreno.

" 0

" A jewel of cinema. One of the best films of the last decade. The Polanski / Brody ensemble make

"" The Pianist "" one of the best films and performances of the last decade.

There are not a few films, or books, that have been made about Jewish stories of the Nazi era. But

despite this abundance, the truth is that we are, particularly and with the permission of the rest, with two

great films. One of them is "" Schlinder's List "", by Steven Spielberg. The other one is "" El Pianista "",

by Roman Polanski. Although both are true cinema, I prefer the latter. It is curious that both

directors have Jewish origins. Or not. But the truth is that, thanks to that facet, both get to connect

deeply with the viewer. And in spite of the fact that the subject invites to it, undoubtedly its quality as

directors what comes to qualify them as such. "" The Pianist "" is cinema in its purest form. It impresses you, it impacts,

youit makes you feel alive. Numerous and well-known are the stories of Jews who lived through the Holocaust. But there are

many possible ways to transmit them and Roman Polanski has done it the best possible. Polanski tells the

story of the great Polish pianist Wladyslaw Szpilman (Adrien Brody) who, like millions of Jews, suffered the

consequences of Nazism. The film shows us, from the perspective of a single person, life in theGhetto

Warsawand its subsequent survival. Without loss of detail, all cruelties are shown as what they

are, or what they were, reality. The ghetto seen from within, with all its hardness. It is inevitable not to feel a

strong connection with the protagonist as the story progresses. Not only because of the great performance

that Adrien Brody received for the Oscar for best actor and his consecration as such, but also for seeing the

situations that He has to endure.that he has to live and that the director has managed to capture in such a brilliant way,

leading him to also get the Oscar for that direction. He uses his own experiences to ��� To add more

detail and realism to the film because many of the scenes that appear in the film, when Szpilman and his

family are moved to the ghetto, were lived by Polanski himself. The film can divided into two

halves: the first, magnificent, more focused on life in the ghetto, trying to convey what it was, through

the experiences of our pianist and his family. In the second part, equally splendid, Szpilman becomes

the center of the story: we see the passing of events from his eyes, we listen for his ears

(something in which the director intends to do emphasis, as when he loses momentarily the hearing capacity when

exploding a nearby bomb), in short, makes us feel what he feels, live what he lives. And he

gets it. And not only with the technical and personal direction that the director prints, but also by having an

actor of the stature of Adrien Brody, who took So serious the role, that he learned piano to interpret

some fragments of Chopin's works that appear in the film, lost 15 kilos and even went so far as to sell

part of his property and live only to feel , at least roughly, what lived Spilzman. The gestures,

the voice. These are the details that Brody interprets so brilliantly that they make the film whole,

even if he had already won them. Special music deserves special mention. The BSO of the film is exclusively fromworks

Chopin's, whose romantic and drama-filled notes add the perfect touch to the already impressive

atmosphere of the film. �cula. The melodies of the composer are fantastic interpreted by Janusz

Olejniczack, and fits in each and every one of the situations experienced by Szpilman, to the point of getting

a perfect identification between the two. : the Polanski / Brodymake "" The Pianist ""

ensembleone of the best films and performances of the last decade.

" 1

" Very impressed I have been with Blood Diamond. Edward Zwick -experienced in typical tragedies- takes us

back to the recent past of Sierra Leone, in the middle of a civil war.

I was very impressed with Blood Diamond. Edward Zwick -experienced in typical tragedies- takes us

back to the recent past of Sierra Leone, in the middle of a civil war. In this catholic context a soldier - more than

fortune, misfortune -, a desperate country man and an American journalist try to find a diamond,

as a ticket back to sanity. I've liked it more-and disgusted by the truth-it's been the

impish display that the director of the baby killers, soldier children, does with less Twelve-year-olds are

trained killers who are drugged and manipulated to fight in the conflict. The film impresses,

stirring stomachs and consciences mainly and does not leave indifferent. As for matters merely

artistic, DiCaprio smells like Oscar. Personally, despite his efforts, I do not even fully convince him

in this role. In some scenes I see him very screwed and provides others as

improvised? Demolition man ?, in my opinion, quite exaggerated.The film is long, I notice, but as they

develop at the same time several frames and things do not stop happening, it does not get heavy at any time. The

photograph of Eduardo Serra -the young woman of the pearl- shows all the beauty of the unfortunately belligerent

area. It has some video clip, supported by the music of James Newton Howard, which is somewhat pretentious but

serves to relax accumulated tension. However, if something is left over the film is the Hollywood touch.

I explain, the pseudo foolishness between Di Caprio and Connelly is more and not sneak. The stage is at least idÃneoescarceos

for theseand it stinks to producer demanding: ??? we are going to put a cute girl even with shoehorn?

-like the doctor in Prison Break, more or less. The other aspect that has squeaked me is the epìlogo, which will be real,

but it's pretty mo yas and seems to be concocted by the previous producer. Except those two buts, a film of notthe

missbrand that, I feel that in many theaters, this viernes.PD: After watching the film and absolutely

concienciada, I wanttake this platform to tell my many suitors and admirers:not me

regalIs more diamonds, please. Diamond? S aren? Ta girl? S best friend.

" 1

" Surrealist cinema, infinitely rich, different, risky until exhaustion. Essential movie

to do after table-stretcher healthy dialogue.

Chance did not give Bu���uel with faith: it did not agree either. That kind of intolerance in theological field conformed a

unique work that came to represent, in part, the convulsive political and ideological panorama of

Spain. from which Don Luis was forced to flee. All that hectic ideology of militant apostasy and aesthetic

anarchy have been formidably written in The Exterminating Angel, which is worth as much as avehicle.

strictly cinematographic��fico that as a profile of a complex personality carved in adversity and in a certain

school of free thought and almost unrepeatable talent (Lorca, Dal���, Alberti). Bu���uel's enormous skill (

and infinite risk) that contracts) is to make veros���mil a completely absurd situation, bordering on sinraz���n:

a large group of guests, invited by the bourgeois N���bile can not (literally) leaving a

room more than any physical evidence prevents them from such an elementary and simple act. The natural course of

those days of confinement gives them a wild survival instinct that clashes head-on with the

protocol and the educated and civilized ways they exhibited before the disastrous situation. " "During the

filming of ���Viridiana��� I met writer Jos��� Bergam���n, who told me that he intended to write a play

with the t�� �The ���ngel exterminator��� title. I told him it was a magnificent title and that if I went down the

street and saw it announced, I would go see the show. As BergamÃn never wrote the work, he wrote

asking for the rights of the title. He replied that he did not need to ask them, since those words

appeared in the Apocalypse. "" Thus Bu���uel explained the origin of the title. The exterminating angel is the skull of

a shipwreck. In fact, the work on which it is freely based was called "" The na���fragos ofStreet

Providence"", never written, but prefigured in the mind of Bu���uel and Luis Alcoriza, his right hand in All

the Mexican experience. And we must understand the film as a shipwreck and how the survivors must

learn to communicate in order to get out of the enclosure and leave the island / room. It would have been better to

make history in England (Bu���uel counted) because the society there is extremely educated and all

that education and refinement very much suited the plot of the film, which seems to be the simple idea that,

under adequate conditions, the human being is capable of the most perverse, even though they are attributed (by nature, by

culture) the things m��� Sublime In very brief words, the ���ngel exterminator is a portrait of

human decadence, but sifted by surrealistic evidence. Perhaps the panic, the fear of death or loneliness

are residues of a surrealistic way of understanding reality. There are philosophers whose absolute writing revolves

around the idea of ​​the absurdity of death: life is an inertia, living is a continuum, and not a continuum

that can be (illogically) fragmented, mutilated.The guests are deplorable beings, superior in an

almost Nazi sense of the term: Bu eluel's entire effort scrutinized until the impossible the mating of a

cultured, imbued and haughty aristocracy, who he despises any form alien to his benefit, to his strict

protocol. It can seem a tease to anyone who attends the film with an excess of critical (or

cin���filo) spirit. You have to want to go further and understand that Bu���uel made a slapstick, an astracanada, a descent into the

embarrassment that the world has an arrogant riffraff that looks down on the others. Pors for the mere fact of being

different. This 21st century recently illuminated already has the term "" otherness "", which is a word, aresource

horrible semanticto designate the evidence of the other, its interference in our world, which can (after all) also

be yours. The indispensable ingredient to do after a table with a healthy dialogue: it does not matterwe

ifliked it a lot. , little or that we consider that it is a real unbearable crash. Everything is accepted. The same has

a bit of all that and brings together films of height and immeasurable boredom. I have been filled with joy by the

review (many before then) of a film I saw in college days, with my head eaten by

Gongora fever and an exalted sense of the injustice of the world. Now they are other times or they are always the

same and they interweave to confuse our generational daze.

" 1

" Sincere, pleasant and very well shot that reminds Allen of his first cinematic incursions.

Woody Allen, returns by his fueros, with a comedy where both Scarlett (his new muse), and the same

director give luster to a sincere, entertaining and well-filmed movie that reminds Allen of his first and more

sincere cinematic incursions, perhaps, the jarring note is that of Hugh Jackman, unbelievable in his

performance and that the shadow of Wolverine and the "" X- " Men "" is a slab that not even Wolverine, with its

incredible metal blades can go through. The music again, is a great travel companion of the footage

that Allen It composes on screen, and that is, it is such an extremely well-made choice that one accompanies, almost as

a baton, the image with the tune. The argument, although improbable, is made funny, and one has parts

where it is not very clear that it is going to find the next moment (nothing predictable the gui���n of the genius of NY).

Anyway, I waited for it as water of May and the truth is that, to my wise to understand, the opinion can not be more

favorable.

" 1

" Glamor, lgrimas, the planet Zog, the protocol, the t��� of the five, the deer of Balmoral, the princess

of the town, the imperial phlegm, the Laborism, the pink press, the lackeys , the splendor and the circumstance. God save

the queen.

At one point in the film, a Blair adviser comments that the British royal family live on the planet

Zog. In another, the Duke of Edinburgh, that character between idleness paid and the most exportable British

phlegm that can be seen on screen or Carnaby Street, says that a deer of fourteen points has been

seen in Craggy Head after having listened to the television news in which they report the death of Lady

Di, in Paris, with her boyfriend. The queen is a portrait nothing hagiogr�� �fico: an elegant exercise ofvoyeurism

sentimentalthat operates from a very British way of looking at life and that, ultimately, examines the

condition of the human being in these times of confused moralities and of volubile political adhesions. Do not put

your finger on the yellowness. Nor does barracks in the pink press. It is about telling the pulse between the

Labor leader Blair, recently installed in 10 Downing Street, and the queen, who has already seen the presence of ten

prime ministers since Churchill sat in front of her to ask, in solemn protocol, thecommands

executiveof the fatherland. Pete Morgan's little master resides in an almost non-existent guise, based on the

sharpness of always-understandable dialogues, even if the casual spectator lacks the appropriate political formation to

understand the hatred of Monarqu���aa a laborism represented by a novice Blair, but firm in its

determinations, always attentive to the protocol and aware that, in the end, the Things will be done according to your whim.

They are those who surround the prime minister who most stab the figure of the Queen and it is Blair himself who, in the

end, opts to appreciate the value of a figure representing an institution. millenarian that the people

admire and that never, under perhaps any circumstance, will turn its back.Pel���cula of acontention

prodigious, nothing inclined to any frivolity, is an example acad� I like how to make excellent movies with very

fragile wicker because the film does not give much of itself. Put one to tell what it is, theis concluded

explanationin a minute. What is all the rest, Helen Miren, I have not spoken and I will not say anything in

fact because everyone has written and said excellences and now I do not have the verb fluid for the sake of the hour or

the fatigue of Monday.Abur my friends.

" 1

" Says a critic who sees "" The Da Vinci Code "" is as exciting as seeing your grandfather solving a

sudoku

After embracing Christianity, Constantine He convened a council in Nicea to unite all positions and

point out heresies. One of the most important discussions was that raised by Arianism. Theposition

officialwas that Christ was God, he had not been created, like the rest of the mortals. Arius, on the other hand, defended

that Christ was a creature. What importance can it have that Christ is one thing or another? Mucha.Si Christ was

human, his sacrifice has value, but no more than that of many other people who have suffered. If Christ was

God, as the church defends, the humiliation and torment of the cross is not one more example of suffering, its

sacrifice is the central moment of history. That act justifies, also, the salvation. All this question

was at stake in Nicea, and it is also in "" The Da Vinci Code. "" The film deals with the battle between a

secret sect, the Priory of Si���n, which has proof that Christ was human, and the most conservative branch of

the church, Opus Dei, which fights to the death for preserving orthodoxy. The story This discussion has

allowed Dan Brown to make the sales record of all time with his novel. However, Ron

Howard may not be able to score as well when he sees the box office. That brings me to the difference between what

a reader looking for that passes the pages of a book ���ived by an answer and what a viewer is looking

for intrigued by a mystery: slightly different things. The pel��� He is faithful to the book for his misfortune. It begins by

raising questions and advances at the expense of more questions and turns. But the role of the protagonists is not

cinematic, it is more intellectual. It is not a movie of characters, but of enigmas. He said a critic who sees

"" The Da Vinci Code "" is as exciting as seeing your grandfather solving a sudoku. The cinema does not work if the

characters are not involved to the core; They have to play everything. The novel, on the other hand, functioned as a

puzzle, as an intrigue that affected religion, culture, the reader. The problem is not that there is no

chemistry between Tatou and Hanks, the problem is that none of his characters live the film.

" 0

" Infumable intensive course of international geopolitics made with undeniable and talentedforms

cinematographic, but weighed down by an excessive handling of situations, characters and subplots that end up

tearing down what could have been a colorful building.

Syriana is a meritorious puzzle whose assembly governs the destinies of the world or, put another way, Syriana

is a practical compendium of geopolitical finisecular, an intelligent look at the powers in the shade. It is no longer

Dante, nor is it the love that he put as the motor of the world. "" The love that moves the sun and the stars "". Not as I

said the sadly gone Hilario Camacho who sang that the weight of the world is love. Where before Dante or

Camacho, each with his ways and according to the time he lived and died, is now an Arab prince,

perhaps educated in Cambridge, sybaritic of sins Western, although fierce bulwark of hisidiosyncrasy

popular. And the weight of the world (now) is the oil and its accelerated turmoil of hallucinations that in some

reserved luxury in a hotel of many stars govern our destinies and organize the placement of the

chips on the board. Syriana is also a spectacular document on the complex structures of thediscourse

financialof the world, but it is not an excellent film. It is not good either. It is a forced mediocrity, a

territory in limbo between the wild documentary of a Michael Moore in vein or the veritable fiction of

John Le Carr���. The slight indications that all the plot is caught by excessive clamps. Drag

insurmountable obstacles. The choreography of the international bureaucracy exhibits law firms of a

surprising sagacity, conspiracies within the offices of the State, financial analysts withinfluences

formidable, Arab pr���ncipes with lamps m� Magic under the thousand dollar and Taliban shoes of terror, the

usual terrorists, ignorant and jubilant ex-votos of their cause, which usually coincides with our

nightmares. This qualified mortar of important people builds a communal house and Under that roof is the

reader and who is writing this. Ah��� we love and cry, we smile and we sing. The problem is that the

intelligence of Stephen Gaghan, director and scriptwriter of this interesting (although I have already said that unsuccessful) film

obliges the idle viewer, I do not take up all the chromatic tones of politics and of their s���tanos, to a

continuous (and tired) exercise of complicity and the plot, convoluted, generous in scenarios and in ideas,

too often deactivates our attention capacity, which is overwhelmed by an avalanche

torrential and sophisticated of small plots that, assembled later, procure a great plot or The Great Plot,

the visionary, apocalyptic puzzle, the shadow map of the world. Syriana needs an op I use to explain the

blank spaces in our brain. It also requires a large dose of patience: the necessary to avoid

those gaps, the pieces seemingly washed away, the whole warp of this global paranoia. When solving these

inconveniences, the film flows with another rhythm, which Gaghan prints: dizzying, agile, contaminated

by the adrenaline of these times of religious fundamentalism, moral relativism (as much as it weighs on

Holy Father of Rome) and fever burs���til.Barnes, a convicted George Clooney, who fattened more than twenty kilos in

a month and let an anguished beard grow, abandons his gesture habitual scorn to be the agent of the CIA

sent to the next East to assassinate an heir of a petrol���fero emirate that is being suspiciously

advised, in the eyes of yankees, by an ambitious Financial analyst (Matt Damon). "" The biggest addiction in the US

is cheap foreign oil, "says Gaghan, who also writes a very free guide based on the

memoir. of an American agent in the Middle East, Robert Baer. The traffic of influences in those high spheres

that we do not know does not imagine that it gives for arguments like Jean Claude Van Damme: everything must be so, thick, of a

thicket dense and organic And it is this density that weighs the film to where it must: the dubious dream of

political science fiction films, with no abundant genre t� Titles, but with its legion of faithful who see on the

screen their reflections on the issues dealt with here, which are not few or irrelevant, as soon asis

the hearingrefined and we lend all the attention we know to the manifested in these two hours and littlecloths

dirtyand black gold. The characters are accidental pieces of the argument: there is no care in creating them

close but rather the opposite : there is no empathy, we feel like mercenaries, people who are definitely

irretrievable to live in the society of every day. It is welcome to praise his ideological estrangement:

his asepsis, his indifference almost. What is shown to us, and that we understand only at the end, does not require

a link from the narrator. The events are "" bigger than life "" as the American critics of

show business say. Like this chronicler of the current film, he still lacks two or three boils of

History and four or five tablespoons of international geopolitics to catch all the subtleties of the

script that , frankly, it overwhelms, it intimidates, it leaves the spectator (this one who writes in particular) out of tune

, disinterested by any deep and relevant thought that may want to sneak. And I do not doubt that

there are. And big. I do not get to much. I will not do any intensive course to see it soon or leave it

for when my mind is less agitated by the lack of free time. That everything is. Addenda: Curiosities /

Phrases1.- Syriana is the name to refer to a hypothetical new scenario in the Middle East.2.- George

Clooney: "" There is no intention in the film ���cula of presenting the Muslims as bad "". Not as good

either.3 .- Matt Damon: "" No one can say that is pro���rabe or anti���rabe. Not anti-American. (The movie) speaks

for itself. It does not give an answer "". He does not ask the right questions or do many questions and we are suffocated

by so much question mark.4.- Stephen Gaghan: "" To make the film, he spoke with spies,dealers

arms, oilmen, politicians, intermediaries, members of royal houses, terrorists. A CIA agentme

helped, he wanted me to understand him, to catch him. He was a professional liar, but I think he hasme

helpedto capture the essence. " The same spoke with a single character and turned out to be, at the time, sp���a, oilman,

politician, trafficker, member of a real house ... 5.- Syriana is filmed� �� in five languages ​​and in four

contents.6.- The cast is numneros���simo: more than one hundred characters of which almost seventy have

dialogue���.- Clooney, gal� In Hollywood, here gray and efficient as an agent of the CIA-mercenary, he consented to the

fattening and wild settlement of his beard, but not shaving, as Gaghan wanted, his head. There are no

demands of the gui���n that can with the self-love of some divos.

" 0

" I know that this film would have enchanted me with 10 years, the bitch is that I'm already 30 and if they leave

things in the middle I get angry.

When one is planted to see this type of film, the child inside must be let out of the inside,

the one that we left sitting in a corner many years ago. , put your head on the side and try to

enjoy the projection, the funny thing is that in the press pass (we must give thanks to Deaplaneta

for his pressbook and gifts so we can be benevolent with criticism.). I know that this film would haveme

enchantedwith 10 years, the bitch is that I'm already 30 and if they leave things in the middle I get angry and the

feeling of emptiness What he leaves me usually accompanies me when expressing my opinion in a text that later, maybewill read

someonebefore watching the movie. Let's go in parts; Although the plot, the setting, even the

interpretation of the kids is fucking great, the film is lost in a mix of things that, to me, have been

nothing short of surprising, especially those philosophical-moral conversations about life, religion and

other stories, in a film that goes directly to "" la chavaler���a "" they seem inadequate to me, such

Once, that message the boys do not get it, but the whiff that will be left to the elderly will be bad for the

mouth of the film. Desdea from "" the lord of the rings "" in taking care of the effects

for the films where he participates, once again, all the digital effects made by thecompany

New Zealandare excellent, worked, cared for, and quasi-realistic. They learn from them in Hollywood.

Finally, they would have missed a muscle between the two protagonists, because although they are kids, who has not

lived their first love?

" 0

" The life of others is a film of those that you are wishing you could tell someone to

go see it.

We live in the 21st century, we are of a generation that has had it all, freedom, good education,

possibilities to do what we wanted, to listen to the music that we give the desire, to read any book,

to say what we think ,? We have always been able to choose, that's what our parents fought for, and thatto

seems so normalus. You do not usually miss something if you do not lose it or if you have never had it.

For all these privileges that we have had and we have, it is a great joy that someone, be it German, Chinese or

Spanish, get back the fear, the resignation, the resentment , the frustration, the hatred, the rebellion,

the pain, the struggle and the surrender that supposed to live in some parts of Europe 30 years ago.The life of the others

is a film of those that you are wanting to tell someone to go see it. Theactor

mainis simply spectacular, but a lot of eye with the writer, with a presence and that gives his

character that mixture of grief, poetry, rebellion, indignation, need to survive without the one that the film

would be impossible. The secondary ones are also at a very high level, both the journalist, the prime minister and the

lieutenant colonel. The theater actress plays a very complicated role, which you fall in love with and hate

equally, but which is undoubtedly a great performance, eclipsed in part by the twoprotagonists. The

malecaptain de la Stasi is undoubtedly an intelligent type, convinced of communist ideals, but at

the same time caught in the dynamics of the Party, which prevents him from seeing what his country has become. Living the

life of another person makes you see reality from another ���ptica, something so healthy and that makes so few people today

(determined to see things from a ��� unique point of view, with the danger that this implies, that it is the

wrong one). Seeing things from other eyes makes him wake up from his dream and leads him to sacrifice everything, which was better than

nothing, for a text, which could surely help somebody to fall. A wall that was not far from there. A

part of a beautiful soundtrack, an atmosphere that makes you feel like you are in the GDR in the eighties.

With excellent scenes in the cases of interrogations and the placement of the entire listening system.

" 1

" The story itself is the worst of the whole, with scraps of stories taken from here and there,

mixed with mythology and popular belief patterns, a conglomeration of inconsistencies at the service of the

power or aesthetic.

On too many occasions the trailer of the film is more interesting than the film that promotes. That

can happen to them with the advancement of this film, one more in the downward career of a filmmaker, M. Night

Shyamalan, who in 1999 reached a worldwide success and unexpected with The Sixth Sense, the only horror film in

a filmography built on the combined basis of genres ranging from fantasy to suspense. It is clear

that a title so famous can not live for life, although some know how to exploit the filin. The friend

M. Night Shyamalan falls into account even though the overwhelming title, taken with pins, is already far

away. Repeat the formulas that seemed to work so well, giving the impression that the multi-talented

filmmaker is entering a creative crisis and that may be the reason main reason why he has shownon

his interpretative sidethis occasion. His last horror story, like the previous ones, keeps him in suspense

until the end only if a clever spectator does not sneak into the room and begins to tie up the ends. On this occasion, henot

haswanted to abuse the formula because he has chosen not to sow the road to follow, as happens in

other titles of his filmography, such as El Protegido and Signals. Predictable at all times, the young woman of water

combines fiction with another type of fiction based on legend. The fairytale with pathetic janitor and boy

for all monotonous life, is starring Paul Giamatti, which we have seen in American Splendor,

Cinderella man and Between drinks, and the angelic although unexpected Bryce Dallas Howard, who left blind in his

previous project and after Nicole Kidman was new muse of Lars Von Trier in Manderlay (continuation of Dogville).

When all the most insignificant details stand out, although they will be with me in that the parody

of the film critic is great-, it means that we have made a mistake with the libretto and its translation images

- here all of great beauty. It already happened the same with El Bosque: an excellent setting does not sustain aguide

weak, hence we consider that history in itself is the worst of the whole, with remnants of stories

taken from here and there, mixed with mythology and popular belief patterns, a conglomerate of

inconsistencies at the service of aesthetic power and, in turn, prey on their Narrative incapacity. The filmmaker seems to be

inspired by the world of fiction that Terry Gilliam already relied on to fertilize the illusion where the

secret of the brothers Grimm emerges, another failed film without us being able to know well the why of it.

Above what we can think, and although it lacks rhythm and integrity as a final product, the adventures of

our aquatic friend Narf, any nymph, entertain. We conclude that Shyamalan knows

well the tricks of marketing and film communication, knowing how to engage with the public, throwing ties

even if he is not able to anchor the ship. In other words, it does not excite, and if it does not manage to become a

credit for an hour and a half, the story, instead of taking us to distant worlds, only serves to rest on its

laurels.

" 0

" The Shadow of the Kingdom is nothing more than another patriotic film made in order to raise the morale of

American society, which tells a story with heroes and Villains in the purest Hollywood style.

Since the first years of cinema life there have been films whose primary function was to exalt the

patriotic values ​​of society, and this has not only been in United States. There is more to see most

of the cinema that was made in postwar Spain and in the first years of the dictatorship. But it is

true that the American is the clearest case of political propaganda made film. After the brutal

attacks of September 11, and after leaving spend a time for society to heal their wounds and heal their

pain, Hollywood has found a genuine patriotic philtre in terrorism. The Shadow of the Kingdom narrates the

investigation that follows a savage attack on a residential complex for Americans in Saudi Arabia.

From thebeginning, the film openly shows his cards, and does not try to mask hisspeech.

patritico The script is quite simple, vulgar, lacking in all credibility and very predictable.agents

Americanare portrayed as superheroes, who must do their job in very bad

conditions, in addition to facing the indifference or hostility of local authorities. But as itnot

couldbe less, the character of the local policeman who communicates with the theses of our heroes is not missing, and to

follow the tradition, from the beginning you know perfectly what his destiny will be. The film has twoparts

well differentiated, the first of CSI-type research, while the second is filled withsequences

well-resolved action, that's it.The Shadow of the Kingdom it is not more than another patriotic film made in order to

raise the morale of American society, which tells a story with heroes and villains at the most pure

Hollywood style. The problem is that in real lifenot so clearly distinguish the good from the

bad, and everything that has relation withMiddle East andUnited States is much more complex than showing

the pel ���cula.

" 0

" A film that although you can not remove the entertaining label, for me it is the weakest of

the saga, and that glimpsing the whole saga as a great movie. ��cula, I think we are facing the film

that serves as a link between all the development of the previous films.

We already have here the almost "" eternal "" apprentice magician, in a fifth installment that initially proposed great

changes and great challenges. These changes and challenges are based directly on the adaptation of the longest book of

all the Potter saga, and seeing the length of the other films this seemed eternal at the time of

adapting it, although seen it seems that they have opted for the snip directly when it comes to skipping

chapters and more chapters, until leaving only a main plot to be able to follow throughout the footage. In the

second place, the changes refer to that middle adolescence that our Harry already has, that already enters

fully into love issues, and that in addition he finds himself more and more alone and with a character little more ���spero

that the sweetness that distilled at the beginning of the saga. All this would be pretty good and would give a breath ofair

freshto the saga, but I have to admit that this film has disappointed me a little. First, by

focusing only on the main plot of the film, which would not be bad, the problem is that when

watching the movie, it gives the feeling Den that many things are left in the ink, in search of a narrative a

little more fragile and spectacular, and for that a simple example, since now that I am reading the book in

question ,N, the piece that I have read, until his arrival at Hogwarts school are almost 200 sheets in the book,

while in the film at 10 minutes it is already reaching exceptional school. Secondly, the

much-announced darkness of Harry Potter, which does not become such, simply a couple of voices that beats his

friends, and a sense of loneliness throughout the entire movie. but he does not get to impregnate the character of

Harry, who is still brave and determined when he touches him, and does not take a step back for many "ghosts" that go

through his thoughts, something that in the book I know that it is also better counted and seen, but that here it fails,

because here the only dark thing that comes to observe the whole film, is the use of all the mosttones

mutedof the colors, very much in line with what Alfonso Cuar���n did in the third installment of the saga, El

Prisonero de Azkaban, which does seem really like m� It's dark in terms of the approach that this is. Another problem

is the use of characters. Some characters appear and disappear as if by magic, and never

better said, and it seems that they are just there to say a couple of appropriate phrases, or simply

to make a bundle and join the excellent group of actors . I do not know how his characters will develop in the

book, because he still does not get to that part, but the roles of Bellatrix Lestrange, Nymphadora Tonks and Luna

Lovegood just show up from time to time, and especially the role of Bellatrix, with Helena Bonham Carter

interpreting it, I think it will be a bit more decisive in the next film of the saga. As I say, Daniel

Radcliffe, Emma Watson and Rupert Grint, are exactly the same as in the previous films, although a little

more grown up. Just say that the only one with something of the future that I see of the tr���o protagonist is Emma Watson,

and if not the time, because I think that with Radcliffe we ​​are going to have a new case Luke Skywalker. The rest of the

characters, also appear very in passing throughout the film, except the great Gary Oldman in his

role of Sirius Black, no doubt the best we see on the screen, along with Imelda Staunton, whose role

of the repellent Dolores Umbridge, I know that it is very successful, being odious almost from its first

appearance, the rest of the characters, as I already mentioned. ��, although with a lot of name too wasted, as for

example the 3 lines of dialogue that Emma Thompson has in the whole film, the three sporadic appearances,

although conclusive for the history of Helena Bonham Carter or even Ralph Fiennes in his role as the one whonot

canbe named, and who, although he has the qualities of a bad mime in the cinema, does not let him see all that he would

have to give shape to a film. magician role as bad as it would correspond. As for the director, not a takes nothing

new to the show. Although Chris Columbus initiated the saga and dot��� of the spectacularity that characterizes him,

and then some other director contributed his grain of sand, as for example that great third part rolled

excellently by Alfonso Cuar���n, here simply David Yates is dedicated to placing the camera and trying the

maximum possible planes where some special effect can be used and so on. �� to add a spectacularity that

only with the shot could not achieve, which says very little in its favor and what shows me that it does one

of the most flat works and lacking personality of the Potter saga, and the worst of all, is thatis already

this directorchosen to shoot the next film, the Mystery of the Prince. It would only save the

beginning of the film, which starts quite strongly and which gives hope on a film that will follow the

same style throughout the film, but can not deceive. �ar us in a better way, because until the final battle between

magicians, according to people who have told me that if they read the whole book, it is quite true to the book, for a

spectator accustomed to special effects of the caliber of Transformers, Spiderman or Pirates of the Caribbean, will

seem to you of everything less spectacular. It is fortunate to have been able to take advantage and see the film in Imax format,

since those last 20 minutes in 3 Dimensions, add the spectacularity that the film itself

lacks. �cula, and that that end is not filmed to be used in the 3Ds, but hey, you can not ask him so

much. In short, a film that although you can not remove the label of entertaining, for me it is

the weakest of the saga, and that glimpsing the whole saga as a great movie, I think we are

before the film that serves as a nexus of union between all the development of the previous films and the end of

the saga, which comes with these last two films that are left to Harry, in which we hope to recover the

narrative agility, a better use of both the main characters and the untapped secondary, and

that regains strength and even the Darkness that had already been marked in the previous films.

" 0

" Solos is a failed film, and despite having good initial ingredients, it has remained

a slightly vulgar product, one more of the Iron���as

mound. life, the Argentine cinema has lived a period of splendor and expansion in the same years in

which a very serious economic crisis hit Argentina. Thanks to this resurgence, the great public has been able to

meet great filmmakers such as Campanella or Bielinsky, recover others already consecrated as Aristar���in, and

discover excellent actors such as Ricardo Dar���n, Eduardo Blanco , Mercedes Mor���no Ulises Dumont. Many of

these titles have been co-financed to a lesser or greater extent by Spanish producers, which in turn have

influenced their cinematographic style. But films like Solos have come out almost miraculously, thanks to the

efforts and determination of their directors, in this case Jos��� Glusman. Solos tells the story of Enrique (Sergio Boris)

and Luis (Adri���n Navarro), two men of thirty and many or forty, who suffer strong disappointments

and decide to live together. What had become a refuge for the sorrows of both, becomes

a deep and sincere friendship. Jos��� Glusman's main virtue is that he does not offer situations or

stereotyped characters, but instead shows a credible story that anyone can recognize. Nor does it fall into

the easy comedy of brainless singles in the American style, which is much appreciated. However,

by not opting for human comedy or drama, the film loses steam as

the minutes pass. Good work of its main character, which brings even more credibility to the group.

Solos is a failed film, and despite having good initial ingredients, it has remained in a

product slightly vulgar, one more of the mound. A real pity that thegoodis wasted

interpretativeof its protagonists, and a script that could have given much more of itself.

" 0

" Lesson of nerve, rhythm, planning and direction of actors of Scorsese, which is seen again

at home portraying the violence of the American suburbs.

It was time! I had not heard from Martin Scorsese in the fiction movies since the already distant

'Casino' (1995). Yes, it's true, since then there's a guy who has filmed with his name 'Kundun' (1997), 'Al

l���mite' (1999), 'Gangs of New York' (2002) and 'El Aviator '(2004), but that was not Scorsese. It seemed, but itnot

was. The one who has directed 'The Departed' ('Infiltrados' in "" modern titrador ""), I know that is Martin

Scorsese.Remake inconfeso (at least on the part of Scorsese) of the acclaimed' Infernal Affairs 'by Wai Keung Lau and

Siu Fai Mak,' The Departed 'tells the story of Colin Sullivan (convincing Matt Damon) and Billy Costigan

(forceful Leonardo Di Caprio), two men who see their destinies crossing both sides of the law to the shadow

of the capo of the Bostonian mafia Frank Costello (overwhelming Jack Nicholson). One struggles to become the best,

the other can only aspire to survive. Deceit, death and betrayal will erase the fine line that

separates the legal from the illegal, in a territory where everyone is guilty in the eyes of someone .Storing

, rhythm, planning and direction of Scorsese actors, which is again seen at home

portraying the violence of the American suburbs. Nobody, not even the great ones of the Asian cinema (well,

perhaps Tarantino s���), is capable of making you like a torturer like the character of

Nicholson. Michael Ballhaus, in the photograph, recreates a dark and decadent South Boston whereby

criminals move like rats, which contrasts with the luminous and sophisticated environment of the police elite. They are

the two parallel worlds between which both protagonists move. The secondary ones work with as much energy

as the protagonists: Alec Baldwin, Mark Wahlberg (the surprise of the film, for me), Martin Sheen, Ray

Winstone and Vera Farmiga dress the stellar trio in an outstanding way. The only buts that can be put on

this return to the first division of Martin Scorsese is the low weight dramatic ���tico that has the element of love in

the plot of the film, and that repeats songs ('Gimme shelter' from the Stones and 'I���m shipping up to Boston' from

the Dropkick Murphy�� They sound twice each), but that's a paranoia, it does not affect the film. For the

rest, one of the best news of this 2006: Marty has returned. And what's better, he recently announced

that he is thinking about moving away from the Hollywood industry because "the bigger the budget, the less risks they let you

take". Will they return to the times of 'Taxi Driver' or 'The Last Temptation of Christ'? An 8'5, half step

below 'Casino' and one and a half below the big ones.

" 1

" Well-constructed characters, a solid gui���n full of intensity and fabulous interpretations

make Bobby one of the films that any restless spectator should not miss.

It arrives at the Spanish screens Bobby, a film that was caught by surprise in the nominations of the Golden

Globes, and that in the United States has raised not a few blisters in the sectors m��� s conservatives of society.

With the recent, political and very unfortunate statements of a certain national policy on the Union of

Actors and their right to demonstrate, it is easier to imagine the type of reactions that Bobby would have raised in the

United States. Although the title seems to announce it, it is not a biopic of Robert Fitzgerald Kennedy, nor

a critic of his murder and subsequent investigation, as JFK Oliver Stone. The film follows 22

very different characters, the only thing they have in common is their presence at the hotel on the day thatwas murdered. It

Robert Kenndyis obviously a very political story. Ethics, with a clear ideology, in which Emilio

Est���vez uses these fictitious characters to draw a very accurate radiograph ofsociety

American, of the problems and discomforts that he suffered. Ena in 1969. Bobby uses all these elements not only

to tell the situation in the United States forty years ago, but also to denounce the current situation in the country. .

It does not take a great vision to detect that almost forty years later, those social and economic problems

have not diminished, but have increased. The country is once again experiencing an unpopular war that leaves thousands

dead, while social inequalities are increasing, as are unemployment and poverty.

Est���vez makes that denunciation through the spirit of a great statesman, as his brother was already

(coincidentally, also assassinated), or Marthin Luther King, Robert Kenndy represented the hope of aworld

better, leaving aside futile and absurd wars, and worrying about the welfare of the people.

Well constructed characters, a solid Guin full of intensity and fabulous performances make

Bobby one of the films that any restless spectator should not miss. And if not, as it shows there is the

final scene of the film.

" 1

" Saw IV falls back on the typical thing to disguise that anxiety so gore of the director. Incredibly painful, a

mess of care.

As bad and predictable as I expected. There is no doubt that the third part of the Saw saga was already ainsult

tremendousto the cinema. It will be teror���fica and everything what querés, but its scripts are truly p���simos. Saw IV falls

back on the typical thing to disguise that anxiety so gore of the director, to cover up those murders with

unpleasant consequences and give them a little more sense. The characters are badly described, the reasons of

Tobin Bell (right, first of all) to dismember those people are ridiculous, especially seeing how they are

tortured, in an exaggerated way and vomit. And I have no desire or reason to extend more. This

fourth and unfortunately not last delivery is just as bad and unpleasant as the previous one. His argument is

pathetic, and with his ending you end up feeling foreign embarrassment. And I have no doubt that I will rent the first one, not only

because of the good reviews it got, but also to get the idea that the Saw saga is one of the worst

insults made to recent movies. But, without a doubt, the fourth is incredibly painful, a mess of

care.

" 0

" I cried, I fell in love, I was seduced. Absolutely Great, round film. The Source of Life comes to our screens to leave us speechless. A faith dogma that becomes a film

loaded with poetry and spirituality with a magical graphic show that will not leave you indifferent. As the

name suggests, this film uses the myth of "" The source of life "" or "" tree of life "" to tell us a

sad and real story that mixes passionately with a spiritual and other fantastic plane d�� The

result is a moral full of mysticism and pain. In the end we are what we are and we are not yet ready

to drink the eternal sap of the tree of life, our spirit is too poor and our attempts to

pursue what we think we want are impotent. Only the soul can elevate us to the dignity of being

touched by the universe and reach our inner peace, love is one of the tools to achieve it and

impotence a barrier in the path that leads to that goal. Wonderful work of Hugh Jackman and in general

of all the actors (monkeys included). I think our beloved Wolverine starts to separate from his viz de

s���perh���roe with enough talent, and this man is going to give talk, by the way, that in 2008 we can

enjoy it again in this role since it will be released��� Wolverine. But do not worry, Hugh is coming for a while, since he

has pending in addition to this 6 more movies and a pilot for a TV series, tremendous actor. Yes, we

must thank the director and writer of the film Darren Aronofsky this wonder that has given us, we

did not expect less after the bombing that supposed "" Requiem for a Dream "" which directed ��� and wrote. This

guy is definitely opting for the experimental and the truth is that his bets are daring and

transgressors Great talent Darren, I think it is proven. I want to highlight "" The Fountain "" the

ability to repeat the same thing several times without getting bored this is complicated, but it does. Both

the BSO and many sequences are repetitive, but nevertheless never heavy, slow or repetitive,

but absolutely delicious and intoxicating. I cried, I fell in love, I was seduced. Absolutely

Great, round film.

" 1

" I've laughed a lot, I've been excited and I have not bored anything at all, poor squirrel, how bad it was in the first and how bad it looks in the second looking at the poster. And I

still can not explain how he does not eat it, since he has to be already faint of so many adventures. What will you

eat? Angelico, which I think gives me (and what I laugh, of course). The film is about a peculiar group,

comprised of a sloth, a mammoth and a saber-toothed tiger in the time of thaw. Given that the valley

in which they live is going to flood in a short time, all that inhabit it begins a pilgrimage to a

supposed barge that will save them from the flood. Along the way, the mammoth suffers a crisis of loneliness, given that

it realizes that it is the last of its kind alive. Luckily, three zarig���ellas (one of a large size)

cross their path. In parallel, a squirrel struggles for its acorn against everyone who gets in their way.

Well, the film has enchanted me. I've laughed a lot, I've been excited and I have not bored at all.

All the characters have loved me, and many things that I did not like about the first one have been removed. The

lazy one is very funny, having his stellar moment and resolving it in a great way (especially for the

kids). Sabertooth does not have a great role, although it leaves a very interesting lesson of surrender (a

little ���o���a, but it is a film of drawings for children). ���os). And the mammoth I love, although I do not know why. Although

the best of all are the secondary characters, such as the zarig���ellas or the worshipers of the sloth. Well,

I lie, the best of the whole movie is the story of the squirrel, which is made wonderfully. I am a fan of her

from the first moment I saw her, and in this part she has a fundamental and very long role. Resumiendo, a

very nice film for children and that she will like. to adults with a youthful mentality. The bad thing is that it has

scenes that can scare the smaller ones.

" 1

" Like a wicked tale, Babluani presents his own Alice traveling to the other side of the mirror and

taking tea with dozens of mad hatters.

When you have nothing to lose, that could have been the promo of this magnificent French film. 13

Tzameti talks about the descent into hell, treasure hunts, fear and animals. Like a

wicked tale -although most of them are-, Babluani presents his own Alicia traveling to the other side of the

mirror and taking the t��� with dozens of mad hatters.If -as it was not my case- the spectator comes without having

seen the trailer and will taste the first minutes of the film better. If I came to know that it was so revealing, I did

not hang it, I would have hung the artifice of it in its place. My apologies for it. That nobody waits,

after the entrance to the unhealthy universe in which the protagonist goes unwittingly, great surprises of

gui���n or unexpected turns. Babluani in its complexity, has made a simple film and takes it calmly

using numerous subjective shots. A Spanish director -which he did not mention- so as not to give clues-dealt with this

same topic and I must say, that he found it more in my opinion. But it is evident that the intention of the Frenchnot

isthe same, the footage anguishes us but in an absolutely minimal way. In this case, highlighting the excellent

photography is not a discreet way of scoring I've been bored The film is narrated in an exquisite black and

white that subtracts spectators but I'm personally excited about it. So a 10 for 13 Tzameti, which -apunto-:

tzameti is 13 in Georgian, tribute of the director to his hometownPD fr���vola: In the Renoir, on Saturday, at

22 the night, watching this movie two seats in front of me? I was Pedrooooooooooooo. I, who always wanted to

be a girl Almod���var as Bib���, as Miguel Bos���, go with Madonna in a limousine and have breakfast in Tiffanny���sHim

withI was very tempted to wish her luck for the Goya, to tell her that I did not like it. Talk to her,

ask her about her lacquer brand? of whatever it was so that he would notice me. He remained uncharacteristically silent

although on the way out, my companions say that he looked at me, diossssssss is it true?

" 1

" A cult tape, pending issue for more than one ... Maybe it's one of my favorite movies,

this second film by Danny Boyle, starring a stranger (at the time) Ewan Mcgregor, role that

I throw to the fame, as much to him as to Robert Carlyle.

First of all, I wanted to start with: Choose life, choose a job, choose a career, choose a family, choose

a big TV that you shit, choose washing machines, cars, compact discs and can openers el��� citrus Choose

salt, low cholesterol and dental insurance, choose to pay mortgages at a fixed interest rate, choose a pilot apartment, choose

your friends. Choose sports clothes and matching suitcases, choose to pay a brand-name suit on a wide range ofin installments

fucking fabrics, choose DIY and ask yourself who you are on Sundays in the morning, He chooses to sit on the

sofa and watch TV-contests that dull the mind and crush the spirit, while you fill your mouth with fuckingfood

junk, choose to rot from old, falling and me��� ndote above, in a miserable asylum, being a burden for the

egoistic and dusty children that you have engendered to replace you, choose your future, choose life. Maybe it's

one of my favorite movies, it's Danny Boyle's second film, starring a stranger (at the

time) Ewan Mcgregor, a role that brought him to fame, both he and Robert Carlyle. Maybe this movie,

although it has a gamberrete and rebellious air, along with "" Requiem por una sue���o "and together with" "Diario de un rebelde" "

would be the trilogy that They should see many children who start fooling around with the joints, another day with the

"" tripis "" and eventually end up falling into the "" jaco "" " Personally, I think a movie that starts wondering to

see how everything is going wrong, with quite hard scenes (I will not reveal anything although I imagine that 90% of

you have seen it) and with some hilarious scenes. Now there is a very good edition on DVD for

lovers of the movie, it just has one draw! It says that a poster is coming and it is a lie! (so go with an

eye). Anyway, if we add to that an acojonante soundtrack, with themes of Iggy Pop, Brian Eno, New Order,

Lou Reed, Underworld and even Damon Albarn I can say that this is a film !! ALMOST PERFECT! !

" 1

" Memories of Queens is a very real movie but it does not manage to approach a story that really connects

with the viewer.

Given the current cinematographic panorama, it would not be unreasonable to create the figure of the defender of the

spectator. Someone who emulates Don Quixote and faces giant windmills alone to

safeguard the honor and dignity of the public. At the same time, thecould be constituted as a sign of support. Because there are

Association of Indignant Film Consumersmore and more cases in which a film deceives or

swindles the viewer, or does a malicious advertising campaign. It could be said that Memories of Queens

enters the second field, since they sell the protagonist to Robert Downey Jr when he has fewappearances

screen. The film is the debut as a director of Dito Montiel, who adapts his novel Guide To Recognize

Your Saints, inspired in turn in their own experiences as a teenager. History is not a paragon of

originality, it is the typical one about young people in a marginal neighborhood of a big city in which people of

different races and nationalities live. The greatest virtue of the film is that it transmits with great success and fidelity the

situation of Queens in the decade of the eighties. But the sensation of reality and verisimilitude are not by themselves

enough to justify an entire film, since for that something more is needed, a story that

reaches the public, that catches him, and that is well told. Memories of Queens has neither one nor the other. His

argument is simple and predictable, transmitting to the viewer only boredom and tedium. To the typical

failures that could be expected given the inexperience of Montiel after the cameras, we must add anarrative

frayed, with temporary jumps not accurate. Of the interpretations, it is worth highlighting the one of Chazz

Palminteri as well as the sporadic appearances of Robert Downey Jr. Memories of Queens is a very real film

but that does not get to approach a story that really connects with the viewer. On the contrary, it offers a plot

without interest and that will provoke numerous yawns in the stalls.

" 0

" I like the black cinema so much that I find it difficult to be kind with these telefilms of endeavor, which do notof classical

thrill, in spite of themselves, to contain the pure wickerworkcinema. ���sic and be filmed with an office without anything

chirr���e.

It may not be possible to recover the black cinema, confidential LA apart. Todd Robinson does nothing that can

regenerate the enthusiasm for a genre abandoned by the multinationals, despite continuing to enjoy the

favor of the public. That the client is always right is a lie. The story here written is real and

spattered the American newspapers of the 40's. A pair of assassins cheated and then killed their

victims, lonely ladies, eager of an adventure, spinsters with possible who saw a spark of risk and

glamor in the middle of a life gray and confined in boredom. What Robinson does is deposit the weight of the

plot on the shoulders of Detective Elmer C. Robinson, curiously his grandfather in real life, who was the one who found

the murderers and took them to the electric chair .Travolta is overactive. Gandolfini is not credible after

admiring him as a mobster, rude, loudmouth, and not in this simple paper in which he has no material to show off

as he should. I know that this is a prejudice and I admit that Los Soprano is a great series and James Gandolfini a lot of actor so

as not to always ask him for a role, and not a little talent in the middle of a film withpieces

quality. Because Lonely Hearts is an empty artifice, in the background. It was presented in Taiwan in October

2006. Then (here is the most curious fact) in the USA. Now, in Spain. It is as if thethemselves

producerswere not entirely convinced of the pull of the film and scrutinized the broad world geography to

see what reaction it would have in Pek��� n, I would say, before San Sebasti���n, where he was also (without pain and

without any glory). Salma Hayek deserves a separate chapter: they have caught the wrong actress. It is not that I let myself be

guided by what I have already read, that the woman who gives life, in reality, was horribly fat and ugly

screaming. Or maybe. But the Hayek is, despite that effort to make it look bad, solid, or not, and you can already see in the

poster of the film what arguments they want to sell us with. They are worth more two () than two carts. Anyway.

Jared Lato, the Latin lover in charge of engrossing the spinsters and then give passport to Pimlico, I say

to the kind sky of pure souls, makes a role corrientita, throwing fool. And that counting on the

plot, well look, gave of yes. So I give him a regular, as a friend of mine says, very aware that when he

sees a movie, he has to write it down. Like at school. Is this short, relatively good?

" 0

" Acceptable, without fanfare, musically more than correct, but empty, food of self-love, crammed with common

places in the genre.

The hagiographic criticism so fashionable does not have in this spectator a devout fan: I usually avoid

that type of cinema that grows around a myth or, in its absence, over a a character with a public

touch, whose notoriety and relevance replace the shortcomings of history because, in the end, everyone

knows where the story is going and it does not require too much neatness in its evidence . Dreamgirls meets the

exact conditions to have been a candidate not to see it, although the music of the Tamla Motownme

excites(these The Dreams are a very acceptable imitation of those The Supremes and Jennifer Hudson it's a

vocally believable Diana Ross) and the cast has enough bells to keep ringing until

you get in line at the cinema. I walked in those for a few days, but then the temptation (it's a good name)me

ledas res to the abattoir of the armchair. Dreamgirls is not Chicago, which I found unbearable. Nor Cotton

Club, which I admire. Bob Fosse made the Allcida All that jazz (The show begins) in other times and now the

Hollywood machine makes musicals because you have to reflote some genres that from time to time they remain

lost, joyously wounded in the showcases of the History of Cinema, without any luminary with smell putting

the paste so that a director with size and a cast with name make (again) the popcorn and the

coca-cola pair in row seven. Despite this beating of semantic sticks, Dreamgirls is not a bad

movie: it could have been an exceptional one if you did not observe too muchirregularities.

planningThere's some setback in the argument and, above all, an excessive excess to all the people that over

the cinema of musicians who climb up until they shine, shining, in the stardom of fame and money have

been written. We have the golden trio with their already highly anticipated roles: the innocent, the discreet and the carnivorous.

We have an abuse of musical numbers as support to solve what the script does not reach. We have,

finally, an atmosphere so shabby and mannered that it seems that we are watching a film. The cinema (the

good, at least) must distance us from the idea that we are witnessing a monumental imposture. Film

cheats, but you have to make up the lie so that everything is affordable to our amazement. It does not matter if

astronauts get out, aliens in a bowling alley or yankees in King Arthur's court. We are for what we are: to

have fun, to enjoy. Dreamgirls, in this storyline, does not take advantage of the excellent material available

and crashes, without much excitement, everything is written against the clichés of the prodigious machinery of the

system, which always knows d��� I would like to press for the product to be delivered to the mouth and, in the end, as it happened to me

, we all left our small contribution to the cream. Diana Ross ��� very happy because her career,

always so lame, is again in dance. The greasy rhythm and blues of Detroit will sellagain

recordshere and in their land because the music does not know the labels of the geographies when it is good, and this

It's big sumo. Jennifer Hudson sings wonderfully and watching the film brings back the idea of ​​acquiring

the CD with the original soundtrack. All that is very good, but Dreamgirls is, in its most artistic,

hollow: there are plenty of minutes left and so many more are missing. It's good that Eddy Murphy shows that he is aactor

greatafter three hundred films where he has played the fool, the fat man, the hustler and the giggles or that

Jamie Foxx continues showing that this is his natural environment (as in the irregular and leaden Ray), but we

could have found a more lively, less chic film. The philosophical ramblings of All that jazz are

here so far away as Vladivostok, in whose halls it will exhibit the greatest glory of the Siberian spectator, I think I

say well. I, just in case, I sign in the notebook of obligations to look on the shelf my copy of the

tape of Fosse and ah��� all my love (for others, scarce) to the musical or to the biopic mel���mano will be

satisfied. Or Moulin rouge to be able to hear one of my favorite songs (Your song by Elton John)

mellifluously taken to the theatrical paroxysm by Nicole Kidman and Ewan McGregor.

" 0

" A cult film from Spanish cinema casposo. In his time, he had more than a million and a half spectators inmoque

the cinema, which is not turkey.

Have you never been to bingo? I only went once and it was very funny. To begin with, an incredible stress,

given that the girl of the numbers accelerated and I did not even have time to scratch my nose. Then, in what you

are sharpening the Carioca marker, an old lady sings line. And a fat guy, bingo. And you with the face of a fool. At the

end of the day, apart from the money we lost, we took a pen from someone who, as we did not

shut up during the whole evening, threw it at us. We did not touch anything (except the pen), but what a laugh. The film

is about Ferm���n Cejuela (Esteso) and Amadeo Saboya (Pajares). The first was dedicated to take eggs and know if they

have chick inside or not, standing for life. The second, bank worker with ardent desires to make his

fortune. For various reasons, they get the chance to get a lot of money in bingo. So,

by the hazards of cinema casposo, nothing less than falling together, Pajares, Ozores and Esteso, what more can you

ask? Well, we have Pajares, Esteso and Ozores, Kings of dandruff homeland. And then small

participations, like those of Normal Duval (or so the IMDB says), Florinda Chico and a black girl in balls that I think

is called Africa. The theme shows us the sad Spain of the transition, where the opening to the game caused

the Spaniards to lose their few savings. Demented guide, with impossible phrases that disarm the most

painted. And clearly, the argument engages, given that it is impossible to know where they are going to come from. In addition, it has

everything you expect from a film of these people, women in leather, play, chases, easy jokes

and dandruff on all sides. , a cult film from Spanish cinema casposo. In his time, he

had more than a million and a half spectators in the cinema, which is not turkey moque. And I say, if there are freakis who

adore films of grotesque drawings with giant heads, how will not there be freakis of Pajares and Esteso? Me,

the first one. The culmination of the ibupric dandruff.Besitos.PD: "" What do I tell the one of the washing machine? That they sell them

more cheaply. No, it says that you have to change the drum. Yes, man, and the trumpet "" With these dialogues, what do you

expect? PD2: "" The Franks were Germans? The Franks were from Galicia, from Ferrol !!! "" patriotic humor from all

sides. After saying that, he takes a potty and is going to shit. PS3: How strong, I had a coach that said "" Theywear it

gave me a watch, but I can not"" and you asked, "" Why? "" And replied with a laugh

"" Why is it wall! "". Fuck, and it turns out that I took him out of this movie. PD4: "If I have the black one," says

Esteso with a black girl on top. What a great mood. By the way, why doesalways appear in the films of

a black girlPajares? Will it be to give an exotic touch? I say this because in Spain, at that time, few saw

each other.

" 1

" Without having the? Power? of its protagonist, it is easy to guess what? Next? It will not happen to the history of cinema as

a good film, but rather for having wasted 80 million dollars and 90 minutes of footage ...

Few films have the "" virtue "" to disappoint me at ten minutes, but that's just what happened

to "" Next "", the last film by Lee Tamahori. We attended a story in which its protagonist is a "" magician "",

who acts in Las Vegas, with real mental powers that he wants to go unnoticed. That said, it could even seem

interesting, but then we were overwhelmed by a number of disproportions: on the one hand, that

"superpower" is so alone in the ability to see the immediate future (just the next two minutes !!);

On the other hand, the "" clever "" agents of the National Security of the United States (without knowing how or

why) go after the protagonist to propose the "" original "" mission " n "" save the entire country against aalert

terrorist""; and finally, the "" arduous "" terrorists are more concerned with finding who will try to stop them

than the very preparation of the attack. The story is adorned with effects visuals that hinder the

tracking of the plot since it is not easy to differentiate between the real actions of those that deal with the

"" visions "" of its protagonist. The interpretation of Nicolas Cage in the role of the protagonist is as poor as

the expressions on his face; and that of his partner Julianne Moore, in the role of National Security agent,

is disastrous, giving the impression that one does not get to believe that he has got into "" tremendous "" shooting. Without having the

"" power "" of its protagonist, it is easy to guess that "" Next "" will not go down in the history of cinema as a good

movie, but more well for having wasted 80 million dollars and 90 minutes of footage, which

incidentally is the best of the film.

" 0

" Women in the park I found boring, careless and, what is worse, seems only made for its

director and its scriptwriter.

Let's see. how to write this without any of the creators of the film taking it wrong. bah, I can not.

'Women in the park' I found boring, careless and, what is worse, seems only made for its

director and its scriptwriter. Official synopsis: "" Daniel, professor of music and pianist and Ana, gallerist, they are going through a

couple crisis after more than twenty years of life in common. Daniel has gone to live alone and wants a divorce.

Ana resists accepting the reality. The malaise affects her daughter Mónica, who, after finishing her

journalism degree, is especially sensitive to not finding a job, a task that she She dedicates herself to her boyfriend,

David. Music seems to be the only activity that centers and reassures Daniel, a man who is uncomfortable with himself and

with others, and who keeps a relationship that is far from perfect with Clara, a married woman who

arouses the curiosity of Monica. One night, Mónica lives an embarrassing and incomprehensible episode in which she is

involved together to Daniel, Ana and Clara. "" My synopsis: "" Daniel and Ana are in the process of separating, and they do not

communicate too well. M���nica, her daughter, can not find work, and she does not communicate well either. When she tries to

rebuild her relationship with her father, she meets Clara, her lover, with whom neither shecommunicate well

nor her father. The only one who seems to have no communication problems is David, a boyfriend of Monica. A pity that

is surrounded by so much incommunicado. They all walk through the Retiro "" Felipe Vega, director, and Manuel Hidalgo,

screenwriter, claim to have focused on the characters when creating 'Women in the park', and ensure that

the characters themselves, with complete freedom , they make up the story. The first thing I believe, because it is

true that its main characters are absolutely consistent with their nature, from start to finish: come on,

let them progress, the minimum. Daniel (Adolfo Fern���ndez), Ana (Blanca Apil���nez) and Clara (Emma Vilarasau) make up

a monochrome amorous triangle, inexplicably lacking in tension. M���nica (B���rbara Lennie) should be the

reagent for sparks to finally come up, but she stays too long in the position of simple observer.

David (Alberto Ferreiro) is a mere accessory to reveal that Ménico copies his father's behavior. Of the rest

of secondary, better not to speak, because they are simple springs of gui���n so that the characters can tell something

of themselves. In summary: Vega and Hidalgo do not tell a story, but show the miseries of characters

close to them, perhaps, but enormously alien to me, for example. In the technical plane it is also reflected In the

priority of director and scriptwriter: most of the sequences of the film are static dialogues between two

characters, most of them seated, and solved a master / plane / counterplane. The other half of

sequences are walks through the Retiro park and surroundings, which illustrate, I suppose, the isolation of these

characters. Man, I do not say that they do traveling circular, but if the narration itself was already

non-existent, the rhythm suffers until fainting. Or the nod. Not everything is negative. The interpretations are

adjusted, but the characters are so contained that the actors sometimes touch the hieratic. In general

, they are correct, highlighting Barbara Lennie on the positive side, and a very hostile kid playing the music

teacher's student on the negative side. But the worst of all is not even the statism, neither the sobriety (���poverty?)

visual, nor the sensation that they are telling me something that I am not interested in. The worst thing is that the last twenty

minutes are devoted to trying to explain the dysfunctionality of all these relationships, with a twist

worthy of culebr���ny and totally out of place. Go cloth, sober sobriety and then I come with ���stas.In order,

that I get bored and a lot, and that still do not know who awaits those responsible for the movie that is your audience. A

4, for the interpretations.

" 0

"One of the things that fascinates me most about this film is the evolution of each character, perfectly

symbolized by the road (a journey into each one's interior). as disparate

if they are complementing each other, to form at the end of the film, as ifwere a puzzle,

the family structure.

One of the films that captivated me lately is Peque to Miss Sunshine, by Jonathan Dayton and Valerie

Faris, an independent film that is very well received by the different international film festivals, winner of

two Oscars, the best Original Guide and the best Supporting Actor (an impeccable and amazing Alan Arkin), dragged

a day before in the Spirit Awards, the equivalent of the golden statuette but independent film. The hope

and the illusion of a girl by make your dreams come true, along with your fear of mediocrity, are the p daub

starting this crazy adventure. Olive is summoned to participate in a beauty contest for children,so

the whole family esperpntica embarks on a battered yellow van heading for California.Una

of the things that m I'm fascinated by this film is the evolution of each character, perfectly symbolized

by the road (a journey into each one's interior). These personalities are so different from one another,

complementing each other, until forming the end of the film, as if it were a puzzle, the

family structure. All the actors shine with their own light. Olive (Abigail Breslin) is a sweet and

plump girl who lives in a fairy world and dreams of being a princess. His brother Dwayne (Paul Dano) is an

eccentric teenager, angry with the world, who fulfills a strict vow of silence to achieve his greatest

aspiration, to be a pilot. Although he hates everyone, he needs his family, and he loves her in his own way. The

character of the macarra and junkie grandfather (Alan Arkin) is a point of inflexion in the evolution of the

protagonists (family that gets into a united mess, remains united), and the that more confidence has deposited in

the talent of the girl. The picturesque uncle (Steve Carell), a depressed homosexual after being rejected for his

great love, leads an unsuccessful suicide attempt, which leads him to be part of the clan. It works as a

bond of unity between the family members, trying to soften the conflicting episodes. The father (Greg

Kinnear) is a storyteller about success that is doomed to failure. His vain attempts to control the

situation and sit on the triumph chair rubbing the pathos. And finally, the mother (Toni Collette), the only

normal character with a very special vocation: to take care of her family. I believe that the background of the story

is of great importance. The feeling of being a loser in a society obsessed with success. The

script is masterful. It combines satirical tints with black humor, situations that invite laughter and images

that leave their mark: all the members of the family pushing and climbing, one by one, to the old van without

door, on the move. In my opinion it comes to represent that, although the external structure (the wrapper, the

superficial) is obsolete and damaged, if you fight as a team for a common objective, you You can reach the goal. The

final sequence in which Olive demonstrates her skills as a dancer is the one that most impacted me. Despite being very

funny, it caused a knot in my stomach. The reaction of the child's family is bright and unexpected.

It is reflected that support and affection are not only demonstrated by words, but also by acts. And it also shows

the incomprehension on the part of the most superficial and petard sector of society (participants and

jury of the beauty contest). If there was still no You have had the opportunity to enjoy this movie, I

advise you not to let it escape.

" 1

" I think I know that Owen Wilson's suicide attempt was due, no drugs or traumatic breaks.

I almost cut my veins myself and that I was not obliged to read the work.

WESTERN ANDERSON will surely go down in history as one of the most imaginative and acid authors ofcinema

recent, where camouflage in comedy authentic urban tragedies is always welcomed same cast that

understands their ideas by very Martians that result. WENSON WENSON, ANGELICA HUSTON, BILL MURRAY always present in

his filmography in titles as unorthodox as LIFE AQUATIC or LOS TENENBAUMS.Se a�� Other recognized

faces in the pianist BRODY or the much-vaunted nude of NATALIE PORTMAN that apparently did not demand that they

cut it to the joy of their fans who kept the honey on their lips in CLOSER. Also theappears

husband of Maria Antonieta JASON ANDERSON SCHWARTZMAN.El seorkeeps your imagination intact butloses

totallyhis way in his mood hereabsent in aut Nice brick where you spend almost

all the footage trying to understand what the hell you want to tell. Some impossible dialogues do not help in anfilm

unclassifiablethat causes yawns in the room or that we remember in the director's mother. I know that

OWEN WILSON's suicide attempt was due, no drugs or traumatic breaks, the poor man tried to

understand his friend's guide taking him to such a crazy decision. Quen I can understand because I almost

cut my veins myself and that I was not obliged to read the work. Save the brick the magnificent landscapes of

India. A 3.

" 0

" Despite its failures, Pirates of the Caribbean: At the End of the World is an acceptable adventure film, which

entertains more than bores, and which will delight of the fans of this popular saga.

At last the day has come in which one of the most expected outcomes of the last times will be unveiled.

No, we are not referring to who will be the next league champion, but to the outcome of one of the

highest grossing trilogies of all the times, Pirates of the Caribbean. The most famous buccaneers of contemporary cinema

finally disembark on the banks of Spanish cinemas to offer us what will be their last adventure? I do not?

This third adventure begins where the previous one stayed, with the death of Jack Sparrow and El Holand���s Errante

in the hands of the Company of the East Indies. Captain Barbossa (Geoffrey Rush), Will Turner (Orlando

Bloom) and Elizabeth Swann (Keira Knightley) leave until the end of the world to rescue from the Kingdom of Davy Jones

(Bill Nighy) the intrepid Jack Sparrow (Johnny Depp) With the help of Jack Sparrow, pirates from all over the world will be

able to face Lord Cutler Becker (Tom Hollander) and the fearsome El Holand���s Errante. First of all, it must be

said that Pirates of the Caribbean: At the End of the World is more on the line of the first delivery than of the second

(bodrum of public proportions) , which is very appreciated. This movie has a slower pace, there is

less visual maremagnum, and the gui��� and the characters are more polished with respect to The Dead Man's

Chest. But we can not ask for pears to the elm, since the freshness and innovation of the original film (and of

which they should not have done more, at least in the artistic sense) shine by their absence. To show us

this new depth of gui���n, Gore Verbinski offers us a tape that borders on three hours, which causes

moments of sovereign boredom among the respectable, especially in its central part. In history there are

many forced and unnecessary twists, plot gaps, and pseudo-dramatic moments that border on

the esperp���ntico. Not to mention some truly ridiculous and infumable sequences of his last hour,

beginning with the own outcome. Since we are talking about the end, a notice for navigators: after the credit

titles there is a "" surprise scene "", if there is any brave person who will endure until then. The technical

section is very well covered, although the crew of El Holand���s Errante continues to chirp, and the last hour is worthy

of praise, technically talking. From here we applaud the decision to recover the character of Barbossa,

which gives us the opportunity to return to delight with the great Geoffrey Rush and his confrontations with the no

less great Johnny Depp. Orlando Bloom is as dull as ever, while Keira Knightley is

perfectforward with dignity a character increasingly deteriorated and less graceful (both

as she bringsinterpretively and physically). Despite its numerous and important failures, Pirates of the Caribbean: At the End

of the World is an acceptable adventure film, which entertains more than bores, and which will delight

fans. of this popular saga.

" 0

" A film completely of the pile. Good special effects and good costumes, but the script wafts

everywhere and the characters are not located.

Who was this Alexander the Great and why is it so important from the historical point of view? This is a

question that many people will ask themselves when they have finished watching the film, after attending the film life

of the Macedonian conqueror led by Oliver Stone. Why was Alejandro such a brilliant military strategist?

What differentiated it from the other generals of its time? What were your dreams, aspirations and frustrations?

Why did he arouse so much fascination among his followers? In his attempt to humanize such ahistorical figure

relevant, the script written by Stone, Laeta Kalogridis and Christopher Kyle, barely manages to portray the

character as an insecure and crying subject whose ��� Only military purpose was to reach the end of the world. Yes, there are

references to his concern to unify culturally east and west, but this is in the

background, giving place to a curiosity "" geographic "" and his desire to avenge the death of his father,

supposedly entrusted by King Darius of Persia. Beginning already with a grotesque historical error, Alexander the

Great has, as one of his main failings, the poor narrative made by Ptolemy, interpreted by Anthony

Hopkins, Although they serve to summarize to the viewer various events that would occupy hours of projection,

Ptolemy's explanations fail thanks to the inexplicable selection of events made by the three

writers, which simply they ignore most of the fundamental incidents information

character character. An example: despite having been responsible for almost all of Alexander's,

educationArist���teles is seen only in one scene, in which he seems more concerned to justify - for the public- the

future relationship between the protagonist and his friend Hefestion, that in teaching the young. Later, after

illustrating the conflict of Alexander to be divided between the political machinations of the mother and the

brutality of the father, the film jumps eight years in time, preventing the viewer from seeing, for example, the

fundamental participation of the hero in some other battle at the side of King Philip, when his ability to

conceive strategies was revealed. The battles, mounted in a somewhat confusing way, can even impress

thanks to the aerial shots and the use of a gigantic number of extras, but they pale

unquestionably if compared with similar sequences seen in "" El Retorno del Rey "", to give an

example. On the other hand, the second battle contains the most beautiful plane of the film: the one in which

Alejandro, mounted on the horse Buc���falo, faces an enemy that is on an elephant.

Succeeding in rescuing the admiration Alejandro felt for Achilles (which included the love of Achilles for

Patroclus). At least the film has the courage not to hide what was between the protagonist and Hefesti���n, as

happened in Troy, where Patroclo was transformed into the "" cousin "" of Achilles, portraying with naturalness relations

between two men of the time (the concept of homosexuality simply did not exist). Stone includes various

shots in which we see soldiers kissing during parties and orgies, but inexplicably cowards when

dealing with Alejandro. Yes, it is clear that Hefesti���n (portrayed in a way too archetypal) and the

protagonist love each other, but they do not give each other a kiss over the whole projection. In contrast, thescene of

sexthe hero with the beautiful Roxana, is shown wildly, reaching the point of ridicule, thanks to the

exaggeration in the interpretation of Rosario Dawson. But accusing Dawson of exaggeration becomes an

injustice if we compare his character with that of Angelina Jolie, who passes the film alternating two looks: that

of a seductive sorceress and that of a scheming villain. Apart from that, the simple fact that she tries to

pass as the mother of Colin Farell (it's only one year older than him in real life), is reason enough to

make no sense to her election like Olympia. Val Kilmer is the only one that convinces with his character,

leaving Farrell's performance in something very normal, with the same tone of voice throughout the film and

with a histrionics that surpasses the normal To conclude, Oliver Stone reveals a disappointing tendency for

the melodrama that I had never observed in his previous works-just count the number of times that some

character screams. a "" NOOOOO "" novelesco during the projection.Therefore, and according to my opinion, a film

totally of the montón. Good special effects and good costumes, but the script wafts everywhere and

the characters are not located.

" 0

" A messy case in which they are saved, perhaps, the beginning and some gag of the protagonists and of

Todoquisque, played by Alex O'Dogherty. Bored, childish and with a ���gui���n? that borders on the absurd.

Do you see the poster? What do you think? A shit, right? Well, the film like that, although it was to be expected. A

mess with capital letters in which perhaps the beginning and some gag of the protagonists and of Todoquisque,are saved

interpreted by Alex O'Dogherty. Bored, childish and with a ���gui���n? that borders on the absurd. I'm going to defend Pepe

Viyuela and Eduard Soto because the poor do what they can in the face of such a disproportion. Nothing to do with its

predecessor, it is too noticeable the change of director and the "" peculiar "" vision that it has on the humor that come

off the comics. It reminded me of the time of Benny Hill in which the police and the fast-moving acrobat ran,

in fact here they use it in several Sometimes, it is known that they were funny to the writers. The argument,

let's see. the argument is about a bad bad guy who wants to leave the planet without water to sell itsproduct

substitute: the botijola. The fact is that Mortadelo and Filem���n will have to stop him and blah blah blah.

I do not feel like telling it or you want to read it. The truth is that I'm imagining the writers, among

whom is the director, writing the gui��� and mond���ndose with laughter. I imagine the three of them discussing what to

put in the film: - Hey! I have an idea. We could do some scenes in a quick camera so that the

people writhe with laughter in the seats. And we abuse it to the satiety.- If yes, good idea. Although I

have another better one. I call my nephew who handles this photochop and make us a dog that pu���etazos,

juas juas juas .- ���Great! In addition we can put the voice of Bart Simpson, people will fall at our feet.

And the dog will be called Bush, juas juas juas ���qu��� I am evil! - I like the pu���etazos. We're going to make

everyone show up during the whole movie. And that's it, we just need to write thedialogues.

characters'Buff, who's lazy, look, let them improvise, that's why they get paid. Let's go to the bar. For that,

shameful. There is no where to take it. Most jokes give foreign shame and the dog, really,

regrettable. Come on, the opposite of the film that Fesser did, which many criticized in his day but that to

me seems a very accurate vision of the c���mic, It is well written and well directed, and you laugh, which is what

matters. But the same can not be said about Bardem's film. Anyway, as I said, regrettable. Staying at

home reading the c���mic, really, is the best you can do.

" 0

" Black Book easily avoids the manique���smo involved in many Nazis with the face of serial killers and

a resistance full of blesseds, but it takes that possibility to a mere surprise effect.

Black book,? Inspired by real events? (sic), follows the story of a Dutch Jewess (very beautiful, by the

way) in its (endless) vicissitudes suffered during World War II, and beyond. Actually, what

is said incidents, no. Arist���teles defines the vicissitude as the change of luck or situation of the

characters, who from fortune pass to misfortune or vice versa. In this case, all that happens to our

protagonist is to go from misfortune to the very same shit, and from the same shit to worse shit. And so

many times more than what the viewer is predisposed to see, in a film that does not understand what is ablow

lowor how to avoid it (at times ��� the indignation that hit me more or less during the second hour of

Contra tide, when poor Emily Watson, who is the best woman in the universe, not only was she raped

6 times, she believes her husband is dead, they try to drive her crazy, they throw stones at her, the priest accuses her of being a whore, but she is

also killed seconds before he could learn that his husband was truly alive and thus avoid his

own death.) (Returning) Black Book easily avoids the manique���smo involved in many Nazis with the face

of serial killers and a resistance full of saints falls on earth. But instead of taking that

possibility to an interesting reflection on war, populism, charismatic leaders, fascism,

biopolitical, aestheticization of politics, the place of women during the war, or any, but

anything, transforms the film into a banal movie of suspense and mystery, of which 10 minutes before they

end you they say who was the real murderer (obviously, the one you least imagined). Black book is

built as Nine Queens, or as Scream. And the bad guys are not necessarily Nazis, but they look bad

when they reveal themselves as such. In short, it avoids the obvious that the Nazis are bad to achieve

a surprise effect. On the other hand, the film is a clear example of the typical structure yankeehollywood of

historical films in that the plot depends on a group of protagonists, and the happy or sad ending, of their

respective destinies. And where of course, that destiny must represent to some extent the destiny of the people

or social group to which the group belongs in the fiction. That is, in a movie about the Second World

War (where the doxa says that the good ones are the Allies) and the protagonists are a group of Jews or

opponents of Hitler, the protagonist will probably be saved , but I will have to leave many friends and

relatives dead, because we all know that many Jews were killed in that conflict. That is to say, the

end, even if the protagonist is saved, can not be entirely happy, because it would be little ethical. As in any

Hollywood film, even knowing that thousands and thousands of people actually died, our interest lies in

our protagonists being saved, and if that happens we remain calm. But as our protagonists

are the replacements of an entire social group, their destiny has to represent to some extent to this. And if they

represent the Jews, we already know that there will be blood. And by the way, our social concern is transformed into

an individual one. I know they all died, but the pretty blonde is saved (or not) and that's what

matters. Regarding the technical part, they should to have told the director that the music of Robocop is outdated

, and that, besides, it is not good to put it in all the action scenes of the film. And that the

improbabilities to the Hard to kill, where chance turns almost into magic, into a historical film,

do not close completely (the only reflection that opens the movie I think it's "" Can someone have so much but so much

bad luck? ""). And when someone reveals that they are bad, they do not have to put on the face of Hannibal Lecter. And that putting

incinerated corpses in the foreground to begin a conclusive, relaxed, post-climax scene

is not necessary (aesthetically or aesthetically).

" 0

" We are facing a different film, a director with a different vision that has undoubtedly given a new

package to the genre.

Are there a mix between the first CRONEMBERG cinema with drops of rosemary and the British cinema KEN

LOACH? Surely they think that fusion is literally impossible and strange, because of course it is very strange

but not impossible thanks to the very interesting ANDREW PARKINSON that the solo with a couple of films has changed

all the layers of terror ZOMBIE. The phenomenon is presented to us in a very sad way where a group of friends

live the phenomenon as a terrible disease that little by little separates them from their world and leads them to adeath.

slow and painfulsaves the blood showing us scenes of cannibalism in a truly graphic way, andnot

the ZOMBIES hunter who pursues the protagonists ismissing, all told in documentary style where the story

surpasses the GORE and the gui���n It is the most important thing. We are facing a different film, a director with a

different vision that has undoubtedly given a new package to the genre. An 8.

" 1

" Anyway, for those who still have not ventured to see the film, once again, highly recommended without a

doubt.

True to my mania to see the Star Wars trilogy of the rev���s (as I saw it the first time I did it), today

I have been watching episode V, "" The Empire Strikes back "" the best Star Wars movie to the fans

and geeks of the George Luca saga $. It is true that in the trilogy recently released on DVD has achieved

that the quality of image and sound is excellent, the changes of which I already spoke when the trilogy fell into my

hands has made it maybe this, the favorite movie of the fans, is now , with those improvements much more

attractive. And that when they were re-released many of the things that we had seen in thefilms were improved

original, however, now with the touch-ups the thing changes (for good) even if I have to disagree with what I

said before. There are few, but the aforementioned adjustments are good, but they do not detract from the final result

. In, for those who still have not ventured to see the film, once again, highly recommended without a

doubt.

" 1

" Hitchcock resurfaced from his ashes and turned Strangers into a train in one of his most personal works

A young and handsome tennis player of success, Guy Haines, is approached by a admirer, Bruno Anthony, in the course of

a train trip. He knows in detail Guy's private life and proposes to commit a perfect crime: an

exchange of murders that would completely mislead the police because both would have an alibi at

the moment of the murders for which Bruno will eliminate the insufferable wife of the tennis player, who refuses

to grant him a divorce and prevents him from marrying the woman he really wants and Guy, in return, would do the same

with Bruno's possessive father. Despite the refusal of the first, who thinks that everything is a simple

joke, Bruno carries out his Machiavellian plan and mercilessly murders Guy's wife. Thus, without hardly realizing

the young tennis player will be involved in an unsolved crime that will make him the main suspect

for the police. After of the failures of his two previous films, Hitchcock was in a delicate

moment of his career in which he found no story that was to his liking. One day,

a novel by Patricia Highsmith that seemed to be written for him: a story of exchange of

murder that addressed two of his favorite topics: the study of the malignant part of the model citizen and the

figure of the false guilty. So things Hitchcock resurfaced from his ashes and turned Strangers into a train in

one of his most personal works. A tense, elaborate and thrilling thriller through which he managed to penetrate

the dark side of the human being to discover a dramatic split in his interior, a double demon��� that

always travels with us and that we believe controlled and therefore voluntarily forgotten but that

fortuitously can become patent, introducing chaos and darkness into a seemingly orderly and

luminous world. The character of Farley Granger would really like to get rid of his wife, but his "" alter ego "" tenebrous

is the one who solves the ballot. It can be said that Guy and Bruno interpret the same character divided in

two. The film also has several famous and memorable moments, like the first sequence of the

shoes, the murder reflected in the glasses of the victim, the anguished scene of the lighter in the

sewer. but perhaps the most spectacular and exciting is that of the merry-go-round, which reveals

Hitchcock's technical skill. I read in a book that the actor who plays the gentleman who crawls under the--

merrygoround with the intention of stopping him really messes up his life. In the words of Hitchcock: "" If that man

I would have raised my head a little. I would never have forgiven him. "

" 1

" It is a pirouette as risky as it is effective, as terrifying as it is fun. Trapped in time, Memento,

Twilight zone, Phillip K. Dick, First, Mad doctors, black comedy, eroticism and dry hosts. Everything you

need

Talent: set of faculties or capacities both artistic and intellectual. Very intelligent person or

outstanding in some science or activity. Synonym: reason, intellect, ingenuity.-Talented: who has talent and

ingenuity. Sin���nimo: Nacho Vigalondo.Cronocr���menes (I will put the tilde) is a pirouette as risky as

effective, as terrifying as fun and the proposal cooler and less "" espa� ��ola "" in a long time that looks for

something that Contestant or The Birthday also looked for, to refresh a little the patriotic panorama. A man whotravels

accidentallyto the past and is with himself. A naked girl in the middle of a forest. An odd

individual with his face covered by a pink bandage. A disturbing mansion on the side of a hill.

Pieces of an unpredictable puzzle that lead to an unusual mode of crime. Who is the murderer? Who's

the victim? It sounds topical, but it's really hard to talk about the film without disembowelling it, so I

'll just say that Karra Elejalde convinces me, amuses me and moves me (although this to a lesser extent, of course)

as H���ctor and that he easily carries the movie behind his back, despite taking a long time according to his own

words, in understanding history. It did not surprise me !!! I could not win the jackpot, but the best guide of the

Official Section almost touched this twisted story that could to take place in a hypothetical Memento

lands in Springfield and that is endorsed by the Fantastic Fest of Austin. It seems to me that crushing it would be an

error because it plays in the same league as the First and the same piropeada precariousness of means that "" that of

mathematicians "" achieves a much more pleasant and honest work, especially thanks to a fascinating approach,

twisted and with enough doses of jet black mark of the house asdo not enjoy it.in the

Maybe youMaybelast third you release the accelerator a bit, but I think it is necessary.that the expectation that you

Let us hopecreated in Sitges opened the doors to the distribution ���n national, something more complicated than the international one. and that the

remake. And those touches of giallo.

" 1

" Ultraviolent film of gangsters and murderers, who runs mostly in a hotel, showing us the most

elaborate methods to kill someone. I did not love it, but I am convinced that it will become a

reference film of the genre.

The subject of the translations of the titles of the films is curious. For example, in this, they have gone from

smoking aces to hot aces, which is much more suggestive for the viewer. By the way, I do not understand why

in English it's called smoking aces, since almost nobody in the movie does not smoke. Aces if they come out, a while. The

film is about a mobster named Israel that another mafioso wants to liquidate and that theyhis

tear outheart for a "" I took away those sorrows "" . So they offer a million dollars for the vital organ this, which

makes come a group of murderers of the most disparate, and each m���sym� It's violent and despicable. In

these, a couple of FBI police have to try not to kill him, given that it is key in a case against the

Mafia.Mother, that org���a de ritos ym�� Shots, violence and more violence. A symphony of brutality not suitable

for the tender and sensitive eye. There were moments of the film that stressed me a lot, either because of the volume that

is always brutal, or because of the amount of unpleasant things that happened. What I say that you can count

the same with a little more subtlety. But leaving this aside, I have to admit that I was very surprised by the

development of it and that under the violent doses there is a story and a story with an interestingending

and surprising. With saying that to my half courgette he liked it all said. Resuming, ultraviolent film

of mobsters and murderers, that runs mostly in a hotel, showed Using the most elaborate methods to

kill someone. I did not love it, but I am convinced that it will become a reference film of the

genre.

" 1

" Although the film is brilliant and is solidly shot and well constructed, the ending is aa

bit ofCansino ... I expected more from the film and a disappointed film came out .. Will my taste change

to another type of cinema?

We already have other heroes more taken to the movies, this time by the debutant Francis Lawrence, although it differs a bit

from the character of the comic, while constantine in DC Comics comics ("" Superman "" "" Batman "" "" Wonderwoman "") is

blond and London, in the film is dark and American, in short, it will be for the American public to adapt

with the adventures of this eccentric hunting imps Besides that Revees refused to be blond (I can not

imagine, sic). The movie starts quite well, and although I have not read a single comic of "" Hellblazer "" that

environment of devils and angels through the streets of LA makes the film a rather promising movie, but.

Is there always to be a but? !!You are right!! The end is a little "" Insulso "" those who have seen

the movie sabr���na that I mean, you want to cover a lot in a very short time and cover all aspects of

the life of "" Constantine " "with a single stroke (by the way Keanu who makes other types of movies, since at the

beginning when I saw him appear, it came to mind Neo de Matrix, we are more pigeonholed than Michael

Landon in "" Highway to the sky "") Perhaps the best thing about the tape is the 420 planes made by computer,

is that those demons so well done and so well remataos. XD XDEn order, summarizing, which is gerund, although the

film is bright and is solidly shot and well built the end is a peloton Cansino. I expected more from

the tape and a disappointed movie came out. Will it be that my tastes are changing towards another type of cinema?

" 0

" Some time ago a succession of sound images had not hit me in such a way to an armchair, although

for many moments I could not decipher the meaning of the I saw, the sensations and feelings were

vivid and intense.

On "" Inland Empire "" (2006) by David Lynch, first to say that some time ago that a succession of images with

sound had not hit me in such a way to an armchair, although for many moments I could not decipher the

meaning of what I saw, the sensations and feelings were vivid and intense.toher again

I am eagerseeto make light in some shadows, I do not see myself capable of making a film about the film because of the impenetrable

and hermetic that it is in its first viewing. This would rather be sketches about the first time I saw "" Inland

Empire "". "" Inland Empire "" is a film against the current, far from the conventional narrative, worries more

in creating sensations with the use of the image and the sound than narratively telling a story (although

deep down). One could enter into the discussion if the cinema is a means of narrative expression or - as in

this case - is an artistic medium with which to visualize (and sound) filias and phobias, discussion that will not

enter for not seeing the meaning. When I see a film I'm interested in transmitting things, whether ideas or

sensations, and if it does through Its plot, its staging or its interpretations are not

important. And "" Inland Empire "" has transmitted me more things than a good part of the current billboard, it transmits

fear, terror, insecurity, suspense, unreality, magic, cinema, art. There seem to be three lines narratives, that

of the actress Nikki Grace (Laura Dern), that of the character Susan Blue (Laura Dern) and the Polish history on which they

are based, the three "" stories "" intersect, overlap, unfold, confuse and they converge, with a

bold and sometimes confusing result. It may be the most radical and hermetic film in the form and content

of Lynch, twinned with her debut in "" Head Eraser. "" Lynch, after his nomination to the Oscar and bestaward

directorin Cannes for "" Mullholland Drive "", is in a position to do what he wants and maybe we are beforeLynch

his total work, although I can rush.may be the current director whose best game brings out sound

as a narrative resource. It mixes resources of video-art, avant-garde and cinema both narrative, visual

and sonorously. "" Lost Road "" and "" Mulholland Drive "" seem like simple sketches of this "" Inland

Empire "". Filled with self-references, complex and markedly sensitive, it is one of the mostafraid

I have beenof seeing them, the nightmare of madness. Happily in the movies there are still unexplored roads to

travel, and this is a good example. (4) The note is also an outline. (+)

" 1

4/4" Seeing how the national scene is today, at least you laugh for a while and you forget the picture, which is a

little shabby. I liked it.

With ���lvaro Fern���ndez Armero, the same thing happens to me as with Hot Hot Heat, no matter how soft the movie is

(The game of truth, for example) something will have to finish me��� making fun, and that's because of Everything is a

lie (Armero himself told me a year ago that the edition on DVD is screwed because it has aproducer

very foreignunlocatable.) Against all pronostic I have a great time with his last movie, Salir pitando for

his characters and his di���logos / discussions. On this occasion the Toledo-Guti���rrez chemistry does not suffer at any

time and it is pure comedy on the trip to the airport. It is the day

of cinema and Antonio de la Torre is immense. In this comedy the least is football (as in The Host the bug)

and the most it's that of losing fear and such, especially in love. Seeing how the national scene is today, at

least you laugh for a while and you forget the photograph, which is a little chabacana. But I liked it (the movie).

" 1

" Generally speaking, the film is excellent. In all cases. The direction, the soundtrack, the

actors, the production design ... Everything. The only thing we can attribute to the tape is some other hole

(in reality there is only one, but it is a hole).

I did not like at all what director Alfonso Cuar���n did with the third novel in the Harry Potter saga.

This is my fine way of saying that they did not forgive him for the mess, the attack, the mutilation of "Harry Potter and

the Prisoner of Azkaban." It's more, when I left the room I said to myself. "I'm not going to see one more movie of

that man." But of course, "" Do not say this water will not drink "". So, encouraged by the good reviews that

the film had harvested, and the bad acceptance of the American public. I said to myself: "Well, it has to be fine. I spend a

day and I rent it "". And that's what I did. I put the disc in the DVD player. I felt. I hope that the

announcement of "" THE PIRACY IS A CRIME "". I gave "" Languages ​​"". I gave "" English "". I gave "" Subtitles "". I gave

"" Spanish "". And later. I did it. I gave "" Movie "". Let's say that (stumbling, since there is always the relative who

asks you "" and that cloud of what it is? "" And other eloquent questions that come out of the soul to certain people)

occurred �� Only that. It happened before my eyes. When they started (accompanied by the question of my companion "" Well,

what a final shit, it can not end there. There is a second part, no? "") The t��� credit titles I could not feel more

satisfied. And the film is worth it. Generally speaking, the film is excellent. In all

cases. The direction, the soundtrack, the actors, the production design. All. The only thing we can

attribute to the tape is some other hole (in reality there is only one, but it is a hole). Although I do not know if

these errors come from the novel on which it is based (if that were the case, it would have to be corrected) or from the

adaptation (an unforgivable error). And is that the only thing that suffers the gui���n is. Why? For what? At

no time, Cuar���n (artífice del gui���n) deigns to answer these two questions. It is not that they are very

necessary, but his answer is missing. But you know that this man, giving explanations does

not care. Something that left us very clear in the third part of "" Harry Potter "". And that is something I hate. You

can not limit yourself to telling one thing without saying why, you have to give the reasons why your story is the way it

is, and it happens as it happens. Even so, Cuar���n fulfills his work as a director. A compliment that I

never imagined I would tell you. As far as actors are concerned, everyone fulfills their task with flying colors, and more than one, they

have fallen one or two awards. They emphasize Clive Owen, that sometimes is something expressionless, although he gives us in a

few moments a brilliant performance; Michael Caine, who gives us the best character in the film and who

has not unfairly rewarded his work with any awards. Other notable aspects are the magnificent

Soundtrack of John Travener and the Fotograf��� a, who has won several awards, although the Oscar has slipped out

of his hands. The film is shot in the form of a documentary, as if the camera was a journalist who records

everything (even blood leaps into the camera). In general: a film to enjoy and to think. With

excellent parts, a production design that removes hiccups. The film is frankly good, and enjoys an

incredible moment that more than one (yam���s of two, yam���s of three.) Har��� that the tears are skipped. In addition,

we must recognize the film as the very correct criticism of society, and that there are many

parallels between that reality (which for some strange reason we think it is something distant) and ours. A faithful

portrait of the world, of how it is today. And what's more, almost a reprimand. That never comes from more.

" 1

" It has fascinated me, provoking that mixture of repulsion and attraction that comes to lean, face to face,

the most murky, complex and contradictory of the condition. (N (in) human.

If this film, instead of happening in a town of Castilla-Le���n, happened in places of Iowa or

Wisconsin and instead of civil guards, the criminal investigation was carried out by asheriff

shrewdand his young assistant, we would be hearing and reading a thousand and one magnificent critics about a film of

black genre absolutely modÃlico and of book If, instead of being signed by an unknown Jorge

S���nchez-Cabezudo, carry the signature of the Coen brothers, we would be talking about a new everlasting

classic of the noir genre . Because "" The night of the sunflowers "" is an excellent film of black and criminal genre, based

on a portentous script signed by Jorge S���nchez himself. Where did this guy come from? What round in his head?

Right now, just a few hours after suffering and enjoying his movie, I do not know anything about him. But I plan to

find out and, from now on, closely monitor it. Because "" The night of the sunflowers "" has fascinated me,

provoking me that mixture of repulsion and attraction that comes to lean, face to face, the most murky,

complex and contradictory of the condition (in) humana.Pong���monos in antecedents: some young speleologists

come to a town, to investigate if a newly discovered caves they may have some attraction from thepoint

tourist-archaeological-scientificof view. At the same time, a commercial traveler is showing his sample of

industrial vacuum cleaners in the area. The two only survivors of an abandoned village are still fighting and

the corporal of the Civil Guard and one of his subordinates, who at the same time is his son-in-law, dine at home. How to get,

with those wicks, an excellent film of black genre? Well that's the greatness of Sanchez-Cabezudo's gui���n.

Using Tarantinian resources, playing with time and space, concatenating the cross stories of

characters as particular as simple and ordinary, having swallowed the dry and brutal violence of

the "Straw Dogs" by Sam Peckimpah; we are facing a film without concessions, exciting, hard,During

devastating.the two hours of footage, there is barely time to take a break. - What is this about? ?, youyourself

askcontinuously. And this goes. of what Jorge wants. And what you want is to change the register,

surprise and enchant the viewer every quarter of an hour. And he gets it. Because, as in the exquisite corpses

that our surrealists liked so much, each segment of the film links with the previous one, but only to

give a brutal turn to a story that, nevertheless, , ends up having a total and absolute coherence, without leaving

a single loose end. "" The night of the sunflowers "" is a film of multiple viewings, which calls for a

DVD edition that allows us to recreate a puzzle as ingenious as well as rolled. If you had to

put a but. the music. Sometimes it becomes tiresome and too obvious. But come on, you already see the one

that we put on an extraordinary and colossal film that I'm already looking forward to seeing again.

" 1

" Essential movie that every movie lover should have on their shelves. It is not a film only

for inveterate movie-goers of yellow whiskers to smoke ducats, if not for a much wider public, that

simply look for a good movie. Let's see a Sunday afternoon.

I do not know how long this box has been in the back of the bookshelf, without anyone

smearing the impeccable little Sunday gift that covered it. Until today, that in an outburst of love

for the home cinema, we have taken the scissors, after giving him seven fruitless bites, and we have removed the DVD from his

involuntary confinement. And if I'm glad I did. The film is about a couple who adéltera in one

of their car trips kill an anonymous cyclist. At first, he tries to help her, but shehim

convincesto run away. She is a married woman of the upper class, while he is aclass assistant professor

middle. At a party she attends, a friend makes a strange comment, which makes them think they

were seen and know their secret. From this moment, a story about morals, deceptions andbegins

betrayals, until it culminates in a final apotheosis. Films like these show us the quality of our cinema,

which in times He could clearly compete with the one who saw us from the other side of the pond. A story very well

braided, with parallel plots and very well defined characters, certainly helps the quality of the actors.

In addition to a great film, it shows us an image of Spain at that time. Those-differences

postwarin those that have been wanted to deepen, getting a total hast���o in the spectators.

Here you neither judge nor stop judging, you simply show social strata, differences and

customs, and all that in eighty minutes. Who can give more? In short, essential film that every movie

lover should have on their shelves. It is not a film only for inveterate movie-goers ofwhiskers

yellowto smoke ducats, if not for a much wider public, that simply look for a good movie. Let's

see a Sunday afternoon.

" 1

" Very remarkable film, from which the critics raise to the altars and that I am sure it will please the

public in general, even if it is only to see the impressive performance of Jack Nicholson and especially that of a Di

Caprio that is immense.

It seems that the billboard is animated and filled with interesting proposals. The Black Dahlia, Children of Men,

The Labyrinth of the Faun, Scoop, Copying Beethoven, or the one that concerns me, the last of Martin Scorsese, who after his

fiasco with El Aviador returns to sound for the Oscars of this ���o. And it would not be strange because it's a

very remarkable film, from which the critics raise to the altars and that I'm sure the p� will like very much. Public in

general, if only to see the impressive performance of Jack Nicholson and especially that of a Di Caprio that is

immense. A short synopsis, to know what it goes, that does not reveal anything of the plot (but it comes well to

read it), because it is what it appears to us nothing else to begin: In the city of Boston a young policeman, Billy

Costigan (Leonardo DiCaprio) is infiltrated in a criminal organization with the intention of ending

the local mafia boss, Frank Costello (Jack Nicholson). At the same time, another policeman, Colin Sullivan (Matt Damon),

is part of the unit that aims to end the gangster group. The police force does not suspect that Sullivan

is a mole of Costello himself. I compare this Scorcese to that of Casino. If you liked the style of Casino, you will

like it without remedy, although if that did not convince you, it may be that your guide ends up paying. With

the style I mean the di���logos, the transitions, the way of posing the scenes, rhythm, characters, the

level of violence, etc. What did I like? Leonardo Dicaprio. The whole movie is spent with aface

derangedthat reflects the anguish of their situation. And above all, do not let yourself eat on the plans with Nicholson,

who is also immense, although that is less surprise. Actually, they like all the performances, except

Matt Damon, that I can not believe it. I also like the plot is closing little by little, as if it

were a funnel that ends with the expected duel. The use of the cars, key in the story is very intelligent as

well, as well as the songs that are playing. And what did I not like? Violence, verbal and visual. It happened to me

as with the aforementioned Casino, which reached a point of saturation that bothers me. It is clear that the gangsters

kill each other, and they say a lot of tacos, but I do not know, it also seemed loud to me, and a long mess. Overall, it

is worth seeing, even if only for the performances, and for an intelligent plot, although it still does not fully

convince me Scorcese. A. 8

" 1

" Film full of incongruities and temporary failures that sing outrageously, see it without giving a lot of

thought to what it tells you can entertain you, but looking for its mistakes will entertain you even more.

Sandra Bullock stars in this film with supernatural dyes where a wonderful life

with her husband and two daughters will be cut off after receiving the news of her husband's death in aaccident

traffic, d al Next she wakes up and finds that her husband is alive, thinking that everything has been

a bad dream. But the next day she wakes up and her husband is dead again, which turns out to be all more

real than she thought. From the outset, a paranormal thriller starring Sandra Bullock already claims a certain

dislike. ��n, at the same time that warns that we are facing a very conventional product and shot facing the shine

of the star. What happens is that the star looks more like little because it happens with the same face of

disgust throughout the entire length of the film and in addition the character he plays ends up being more pat�� Ethical than

anything else. And it is that when one has long since realized that what happens is that the protagonist is

living the days in a disorderly manner, she seems to discover it and also tells you in voice high and even

doing a sketch so that we understand it well and we do not get lost, as if we were stupid. After all this

the grace of the film is to see if the Bullock will be able to save to her husband of an imminent death or if

she will not manage to do it, but the writers comment the great failure to present the husband as a cocoon,

which makes you lose all complicity and emotion for what happens to her , or not, or rather, what you want is that you

kill yourself and in the process that you take the woman with him. But this is not the only mistake made by the writers because

the film is full of incongruities and temporary failures that sing a lot, and that if you put

to play over time at least keep a certain coherence, not a puzzle of pieces that later do not fit. The film

deserves a mention of the most chorra scene seen by a server lately and it is like converting atask

daily and normallike going to pick up the clothes lying in a sequence of tension in crescendo stuck with

shoehorn to justify another scene. But the jackpot takes that ridiculous end, skimming the joke,

how the Bullock pretends to save her husband, seriously I was breaking the box and hallucinating, it can

be More silly? As a telefilm for the Sunday after-dinner show you have a certain pass, seeing it without giving a lot of thought to what

it tells you can entertain you, but looking for its mistakes will entertain you even more.

" 0

" The profound legacy of an unpaired filmmaker Two years before his early death from diabetes, Robert Rossen signed the one that would be his last film:

Lilith . Four decades after its premiere, its dramatic complexity and lyricism reach us intact,Vincent

with the same ability to question the viewer.Bruce (Warren Beatty), a young ex-combatant,

He returns to Maryland, his hometown, with the intention of working at Poplar Lodge, apsychiatric center

nearby. Your willingness to help will make those responsible for the center do not hesitate to accept you among your

staff. She will soon notice Lilith, a beautiful and intelligent patient who has built anaround her

imaginary world, with a language and logic of her own. Since the beginning, thanks to Rossen's staging,

the viewer is also curious about Lilith: first without seeing her appearance, she will be shown to the intern

watching Vincent's movements from the window, and it will not be until a few minutes later , after hearing a

lot about her and having fanned our desire to know her, that, in the first exchange of words with

Vincent, Robert Rossen will give us a closed shot of his angelic face. Through her beauty and a

special sensitivity that leads her to contemplate, without rest, the flashes of light in the flow of the river, Lilith

will become before our eyes and those of Vincent , in a kind of nymph or demigod who lives in harmony with

nature. It will not be until she spits from the bridge, provoking the laughter of the companions of the center,

that we will be removed from our enso���aci���ny and we will be returned to reality. However, Vincent will be captivated

by Lilith and will get away, convincing those responsible for the psychiatry, to spend as much time as

possible with her. By his side, he will be able to forget the ghosts that torture him, such as the death of his mother or the

memories of war, and he will be infected by his joy of living. Thus, despite having rejected her once

as a caretaker, she will ignore her principles and surrender to the pleasure that Lilith offers her: after being

crowned as medieval kings, in a scene that symbolizes the definitive approach to the world of the

sick woman, the desire of both will be consummated. By framing it in nature and relating it to the flashes of light

in the water, the sex that the couple will have will be shown by the director as something sublime, eternal andthe same time

fleeting at. However, Vincent, defined by Lilith herself as a "pain-worshiper", will not settle for the

love the young woman offers her and will be enraged to discover that she has sex with Mrs. Yvonne ( Anne

Meacham), another internal. Unable to accept the fact that he does not own Lilith exclusively, he will be driven mad by

jealousy. His most destructive instinct will emerge - ending with what he so longs to possess. After the terrible outcome, I can

only return to the psychiatric hospital as a sick person. With this hopeless end, Robert Rossen will close

his filmography. The director, who was beaten by the power of his own country before the communist alarm,

defines the moral imperative, expression of the desire for power, as the cancer of humanity. For Rossen, it is the

human being himself in his affinity to possess (in this case, to own himself) that imposes a moral area

that governs his life. Judging by the story of Vincent, as well as that of his married friend (less developed but

not insignificant), that morality that aims to define the limits of good and evil, capable of

delimiting the madness, punishing sex or sending one to war, it only causes frustration to man and

brings him remorse. To all this, the North American filmmaker puts Lilith before her, possessing amoral

permeableand characterized by its natural goodness. With a staging that treats with kindness theworld

personalof the sick young woman (the details of the flashes of light, as well as the tracking that follows the reflection

of the couple in the water, betray the will of the filmmaker to be next to her) will be through his martyrdom

in the hands of Vincent that Robert Rossen will make his profound legacy reach the viewer: as Mrs. Yvonne says in a

moment of great lucidity "" the principles must be constantly examined "".

" 1

" Scenes like the sad farewell of the lovers, and an end very close to our reality, willus

remindthat, despite the maturity reached by the cinema and its viewer, the screen can still be overflowing with

emotion. .N

After an elegant movement of the camera, the privileged spectator contemplates the evolution of people on the

street from a zenithal perspective. It starts to rain on the cobbles that fill the screen as if it were a

brick wall. On this wall the credits of the film are projected. The passers-by,

covered entirely by their colored umbrellas, slide between the names of those responsible for the film

as if they were obstacles. Thus, to the accompaniment of the music of Michel Legrand, typography and walking umbrellas dance

together forgetting their different nature. With this choreographic game, In my opinion, representative of what

the subsequent footage will assume, The Umbrellas of Cherbourg begins, a film with which Jacques Demy would

take the Golden Palm of Cannes in 1964. Genevi���ve is an attractive young man who lives with his mother while

helping him in the umbrella shop they own. You will meet Guy, a handsome and kindly mechanic, and they willinimmediately

falllove. Although Madame Emery, the mother of Genevi���ve, does not approve of the relationship due to the youth of her daughter and

the poverty of Guy, it will be the military service that separates the couple: �� He will be destined two years to Algeria and

maybe they will not see each other again. Pregnant by her beloved, but without receiving news from her, Genevieve will give in

to her mother's wishes and marry Roland Cassard, a wealthy jewelry seller. Some time later, Guy will return to

the city. Judging by the argument of the film, which has already been told to us more than once, we could think that we are

facing a melodramatic musical either; However, we will soon realize that we

are facing an unusual film. After the initial credits discussed, we will be surprised by some

characters who speak singing. Neither spectacular numbers inserted by force nor musical moments motivated

by the plot; in Demy's physical Cherbourg, in which the real landscapes present the saturated colors

typical of the musical genre's decorations, singing is the natural expression of the characters that

They inhabit. The restlessness invades the spectator: Are we faced with the sublimation of the constants of the genre?

Before a tribute? Perplexed in front of the recital that never ceases and the perfect choreography of the chamber and staging

, we can not stop questioning about why such a technical feat. A classic andstructure

predictable, crystallized in three episodes that reveal the frame of enunciation, as well as somecharacters

stereotypicalthat even come to ironic about their own condition. (Madame Emery: ���Only dies of love in

the movies!), Will induce us to consider the linguistic nature of what we are seeing, and to understand

the innovative contract Jacques Demy offers us: The director chooses to cut with the ties that enslave

the worn out cinematographic musical to the theatrical tradition, leaving aside the cabaret number and

converting the constants of the g� ��nero in codes that govern the world of the film, which determine its nature.

Thus, from Demy's hand, the musical ceases to be a combination of elements of disparate origin to become annarrative mode. It is true

essentially cinematographicthat the previous conclusion is the result of a

reflection after the viewing of the film, however, we can confirm the conscious position of the

viewer during the projection of the film. Only through his willingness to participate in the game proposed by

Demy, can we explain his involvement in a world that seemed so hermetic to him. The spectatorgets rid

voluntarilyof his shell and is vulnerable, allowing, in this way, that what at first he

came to seem laughable, deeply moved him. Scenes like the sad farewell of the lovers, and an

end very close to our reality, will remind us that, despite the maturity reached by the cinema and its

viewer, the screen can still be overflowing with emotion.

" 1

" Excellent Spanish tape, which ends with a somewhat diffuse and not very concise finish. Very often I usually check a bookshop near Lavapi���s, I do not know, it's a space small, almost as if it

were the home of a friend, and there, between books and good music, not long ago I found the novel by Ddier

Van Cauwelaert "" Education �n of a fairy "", of which Jose Luis Cuerda has made an adaptation, and in which

Cuerda also makes a cameo in one of the scenes. A tape, which is almost a story Fairy for adults, where

Ricardo Darin makes a character that in a way reminds Roberto Begnini in "" Life is beautiful "",

trying to show the kid that life is not as ugly as it seems, sweetening it with Fairies , Giants and

wishes. Lately it is difficult to see movies where children come out, and it is that, as a director said whose

name right now I do not remember, it is complicated make movies "" with children "", since these do not usually

behave on the screen as they would really do outside of it, this is the case of the boy co-star of the

film, and it is that, a long time ago (perhaps since Dakota Fanning) that he did not see a kid so repipi, re-experienced

, repellent and stupid like the one that appears on the screen, well, that What talk seems to harangue what

he says, and more to fall sympathetic, one wants to take off the shoe and give a good spanking of cheeks,

pesao.No I can not forget or Bebe (great in his role "go back to delight us with another album like the excellent

" "Pa out cobras" "?), by the way, how much that girl loses without clothes, on the other hand is Irene Jacob, who

is difficult to understand a word when he opens his mouth, although curiously his "" son "" if he speaks perfectly the

language of Cervantes. Perhaps, what I liked least about this film that is round in its journey is that

end, so diffuse, so little concise, in which one can (or should) imagine what he would like to happen.

" 1

" Stone may think he is a good documentary maker who only tells the truth, but far from it,

we should remind him that instead he is telling us what he thinks It must have been that day.

Sensing already the narrative potential that could have the new attacks of this 21st century, the witnesses

of March 11 referred to the mobile terminals that continued ringing next to the corpses as of a

magical realism characteristic of Garc���a M���rquez, more desolating. On September 11, the parent of the 11-M, deserved to

appropriate the copyright of these narratives. World Trade Center already adds the second film about

9/11, although it is the first one that supposes a speech, a direct response. World Trade Center shares with

United 93 the intuition that what happened �� can not be understood in a single story, and before that is limited

from its approach to a watchtower: the rubble of the Twin Towers. However, the cinema of catastrophes,

the objective criticism, the snapshots narrated el nopticamente do not remain there, and instead sublimate in the form

of family tragedy, of modèlica familiar tragedy. The two characters of the film do not even offer

different perspectives of the same event, on the contrary the scheme is mimetically repeated in both; as if

there were no other possible answer. Well if there is one, that of the marine; a real character that, however, seems

set in the final montage. Stone may think he is a good documentary maker who only tells the truth,

but far from it, we should remind him that instead he is telling us what he thinks he should be. � Or at

least it should have been that day.

" 0

" A great movie. It is for many reasons. The first and most important for what it makes you feel.

Since many people will not agree with me but for me, this is a great movie. And in addition, I say it

sincerely. A great movie It is for many reasons. The first and most important for what it makes you

feel. At this point we all know what the "butterfly effect" is, well in its atmospheric aspect (the flutter

of a butterfly in New York can produce a hurricane in Tokyo, where the name comes from of "" butterfly "", in its

"" theory of chaos "" (or as a small change can trigger an infinite disorder) or in

space-time, which happens if we make a small change in the past, because the future will change in aeffect

chainof unpredictable consequences. In this film you feel the effects of this theory as in any other

that has tried This is the main achievement of the film, making you feel that every decision you make in

life, every action you take, every gesture, word, can mark the future. another in an

instant of your life can mean from dying in a precise moment, to lead a lucky life, or to live

an authentic hell, going from one end to the other. another cone a terrifying facility, in a situation of total

chaos. The protagonist uses some notebooks that he wrote as a child to go to the past, always at the same point,

and although he always tries to fix things, he never gets it, he always comes back, and it's always worse. As if the

past could not be, or should change. The excellent ending, the way you have to change things is not

with a small change but with a total change of course. And that's what the protagonist does. But just as

there is the butterfly effect, there is also a concept at least as interesting and mysterious as ,l,

destiny. No matter how much we change things, no matter how much we fight against the events, if two people

have to find each other, they will love it, sooner or later, in New York or in Madrid. To emphasize also the

feminine protagonist, habitual of peque� Papelesos beautiful girl roles in movies for teenagers, but that here

is very consistent. The excellent soundtrack, especially the final theme of Oasis "" Spot Cry your Heart

out "", with the scene where they are on the street.

" 1

" The best film of the singular actor William S. Hart, who began in the theater representing nothing less than

works of Shakespeare. With 44 years old he began to play cowboys in the cinema and he did it well for his handling with

the horse.

"" A cowboy, accustomed to go alone for life without more roof than the sky and more home than green meadows,

meets a girl and falls in love. Thus, she decides to fight for land to live with her. To

achieve this, he must take part in a crazy race until he reaches the promised land "". "" Tumbleweeds "" is the best

film of the singular actor William S. Hart, who began in the theater representing nothing less than works of

Shakespeare. At the age of 44, he began to play cowboys in the movies and he did well for his handling with the

horse. This film is a great movie, the best western of the time silent, a song to the pioneers of the west,

highlighting their human values, their desire to start a new life. The scenes of the race to his dream

are spectacular, very well shot, with bravado. The rest is seen in a pleasant way, not tiring the spectator

at any time. Excellent photography, naturally in black and white. William S. Hart is accompanied by this

unique western B���rbara Bedford, Lucien Littlefield, and / or J. Gordon Russell.

" 1

" Mediocre, although more or less amusing film of Michael Raddord that, undoubtedly, has knowntimes

better.

Mediocre, although more or less entertaining film by Michael Raddord who, undoubtedly, has knowntimes

better. Here is limited to narrate a story of "" great thefts "", with little imagination, although helped by the

good work of that interpretive monster that is Sir Michal Caine. When he leaves, the movie is really

good, being a real pleasure to hear him in his original version. In his scenes, especially when he

tries to enter In the armored chamber where the diamonds are, while the watchman is eating

something instead of looking at the screens in front of him, the intriguing emotion appears strongly. This that I have

commented is a totally incredible moment, but that is the cinema. However, the rest of the narrative is the

most conventional thing that can be seen, also having a great h���ndicap: it takes a long time to get into the subject,

maybe because it is necessary to know the different characters, but in my opinion it would have been better to start with

a strong prologue, to hook the spectator. It does not happen and so the tape is m��� It's cold, looking like

someone who hears rain: no passion at all. He spends his time and does not bore, certainly, but he knows little and forgets the

five minutes.

" 0

" This is England is the film revelation of the English cinema of the past year. It could be defined as a kind

of England History X in both Comoritu like in concepci���n replacing Edward Norton by Stephen Graham and

Eduard Furlong by Thomas Turgoose

This is England is the film revelation of the English cinema of the past a� ��o. It could be defined as a kind

of England History X both in spirit and in conception, replacing Edward Norton with Stephen Graham and

Eduard Furlong with Thomas Turgoose. Its director, Shane Meadows, had already made another tape with a similar

theme once in the Midlands. On this occasion the story focuses on a rathertime period

conflictive, the Falklands war, in the 1980s when England sent troops to conquer (I will not

get in if I legitimately or not ) these islands that belonged to Argentina. Shaun is a 12-year-old boy who lives with

his mother. It has the label of failure hanging around the neck. His father died in the army and with the face of a

brewer Holligan and a single tooth it seems obvious to know because he is the target of all school jokes. As

he has no friends when he finishes school his life should be boring and boring in the small town

where he lives but he knows a group of young people who adopt him (before the approval). n of his mother, I do not know what

the majority of the film is thinking). A child with so little experience will end up facing the

principles that are around him, when Combo leaves the prison the group disintegrates. Shaun has to

make a decision and he opts for the most radical group. The film is hard. There is no way to sweeten certain

things. Because of its language and violence it was classified for adults in England but some cities

independently decided to carry that protection so that the majority of adolescent boys (preferably

white) could see it and become aware of it. what happens in these neo-Nazi groups that seem to

be back in fashion. It is curious that England, one of the places with the largest number of immigrants

and foreign and multicultural population, does not cease to set an example of its society with tapes like this. His dialogues are

vulgar, repetitive vulgar. That is, director, realistic and bright. I do not believe that the tape falters at any

time and the few magic concessions that are allowed are delicious (with the documentaryand epigraph

prefacebasically). The film teaches and does not indoctrinate, that's where its perfection lies. The string of awards andimmediate

nominations has beenBritish Independent Film Award, Flanders International Film Festival, London

Critics Circle Film Awards, London Film Festival, Newport International Film Festival, Bucharest festival,

Paris Festival, Festival of Rome, Festival de Gij���n (Winner Enfants Terribles), and official sections in

Toronto or Tribeca for giving examples of what has been done and what remains to be done. His best

references: American History X and Romper Stomper (excellent Australian film starring a

hitherto unknown Russell Crowe who is now a cult film).

" 1

" O��� that this was a small movie and, in fact, it has something of a little. Although its influence is enormous and

its field of action is still greater. Social cinema, critical cinema, cinespero cinema, corrosive cinema, good-humored cinema,

in the background. Cinema that aspires to catch the spectator and make him, once again, get excited. It can still be.

Indie: désecese of the cinema that voluntarily departs from the traditional circuits and that gestates with the very

clear intention of being independent, not contaminated by the tics of the majority consumer cinema. Then

Peque���a miss Sunshine is not an indie band, as they sell it, although Sundance endorses it with its brand of factory.

It is independent, separated from the traditional circuits and massive commercial pretensions (in the style of

Pirates of the Caribbean or Spiderman in any of its deliveries) is its humility, its reluctance to overwhelm: there

is nothing in the script that can wake up the amazement of the spectator accommodated in a fairground cinema,

feverish shots or indisputable special effects. Here is no easy movie and that (well looked at)

gives it a rare status in this world of ours where everything is driven by the path of affordable , of the

easily chewable, but as the film has participated in the Hollywood Oscars and has entered the hoop (

say) of the industry, it seems that it should be evaluated, criticized, understood as a movie. more

family entertainment in the style of the aforementioned, both worthy and liked by thisscribe

digital. Miss Sunshine is an antholy road-movie, cheerfully ,cida, corrosive in its simple way of

showing the diseases of a society, the American, too dedicated to satisfy pleasures

immediately and turn everything into fast-food, fast consumer product, be it a hamburger, or a book, be

a movie. This goes from a dysfunctional family, which is a very fashionable word. The Hoover are the paradigm

of the broken family: nobody has the head where it should. There is a teenager between the grunge and the Nietzschean who

does not speak to impose a discipline (oh, if San Juan de la Cruz raised his head), a pornographic grandfather

who snorts heroin in his spare time and advises the free love and fornice as a hobby, a father hooked on

the sociology light to Paulo Coelho, a gay duo just out of a suicide attempt, a

chubby girl who wants to be a miss and a self-sacrificing mother, authentic mother of a family destined to burst at

any minute of the day. Welcome to hell, says the autistic boy in a moment of the film. Friendly, ���cida,

perverse, intimate, colloquial: there are many adjectives. The quality, however, most dominant is optimism, the

crucial fact that a road marks the north, the future. Or that a dismantling van in pure

scrap does not cease in its final destination: the hotel in Redondo Beach (California) in which awill take place

unique contest, the election of Miss Sunshine, the aberrant contest of ni� Enas where, in the end,takes place

the fabulous outcome, a kind of metaphysical cl���max in which one is reconciled with the goodness of the cinema, with

its blessed catharsis. In other words: now that it is not possible to see it in the cinema, go to thevideo store

nearest. They have one nearby. Or one of those impersonal cashiers that eject the DVD as if it were a condom

on a night of partying and had one all feverish instincts. Run. I will not see the best movie

of the year, but I am (emphatically) one of the coolest, ironic, scathing and, above all, pleasant .

" 1

" It is bland, lacking in rhythm, substance, interest and with the feeling that all the film's participants

are aware of it.

The history of cinema has to its credit many and varied examples of bad books adapted to great

films, some of them so large that they have gone beyond their own adaptation context.my memory

The Godfather, Tibur���no Parque Jur���sico comes to, to give an example. Books that, regardless of theirquality

literary, have reached the screen stomping and leaving a mark, such as The Silence of the Lambs, or What

The Wind Taken. It was quite obvious that The Da Vinci Code could have entered perfectly into that same

group, not up to certain titles, but have made a worthy role adapting a theme that could have

given a lot of yes. Well, not even that. One faces the film of Ron Howard, fearing to fall into abluff

considerable, nothing more to see the cast. Too many familiar faces, I think, all in poster. Too much interest

because we see how many famous people participate in the film. Too many airs of overproduction.the

Beforemovie starts I am told that it is a little book, which does not surprise me too much because from other

sources it has come to me that the book only lacks the relevant notes to turn it into aguide

cinematographic. So I grab the coke, I open the potatoes and watch. When the film is finished, I can only

say that it is bland, lacking in rhythm, substance, interest and the feeling that all the film's participants

are aware of it. It's as if from the director to the man in charge of combinghorribly

Mr. Hankseveryone knew that the film does not have any chicha and they just recited text and moved the

camera hoping it would not take long to finish with the scene. The film is soporific, and not only is the

book to which it adapts, but all the production itself. And that, in my opinion, we are facing a topic that could

have left a great blockbuster, if only they would have liked to promote it: when they are going to explain everything the

roll of secret societies, historical personalities involved in a historical conspiracy, and the evidence

that they have been leaving in their works, only then it seems that the actors recover a little of life in their faces

and they are interested in the subject, making the respectable a little part of it (although by now they are

all more than boring). That is, we have a story that everyone likes, relating characters and

historical places with dark power plots and secret societies. Something trite, it's true, butare born

the blockbustersof topicazos. And if you know how to take those topicazos well, you can at least offer aresult

decent. However, in The Da Vinci Code, everything is carried out with the utmost reluctance, worrying only about making a

good impression of what the roll is about with unnecessary flashbacks. loaded with budget and continuous allusions to the

same concept as if the public, in addition to being a fool, was an idiot. So there is little to be said about the holes in the

gui���n, the lack of historical rigor in more than one piece of data that they release, or the fact that half of the

riddles, supposedly of antiquest origin, are in modern English. There is little to say about a film

whose authors are aware that they are not more than a small part of the enormous marketing operation that

the book entails. Dan Brown, and they do not limit themselves to makeup, even with a little show. Da

Vinci, in addition, is not even the crux of the conspiracies. Only one famous name to bring the masses to the

book, to the screen, or to the hundreds of books whose title is composed of a famous character and a synonym of

"" c�� �digo "". And, with the box office data of this movie, do not be surprised if in a couple of years we have the box office

full of the consequent adaptations?

" 0

" Moving a book of eight hundred pages to the screen is an almost impossible task and with La Orden del

F���nix they have not succeeded. Although it sounds strange, in this new installment of Potter the magic has been left in the

book.

Five films in six years. The same protagonists, the same routines and an almost traced structure. It's

almost a paradox, but the truth is that the Harry Potter films have less and less magic. From this

fifth installment we can rescue some scenes, but on the whole it does not seem like a great movie, neither for the

magician's readers, nor for those who only know him through s of the cinema. What holds the interest in the

Harry Potter novels is not the anecdotal in each volume (we all knew that Voldemort will resurface andall

weexpect the great final match between Potter and his n���mesis). What really hooks the reader is the

growth of the characters, the evolution through the years and the possibility that this gives you to

know them better. If it were not for this, I am sure that those billets of more than five hundred pages would

remain in the bookstores gathering dust. The problem is that in a film of something more than two hours it is almost

obligatory to focus on the anecdotal, which in the end is what makes the saga advance , to the detriment of what

really works in the books. The only evolution that we appreciate in the characters is that they are all more

grown up and have hormones somewhat upset, but little more. While through the books the

reader can know the motivations of the protagonists, on the screen it is impossible to know what is what

moves them. And at this point in the saga, things have become so complicated that it is difficult to understand what is

happening without all those references that have remained on paper. In the end, everything is a great outline of what

the book offers and I guess it's not just the writers' fault, it's maybe an impossible task. The

fact is that on screen The Order of F���nix does not work and the story becomes boring, unrelated and repetitive. Even

the youngest can not stand a weary rhythm that is limited to brushstrokes here and there, offering

only a few scenes less spectacular on the way to a final, which they have resolved in

derailmentfive minutes. Another added problem is that the actors they hired six years ago because they were funny in front of

the camera have evolved differently. Now some are tall and others are just bad.

However, the selection of new actors, if successful, and both Imelda Stauton, in the role of Dolores

Umbridge, and Evanna Lynch, giving life to the lovely Luna Lovegood, are really good, until the point to

expose the shortcomings of the rest. In short, Harry Potter and the Order of F���nix is ​​quite

mediocre and the most aspiring is to be entertained at times. At this point I guess it's too late

to change some actors, and maybe they should have done it a couple of movies ago. What is necessary to

recognize is that, with the richness in important details that have a novel of more than eight hundred pages, it is

practically impossible to transfer to the screen all the magic of Harry Potter . And that, when the protagonist is

a magician, is something unforgivable.

" 0

" It is as if now we were going to do semi���tica with the song of the summer and to look for three feet to a

simple cat. Poseidon is the cat of summer. The fat cat that is going to make a box.

There is a certain cinephilia of strict temperament and severe step that does not compromise with products like this because they

abound in deceits and because they may be too much, and very premeditadamente, of artistic values. The

subgenre of naval catastrophe has not given in the history of the cinema remarkable titles and Wolfgang Petersen has not

done much to twist the norm. Poseid���n loses water in the gui���n, and not in the wave of I do not know how many meters he knocks it down

. It matters little that there are actors, nor is it relevant that these actors have been given some

sentences. There are twenty minutes of verbal film and seventy (thank goodness that the footage is reasonable) ofeffects

special. And not bad, precisely. We have heard many times that the cinema that lacks means is supplied with

ingenuity. Cinema is art and, sometimes, business. Or even business and, in rare instances, art.of

Devoidartistic ambition, Poseid���n is shipwrecked because he does not need to float to make a box office. It requires a vitaminized trailer

of various truculencias where the producer's goose paste is manifested and it does not go more in effect. In

this case, Poseid���n reaches without stridency the acceptable average of digital artifice films. The deceit is

consented and far from being a warning so as not to repeat such experience, it becomes a generous seed of

future approaches to films of the same nature, to products that are so scandalously commercial (and mismatched)

. strictly cinematographic quality) that are even excluded from the usual butcher shop of some

current press critics. It is as if now we were going to do semi���tica with the song of the summer and to

look for three feet to a simple cat. Poseidon is the cat of summer. The fat cat that is going to make a box. The

cinematic education, which also exist, like the bookish or musical goes to see these messes

when you have, what do I, acn, or eyes great that open more before the prodigy of the studios and all those little

machines at the service of the pure and simple spectacle. Then that gentle and undemanding parishioner would haveindulge in

tothe pleasure of seeing other things. The same way past adolescence, with its vertigo and its lesions, they see a day

The diligence of John Ford. OM, the vampire of Dusseldorf, by Fritz Lang. In short, cinema, art, knowledge,

beauty. Evasion too, of course. That said, maybe we agreed to see Poseid���n in a summer movie theater,

eating popcorn in one hand and emptying a liter of Coca-Cola in the other. A good ambiguity would give thecounterpoint

ideal metaphysical. Oh, except for the first two minutes of the film where an omnipotent and perfect camera sweeps the

ship. The only real thing is the character that jogs on the deck. The rest, we already knew, is a little

infographic.

" 0

" First title where I met Tony Collette. "" Muriel lives in a fantasy world. To escape from the claustrophobic village in which the summer passes, from her

annoying family and her corny friends, she immerses herself in the catalogs of weddings and in the songs of Abba,

waiting for come your blue prince "". It is frankly a good film, very well shot and

narrated by PJ Hogan. With magnificent interpretations of the female protagonist couple (here I met the

always magnificent Tony Collette), the film is still interesting, given its great human depth, where all the

passions come to the point of pain before knowing the complete happiness. A fulldrama, a real

-blowntouch of attention certain negative aspects of society, not precisely in search of the happiness of its

citizens. Humor and drama are linked wisely and the film is remembered with love and emotion. Unforgettable

music, with the best songs of Abba, one of my favorite groups. In addition, the excellent sound of the

film helps to taste it better.

" 1

" A master piece (how many are already going?) That will undoubtedly remain forever as a classic, and, in addition, the best

film by Martin Scorsese (���me I passed?).

When one is born for one thing, nothing can be changed. -Scorsese has returned !, without aviators, gangs, or

biopics. He has returned to what he is better at, the cinema of mafias. And is that the director of One of our people was

born to be director of black film films. His new work, Infiltrados (The Departed, or The

Dead, title inídito, but much more successful), is an absolute sample of cinematographic talent and

supreme intelligence . Maybe it seems to me that I'm passing by and that this, no matter how much of a movie it is about Scorsese, is

still a band of cops and mobsters. Well, you are wrong: Infiltrados exceeds the quality of many of his

films genre. Because: ���Scorsese. The film could be called a return home. The truth is that I

can not express all its virtues in a single sentence: its excellent gui ten leaves you with your mouth open every

minute that passes. The rhythm of the film is exciting, since it keeps the viewer stuck in the seat minute by

minute (if the film lasts two hours and a half!). Its cast is defined by a single word: spectacular.

And what can I say more? Ah, yes! Scorsese, you are a true genius. Who would say that Infiltrados is a remake?

Well the truth is that yes, although more than a remake is an inspiration (based on the acclaimedTrilogy

Hong KongInternal Affairs). I must admit that lately I like the remakes less, but of course, there are

exceptions, and the tape in question is one of them.���The manager of the script is William Monahan, writer

considerably unknown, and here, performs a masterful job.��� The fact is that this inspiration has

become a real Scorsenian paranoia (or whatever you call it), and to finish first, to say that it is apiece

unique, without a single failure that pretends to be, and -becomes a masterpiece.��� Another strong point of the film

is its excellent distribution. In it shine three, or perhaps more, generations of actors. For a band, we have the

great Leonardo DiCaprio, who is completing his third collaboration with Scorsese after the gangsters Gangs of New York and

El Aviador. The American actor, of the, least, second generation, faces Matt Damon, who

also plays one of the best roles of his career, playing the evil mafioso infiltrated in the

police, and finally, within the trio protagonist, Jack Nicholson, who rather than interpret someone in

particular, interprets himself (excellently as always, of course). The rest of the cast is

completed by Mark Wahlberg, the authentic discovery of the film, with a masterfullypaper

interpreted; Martin Sheen, great actor, already veteran, who plays a role that I like very well; Alec Baldwin, an

actor who has never liked me very much, but here he does it with pearls; and finally, the only woman in the

team, Vera Farmiga, a great actress who is authentic "" infiltrated "" (in the other sense). And

finally, to say that with each actor you feel very, but that very���identified (look at the anguish of DiCaprio,

the apparent naivety of Damon or the frivolous and immoral personality of Nicholson). Scorsese has surrounded himself with

some authentic stars. In short, a master piece (how many are, already, this month, ���no?) That will undoubtedly

remain forever as a classic, and in addition, the best film by Martin Scorsese (���me I passed?).

" 1

" Raimi offers us some of the most embarrassing scenes in the history of blockbusters. Of all the sequels that this 2007 has prepared for us, the first one I've seen has been

"" Spider -Man 3 "" The film had the hopeful background of "" Spider-Man "" and "" Spider-Man 2 "", two

good films that, without reaching the excellence of "" Batman Begins "", they fulfilled their task perfectly.

He also had a director as funny as Sam Raimi and the emergence of such emblematic villains as The Sandman

, The Goblin or Poison. One of the shows of the year was expected for that reason. Crass error.

Of course, anyone who, to enjoy a movie with a display of special effects,

will be happy with the cinema and think that I am a pendant for Do not share your opinion. But if you are one of those who

ask for a film. If you ask him, for example, a gui���no a suitable rhythm, prepare for

disappointment. It is not that the film is totally boring, that it is at times, but what happens on the screen does not

happen with the naturalness and fluidity of the previous films. Everything seems forced, the formula sounds

repetitive and, even if it is repeated, we should not notice it. It falls, again and as usual in modern

American cinema, in the simplicity of the action scenes. ,N, thus preventing the dramatic andinvolvement

emotionalof the viewer in what happens. One can feel visual amazement at the special effects but there is no

room for emotion. It does not help either, the accumulation of characters that, in some cases, seems like a

mere excuse to please the fans. of the c���mic, but to those who have not found a suitable place in the

script. Thus, Gwen Stacy (Bryce Dallas Howard), key character in the cosmic, is completely out of place and

seems a simple introduction to a character who, to leave the Kirsten saga Dunst, could charge

prominence in subsequent installments. Also JJ Jameson or aunt May are mere extras inscenes

meaningless. To say something positive, not everything is going to be bad, to recognize that The Sandman (a successful Thomas

Haden Church) and all his story (in which appears a wasted Theresa Russell), are the best of the script

even if they had been left alone with him as a villain and had developed his story properly (he

asks for it to shout ), the better they would have gone. But the worst of the whole film are the moments when Peter Parker

(Tobey Maguire) is possessed by Venom and becomes a badass. As it sounds. Raimi offers us, here,

some of the most embarrassing scenes in the history of blockbusters. A horror difficult to understand

and that becomes the most unfortunately memorable of this painful and disappointing product entitled

"" Spider-Man 3� ??. Final rating of moonfleet.es: 2.5 out of 10

" 0

" "" Laura "" was the star of several names now immortal celluloid, and is a title to stand out

in that splendid genre that is the black cinema.

Rouben Mamoulian had been removed from the project. No director of sufficient prestige was

available. He was the producer, a vien���s of almost forty years, who took over the direction of the film. His

experience was not too abundant: a few minor films that had alternated with works on Broadway

since he emigrated from Austria, fleeing Nazi madness. His name was Otto Preminger, and Laura was

destined to be the movie that would throw him to stardom, as he did with the two protagonists of the film,

Gene Tierney and Dana Andrews.An ironic and tough police detective, McPherson, is in charge of investigating the

murder of a famous publicist, Laura Hunt. At his questioning round of suspects he goes to the home of

Waldo Lydecker, a brilliant and hedonistic radiophonic columnist who has been characterized by great interest in

black crime. Through her statement, we will go back in time to learn about Laura's story and the

events leading up to her death.Time back a young Laura tries to get Lydecker to sponsor the publicity of

a fountain pen ���fica. Annoyed during his lunch by the impetuous young woman, the writer dispatches her in a bad

way. However, he is impressed by the personality of the beautiful girl. Later,work

she will go to herto apologize and accept the publicist's offer. It will be the beginning of a long friendship in which

Lydecker (much older than her) will become a fatherly and protective figure, Lydecker's feelings

towards Laura will be more and more confused. At a party Laura meets Shelby Carpenter, a ruined landlord

and vividor that is sustained under the protection of Mrs. Ann Treadwell, a woman of good standing who is

in love with Carpenter. However, after meeting Laura, Carpenter will try to seduce her without too much success at

first, until after a while they will be intimated until they make wedding plans. Lydecker, who despises

Carpenter, will try by all means to prevent the wedding, getting to reveal to Laura a relationship that the

gigol��� maintains with a young model who works in the same agency of the ���orita Hunt. Doubting whether orbreak

not tothe commitment, Laura retires to her house. Shortly after, on a Friday, Laura calls Lydecker canceling a

dinner date they had that same night. A few hours later his body is discovered. After this whole police plot

a great secret is hidden, a hidden fact that will turn the plot at the most unexpected moment. . The

detective McPherson discovering a complicated tangle of romantic relationships,

feelings,jealousies and emotional games which go complicndose a total way, to the point

that going ��� obsessed with the portrait of the deceased Laura, discovering that the magnetism of that woman is so

powerful that it lasts even after his death. With that convoluted mara���a of interests and half-truths as a plot

printed in a fragile script and brilliant dialogue lines, and an impeccable direction, Laura is in its own right

one of the great titles of the film noir, which gathers traditions of the genre (starting with the work of Agatha

Christie) and elements of previous films such as The falcon malt�� �sy is linked to later films such asVertigo. The

Hitchcock'sintricate script (although seen today may not be so much) stands out for its vibrant plot

in the l�� The usual line of the whodunnit and for those types of phrases ("" I do not use a fountain pen, I use a goose feather

dipped in poison "") that turn classical film noir into a g��� Nero really delicious. On the other hand, Otto

Preminger constructs the facts in a clear and concise way, without going around with detours, a style that nevertheless did not

stop being habitual of the time. Aided by a splendid photograph, Preminger surrounds the film with anhalo

aural, especially in certain shots by Gene Tierney, whose beauty, on the other hand, is portrayed in Laura in

a sublime way. As I said, the film elevated Tierney and Andrews to the category of big stars. Laura

Hunt is one of the final roles of the Tierney, one (I will never tire of saying it) a wonderful creature that

makes me think that God exists. In Laura her scenic charisma and her demeanor are captured on the screen as they seldom

did; in addition, the interpretation of the actress comes to captivate as captive the mordant Lydecker.

For her part, Dana Andrews (for many years I thought she would be a woman!) Also stands out as the typical disbelieving

detective. and language of the genre; Although it can not be compared to the detective portraits of the great

Bogart, the good of Andrews knew to be up to the circumstances and give his character ahook

good enoughto gain prominence in certain key scenes. Vincent Price, who plays the

womanizer Carpenter, emerges unscathed by his usual charisma; even though his character is too ungrateful

to shine with his own light, his mere presence is enough to remind us what a great actor this man was.

Treadwell, the fan of Carpenter, madame has the face of Judith Anderson, the unforgettable Ladykeys.

Rebecca Impossible to overcome or continue to match a role like that, but his imperturbable face fits

perfectly to his role in the film. A separate chapter deserves Clifton Webb, an actor imposed by Preminger

for more tantrum by the all-powerful Darryl F. Zanuck, to whom the homosexuality of the aristocratic Webb

should take his dream. Luckily for the film, for Zanuck and for Webb himself, who returned to the cinema after

an exile that dated from the beginning of the sound, Preminger rescued him to play the b��� fido dandy

Lydecker. Clifton Webb is simply immeasurable, and fits the role as elegantly as

the suits fit. His are the best phrases of the film, as well as most of the scenes in which he

participates. A ten for him. Another element of the film that has remained in the memory is the main theme of

it, also titled "" Laura "" and composed by David Raksin. Although I personally do not say much to me, itnot

canbe denied that it is a beautiful composition, and many cynics surely have it among their favorites. Laura was

the star for several names now immortal celluloid, and it is a title to stand out within that

splendid genre that is the black cinema.

" 1

" One of the best Spanish films in which Del Toro reveals himself as a narrator capable of combining, in the

same story, the magic of the fey and the most horrible of the human condition.

He knew the facet of Guillermo del Toro as a solid director of a cinema of action and terror that heimbues

alwayswith his particular and imaginative vision. But this magnificent film, which, ahead of time, is one of the best

produced this year by the Spanish cinema, has discovered a great narrator capable of uniting, in the same

story, the magic of the fibulas and the most horrible of the human condition. The labyrinth of the faun is a film

as atypical as it is daring in its double narrative proposal. If the story monsters that Ophelia (magnificent

Ivana Baquero) faces in their adventures are terrifying, no less are some of the human beings with

whom they will coexist in a hostile reality. His mother Carmen (Ariadna Gil) tells him that he is older for so much

"" zarandaja "", but she clings tightly to her personal universe, to the point of living almost abstracted from the

ungrateful everyday life. He surpasses with a commendable value the hardest proofs of his fable while living with dread

the new events that surround his life, that of his mother and that of his unborn brother. The use of

imagination as a way out of the most horrible reality, therefore, is one of the issues proposed by Del

Toro, who suffered the most cruel side in the first person. of life during the abduction of his father. The film

situates us in post-war Spain coinciding with the Second World War. It is 1944 and are still redoubts

of the republican troops, known as 'maquis', fighting refugees in the mountains against thearmy

Francoist. A splendid Sergi L���pez puts face to the merciless captain Vidal, who will command troops

destined to finish with the group of insurgents posted on the slopes of the mountain. Carmen is the widow of a

tailor and the mother of Ophelia, a 13-year-old girl addicted to fantastic stories. As a means of survival,

Carmen married her second marriage with Captain Vidal, who seems interested only in the welfare of the son

Carmen has in her womb and is about to be born. And he treats with disdain his wife and stepdaughter, condemned to

treat him slavishly to face those years of national famine and famine. Both travel to the

mill where Vidal has its operations center. There, Mercedes (great Maribel Verd���) directs the service of the

house and the Doctor (���lex Angulo) takes care of the state of health of Carmen, recently arrived after a long and hard journey

next to Ophelia. Ophelia, oblivious to the vicious hunting of Vidal (the interpretation of Lopez is at the height, for

example, of Ralph Fiennes in Schindler's list made the s� ��dico Amon Goeth), you will discover the ruins of a

labyrinth in the forest. There you will find yourself with a faun who recognizes her as a princess. Although incrimulating at the

beginning, she agrees to face the three tests that will return her to her reign. He will run all sorts of

dangers, but none will terrify him as much as his padastro and the dark world that he represents.state of

Carmen'shealth worsens as delivery approaches and she is caught between the duty of assisting her mother

and the tests she has to complete by the time the full moon arrives.Statistics l��� Gubre and sometimes repulsive, The

labyrinth of the faun is not a film like the Narnia cricnals, despite having fauns and fairies in its

history. The extreme violence shown or suggested by the ellipses in the real story, as well as the frightening

ambience of the opera, prevent this is a suitable tape for a p�� Children's audience. But it is highly

recommended for the rest. The film, in its corollary, vindicates the world of imagination and dreams as

antidote against the worst side of reality. Del Toro, here, makes almost a statement of principles about his

own vision of life. According to the Mexican, literature, cinema or other arts can provide us with access

to such a stimulating world, but, as the film warns, this will only be open to who know how to look

Therefore, it may be necessary to look with the eyes of a child.

" 1

" The problem with this film, is that the rest of the actors are bad, very bad, overreacting to the point of

satiety, leaving the film in a mere telefilm or pilot episode of a short-lived soap opera. On the air.

"" Arena in the pockets "" is the typical strip of conflicting guys, who previously starred others, with

titles like "" El Pico "" or "" I am the heifer "" pon�� " The youth of the 80s are questioning, now, at the

turn of the millennium, we must update this type of cinema, and the "almodovarian" "Yohana Cobo, Clara Lago (" "journey

Carol's" ") or several secondary TV (including Daniel Guzman or Antonio Denech) have been the ones who have taken

over from that type of film. The problem with this film, is that the rest of the actors are bad, very bad,

overacting to the satiety, leaving the film in a mere telefilm or pilot episode of a teleserie of

short duration in antenna, and where the argument; In some moments he reminded me of Ismael

Serrano's song "" La Huida "", he gives for little, for very little. At no time one can come to believe what he sees on the

screen, and, honestly, it does not matter what will be of the lives of the 4 protagonist kids, apart, the

tape is aimed at all the possible themes, abuse, discrimination, incommunicado Den parents and

children, school bullying. Without ruffling the argument the least; What a fierce screenwriter! A tape, which does not give

more than one viewing and that has only conquered me for a few moments with his soundtrack (Quique Gonz���lez

and elbicho).

" 0

" Cruel and pretty raw. After an hour and a half of footage, when you reach the end you breathe, accompanied by a

feeling of pain, guilt and desire that what you have seen on the screen is there and does notagain

happen.

Interesting pseudo-documentary directed by Michael Winterbottom, that after the excellent "" Code 46 "" and the

mediocre pseudo-pornographic film "" 9 songs "", delves into the situation of the Islamic prisoners Americans in thebase

North Americanof Guantanamo. The film, or documentary (I do not know very well how to call it), is hard, cruel and quite

crude, and finally after an hour and a half of footage, when you arrive At the end you breathe, accompanied by a feeling

of pain, guilt and desire that what you've seen on the screen is there and does not happen again. It has

caught my attention, something that I saw in the film page "" The hours lost "" and that is that they also commented,

that the protagonists after the unfortunate event did not feel bad, that goes, in the back He felt that this experience

had helped in their lives; I would not like to put myself on his skin, but I think if he saw me in that position, I do not know

if I would feel like them, I probably would not want to see an American flag on my pu���etera vida.In order,

like the tape of which I put my opinion / criticism yesterday, a film that is worth seeing, although during

that hour and a half we suffer almost like those on the screen.

" 1

" A very bad movie that also has a whiff to second category film in all aspects.

'Tigre y Drag���n' made fashionable the Asian films of jumping fighters that leaping jumping, they are

hitting right and left with everyone who gets in front of them. And although they were done before, it

was the root of Ang Lee's film when we had a real explosion of titles with similar characteristics,

some of which managed to cross the borders of their country. �s, and many others who have stayed inside but then

we have arrived in DVD format. 'Shinobi' was released last week in our country and not in all the cities

of the national territory. Seeing her one understands why? And there are films that deserve sleep

the dream of the just forever and not be released or edited on DVD. Of course, if that does not happen,

how can we find out that they are bad? We would always doubt if we had not seen them. I have

seen 'Shinobi' and I can say that it is a complete loss of time. I expected it? No? I'm

surprised? Neither.In an era when ninjas walked the Earth at will, two clans will

face death because I know, which is the best reason to face death with someone . For

this, both sides will choose two small groups of warrior experts to face each other and they will

decide the outcome of the fight. The problem of the matter is that the leaders of both groups are a kind of

Romeo and Juliet, both very loquitos the one by the other. This will obviously have a drastic effect on the

course of events, since both lovers do not see the struggle as logical and yet have to face it.

God, what? bonito.La film is a stunning cutrez, but not technical, but rather thematic. The

argument premise is rather minimal and at no time is enough developed so thatremains

an interesting story. On the other hand, their treatment is totally wrong, since they want us to believe that

the film does not give importance to the spectacular scenes, trying to prioritize the intimate. The downside of the matter

is that the spectacular scenes are the best of the film, and for that not all, and the intimate is solved very badly

not being credible in any way. n moment, since the love story is deflated on all

sides to be stuck to shoehorn and poorly explained. Then they try throughout the projection to be natural

and make us see that those two are in love with each other. For this they use long sequences that look like

pure postcards that negatively influence the rhythm of the film making it bored. The

best of the action scenes is to discover the skills of each warrior, whichme

incidentally remindedof the X-Men, but that's it. In fact some of the sequences are confusing and one does not know

much. In addition, there is no time to get to know the characters a bit since they are taking them out of the way at

lightning speed. The visual effects are more or less acceptable, but they do not manage to hook or fascinate as

Zhang Yimou's films do, for example. Apart from the happy plot incongruities, since if

many of these guys can almost fly and move quickly, what for? How do they take a horse with

which they go slower? And on top of that they set up a scene of equine persecution. What? they are giving

supersalts, man! The actors all walk around the film with hermetic faces, without exception. J ??

Odagiri is quite expressionless and his interpretation does not have the force it requires. Yukie Nakama is very pretty

but as an actress here she leaves a lot to be desired. The fact is that the actors all seem to be reluctant, as

if they did not trust what they are doing, and I would not miss it, because getting involved in such a production must have

been exasperating. A very bad movie that also has a whiff to second category film in all

aspects. I do not say B series so as not to insult a type of cinema that has left me with very good mouth flavors in

fantastic productions. Ten Shimoyama has shown himself by creating a film for quick forgetting. We will have to wait for

other options in this type of cinema and I hope that they will not be late.

" 0

" One of the two or three favorite films of this chronicler and the most acid look that the cinema has written

about himself. Of necessary revision for greater jlbilo of the soul. Joye cin���fila.... superb sample of

human genius

Anyway1. "" It's still wonderful, right? And without di���logos! "" The story of Sunset Boulevard (the titlebeing

heresuperbly imposed, The Twilight of the Gods, the original English is masterful) is narrated by a

dead man which we see in the first frames floating in a story pool of a Hollywood mansion.

Joe Gillis (William Holden) is the voice-over that narrates his own death to us the story of awriter

second-rate, food for debts, who accidentally takes refuge in a diva's mansion.cinema,

Silentalienated, nourished by nostalgia and psychic in its decadent loneliness (Gloria Swanson). The twilight of

the gods is a treasure for the devoted collector of images of the S�� Optimum Art. To Scarlett O'Hara swearing with

a handful of dirt in her raised hand, against the ocher horizon, swearing she would not forget to starve or Rick

of Casablanca with the French inspector consenting the beginning of a great friendship while a plane leaves in

the fog, we add to Norman Desmond (immortal Swanson, incredible, prodigious) down the stairs to be

stopped by the police between flashes and spotlights . Like a diva in a film festival. Before we saw a shot

of removing his hat (Billy Wilder always went out with one): a caravan of police cars

approaching the mansion n with that voice over narrating: "" Yes, this is Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California. It's

around five in the morning. It's the homicide brigade, complete with detectives and journalists.

They have reported a murder in one of those huge houses in the 10,000 block. It can be read ineditions

the evening, they will say it on the radio and it will be seen on television because an old star is involved, a great

star. "" The voice stops before his body, in the pool. Never before the cinema had dared to tell us

the ending with so much crudeness: the protagonist is the dead man.2. "We did not need di���logos. ��� We had

faces! "" Wilder had, in the words of William Holden, razor blades in his brain. The same agreed to

bring the film afloat, which was born silenced and recorded in secret. The director misled Meyer, theproducer

almighty Hollywoodof Metro and glamor, telling him it was another, and with another argument, the one that

was being filmed. The reason comes from the very transgressive nature of the film and its

carnally homicidal purpose, almost cannibalistic. It narrated the decline of the silent cinema and was primed in an ugly and bloody way in

the Hollywood modes, in its pathetic codes of life and in the stagnation of the film industry, which

preferred Noa risk not for the sake of political correction and the pleasure of the never too demanding public.The

wording of Wilder and Charles Brackett perverts the cl�� structure Physics of cinematographic writing. Maybe for the

first time so bluntly. It is not only the fact that it is narrated by those who already know that it has

died but also by the will to talk about cinema within the cinema and to speak with bitterness, eagerly, without

hairs in language. This metalworking, formidablely explained afterwards by the Coen brothers at Barton

Fink, is reinforced by the successful inclusion of heavyweights of the silent cinema, generous loans, for give more

verismo to the counted. There is Erich Von Stroheim (mythical German director of the film Avaricia, 1927) and Cecil B.

de Mille (adoptive father of that first cinema that left the laboratory to flood screens , that here makes

of himself, how not, with his natural and curious way of dressing, high boots and gestures of hunter in a safari

). Salted of fatalism, the gui��� n is pure black cinema or black cinema lightened with a high-level Greek drama

, although Wilder lightens some of the themes of one and the other and convinces himself that perhaps a veryportrait

impoliteof Hollywood , which he knew well for his stage as a screenwriter, could not be suitable for the film to

have the approval of the bosses. His daring is to slap the Classic Hollywood, aristocratic and fetishdeterred

and Wilder is notby pulling repertoire also classic and aristrocratic and so we attend angame

astonishing cardwith Buster Keaton as chief of cards or the aforementioned Von Stroheim or De Mille. The sordidness in the

narrative or the continual appeal of flashback, a novelty in the usual way of telling things in the cinema of the

time, gives the film an artistic tone: as if Wilder had noticed that the material, in its hands, could

revolutionize the History of Cinema. There is nothing harsh about Norma and Joe's relationship: the splendor

of the diva, her belief that that shine still beats, and the failure of the scriptwriter (another gui���o to the mediocrity

of the mercenary screenwriter of the worst films of the Metro itself at the time) never acquire anentity

authentic, solid. Norma is a victim of the technology (then the video will kill the radio star, but

that's another story) and it is secluded in a mansion: it is tied to the old bovines with their famous films,

smears with all the oils of the world. Cosmetics, makeup, informs us of the true disorder of

Norma Desmond: it is not the cinema, it is not the abandonment of the noise of the flashes and the clappers, it is the time, the

unplayable, that is the true cause of his madness. The years have devastated his sanity. Live with whom her first

husband and who is now the perfect butler, clinical and efficient until drunk. The arrival of Joe, who

represents the outside world, uncovers his dormant yearnings to green the fugitive fame, the noise of the flashes

and the clappers, the time maybe recovered.3. "" ��� I am still great; it is the cinema that has become small! "" The

twilight of the gods, together perhaps with Citizen Kane, is the film that most bibliography It has aroused. Wilder

wanted Greta Garbo, but already retired, refused the offer. Mary Pickford, another silent glory, demanded more of

the bill. I wanted a biopic to use and a film about the sunset of an archetype. Mae West, that lizard-born

male, claimed that she was younger than Norma Desmond in the gui���n. Gloria Swanson, pushed by George

Cukor, was chosen. The transition from the mute to the sound led her badly and she retired to live off the succulent

rents appearing in theater, on radio or in the new queen, television. For Gillis, before Holden,

Montgomery Clift paraded, claiming that his fans, legion, would not forgive him for flirting on screen with a

crumpled grotesque. Fred MacMurray, liked by Wilder, was rejected by Meyer. Gene Kelly did not see a

recognizable style movie in his dizzying career. William Holden was not considered by the director a

competent actor. Even in a magazine he attacked him frontally saying that he was a mediocre actor of series B,

but he ended up accepting and surrendered to his superb interpretation. But among all, it is Gloria Swanson who gives

dramatic support to the film: the one that keeps it intact, who has recorded in our film memory hisface

stretched, his exquisite crazy gestures, the glamor and the pathos, the sublime madness and also forgotten love.

Bette Davis would have been a fantastic Norma Desmond, I say. The repertoire of gestural nuances of the

Swanson is the usual inventory of all those silent actresses, who say with a grimace what later

needed two verbs and nine adjectives. His perfect tics parade has gone down in film history.4. "" Fuck

you "" A curiosity: The twilight of the gods had a private pass prior to its distribution. It is natural.

Louis B. Mayer, the Metro boss, approached Wilder and said: "You, you bastard, you have

discredited the film industry. He has dragged her through the mud. He has bitten the hand that made him

someone and also gave him food. They should tarry it, feather it and throw it out of the country. " Wilder just said

, "Fuck you." Another: Wilder's first idea was to make the film begin withbody

Joe Gillis'sin the mortuary, under the s���bana ,. talking. He was convinced by Buckett, his alter-ego in

writing, that this was going to cause everything to be taken to chacota.Addenda or postscript or what was missing: only

by the imposing descent of Gloria Swanson down the staircase When it's going to be stopped it's worth the movie.

That image lingers in the memory of this writer as the blue sky or as the moon cut out on the roofs of

my house. We know, on top of that, that he has killed maybe so that for the last time the spotlights will look at it and the flashes of the

journalists will blink like bullets. I read that all the reporters in that scene were not actors, butreporters

authentic. And then there is the formidable dead man, the parlanch���n cad���ver, who gives in his parliament a repcido rebound

of healthy iron���a, of clean rawness. 2.2o 2.230, The twilight of the gods will be the film that was in 1950

and that was tonight when I had the absolute pleasure of revering. And they go ..

" 1

" With an ending and a totally predictable plot development, the film's acoustic tone only

emerges from the spectacular falls of the characters.

With an argument more used than a public w���ter (with perd���n), the film presents the problems that

arise when a couple marries and their respective Children are forced to live together. The problem in this

case is aggravated since it is an exaggeratedly large family (the mother has 10 children: 4 more biological

adoptees and 8 father). The conflict of coexistence is evident.remind you of the plot of many Spanish

Does not itseries such as Family Doctor or Los Serrano? I do not know in depth the panorama of American series but

I suppose that it is a recurrent argument in fiction when ideas are lacking. With an end and a

completely predictable plot development, the film's chemical tone only emerges from thefalls

spectacularof the characters or the pringue of the same with liquids of disgusting appearance. And if that were not

enough, the film is full of topics (like that of the Chinese or Japanese daughter obsessed with

photography) and scenes that remind other films like the naval captain who educates his children with the

correctness of his profession present in ("" Sonrisas ylgrimas ""). This rectitude of the father clashes with the

educational freedom proposed by the mother. The boys unite despite their differences against the common enemy: their

parents, and organize a strategy to separate them. Perhaps the only emotional scene that is worthwhile is that of the

lighthouse that develops when the film ends (I do not follow so as not to cheat the end to anyone) since the rest are

a series of sequences that rush sharply into a predictable and sweetened ending.

" 0

" Juan Antonio Bayona, aided by an exceptional godfather, Guillermo Del Toro, has directed a very effective

horror film, supported by an exquisite production and a somewhat hackneyed, but solid, script by Sergio G.

S���nchez.

It is the "" hype "" Spanish of the year. Before debuting in our country, he has already achieved the favor of American criticism and

industry (guaranteed distribution and remake), and will also be in the fight for the Oscars. And

we are also talking about a horror movie, which is a first film. "Is it really for so much

'The Orphanage'? Well, in my opinion, yes. Juan Antonio Bayona, aided by an exceptional godfather, Guillermo Del

Toro, has directed a very effective horror film, supported by an exquisite production and a gui� Mann somewhat hackneyed

, but solid, by Sergio G. S���nchez. What counts brings us back to stories already told, of course: Laura

(very convincing Bel���n Rueda) returns to the orphanage where he spent his childhood with Carlos (sober Fernando Cayo) and

his son Sim���n (sweetheart Roger Pr���ncep), with the intention of opening a residence for the disabled. Very

soon, Laura will discover that the past of the orphanage lurks, and even threatens, her own family. As the film progresses

, it is not difficult to remember 'At the end of the stairs', 'Suspense', 'The Others',' Poltergeist 'or

' Amityville ', and even some other variant of the subg���nero "" enchanted house "". The great thing about Bayonne and S���nchez

is that they do not deny the commonplaces of all these titles, but use them to enhance an atmosphere

that little by little becomes dark and terrible. Laura's struggle for her family is told with gusto, and with a

brilliant technical invoice in every way. To make matters worse, Bayona manages to succeed in the tough task of

putting fear to the viewer without resorting to the viscera or the girls-in-the-shirt-with-hair-rowdy-crawling. In

'The Orphanage' the ghosts are shocking for what they do and for what they have done, and it is quite a success

the way they are introduced to their small world. The rest of the ingredients are � at the height of the

circumstances: magnificent picture of ���scar Faura (a veteran in this of terror), excellent music

by Fernando Vel���zquez and spectacular Artistic direction and sound by ������igo Navarro and Xavier Mas.

And it is that sometimes please the viewer is a matter of money, yes, but also attention to detail. "The

Orphanage" is presented as one of the best proposals in Spain. ���olas (and horror movies) of the season. Film

genre, yes, but not bad cinema. Not much less. An 8.

" 1

" The film is quite long, and until it makes its surreal appearance (the best of the film) Jack

Sparrow becomes a bit heavy.

The third part of Pirates of the Caribbean is a close (���?) Worthy of the trilogy, it answers the

questions that were left in the air in the second part. The show and the fun are guaranteed,

thanks above all to the great performance of Johnny Depp, who with his unique style makes the pirate Jack Sparrow one

of the funniest characters I've ever seen, only for him it's worth watching this film, although in some

moments it can be a little childish. Totally opposite is the performance of Orlando Bloom, as expressionless

as ever, it is clear that his presence only serves to delight quinceañeras and fans. The film is quite

long, and until he makes his surreal appearance (the best of the film) Jack Sparrow becomes a bit heavy,

then the story takes place with a frenetic rhythm and the plot becomes somewhat confused and entangled, as

also happened in the second part, there comes a time when you do not know who is betraying who ,N, or what

characters are in one boat or another. You can really enjoy watching this film, although it is clear that it is not

a great movie and that there are really absurd and pathetic scenes, like the wedding on the ship.

" 0

" It's a pity that the title is not more than a title. It would be a best-seller. I had the chance to see Manuale d'amore, an Italian comedy that is triumphing despite being a

modest and very simple film. And it could not be more predictable: the phases of love represented in several

stories. 1 .- The love. Perhaps the most complicated to narrate, develop and treat because there are so many

ways and reasons for fall in love as people; so many ways of reacting as ways of being. In this case, choose

the arrow. A boy who has no luck in life knows by chance Giulia, a beautiful girl. Go

after her, try to meet her and in that attempt many things change in your life, but not by chance. A

beautiful story, the most idyllic. And perhaps the hardest to believe.2.- The crisis But what happens when the couple

has decided to take the step and get married? What follows the beautiful phase of falling in love? Although it is not amoment

desirable, the next step is the crisis, in which the defects are already beginning to overcome the virtues. Love

begins to dress with affection or even a minimum of respect and it can be considered that the decline of thebegins

couple. How to solve it? Two very simple: go ahead and try to fix the thing (with many

solutions as ways to fall in love) or cut for the sake of health. If you opt for the first, the most logical thing is that you

will commit 3.- Betrayal Many couples choose to move forward, but not precisely fixing their

situation, but by inertia they pretend that nothing happens. But there comes a time when someone looks for something

outside of marriage. And when it is discovered, it arrives? 4.-The abandonment Although it does not have to be necessarily because of

betrayal or infidelity. You may fall in love with another or another. And what do you do? Do you kill yourself? Are you going

ahead? When you realize you've started chapter 1. Obviously the film is a thousand times better, it's

narrated with a lot more grace and it's a perfect example of how to make a good romantic comedy with

economy except for the gui���nL���stima that the title is not more than a title. It would be a best-seller. But it would be

one more, because for this, as for many other things, there are no formulas or manuals that are worth. A

pity?

" 1

" A beautiful love story regardless of the sexual choice of each oneMany of the great love stories of all times in both literature and cinema revolve,

mainly, around couples who, possess Pordos by a love and a passion sweeping, they are forced to

stay separated according to social, political or social conventions: Brokeback

Mountain, the new work of the Taiwanese filmmaker Ang Lee tells one of these stories, which revolves around two

people who, faced with the impossibility of assuming in front of everyone what they feel for each other, process

their feelings differently. The point that lovers in question are men is a mere detail. It is

obvious that a romance between two Cowboys, iconic figures of the American cinema imaginary, would be something

difficult to describe, however, the beautiful script of Larry McMurtry and Diana Ossana (inspired by the short story

by Annie Proulx) transforms this obstacle into a story in which the relationship of the two characters is told

in a natural and sensitive way: hired to keep a flock of sheep in the High of themountain

Brokeback, Ennis del Mar (Heath Ledger) and Jack Twist (Jake Gyllenhaal) are taken to isolate themselves from the world for a

few months, having only the company from each other. Initially reserved (especially Ennis), they

establish ties gradually, first becoming friends, confidants afterwards and, to the surprise

of both, lovers. Once this connection is established, the cowboys initiate an impossible romance that, going through

decades, will become more and more tragic depending on the conflicts between two temperaments. so

different. The film portrays the relationship of Jack and Ennis as something more than a simple sexual desire: imprisoned in

realities that are hostile, the two men face their encounters espor�� Doctors as opportunities to

relax and feel happy, complete. Married and converted into parents, they exchange

confidences about their marital problems and about other heterosexual encounters. Fleeing stereotypes that

can degrade the characters, Ledger and Gyllenhaal offer fundamental actions for the success of the

narrative; Like Ennis, Ledger maintains a position that is always tense and constantly closed, as if he

were eternally defending himself against an attack that may come at any moment. Introspective and

repressed, he barely has difficulty expressing his feelings, brutalized by a miserable existence and

by abandonment, Ennis finds protection in silence - even when he speaks, his mouth is hardly opened,

as if that represented a Dreadful effort. Thus, the intensity of what he feels for Jack represents,

for him, a blessing and a curse: on the one hand, with the cowboy he feels free to express himself (though not

very much), for another, the burden of guilt and fear provoked by an environment full of prejudices transforms him into a

tormented figure for what he is feeling. Jack Gyllenhaal, meanwhile, plays Jack Twist as a

person frankly more emotional and willing to accept (and express) their own feelings. When he realizes

that what he feels for Ennis is sincere and is love, he does not hesitate to suggest that they leave their wives and live

together, even though they run the risk of becoming victims of the violence inspired by intolerance. In addition

to this, one of the issues that fascinates me most about Brokeback Mountain is respect for the nature

of Ennis and Jack's relationship: while the latter is obviously gay , demonstrating sexual interest for other men,

the first never denies a similar attraction. The impression that Ennis falls in love with Jack for the mere fact of

being a man is therefore a mere coincidence. When he is far from Twist, Ledger's character never

seems to notice other men, being clearly more attracted to the opposite sex. On the other hand, the

only heterosexual relationship of which we have record on the part of Jack is that of his wife, who from the

moment that appears on the screen, presents a firm personality and that confers Jack the condition of the

passive half of marriage-even sexually, since the initiative to address it is hers. It is for this reason

that Ennis would not tolerate knowing about Jack's other homosexual relationships; for Ennis, that situation represents

something unique that only affects them, and discovering that Twist maintains relationships with other men would be a

blow too hard for him. Unhappily for both, Ennis is not able to assume what he feels

completely, and it is not only about the relationship with Jack, but also becomes inaccessible to the wife and

daughters. But not only the male cast is the one that shines in this film: the tortured wife of Ennis del Mar,

Alma (played by Michelle Williams) builds a character whose lack of culture andsophistication

intellectual, allied with the machismo of the society in which she lives, makes it impossible to adopt a morestance

determinedin relation to her husband's romance with another man. And if Anne Hathaway has the opportunity to

demonstrate her dramatic reach during a difficult conversation she has with Ennis by phone when her

character is forced to recognize harsh truths that always she tried to ignore, the veteran Roberta Maxwell,

like Jack's mother, offers a good scene in which she demonstrates her compression and her pain simply through

the eyes, in a performance that deserved (almost more than Williams) a nomination for the

Oscars. Enveloped by the beautiful instrumental soundtrack of Gustavo Santaolalla, who is as intimate as

the interpretation �n Heath Ledger, Brokeback Mountain also has a subtle but effective work in terms

of artistic direction: observe how, for example, the house of Ennis and Alma presents always sad colors and

oppressive, reflecting the gray existence of marriage, and as ambi���n the residence of Jack and Lureen is

clearly decorated with the likes of her, helping the character of Gyllenhaal to be shown as a stranger

in his own home. Elements like these help to demonstrate the sensitivity as Ang Lee's filmmaker, who

also succeeds in establishing a slow, contemplative rhythm, allowing us to get to know the characters with

the necessary calmness. Also it is necessary to say against him that Lee should have demanded a better makeup for

Heath Ledger, since his aging, in spite of the optimal performance of the actor, does not convince much that we say.

Leaving homosexuality aside, the love story told in Brokeback Mountain comes to be

universal. It is perfectly possible, for any viewer, to identify with the pain of the protagonists,

regardless of the sexual options of each one. That is why, in the list of greatromances

tragicin the history of cinema, a place must also be left for Jack Twist and Ennis del Mar.

" 1

" An original film in his approach, which however, it ends up entering too many commonplaces.

They said in "" South Park "" that Canadians have something special, and of course, it can not be otherwise

than coincidentally in Canada they have decided to make such a special comedy, although Edgar Wright already did Something

similar to "" Zombies Party "" (Shaun of the dead) where the duo Simon Pegg & Nick Frost have become

"" world famous "", this is another way of seeing things, and that is that , integrating the happy 50's in the

States with a tape about Zombies is an original way of doing things. It features in the cast Carrie Anne

Moss, the Trinity mythology of the saga "" Matrix "" , as mother of the protagonist boy, as well as the eccentric Billy

Connolly, here unrecognizable as Zombie, which gives title to the film (Fido), as well as one from the side of

countless films, Dylan Baker, without forgetting the appearance of one of the usual faces in thecinema

Cohen brothers, has Tim Blake Nelson, here is a neighbor who has a curious (and sexy)

escort. I think it's nothing short of curious, like, Andrew Currie knows how to integrate into thesociety

Americanof the 50's a group of zombies, as a companion animal and that after a few minutes of footage can

even appear "" normal "", with a start reminiscent of Romero's tapes, more specifically

his first great success "" The Night of the Living Dead "" In some sets the film comes to remember other

tapes of the genre, such as "" A hallucinating gang "" or " "You will not kill. to the neighbor "", as well as to "" pleasantville "" is that

the comedy component is much more rooted (and unoriginal) than one expects, and in some bars

one has the sensation n that what they show on the screen, although original (That undoubtedly), has a "" aftertaste "" a

"" already seen "". In short, an original tape in its approach, which nevertheless ends up entering

too many Common places; By the way, I understand that its premiere in Spain will be produced only on the

shelves of the Videoclubs, well, that will go directly to DVD.

" 0

" Cinematographic wonder can be, without a doubt, or perhaps next to those of Cuar���ny and Scorsese, one of the

best films of the year. Do not hesitate to see it, it will amaze you.

Just a year ago I saw the first film of, by that unknown moment, Mexican director Guillermo del

Toro. It was called Cronos, and was starring the great actor Frederico Luppi. It was a beautiful movie,

very poetic, and at the same time tragic and unpleasant. After several failures (all of them in Hollywood), the

director signs his best film, El laberinto del Fauno, which describes it more or less like the previous one. The ribbon

mixes perfectly. In reality and fantasy. And it is that it is located in the post-war Spanish, focusing on the

life of Ofelia, a girl whose mother is pregnant with Captain Vidal, his stepfather. When Carmen, the mother,

being about to have the child, decides to go with her daughter to the town where her husband is, so that his

future son is born with him. Once there, in the midst of the guerrillas between the vestiges of theresistance

republicanand the army of the captain, an unpleasant, cold and tense atmosphere will be created for Ofelia . And one day,

searching through the woods, she discovers a labyrinth inhabited by a faun who reveals a secret to her: she is, in

fact, a pricesa, the last of her lineage, to which her family has a long history. waiting time In order to

return to her magical kingdom, the child will have to face three tests that little by little will be better. But the

tests will not be so easy for Ophelia, since not only will she have to use her intelligence (and the help of the

book that the faun has given her), but also I will have to sacrifice his life. Meanwhile, in the mill where

Vidal has his operations center located, stories will be parallel to that of Ophelia, like that of Mercedes,

the captain's housekeeper, who apparently complies with everything that he sends him. The labyrinth of the faun is not

(as they say there) the Alice in the country of Spanish wonders, but a story��� totally poetic and

symbolic with true scenes of terror. What Guillermo del Toro wants to tell us, and there goes the message of

the film , ���is the following: reality��� is imposed before fiction. It is a moral, if it can be said,

terrible, but incredibly original if He knows how to treat well. And here del Toro excels, in creativity.

Each sequence has a meaning, real or imaginary, each fact has its beginning and its end, each scene

shows its darkest and brightest side at the same time. To represent this parallelism (fiction and reality), and

situating ourselves in the post-war Spanish, the excellent director of photography Guillermo Navarro has opted to

add Dark and gray tones to the scenes where the real world appears and, not leaving aside the fact

that the imaginary ones are really distressing and not very pleasant, has added more picturesque colors in them.

Attentive to the banquet scene, because there, all the colors are very typical of Mexicans (reds,

oranges, blues and yellows). And also look at the tones you give to the night and day. In the first, they

are all blue and orange, and in the second, green and gray. But first of all, to say that it is a film

excessively (without being bad) dark. Come on, like all the director's. The film deals with delicate and

difficult issues, such as post-war, death, self-satisfaction, the imagination of a child and

the evil in itself. And is that few directors are like Guillermo, that is, they have their own style to tell

these issues. It is really difficult to play so many at once and that you have a tape like this one, perfect,

balanced, with sense. Because of its great quality, I hope it wins the Oscar to which it chooses (best foreign film).

All in all, El laberinto del fauno is unforgettable, either because of its overflowing creativity and imagination for its

talented and impeccable direction. Within the incredible distribution, not two or three stand out, but all. Both Sergi

L���pez (Vidal), in the best role of his career, full of evil; Maribel Verd���, an actress that I have never

liked until now, which shows, apart from having acting style, that she does very well (attentive to the

forest scene); Doug Jones, playing one of the film's most difficult roles masterfully, the

faun; Ariadna Gil, who we hardly see her at all (but more than Frederico Luppi, who appears exactly 5

seconds), but we enjoy her precious voice; Alex Angulo, that great actor who has the face of a doctor; Roger

Casamajor, as the brother of Mercedes (Verd���), in a great role; and finally, the debutant (inroles

leading) Ivana Baquero, an authentic prodigy of ni���aa who would read the Goya right now. In short,

as you can see, del Toro has been surrounded by the best of Spanish interpretation. To finish saying that

this cinematographic wonder can be, without a doubt, or perhaps next to those of Cuar���ny and Scorsese, one of the

best films of the year. Do not hesitate to see it, it will amaze you.

" 1

" One of my five favorite movies. Of course, I have the word that more times I could have shouted

when I got excited "" Libeeeertaaaad "". They can take our lives, but they can not steal our freedom!

First of all, congratulate all my readers the new year that we just released. I hope this year will be at the

same level as last year, or that at least you still like what you read. Well, it turns out that we were

watching television programming, with several interesting movies when my half courier commented that

I had not seen Braveheart. After three shocks to the heart and half an hour of assisted breathing, I recovered my

senses. What half of my courgette has not seen one of my favorite movies? Quick doctor, ancylinder

extra-flatv���a dvd and three hours of needles probed.The film is about William Wallace, alord

Scottishwho lives during the invasion English makes a stack of years. Overall, he lives happily as a child

when life revolves around the nose and becomes an adult in a matter of six frames. The boy

recovers, but as life is very bitch, and the King of England more, things begin to happen that make

the piece of Scots this mount one of shitting the bitch lame, until finally screaming "" Libeeeeeeeee "" and

make me jump off the sofa to look for some kitchen knives and release I alone Scotland. I do not say m���s.Puff, the

hairs like escarpias are on me. I'm going to confess something to you, only to think about the film my vision becomes cloudy, my

distemper drops and an emotion runs through my body. The film has it all, everything I can expect from this

historical - blic - biographical genre or whatever you want to name. It is very exciting, with moments that give

goosebumps, like the first rebellion the incredibly emotional end. Other very dramatic moments, of

betrayal and broken love. And moments of action that with the current means is not enough to imagine something like that.

Well, and not to mention the use of the soundtrack photograph. I do not know, I do not have words to describe

a film like that. Resuming, one of my five favorite movies. Of course, I have the word that more times

I could have shouted when I got excited "" Libeeeeeeeeertaaaaaaaaaaad "". They could take away our life, but they will not be

able to steal our freedom !!! Besitos.PD: Look, Mel Gibson does not like anything, but of course heme

thrillsin this role���nPD2: O��� a day that has the scene in which more naked asses come out of the history of the

cinema, I do not know if it will be true. PD3: Lagrimones as the balan de ca������n furrow my face as I write these

lines.Moments to remember: When he enters the village on horseback as if to surrender andbegins

the rebellionalone.The two revenges of the two husbands.The demonstration buttocks (also called bald)

they do to the English. The meeting, in the middle of the battle, of the Irish with the Scots. When the

father of the ladybug pulls his lover out the window. The betrayal on the battlefield of the nobles. The scene of

the battle against the heavy knighthood, when Wallace says "" Hold on, quieeetos, quieeeeeeeee "" more than the

scene itself, for the photograph at that time. The betrayal in the castle of the nobles.first speech

Wallace's, referred to the enemies "" (...) will be willing to change a lifetime for this day, for an

opportunity, only an opportunity to come back here and tell our enemy we it can take life, but

it will never take away our freedom! "" Of course, with hairs like escarpies and the penis like asailboat

brigantinemast, when it is suffering torture and everyone shouts "" clemency "" and he, with the last sigh that

remains in his chest screams "" Libeeeeeertaaaaaaad "" killing the son of the king's whore.The final speech of Bruce "" In

the year of the Lord of 1314, Scottish patriots, hungry and in numerical inferiority, attacked the fields of

Bannockburn. They fought like warrior poets. They fought like Scotsmen. And they won their freedom. " Pufff,

tremendous.

" 1

" Unable to reconcile at a common point the overwhelming visual invoice of their careers, turns and loops with

the simple, not simplistic, production design of their charisma. ticos personas

In his brief but successful filmography, Pixar has managed to reach a complex balance betweennostalgia

livelyand new computer techniques. It is there, first of all, where Paradjically fails his

most ambitious and adult film base, Cars. Probably for being unable to reconcile at a common point the

overwhelming visual invoice of their careers, turns and loops with the simple, not simplistic,

production design of their charisma. ticos characters. An obvious error for a film that, in effect, seems to be

ashamed of itself because it does not find, or does not want to find, a single argument that defends the discourse

that it so vehemently proposes: the nostalgic look Logical to the Mother Street of America, to not only remember, but

also to recover the way of life that entailed the Ruta 66Cars myth is, therefore, a indulgent film

that fails to sublimate its initial material but, instead, pulls from Pixar Catalog; that is to say of

representative characters, double readings and gags of height scattered by a plot as disjointed as

excessive. Cars, which manages to shine intermittently, is placed on the edge of caricature and it only occurs to him to

resort to his impeccable visual pyrotechnics to disguise his defects, although unfortunately he accentuates them

more.

" 0

" Clooney and Blanchett have been criticized for the lack of chemistry between them. More than a chemistry problem

, I see it more as a matter of overacting in both.

Soderbergh's career is one of the most unequal in today's cinema. Oscarizado by Traffic and sold

to the? Mainstream? With the endless sequels of Ocean and its thieves, we now presents The good German, an

exercise in self-satisfaction that serves to pay tribute to the cinema he likes: that of fatal women and

hieratic men wrapped in convoluted stories of spies. The director situates us in a post-Biblical Berlin

where nobody seems to have a future and most try to erase their past. To this bleak panorama comes a

journalist -Clooney- in search of a great article and an old love? Cate Blanchett-. A murder and all

the clichés of spies cinema make up a rather diffuse argument that is likely to be lost if you are not

very attentive to the screen. Clooney and Blanchett have been criticized for the lack of chemistry between them. Morechemistry

than aproblem, I see it more as a matter of overacting in both. However, the couple does

what they can with impossible, typical and Manichean di���logos. Evidently it is a copy of the

interpretations of the hard Bogart or the fragile Ingrid Bergman but, moved to 2007 and with suchfaces

contemporary, chirr���an.The most positive aspect of the film is the impressive black and white photography

. Soderbergh has been working with the methods of the 40s, using a single camera and lenses of that decade,

resulting in an enveloping atmosphere and a Ethics worthy of the productions to which it pays tribute.

As cold as the war that came a few years later was the reception of this film in the last Berlinale. The

Americans have not backed it at the box office either, and since they do not forgive him there, it was completely ignored in

the recent edition of the Oscars. He competed for the statuette for the Best Original Soundtrack that

finally, got Gustavo Santaolalla -Babel-.

" 0

" The documentary is full of humor, admiration and an enviable rhythm. There are some exercises that are a perfect example of ingenuity and creativity against economics. And whensee them you

youknow you can say "" with maïa you get to do something with hardly any money. "" Brian Herzlinger is a 27-year-

old who can not find a job and since he was a child fan of Drew Barrymore. He was a member of his fan club,always

has hefollowed his career? and thanks to her name and a phrase that she said she is encouraged to make and document in

video, together with two friends, an apparent impossibility: to stay with her. Hence the title of this documentary: My date

with Drew. Well, in 30 days and with 1100 dollars (you have to see the documentary to know the reasons for

these curious factors of "" production "") will try to get to stay with her, so I will go asking

people who know people from the industry to get in Contact her The result? As in life, the

journey is interesting, fun, rewarding ... The documentary is full of humor, admiration and an

enviable rhythm. It is real as life itself and it is a wonderful journey and reflection of what many of us hope and

some of us achieve with certain initiatives. It also navigates between the waters of "" fanaticism "", of the

"" idealization "" of people who dedicate themselves to colorful and socially known works such as actors.

In some moments it is inevitable to feel embarrassed by the protagonist, who gets depressed by the

results he is getting and that allows something like knowing an actress to interfere in his life. ��, it

is a documentary full of life, of illusion but not of the one that can remain in good intentions. It is a reflection

of how little money, good friends and much illusion you can get things like this, which may be

questionable, but which are as personal as nontransferable. I partly feel identified because,

although I've had the good fortune to meet professionals that I admire, it never occurred to me to document it like

Brian. And that there are many, many and many reasons to do here something similar to what he has done. On his

website you can see more material. At the moment it is not published in our country, but if you look for it well in

cyberspace you can find it.

" 1

" Clark uses masterfully like other authors like Romero in his Zombie saga or Parkinson in Dead

Creatures the subgenus of the living dead to break molds based on fierce criticism showing that

sometimes horror serves also as a cinema of denunciation.

The late BOB CLARK who achieved fame with the chemical saga PORKYS directed at the beginning of his career

notable works of the most visceral terror in the SLASHER BLACK CRISTMAS and especially in this work teacher who happens

to be according to my opinion the best title of his filmography. Two great interpreters worried with his

great characterizations, RICHARD BACKUS of great television fame after its participation in several series,

REMINGTOON STEEL or Law and order. Accompanied by the always solvent JHON MARLEY who had just participated in the

sponsor. This work could be summarized in a camouflaged horror film about ZOMBIES when in reality it is one

of the metaphors m� Shining on the dramatic consequences of the Vietnam War. Young people who

arrived totally alienated drug addicts who never returned to be the same. CLARKuses

masterfullylike other authors like Romero in his saga ZOMBIE or PARKINSON in DEAD CREATURES the

subgenus of the living dead to break molds based on ferocious criticism showing that sometimes the

horror also serves as a cinema of denunciation. It does not lack moments of frank anguish or something of GORE,

some di� Bright psychologists, sick photographs with remarkable music help to create one of the greatreferences

cinematographicin the genre unjustly forgotten.

" 1

" This episode is modélic and emotive, cinematically splendid, it denotes avirtuosity

technical

Good animated film, directed by the "The Incredibles". "Here I am not sure

that he achieved so much critical-commercial success, but what doubt is that he has achieved a very dislikeable tape, full

of good gags and accurate dialogues, replete with universal positive teachings such as the attempt to overcome

a human being. Rodent, the trust between them or the love of work that one is passionate, friendship and,

above all, and following tradition, the love of the family, that despite the differences of criteria

among its members, it is always a safe resource to be helped in the penalties.is something long,

Perhaps itespecially for the children, that according to I could verify, they do not have enough pac (the smallest) for

endure a story that departs from simplicity and easy and forgettable gag. It is imaginative, agile, funny and

with dramatic elements, although do not stop at them, fortunately. Because the medical aspect is the one that

prevails throughout the footage, with a psychological tracing of the characters well measured and studied, as well as a

virtuosity in drawing the drawing, where funds acquire their own life. Perhaps, paradoxically, the best

happens in its first third, just before the protagonist arrives at the restaurant. His family life, in addition to

the attempts to steal food in the house of an old woman, are prodigious in their comedy. Then, everything that

happens in the restaurant, is regular in terms of rhythm, but never bores or fails to interest. That is why

"" Ratatouille "" is, in my opinion, a very estimable animation tape. ,N, who likes and spends a very enjoyable time,

with a few minutes, the preparation and delivery to the hard kitchen critic of the surprise dish he has ordered and

will depend on �� the future of the restaurant. This episode is modélic and emotive, cinematographically

splendid. which denotes a technical as well as emotional virtuosity that reaches directly into the heart.

" 1

" If it were not for the final half hour, we could be talking about a passable movie. After years of failure and without producers or directors betting on him, Sylvester Stallone has launched

a recovery operation with which he intends to recover part of the lost glory. The first step of this

process has been the realization of the sixth part of the wanderings. of the character that has brought him the most glory

: "" Rocky Balboa. "" Today it's hard to imagine, but in 1976 Stallone, an unknown actor and scriptwriter,

conquered Americans with the story of a A small-time fighter who has the

opportunity to celebrate the fight of his life. It was the film that the United States, depressed after the defeat

in the Vietnam War, needed. Stallone was nominated for best actor and original script at theceremony

Oscarsthat year, something that only Charles Chaplin and Orson Welles had achieved with "" The

Great Dictator "" and "" Citizen Kane "" respectively. The truth is that over time, these comparisons sound

ridiculous but that's how it was. For his return, Stallone has opted not to take risks and bet on insurance

taking back the scheme of the first Rocky, at least at the beginning. Indeed, the first hour is far more worthy

than one would expect and moves in a field not too far from the low budget independent drama.

So, with restraint, it's how Stallone gets the best moments of the projection. The bad thing is that in thehalf

finalhour he decides he has to please a certain type of spectator (��� Who can it please? I wonder

) and begins a caustic assembly, confusing and meaningless that completely eliminates all emotion that could

elicit the most that foreseeable outcome of the tape. If it were not for that final half hour, we could be

talking about a passable movie, despite its shortcomings, but its final size and disproportion the fact that onof it

topdoes not finish the story definitively (to do this better if I had not done anything) they make me move

the balance towards a clear suspense.

" 0

" Not only is it one of the great films of the year, the best cinematographic end of the year that we could

receive, but it is one of the best tapes of the last years, it hits you, it removes you, it moves you.

Alejandro Gonz���lez Irritu presents Babel, the third episode of the trilogy about the Human Soul, after

the excellent Amores Perros (Passion) and 21 Grams (P ���rdida) two tapes that with their own right have become

representatives of the best cinema of the last years. This episode tells us about Incommunication and

Compassion and again the director confronts his characters to the tragedy and connects them directly or

indirectly. In Babel an accidental shot is the central axis of the story, a marriage North American

formed by Susan and Richard (Cate Blanchett and Brad Pitt) make a tour of Morocco to try to

overcome a crisis, two Moroccan children play with a rifle and shoot a bus Hs hurting Susan,

meanwhile, in the United States the girl, a Mexican immigrant (Adriana Barraza), wants to attend the wedding of her

son that is celebrated in Mexico, as the accident happened in Morocco it has been impossible to find a substitute,

he risks crossing the border with the children in the company of his nephew (Gael Garc���a Bernal), finally in

Tokyo, Chieko a young deaf woman (Rinko Kikuchi) traumatized by the suicide of her mother, she looks for a man with

whom to lose his virginity and discovers that his father is being investigated since the rifle was his property. In

this film live five languages, English, French, Spanish, Arabic and as you see it in japanese version dubbed the

har It will lose its meaning so from here I recommend looking for the projections that are in the

original version. The origin.Babel not only closes a trilogy but it supposes the end of the relationship between two of the

geniuses that have emerged in recent years who are responsible for a way of making films that has influenced

other filmmakers, on the one hand, the director Alejandro Gonz� ������lez Irritu and on the other screenwriter Guillermo

Arriaga. The official reason, Arriaga wants to fly alone and go to the address, the unofficial,

reasonGonz���lez Iríritu has had enough of the scriptwriter that it demands to be present in all the creative process of a

film, from now on we will have to see how Gonz ruedalez Irritu rolls without the support ofscripts

Arriaga'sand how the screenwriter unfolds after the cameras. As in Amores Perros and 21 Grams, Gonz���lez

I������rritu returns to deconstruct the montage making the story a puzzle but to a lesser extent than in

his previous titles something that ends up being appreciated. But it still hits the viewer by showing how few

the tear of the characters, I will only give three examples but there are many more, Richard the character

played by Brad Pitt in the hospital with the life of his wife hanging by a thread and talking on the phone

with her small son and trying unsuccessfully to avoid crying, Amelia, the Mexican girl on the verge of

exhaustion trying to find help to cross the border with fatal consequences, and finally Cheiko

trying to maintain his first sexual encounter with the police who investigates his father. He also

shows that he is an excellent director of actors, if in Amores Perros we discovered Gael Garc���a Bernal and heus

showedthat the Canary Goya Toledo is a superb and wasted actress like few and in 21 Grams it made that

three magnificent actors of the size of Sean Penn, Naomi Watts and Benicio del Toro shone as they had never

done before, in Babel re���ne three consecrated stars such as Brad Pitt, Gael Garc���a Bernal and Cate Blanchett, with

actors practically unknown as the Mexican Adriana Barraza or the Japanese Rinko Kikuchi and with non-actors such

professionalas the Moroccan children is the cause of the accident, all of them do an extraordinary job,

Barraza, Kikuchi and an impressive Brad Pitt that overwhelms from its first scene, a simple

conversation of couple on the terrace of a bar, has never been better. The desparaci.n.De sde last

May, date in which Babel was presented at the Festival de Cannes, where Gonz���lez Iríritu won the award for

best director, he longed to see this film and I did not see the moment when it came to our billboards, now

that I've finally seen it I've realized that it's been worth waiting for because Babel is definitely not just

one of the great films of the year, the best cinematographic end of the year that we could receive, but it is

one of the best films of the last ���os, it hits you, it removes you, it moves you and it tells you that everyone on this

planet is interconnected and that in order to accept it we must learn to communicate.

" 1

" Apabullante ���pera ���pica, meticulous in detail, rich in readings, striking at a purely visual level: it will

go to the History of Cinema to open a new market, a different way of understanding entertainment in

the 21st century. And it is admitted that this clerk is pledged and that thehypothetics enter into his considerations

predictablebecause he is dictated by the emotion that inevitably seizes him.

Confined to sporadic outbursts of Gladiator-type mass consumption, the peplum, the epic cinema of Romans or

adjacent civilizations has always had swings in its popular diffusion, small crests and large ca ���das,

although when she triumphs (like the Spanish woman when she did what they said), she really triumphs. 300 is the pitch of

the season and not only raises the usual adhesions or repulsions in those who usually give written testimony

of this farndula that is the cinema but awakens lively bar conversations, sometimes incendiary,

purpose of its benefits and its limitations. In this sense, 300 fulfills what its very cleverclaim

financiers: that everyone, whether or not they have read something from the tape, has heard or not something about its content,

goes to the cinema, leave the bitches and come out with an overdose of virile, muscular and tense flesh, and let no one

think that this putting me in shirt of eleven varas or in tribulations filogay, that even in that they have wanted

some to look for arguments to this piece of film (we already begin the disembowelment) that should not stop

seeing any moviegoer and it does not matter if he comes out excited as Vikie the Viking or sad as Buster

Keaton in his good time.300 narrates a battle: basically (with small subsidiary plots) what counts

is ���so, the savage onslaught of a huge and invincible Persian army on a fist her ���ico of Spartans

that in number of 300 make courageous against that unconscionable des numerical proportion. The fundamental question,

which makes 300 look like no other film ever filmed, is its pioneering character in a certain type

of cinema that extracts from its surroundings its formal material, its way of revolutionizing an art that has always been

attentive to changes and that has never dispensed with technological innovations, whether it is sound as

color or dolby or 3D hortero. Then the digital language appeared and then the cinema, the seventh of the

arts, gave up its part of the cake and adopted (for the benefit of the public goloso) points of view and ways of

filming (and especially riding) that would amaze the spectator of the fifties when the climax of daring

in special effects were the tattered corpses of Jas��� and the Argonauts. The visual daring of 300

fulfills many demands and crown a director who already promised in the undervalued (the gore genre walks in a

fallen wreck) Dawn of the dead, Zack Znyder perpetrates a fantastic distraction that does not intend to investigate

History or pontificate on certain values ​​but to invent a series of events of annature

essentially epic: the Battle of the Passage of the Term���pilas , a corridor on the coast, a detachment of

thrown out men of self-sacrificing spirit and vocation of martyrs and a mastodical representation of the enemy

in the form of a flood The discourse of the film is not flat: it contains an exacerbated tone of military harangue of

unequivocally patriotic message that will enchant the Yankee reservist and the spectator accomplice of all the

nationalist iconography to use, but also can be extruded readings of a less cliched ideology to

primitive and crude fascism that seems to derive from the film and which many critics intone as an

irrevocable character of Snyder's proposal. I refer to the addictive staging, to its feverish

concatenation of scenes of a vigor out of the ordinary. If we look at the film as mere entertainment (withoutattention

payingto its cultural background, without looking at its fidelity to history, without establishing unnecessary games of

contemporaneity), 300 is an absolute joy, a gap in the cinema that comes, a sort of point and

so that the hard core production in Hollywood know what to expect and, henceforth, do not skimp a dollar

on the invoicing of Films of this nature where modernity is splendidly combined (own c���mic

Frank Millar's) and a certain pulp aftertaste, an honest tribute to all B series literature and to the

rewarded bibliography. It is a story in which Miller dives to outline his history of Spartans and Persians, of Le���nidas (a

great George Butler) and Xerxes (a mannered Rodrigo Santero). Whoever wants to delve into other aspects, has

material in which to get lost. 300 condescends to forge a new genre whose name we would not know here to present.

As if we were saying a digital baroqueism supported not only in a hypnotic plasticity but in a very solid

gui���n (when the argument seems to give so little) that it has even a magnificent, literary,voice-over

captivatingthat seems to recite the heroic course of the brave defenders of Sparta in front of the hordes of

Barbadians who intend to invade it. In the light of today, 300 acquires a meaning Relevanten relevant, we have already said.

One can consider that the Spartans are the supporters of what has come to be called West or

Europe and that Xerxes and his Persians on the backs of elephants, rhinoceroses and other mythological bestiaries represents the

intromission Deln of the Other, of the enemy, of those who come from outside and pretends that we will be denied the future by imposingus

their present on. All that is very good. It is necessary to consent that the cinema elicits these and similar dialogues, but

there is also the incomparable grace of cinema as Entertainment and then 300 is a work of art, awork

writtenof art at the beginning of the 21st century. Equal art, like human language, adapts to the times and is

supplied with its signs to reform its ideology and face with certain solvency and with possibilities of success the

future. The choreography of the combats is of absolute beauty and this writer is not a friend of fights on

screen and has never enjoyed a scene with abundant minutes where they give each other smash. Here,

for once, everything is submitted to the utmost dictation of a script that one believes completely, lacking in importance

that what is counted is recognized as veridical or we understand that what The only thing that Snyder intends is to adapt the film (and

adaptation) to Millar's c���mic, which in turn adapts an episode of the story thatgraphic art

Herodotus collects inhis Book VII of Hellenic History. And then Greece was the World. 300 lacks modesty: it does not

require concessions to orthodoxy. There is blood (which dances in the air as if

choreographed to the rhythm of the lances) and there is a rudimentary sense of violence that has nothing to do with

concepts of violence that we have been acquiring, almost without wanting to, by pure cin���filo spirit, by the hand of

Tarantino, Boorman or Stone. This is different: we gain our consent with just investigating the

mythological nature of its plot. It makes no sense to seek ethical compromises on the foolishness of violence and

all that so sensible and so good to see in these times of political correction (apparent, of course) when what

we have planted on the screen is a reading (one more) of a classic episode that is read in thetexts

Latinwhen I studied BUP

" 1

" A late love story ��a, accidental and forbidden. Better said, self-defense, which may be the biggest

difficulty you can find.

I had been told that if I did not consider Brokeback Mountain a love story, I would not like Wishing to love.

Before this categorical and ominous sentence, someone with whom I agree (surprisingly) intastes

cinematographic, recommended me this film fervently. I already had in mind to see some of the much venerated Wong

Kar Wai, but his enthusiasm (and because I trust his opinion) got him a certainWell,

preference.neither for one nor for Another. Desiring to love is a game of the director. At first, the precision

of the staging, the presentation of characters and the bases on which the story is going to turn are

put on the table in an exemplary manner, but until the 28th minute the film is confusing and goes around a lot without

giving clues. From a dinner, the film becomes subtle and of great emotion: playing love, rebuilding a love,

interpreting sequences of a relationship that was not warned and in which There were two victims who joined.

Both live a love caused by infidelity. But they have in mind not to be like the healers who have

united them. That will be a problem. As big as the love they profess. I can understand that this film is one of

those films that you hate or adore. And those who turn a director into a cult or a full-fledged author.

I stay in the middle and I do not pretend to praise or sink neither the film nor the director with permission of both

recommendations (who loved the film). I did not like the tics of the director, putting fades to

black every two minutes, performing sweeps in an intimate sequence, putting musical moments sometimes

meaningless and reminiscent of moments "" El Corte Ingl���s " "? Tics of style that took away much of what I

narrated. To your favor? It is a story of late, accidental and forbidden love. Better said, self-defense, which

may be the greatest difficulty you can find. If I have to keep something from the film, it is the sentence

of the female character: "" Paying attention you realize things. " "That's why some of us do not notice many,

even if we wear glasses.

" 0

" Quemada already, the Danny Ocean thief's franchise can not give more than: havoc, boredom,collapse

absolute narrative. In addition, remarkable moments, entertainment at times.

The Clooney & friends festival has already hit rock bottom: the artistic city hall of some of thenot enough

icons of current cinematography is. While Ocean's eleven was a pleasant entertainment, an updated

version of a seventies success where the Rat Pack of Sinatra and Dean Martin was composed to burst casinos

with a chic, glamorous and boring air . Sodenbergh slips in this digital contraption because his characters are

analogous. I do not write it: it is part of a dialogue of the film itself. The convoluted and intelligent suspense of the

first installment now becomes a simulacrum of suspense, in a kind of aesthetic and narrative orgasm that does not

come. That dissatisfaction hinders the good intentions of the tape, which shows with math skill the

hooks of the previous ones and improves (it was not difficult) the results of the second one. Internal speech: Sodenbergh

earns a few dollars to finance the indie movies, his whims, the enso���aciones that nobody sponsors.

Schizopolis or Bubble, which I have not seen, are (in his words) the cinema that he likes to do. This does not bother him,

but he lets himself be contaminated by apathy and, in the end, exhibits his mediocrity. As the footage progresses, we

reason that there will be no climax, that the theft will be a bluff, that the characters are tired and that the

actors look like a bunch of friends who have been placed in the middle of the tinsel. from the casinos and thelights

brightto pocket a few bitches while enjoying how much they love each other. The simplistic tone of

this divertimento does not obviate some brilliant moments (Matt Damon in the paper of narigudo secretary of a

Chinese owner of an air space or Clooney and Pitt softened before a program of Ophra in the television )N),

although the moments pitifully stored in memory are the bad ones: an Al Pacino without motivation, aplan

robberywithout grace or object, a mechanical and elusive Andy Garc���a .External discourse: Sodenbergh loses name.

The food cinema that Clint Eastwood or Steven Spielberg or Francis Ford Coppola have always done can also

be represented here. Sodenbergh can afford these industrial outbursts, but his serious cinema, the onenothing to write home about

he likes, is also.

" 0

" Brick is a work deflated by its budget shortage and its adolescent cast, which gives the tape

a sense of artificiality that (at least) confuses and confuses.

Why are the main characters of the black movies of the forties so tall? Why did not

their directors opt for young people without hair on the chest, facial acne and easy laughter, or girls with smooth

skin, a waistline without cracks and a raqu��� experience? ethics I suppose the essential reason is that the public who filled the

rooms at that time was equally mature and interested in finding beings with whom he could identify.

Of course, those were other times, and the film noir was in charge of exorcising the fears and hopes of

a skeptical generation marked by the war. Thanks to this, today we can enjoy a g� Mythical genre that has

had more than worthy continuators, especially in the Nouvelle Vague and in the American neo-noir of the

nineties. La Nouvelle Vague endows black cinema with spontaneity and narrative fluidity, as well as freshness and

everydayness in its staging. The di���logos and the scenes are street, and their youthful characters,

faced with an aging society that do not understand or want it. From the skepticism of the generation between

wars we passed to the rebellious existentialism of a generation that sought its place in the world far from the map

provided by its adult conservatives. Today times have changed. Theaters are populated by teenagers

looking for their dose of tits, romance and good special effects. And they no longer look for places alien to their environment

where they grow (the advertising that overwhelms them always prefers them young) .Brick (referring to the bricks

of hero���na that The Pin makes) inspires us the memory of the evolution of the black genre (and of thehard-boiled

Asian, with its urban gangs) that always tries with effort to reinvent itself in more or lessformulas

successfulbut Without remission, they return us to their sources, making us snort: "Again it will be!", good!

or ���am��� I liked those of Bogart or Tarantino! And it is that, according to the promoters and admirers of thecinema,

so-called independentthe greatest success of this young director Rian Johnson's prime work lies in having

placed a genre designed for adult characters in a context of California teens playing to be

terrible mafiosi, dead girls or clever detectives. All very apparently postmodern, but seasoned with

a very classic script: detective (occasional) in search of (his) lost girl, femme fatale sensual of dark

intentions (crazy for shooting the detective ), fearsome mat yn and eccentric mafioso boss). The characters are

cartoons of animated drawings, which only in a few moments manage to take a more solid form. Almost always

when they appear on stage the day starring a solvent and content Joseph Gordon-Levitt (how I

remembered Fele Mart���nez in Thesis!) And that mu Eeca expressive eyes and conspirators called Nora Zehetner (seen

by the H���roes series). The others are to throw them to the sharks.it was precisely this amateurism

I supposethat pleased the public of Sundance (Special Jury Prize) and Sitges (Citizen Kane Award for best

new director). And it is that Johnson manages to create a sensation of closeness and freshness at the expense of a guide prepared with care

, although accentuated by the lack of budget (the scenarios are scarce and repetitive). What we have left

(I'm sure we'll soon know) is to think that this filmmaker would have made a larger budget and a

more adult story (in all senses). Brick is a work deflated by its budget shortage and its

distribution adolescent, who gives the tape a sense of artificiality that (at least) confuses and

bores. A pity, because his intimate scenes (the discovery of the corpse in the tunnel, the calls to his

girlfriend, the meetings with Nora Zehetner) promised what eventually becomes a puzzle seasoned with

endless pu���etazos. Even so it is a success (typical of any postmodern product) to offer an unusual collage

that combines black cinema with characters that still swarm through the institute (in fact Johnson film��� at school

I attended of small), despite seeming so theatrical and forced. Discovering adolescent roles that do not

fluctuate between thick humor, prefabricated terror, or pastry romance, is almost a miracle that should

be protected by UNESCO. I suppose that everyone who sees Brick will be �� hoping that Johnson willmake us enjoy

soona warmer and more black work than this (and perhaps without so much wasted testosterone). Apparently

has more than proven resources. In process is what seems to be titled The Brothers Bloom, anoir

triangular, with two brothers (Adrien Brody and Mark Buffalo) and an unreliable companion (Rinko Kikuchi, the

excellent deaf and dumb Babel). The cast completes the always great Rachel Weisz.

" 0

" It is very complex that a film about the holocaust does not hit ourfiber in one way or another

sensitive. well, 'The last train to Auschwitz' does not get it.

Directed by Joseph Vilsmaier and Dana V���vorv��� and starring Gedeon Brukhard, Lale Yavas, Lena Beyerling,

Juraj Kukura, Sibel Kekilli, Roman Roth, Brigitte Grothum, Hans J���rgen and Ludwig Blochberger among others, The

last train to Auschwitz (Der letze Zug) was a winner at the last Bavarian Film Festival. The film situates

us in the middle of the Second World War, in 1943. The Nazis They want to clean Berlin from Jews definitely.

More than 70,000 have already been deported from the city. In April 1943, a train withleaves the Grunewald station

688 Jews to Auschwitz. The trip lasts six days. In the train begins a fight against heat, hunger and

thirst. In their despair, some try to flee; among them, Henry, Lea and Ruth. But time is short and

Auschwitz is approaching more and more. From time immemorial (cinematographically speaking) the Holocaust has

been one of the cornerstones when it comes to removing consciences in the world of celluloid, being focused

from a sinf� Den of perspectives and offering us great gems like Schindler's List or The Great Dictator, to

name two examples sufficiently distanced both chronologically and conceptually. In fact,

historical revisionism, in general, has given rise to a large part ofoverproductions in

the majors'the golden age of Hollywood. On the contrary, the ab (use) of The same theme may well have the opposite effect

to the desired one, and an excess of productions centered on the same event may well dishearten the

viewer, something that, in a totally different context, is occurring in these same moments with the

fantastic adaptations of superheroes or videogames. In fact, in the last few years there have been a

lot of films about the Holocaust, from the aforementioned Schindler's List, to

The Pianist, Life is Beautiful, or much humbler productions like The ninth day, AmÃ «n, The sinking or The

gray area. Unfortunately, the last train to Auschwitz is not even remotely , to the height of any of the

previous ones, resulling a somewhat nondescript product not by its own staging - more than two hours

inside a train - but by the little substance of its interpretations. Thus, in spite of the extreme

agonayaynic suffered by the Jews crammed into the last train to Auschwitz, and in spite of the

reiterative flashbacks that pretend, on the one hand, to entertain history and, on the other, to humanize still

its protagonists, its history does not come to be captured despite the predisposition of the spectator himself: neither Henry,

nor Read, neither Ruth, Albert nor Gabrielle have their own faces, none of them comes to shake us despite its

terrifying historical context. So, the last train to Auschwitz consists of two hours something tedious,

repetitive and lacking in nerve, except for certain moments in which irremediably the spectator

must feel the affliction of its protagonists; But the truth is that the film does not use cruelty,

nor tension, nor politics.

" 0

" I recover the confidence that I had lost with Gangs ... and The Aviator.Scorsese has returned. Impressive, your best work from One of ours. Rhythm, tension, casquer���a.Es

trepidante, spectacular, has a masterful interpretations (huge Wahlberg) and even old Jack

goes over the line as he did not from Mars Attacks! Atenci In the montage of the movie, asmoves the

the friendcamera Martin, and the prologue and the outcome. I recover the confidence I had lost

with Gangs at once. and The Aviator. To see and review and see again. A movie lesson. The best thriller of the year. ���The

first Oscar as director to the director of Taxi Driver, Goodfellas or Wild Bull? A piece of 9.PD: I would

still have to digest it a little bit more, but my SERIOUS IMAGINARY PROBLEMS have put me in a booth and

as I write these l��� lines, three big guys, with a mustache and a southern accent (from America) shout behind

me. Add a shitty keyboard and, Tach���n !!!!!, I piro for home. Greetings to all.

" 1

" A bit lazy but that compensates with its duration, which is appreciated at a time when even thebeyond

announcements gotwo hours. Recommended for listeners of? Talk to talk?

It seems that there is an axiom in the world of cinema that says that all the films in which Robinof the films where

Williams comes out with a beard are good, and allhe leaves without a beard are "" The bicentennial man "". In "" Voices in

the night "" Williams has a two-day beard. The film tells a fairly simple story. Aradio host

gay, Gabriel (Robin Williams), in whose program he reads his own stories, receives the manuscript diary of

a fourteen-year-old boy, Pete (Rory Culkin), detailing the sexual abuse he has suffered during his

childhood. His social assistant and new adoptive mother Donna (Toni Collette) has recommended it as therapy, and

Gabriel is so impressed by the book that they establish a telephone friendship. But one day theboyfriend

announcer'sbegins to suspect that Donna and Pete may be the same person, so Gabriel starts the

search. The brief gui���n, with very few characters and that barely reaches the hour and a half, is in general

quite careful. Even though she dresses in a thriller, mona stays, and unless there are very specific moments, there is never

a feeling of restlessness or suspense due to the destiny of the protagonist. That yes, always manages to maintain

interest until the end, which is a bit disappointing, mainly because it is not too

conclusive, and since the film does not look much like clamoring for a sequel, we do not understand very well what

is the objective of such an open ending. It is true that the film is based on a real fact, and I suppose that for that reason

it will pretend to be faithful to it, but it's about movies, not a newscast. If Michael Moore does what he

wants with reality, I do not know why Patrick Stettner could not have taken a license or two to

give him a little more packaging to the last minutes of "" Voces en la noche. "" The visual style of the film is

much appreciated. Very relaxed scenes and a very careful compositions, especially as regards the

treatment of light. So much so that as the minutes go by and the plot is getting

a little darker, so does the lighting, and there comes a time when it seems that all

planes are illuminated by a match. Sometimes it is suggestive and others, simply, you do not see a

cucumber. The weight of the film falls almost entirely on Robin Williams and Toni Collette. Williams fulfills

perfection; very far from "" Patch Addams "", his interpretation is quite restrained and also the character is

quite adequate, with that air of fragility and those kilillos that he has taken with his detoxification cure. .N Toni

Collette, on the other hand, despite not being a bad actress, has a very complex character, and who

also has a somewhat ridiculous denture, which takes away from her realism. interpretation. The

film also Sandra Oh is passed, but neither islong time and looks much tampoco.En end, a somewhatfilm

flojillabut compensates with its duration, that is appreciated at a time when even the announcements go beyond

two hours. Recommended for "" Speak to talk "" listeners.

" 0

" The staging and the narration, although they may not be too personal, manage to reach a

level that surpasses the telefilm.

I do not believe that anyone in his life has not seen a TV movie of Antena 3 in the afternoon. I, confess that I have

done it more than once, and of two. We could say that they are divided into familiar and "psychological" thrillers ordramas

romantic. Among women I think it would have been better to be a telefilm than a film destined for

theaters. And why? Well simply because it has all the characteristics of one of those clunkers, although yes,

with good points and convincing interpretations. If these two aspects lacked them, I would include, at least

me, the film of the debutant Jon Kasdan in the list of these telefilms. At the beginning, we could

distinguish that difference, with that scene "" break-up "" with a beautiful Elena Anaya (who only intervenes in

this small sequence and in a flashback where only kisses). This scene is well filmed and the

dialogue is minimally good. But it is from there that the thing starts to sway. The chicho

becomes the absolute protagonist, and travels to his grandmother's house to change airs. There he meets two

women: a mother and a daughter (two lovely Meg Ryan and Kirsten Stewart). And I suppose that the scriptwriter also

falls into the temptation of knowing other techniques and letting the script swing. This is where you see that

insecurity as a whole that contains the film and that lack of narrative force. Also note that sometimes younot

doknow if you are watching a drama, a comedy or a romantic movie. I think one of its most serious faults is

not knowing how to find a gender group. A Among women can be described as irregular, insecure and

lack personality, but we can also say that it is a film, at times, pretty well told and with

some interpretations, not excellent, but remarkable . So I'll go to the point and tell you what I

thought was best. As I say, the staging and the narration, although they do not end up being, at times,

too much. personal, get to reach a level that exceeds the telefilm. Examples of good planning

would be the two scenes of kissing (the rain with Ryan and the night with Stewart). Both manage to have a

convincing emotion and that, the truth is that it is appreciated, because many other films do not get it. And

finally, talk about the actors. Adam Brody, the protagonist (many you have seen in the OC series), plays his

role correctly, without more. It offers what we want, a performance that is neither surreal nor pedantic. But what

stands out, at least for me, is the appearance of the not-so-young Kirsten Stewart, in a role that

you get fond of thanks to an interpretation It's really successful. Meg Ryan, who I suppose went through, is the

"" key "" role of the love story, although her appearance is grateful for not having seen her for a������ os,

because its interpretation is not nothing of the other world. And it is rare that in a type of film so the performances

become the best of the set. In short, we have a failed film, generally speaking,

although with correct interpretations that make us stay A bit in the memory (during the next

two hours after leaving the cinema, of course). A���ny so, it is too irregular and almost always lacks

personality. If you have not seen it, you do not have to waste your time. You will not be disappointed, but you will not like it

either. It is, simply, bland.

" 0

" ���Y t��� Who are you? It is a maudlin, tearful and excessively sweetened melodrama that hits the

bottom, but fails miserably in form.

Semantically there is no great difference between the two words, but it is not the same to be opportune as to be

opportunistic. Life is full of people and opportune things, although unfortunately moreabound

opportunists. Films also happen to the movies, there are some that come at the right time to

open or continue a debate in society, and there are also some that take advantage of certain circumstances,

good or bad, to procure a better welcome or commercial career. And that a film like "And who are you?"

, whose title already gives many clues about the development of it, the world premiere against

Alzheimer's is a tremendous and blatant bad taste. It is fair to tell a story about one of

the worst evils of the last century and above all, of the victims who suffer and suffer, directly or

indirectly, But it is also true that a story of such deep depth and transcendence should be told

with more tact and sensitivity, and not turned into a cheap melodrama. Very little is left of the Antonio Mercero who

directed La Cabina, and if his previous film, Planta Cuarta, already sinned softly, in ���Y t��� Qui���n Eres? he throws himself

into puerile sentimentality and easy lgrima. The film lacks dignity and respect and it has the

sensibility and the sweetening of Mercero. The script is full of absurd situations and common places, with

some stale dialogues and even more stubborn characters. The whole family of the characterstands out negatively

of Cristina Brondo, with the character of the father at the head. Obviously the actors are all very well, with

a Manuel Alexandre and Jos��� Luis L���pez V���zquez who perform a brilliant job effortlessly and despite

the gui���n. Well Cristina Brondo, capable of holding on the same plane with these two monsters of

interpretation.��� And who are you? It is a maudlin, tearful and excessively sweetened melodrama that hits

the bottom, but fails miserably in form. And Antonio Mercero should have shown something more

respectful before addressing a topic of such magnitude as Alzheimer's patients and their families.

" 0

" In Jungle 4.0 we see Willis again in a T-shirt and covered in blood, but he does not convey the sensation

of losing the game with the bad guy, something that makes a classic first film of the

saga.

The 4.0 that have added to the title of this fourth installment of The Crystal Jungle (a very curious

"" translation "" Die Hard, by the way) says clearly that On this occasion, the bad guys who will have to

face the good of John McClane are very dangerous hackers. Or, worse yet, dangers-the very last terrorist hackers.

"Cojona, right? Well, the truth is that, in the end, they turn out to be dangerous, veryterrorist hackers

bad, imbecile. And of course, if the bad guys are idiots, then we have to put the batteries if we want to see Bruce Willis

staining the blood shirt. So, we have McClane against the bad guys in the car, McClane against the bad guys in a

helicopter and the classics (thanks to Cameron and his Risky Lies) McClane against the bad guys in hunting. The

excess is such that half an hour is easy to feel saturated with action and disconnect the ability to wonder,

so that the film goes through the screen without transmitting too much to the viewer. The first time that McClane

tells assholes the super bad guy is tricky. The second, you sketch a half smile. From the third

you start to think that the bad guy is called the second name Asshole and that's why he does not flinch or anything. That happens

by choosing Timothy Olyphant for the role of bad of the film, making it clear that the absolute protagonist

is Willis and that not even his alter ego should overshadow him in the film. I imagine the screenwriters at the moment

they thought that a cake fight in a car that hangs dangerously inside an elevator shaft would be

the bomb (although we have already seen it in Parque Jur���sico.) in the first two installments, in fact). The only

problem is to explain how the hell a car ends up in the hole of an elevator that is next to theroom

controlof a gas station. At that time they called the writers of Perdidos, who explained that

they simply do not explain anything and that it works. And so the thing has remained. In short, this fourth installment

of the series is completely dispensable and there is very little that can be saved. If anything, we must recognize that the

issue of hackers have not taken badly at all and although what they do must be completely impossible, it seems

feasible and that if it scares a little. For the rest, the film is tedious, with little rhythm and excessive in all

aspects. That they give me back the money.

" 0

" Finally, after seeing that our young critic has left the room trying some steps of claket

that did not manage to coordinate, according to him because there was no ice, we will qualify the movie very good.

It is definitely a good movie, with a great message to give, but not for the little ones, at least not

for children of 4 years old. That yes, to them it keeps them entertained and pending of the screen. In this occasion

the creators have managed to tell us a story that comes to move the most adults, and that entertains

the m The children, who see incri- dulos as their elders, have a lump in their throats. As for the

technical details of the film, highlight that mixes real images with those of animation,

succeed in such a natural way that barely parties who are interleaved in perceived the one and the

otras.No me I missed that Prince decided to give his songs to the soundtrack of the film. Anyway,

I think that this initiative has more marketing than altruism, although the intention counts. Finally,

and after seeing that our young critic has left the room trying some steps of claket that did not manage to

coordinate, according to him because there was no ice, we will qualify the film as very good.

" 1

" Effective film that narrates almost with historical rigor the last days of a decrepit Adolf Hitler in a

bunker in Berlin.

Effective film that narrates almost with historical rigor the last days of a decrepit Adolf Hitler in a

bunker in Berlin, it is curious to see many of the gestures that we have seen in historical reports. Richly

interpreted by Bruno Ganz, the director Oliver Hirschbiegel who already directed the hallucinatory "" The

Experiment "" uses for the film some bluish tones and they become softer towards the end of the

tape, a roster of excellent actors and a soundtrack that although brief is fully satisfactory.,

Perhapsthe only downside that I see to the tape is its excessive duration, 150 min. and its linear development and a little slow,

with some situations that do nothing but repeat itself during the footage until the satiety (although, in a

war, to be honest, it is not that there is much creativity). It calls me powerfully the attention where

the total eccentricity of Hitler arrives, to which he gives equal one hundred that 80 and although completely decentralized he

manages to take to good part of his men ahead. !! If this man was a little

asshole! In short, an excellent film to see the other side of that mean being that was Adolf Hitler.

" 1

" Without detriment to foreign glory, worthy example of an autonomous thriller (almost) with enough attractions

to dazzle the public and earn a place in the desolate ranking of the gender in Spain.

The national thriller has little baggage for us to avoid this strange piece in our cinematography

that has value for its own sake and for what it represents. Far from the formal scarcity of other products of the

genre, Daniel Monz���n (a critic turned director, the man crossing the mirror) clings tocinema

Hitchcock's, his elegant and elegant plots, in connection with Patricia Highsmith's literature and with themovies

series Bof the sixties (there are the implants and the evil of the film with Gui���os to the bad guys of theseries

Bondor a vulgar Fu-Manch���). Nor does it lack the grateful look to Ray Bradbury and the greedyproduction

Americanof the 50s with psychotropic threats and terrifying theories about alienation. The Kovak box It is

a fast-paced film, paused when necessary, embastada with discreet cin���filos notes and intoned as

a macabre symphony whose end (in a very well used Cuevas del Drach) deserves to go down in history

of the home cinema for the simple reason that we are not, at all, accustomed to that whiff of the end made

in Hollywood. The doctrine of Monz���n is entertainment, a meticulous sense of filming as a vehicleentertaining

for transmittingcontent. And the tape, complete, is enjoyable not to be able to. It is cracked by the

gui���n artifice, which sometimes gives the impression of being very forced, although the screenwriter (himself

Monz���nnext to Alex de la Iglesia scriptwriter, Javier Guerricaechevarr� )A) crush all the excesses so that

everything flows smoothly, with a great classic film packaging. Not in vain did I start quoting Hitchcock as

Monz���n extracts from the esteemed chair of Don Alfredo the twists and turns, the monumental plans (the

scenes of the airport, the rush) from the camera to the vehicle that crosses the dangerous roads of the coast

) and, above all, the mechanics of fascination, that is, the way in which film runs to its

end, which may seem (also) a forced point, but it does not fit another except that we entered in a

purer version sci- fi, nothing relevant. Timothy Hutton, Luc���a Jim���nez and, above all, David Kelly (grandfather

Charlie'sin his chocolate factory) are great, although the role of Silviia / Luc� ��a is blurred, not

explained with solvency If we are aspiring to win a territory in the thriller, it is not something to pretend (

taking into account our relaxation in everything that smells of risk) sneaking and carpet and fanfare in

science-fiction. Time, there is no doubt, there will be. While to taste Spanish films like this, so pleasant in the, so enjoyable

formal(I insist). A commentary of the director about Gloomy Sunday, the song that the tape

interprets Billie Holiday and who bases the whole plot: "" It's a very special song called Gloomy

Sunday and it has an incredible legend. It was written in 1933 by a Hungarian, Rezs��� Seress, and then he committed suicide. In

the following years, it was a banned song on US and UK radio because they

said it was a song that induced �a to suicide. In fact, it was found that many suicidal people had

heard the song before taking their own lives. It is a really sad song, with something very

special and mysterious in it, which is one of the most versioned songs in the history of music. I have

tried to make the film have a tone very similar to the song, that is, dark, disturbing, but

with a great buried romanticism ".

" 1

" The best thing without a doubt of the film is Ver���nica Echegui and Dani Mart���n, as well as the aesthetics that she presents to us,

including scenes in discotheques, overprints of the sms sent by the protagonists,meetings

tunning, and the discovery of Madrid by the two friends.

Bigas Luna returns to the screen with "" I am Juani "". History of neighborhood in which the protagonist is

anxious to overcome, because there comes a time in her life when she needs to take a radical turn and change everything

that surrounds her. Logically, their environment, marked by marginality, contributes logically to a father who wants to

expropriate the house, who is often drunk and jokes, a mother who decided to take care of her husband and start

a family instead of having tried his luck as a singer, a boyfriend (Dani Mart���n) who, despite going out of his way for her,

does not take away the fact that he is a gulf and puts his horns on it. To all this we must add that Juani (Ver���nica Echegui)

works in a supermarket and that what she really wants is to be an actress, and unless she does something her life is going to

become a reflection of her mother's, wasting the few opportunities he had, and with the consequent

remorse of not having tried. After deciding with her best friend and leaving her neighborhood, to move

to the capital, Juani will realize that getting her dreams is not going to be as easy as she thought. to. This is what

Bigas Luna presents and tells us, that is, supported by a style typical of the world of tuning, and of the most

youthful, where often the protagonists They can be confused with prostitutes, due to their outfits, and

where the boys have fun doing their highly modified cars. Then it presents us with a

world away from all this, where reality becomes harder, and we are shown the difficulties to reach

our goals. The best thing without a doubt of the film is Ver���nica Echegui and Dani Mart���n, as well as the aesthetic that heto us

presents, including scenes in discotheques, overlays of the sms sent by the protagonists,

tunning meetings, and the discovery of Madrid by the two friends among other things.

" 0

" Malograde (again) of doing height biopics. This remains in a caustic inventory ofwomen

naked, colors and various hallucinations. Will it be the painter's syphilis or the director's artistic drunkenness?

Klimt is a dispassionate visit to the history of recent art: an amateur trip, with no sign of lasting

memory, the mind of a color obsessed, the refined eroticism of nymphs surrounded by gold and flowers.

There is almost nothing memorable in this colorful telefilm that comes to the screens with the claim of John Malkovich,

credible, although excessively lost in a character too excessive. Raoul Ruiz establishes aset of lenses

very original: he makes an unusual film, subjugating, concise in his involuntary brilliance, but leaves an

impression as ethereal as the limbo of those paintings on�� �ricos and flambeados de sue���os.It presupposes an interest for

the character that then derives in an interest for what the character represents: eroticism, runaway sanity,

the presence of people important in that convulsive beginning of the century (Melies, for example). The academicism, the

orthodoxy and the formal correction that Klimt fled from is reflected perceptibly in the absence of orthodoxy and

formal correction of this film that will be neglected. many hopes and open, I do not doubt, others, plethoric

wishes to know more about the Austrian painter because this biopic is poor in information and rich (

disgracefully rich) in flourishes of biographer in love with his biography. Misguided, Ruiz dresses

in a forced intellectuality that tries (and manages to half) to recreate aperiod of thecentury history

transcendent and relevantXXin social and artistic aspects. Certain incontinence in the use of thenude

femalecan Induca induce that it is an erotic film with properly documented biopic tubes,

but there is no show or effort in the merely sensual scenes or in the expression of a time or in the

explanation of the reasons of a genius. Filis who devastated this painter's talent has also disassociated the

cinematographic pulse of a director in possession of convincing material, valid to raise a tribute to

Art. , of which the film is scarce. Malkovich is not the good actor we know either: as if he understood that this is not

the film for which he is going to be remembered. He looked for sumptuousness and left smeared with tedium. I

stayed, in the field of life of painters, with the crazy red hair or Surviving Picasso, who without being anything

of the other world, explained with moderation and interest the life of the artist malague��� or with an apotheosis Anthony Hopkins.

Malkovich, oblivious to this world of Belle Epoque transmuted into gray palette of mutilated emotions, survives,

like Picasso, but no more. Addenda: and the women, as if they were Japanese models, have a shaved care of the

pubis that in nothing corresponds to those times. (but, come on, this is a very personal assessment.)

" 0

" I missed a pirate movie experiment that was a commercial failure at the time. .N Onlyis

the performance of Walter Matthau, who has great moments,saved.

With great enthusiasm that we prepared to see this film, my medium courier and me. Those of pirates are always

interesting, they guarantee you good swords and naval combats (the combats of the piratemovies

pornare nabales, hee, hee, hee), in addition to interesting arguments about treasures of incalculable value. The only thingbothered

thatme a lot is that I did not hear about this movie, but neither will one know more than

the other. The film is about a pirate of wooden leg and his faithful squire, a little chatty but effective

kid. It turns out that he is the famous pirate Red, who was given for dead years ago and who now returns. On his

way, he finds himself with an Aztec gold throne, which makes him obsess with persely chasing him to the

ends of the universe (more or less). I have read there , Roman Polanski took 10 years to make this film,

since no producer wanted to take it. They anticipated a tremendous commercial failure of it, as it

was. And it did not surprise me. One when you see one of pirates is expected a very different thing than what is this movie. The

thing is made with a sense of humor, with quite simp���ticas scenes (of blows and things like that), but in thepart

typical, it is very far from something good. The argument is very strange, with a fat lame pirate and a tendency to

cannibalism that makes him patochadas everywhere. No, I do not like the experiments here, we need a

bad-tempered, sober, and heartless pirate. Then I did not like the theme of the soundtrack, which does not hit anything with the

movies of the genre. Resuming, I extracted a pirate film experiment that in its ��� Little was a commercial failure,

rightly so. Only the performance of Walter Matthau, who has great moments, is saved.

" 0

" The spark is just as simple, the script is still very bad and therefore something has to change positively

if I liked - a little - more than its predecessor: Steve Carrell.

Already in Como Dios the humor that Shadyac offered was really childish. Besides, the script was terribly bad

and Jim Carrey was in his less graceful sauce. I do not know why this director was accustomed to shoot a sequel

that, let me say, was more unnecessary than many of those that have been released this year. ���Convert a

kind of politician into a kind of Noe? Go for God, a reason enough to film the mostcomedy

expensivein the history of cinema. The spark is just as simple, the script is still very bad and therefore, something has

to change positively if I liked - a little - more than its predecessor: Steve Carrell. He is the nucleus of the

function, the only thing that really supports this disastrous family comedy. Forgive me if I am passing, but

this film promised a lot and, the truth, has left me totally indifferent. Some will enjoy

some gags, but unless they recognize that they would not have the least grace ifdid not appear

Carrell. Quite clear examples would be the scene of the fish tank or some other chemical facet that puts to be

horrified with the animals. And if I had to say something else in favor of I follow God, it would be the spectacular

special effects that shine more than ever in the final scene (that of the ark sailing through the city).

Yes, that shows that the budget is outrageous, but this film lacks something, not personality,

but grace. It could have been much, much better. And what do we do now? Because if the most expensive comedy is like

this, I do not want to imagine how it will be the cheapest. Big budget, mediocre quality. How many times

will we have to hear this phrase in the next few years? And let's not forget the moral of the happy end, which could have already

been saved.

" 0

" The fleeting appearance of Chaplin himself as a dizzy waiter - a cameo of only ten seconds to the sumo -

does not even become the only salvageable part of this pastiche. Slow phone.

In The Countess of Hong Kong are few features, just vestiges of the great filmmaker who was Charles

Spencer Chaplin. In the beginning, in the entanglement of the open doors and the exaggerated escapes, or only in the gestures

of a correct Sophia Loren in her role; we find Charles and his genius. Comedy of situations, choral,

anachronistic and failed from every point of view; filmed with a certain dull color, as tired as the

gui���and the insipid unjustified cameos of the whole Chaplin family. Great faults in the montage,

unimaginable in an artist with the dedication and past of �� This, as for example that Sophia Loren (we said thething

bestaway from the film) changed from one scene to another not only of hairstyle, but of hair color ��� ?, revealing to us

a great artist in a stage , let's say to be good, senile. The constant fights - and the indifference - during

the shooting between the protagonists, accentuates the gloomy fame of the film. During a dance in the transatlantic,

the best phrase occurs: "" Pap��� says that everyone should be loved, except the Communists. "" The fleeting appearance

of Chaplin himself like a dizzy waiter-a cameo of only ten seconds at the sumo-does not

even become the only salvageable thing in this pastiche. Tel���n lento.Summary: Last film of Chaplin, also filmed

in England. This time in technicolor and cinemascope, with two glittering stars of the moment. Amillionaire

recently appointeddiplomat (Marlon Brando), he falls in love with a dancing cop in a Hong Kong cabaret

(Sophia Loren) during the course of the boat trip to the United States. Big box office failure.

" 0

" Staging with a classic accuracy that helps cause chills The prestigious magazine Premiere of the United States is about to publish the April issue, which will include In

a list with the 100 best performances in the history of cinema and the specialists and critics who

conducted the exhaustive investigation, they decided to give the number 35 to Philip Seymour Hoffman, for his

interpretation of Capote in the film of the same name. From this list were left out performances like

Marlon Brando for The Godfather, Ingrid Bergman for Casablanca and Clark Gable for Gone with the Wind,

however Phil came to 35th place, even over Anthony Hopkins for The Silence of the Lambs. That

size is the work of this actor in Capote.A film in appearance simple and cold, but that in the background is

only the necessary environment to narrate the obsession It corrodes little by little the character, until it is brought to the

limit, until, after so close to the fire, it burns. The action takes place in a small and quiet town in

Kansas, where the murder of a whole family, Truman Capote, author and journalist, read the news in a

newspaper and immediately moved to the scene to make an article for the newspaper The New

Yorker, little by little, he knows his inhabitants, to those involved and witnesses, even to the murderers with whom

he initiates a dangerous friendship relationship. Truman never imagined that his stay would be prolonged and that the

article will be converted. Ena in book, a book that cost 5 years of work, a book that changed forever. e the

way of telling stories and that today is a must for any library that wants to be

respected. So we are not looking at common and current biopic, Truman Capote's life is not narrated, from his

birth to his death, only this period of his life is narrated, in which he is immersed in the creation n what

would be his masterpiece, is the story of the creative process of his novel, A sangre fr���a, a painful process

that lasted for more than 5 years. And although through several dialogues give us a perspective of the childhood and

life of the eccentric writer, in reality the central theme remains his obsession and passion for the events and his

book, a passion that can be clearly seen behind the eyes of Hoffman, from the discovery of the facts,

to the suffering that lives to put an end to the book. As it is around the

protagonist, it seems that it is only essential for Phil to do his work, the staging

with a classic accuracy helps to cause chills and to follow almost with the same Methodism to Capote scene

by scene. Undoubtedly, a great job, which will be long remembered. Today I start reading A sangre fr���a, by

Truman Capote.

" 1

" Anyway. Entertaining cinema (there is no discussion here) that is forgotten with alacrity. Everything must be in the

vineyard of the Lord. If it were not for the popcorn ... There are

few novelties recently brought horror movies to throw bells on the fly by the announcement of another

product grown under the influence of Japan and equipped all the topics of the gender without missing

any. Press is not bad of solemnity. It is not good either. And mediocre will be an adjective that comes long

when you have left the cinema and think about cold quotimo have been released. It is not badly done, without being well

invoiced. It does not have a handwriting of bells, no matter how much the poster excites the bizarre image and the

idea of ​​metaphysical oppression. The actors are not brilliant. Not bad either. Mediocre is an adjective thatthem

comes tolong when you have left the cinema and think cold blah blah blah. The inclusion of a cybernetic threat

gives a point of novelty that comes immediately downstairs when the director (he may not have any idea

of the name and that he has no intention of finding out about it) starts to develop his story, which is

short, that he could to give in such a case that another would have fallen the task of directing it. ��� Wes Craven, Christophe

Gans, still delighted with the scares of Silent Hill? Entertaining cinema (there is no discussion here) that is

forgotten with alacrity. Everything must be in the vineyard of the Lord. Afterwards, I feel like compensating for the

error with a tape of more substance, one that sticks to the senses for several days and that does notus

abandon. Apocalypto, for this scribe, this year. O The labyrinth of the faun, to name aproduct

quasi-national. And in cinema of all the life Jezebel of William Wyler, but this is the good thing (the wonderful thing, thething

marvelous) that this vice has ours: to be able to compensate us of lost loves with old loves.

" 0

" Secret Games is a failed dissection of North American society. There are some situations in life that produce a curious sensation of something already lived, of d���j��� vu , as

if we were protagonists of a flashback, to use cinematographic language. The presence of Secret Games in

the 79th edition of the Oscars is one of those situations, since five years ago, the previous work of

Todd Field, In the Room He also had a prominent presence at the Academy's Annual Awards. In

Secret Games, Todd Field supports the homonymous novel by Tom Perrotta, who has also participated in the

gui���n. The calm and tranquility of a residential neighborhood is cut short when Ronnie J. McGorvery (Jackie

Earle Haley), a pedigree just out of jail, returns. Some neighbors, worried about the children, create a

committee whose objective is to stay alert watching Ronni, and try to throw him out of the neighborhood. Meanwhile,

the routine life of Sarah Pierce (Kate Winslet) turns upside down when she meets Brad Adamson (Patrick Wilson).

Todd Field presents us with a story that explores the hidden side of the lives that unfold in a peaceful

American residential neighborhood, lives full of lies, deceptions and broken dreams. The initial proposal of the

film, despite a disastrous narration in the form of a voice-over, captivates the viewer, with afirst half

very attractivehour. However, little by little the plot weakens, without taking too long to fall apart

completely. The script, in which there is not a hint of originality, which ostensibly, decays and

weakensquickly produces a great narrative abyss, in which the attention of the audience falls. �s of the viewer. On the

other hand, the characters are mere cartoons, flat, without motivation or ability to evolve. The rhythm,

slow, that Todd Field prints to the story and the duration of the tape are the elements that give lace to

Secret Games. b) Only the interpretations and a certain unhealthy and to some extent masochistic curiosity

keep the public in their seats. Kate Winslet does a brilliant job, as she has accustomed us with

great restraint and sobriety, an interpretation that has earned her her fifth Oscar nomination with only 31 years . For

her part, Jackie Earle Haley makes her character human, which is already commendable and worthy of applause. Patrick

Wilson makes a correct interpretation, while Jennifer Connelly, as usual, there is no one

who creates it. Juegos Secretos is a failed dissection of North American society, full of

hackneyed situations and Common places. Todd Field disappointed again five years later, proving not

to live up to expectations. As then, the only attraction of the film are the interpretations of

its actors.

" 0

" The Italian foal VI ?, stands as one of the most important products? Trash? of the billboard. Pure Z series that

can reach to attract their sympathies.

Falling eyes, sad look, crooked mouth and appearance, despite the years, and blows, still strong and good-natured.

Stallone returns to unearth from the pool of memories the fragile philosopher of film fiction. And

more than dedicating a mausoleum, his character is still alive and eager to fight, so he dedicates a monument,

himself, to the events and loved ones of the past. The fans of the "" Rocky "" saga are going to have a

good time. In his retirement, the double world champion of the heavyweights is no longer dedicated to dealing smacks

in the ring, but I am giving advice among friends, acquaintances and anyone who crosses their

path, even if it does not come to mind. He also tells his stories of the past over and over again to unknown

fans or clients of his restaurant, which if he comes purposely because it is included in the menu of his "" Adrian? S. "" And he

has his grace that a film that during most of its footage is filmed in a realistic and

street style is flashing fantastic looks until it fully penetrates the most incredible terrain. Duranteble during

its final stretch. When the legendary Rocky Balboa, almost 60 years old, holsters his shoes and gloves again

to put up with not only the guy in the quadriltero but also To give him a much younger andrival

undefeated, a vain and unpopular delivery machine called Mason "" The Line, Dixon, embodied by

Antonio Tarver (current and real middleweight champion), and who still had not hit the last of his

shoe. Never feel like it's over. For Rocky, combat it will help to leave behind the emptiness by not being able

to demonstrate again what one really was and is, already a son tontorr���ny and self-conscious by the long shadow of his

father. throw in the towel His formal daring comes to use the black and white,? Travellings? and

? zooms? fast; Broken images, aerial style or television realization, emulating a broadcast by

television. For this reason, and for the whole, "" Rocky Balboa "", the "Italian foal VI ?, is one of the most important

products? Trash? of the billboard. Pure Z series that can reach to attract their sympathies and to which, in its

decadent vision of the spectacle, it even comes to it as a ring to have Las vegas as the scene of the

final confrontation. The stairs of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, immortalized in the first Rocky, are the

object of a special tribute; and also the famous music of Bill Conti, and the "" Gonna fly now "", they become more

paused and melancholy, until exploding in their euphoria before the imminent arrival of the final fight. But I

stay with that old abandoned dog that welcomes the protagonist, played by Baskis, the same

property owned by Stallone; and with those close-ups of an aged Rocky, cap at the ready and perhaps defeated by

the years and memories. And little more.

" 0

" We do not know if future generations will discover any beauty or worship worthy innovation in this

potpourri of Kitsch styles, immortal classics and universes t��� peaks of the pop era, but at the moment it seems that itnot like that

is.

Now it is fashionable to make trilogy, which does not have to be neither good nor bad, but, at least, we are

clear that the third is the decisive one and it will depend on the value that must be attributed to said trilogy. More

still when the episode that is in between (The chest of the dead man) does not contribute much more than that of being a

bridge between the first and third part, the one that presented the true knot of history and which already

indicated that the freshness and simplicity of the first delivery could degenerate into a disjointed, unbalanced

and irregular "" show "" baroque. "Really" "Pirates of the Caribbean" ", as trilogy, is a trilogy about pirates,

seeing the result ?. Do not we also find an odd mixture between the romantic figure of the pirate and the

buffoonish caricature of the pirate? ���Exaltaci���no ridicule around the pirate archetype ?. And beware

when it is said that Verbinski's trilogy "" has resurrected the pirate genre "" (to begin with, the ""genre

pirate"" does not exist as such), for the baroque, the phantasmagoria, the humorous and not always fortunate humor,

the dyes of dramatic epic and others, are taken to such extremes in their third installment that there will be go

thinking of applying different and varied criteria. It draws attention to the carelessness and ease

with which many critics and commentators describe the franchise as "" pigeon cinema "", or "" cinema for

all the public "" . ���Cine entertaining ?. That was worth for "" The curse of the black pearl "". From "" The chest of the

dead man "" this has become something else. And now, in At the end of the world, attending to the

"" movements "" of the plot - which is made convoluted to the viewer's mind by the abuse of "" movements "" in

the story of the characters, not because the plot is complex - can anyone really believe that the 168

minutes can be "entertaining" to the average viewer, especially the adolescents to whomis supposed to be

the productdirected? No. At first glance, the trilogy of pirates becomes an unclassifiable expression

of the grossest operation of the mass-film industry, a desperate attempt to search the genuine and

original in a time when it seems that everything is already invented, especially in the field of family cinema,

entertainment, adventures. But that the result is unclassifiable does not mean that it is original, it can

mask a profoundly flawed product in its ultimate pretensions. Most important, the problem is the

mixture of textures, a mixture that does not respond to the needs and attributes of adventure cinema. Nor does it respond

to the needs and attributes of the public. Or is it that we settle for the four antics of the Sparrow buffet

and the visual delight in the battles and the suggestive power of some passages thanks to the successes in the

art design? rustic ?. Mixture that has no reason to be beyond a very specific pretension. Throughout

the 168 minutes we come across frames that almost refer to minimalist art, gestures and landscapes on���ricos,

Dalinian surrealism, at times it seems a film of experimental cinema. The schizophrenia that

Sparrow faces in the hell of David Jones is disconcerting, especially because it is not entirely located

in the context inherent in the character. It is true that a free pirate can do little or nothing with a ship settled

in a desert, without horizons and without being able to go anywhere. But we all know that Sparrow is aadventurer

lonelyand his schizophrenia can not be justified by isolation, since it is his natural condition. Each geek

can justify the scene to his liking, but - intuitively - the critic easily detects thatscenes

Sparrow'sin David Jones's hell (and why David's hell is supposed to be Jones is of that form and

not of another? Does it have something to do, in reality, with the character?) They are a "" short-stick "" capricious with the pretension

of originality in flag. In addition, Jack Sparrow has always been a buf���n, we have been saying it since the

first installment, but in those scenes the character is ridiculed, perhaps in an already excessive degree. The phantasmagoria is

still present in the The mythical motifs of the represented world, in this case, we see some suggestive images of

the souls of the dead wandering under the surface of the sea or pilgrimage on the boats, towards a hell of

Dante that here It has the name of David Jones. Elizabeth's father is one of the pilgrims to death, and

his farewell - the way he disappears from the story - can be shocking. The world of the

Pirates of the Caribbean is increasingly dark and sinister, it no longer seems like a fantasy film, but a sequence

of onionic passages in which, for moments, the disneyan spirit reappears. It is true that the on texturarica texturealready

wasin its predecessor, but here it accumulates almost scene after scene, including that final battle in a sea that is

no longer the sea, it is a spiral-shaped nightmare aqu� It is the ethic that rolls the ships that hold the

sea ​​adventurers in conflict, and the matter is not ballad, since the strange sensation conveyed by the movement

in Romrculo breaks with conventional schemes when filming battles ���picas.No lack of imagination

either in the scene in which the Black Pearl and its crew pass from the world of the dead to the world "" real " "

When the sun falls in the world of the dead, the ship is put under the surface, under the surface, to re-

straighten on the surface of the real world, when the sun is rising (it is such an original scene that

can be defined in writing, you have to see it, period.). As simple and evocative as it is suggestive and striking in the

visual expression of Verbinski. You could never get so much cinematic advantage from aattraction

disneyland. Then appears the goddess Calypso, trapped in mortal body because of a pact between the

members of the pirate guild, which turns out to be the lost love of David Jones.Barroquismo,mythologies

toned, circus humor, poetry��� a, surrealism, tales of the underworld, dreams on���ricos.���pel���cula of pirates inplan

classic?. If Michael Curtiz raised his head. The plot of "" At the end of the world "" is what we already intuited: the

final battle in which the pirates play survival against the new order of Lord Beckett. But it is not

so simple; on several occasions the characters go from one side to another, and the unattentive viewer can be

lost with so much movement. And what is worse, it is a movement not sustained on a plot basis (or,

if there are, they are poorly developed and consequently the viewer can not understand why Will Turner does

this now and then the other and then what more there.���cine of entertainment ?, bah) but on the need to

stretch the product to reach 168 minutes. Long-term blockbusters are in vogue (

Peter Jackson and New Line are to blame) and must be placed in the right size box according to themodel

industrialpredominant. The third one had to be defeated and it is necessary to give three hours of spectacle. Anyway.

It was predictable, we also ran into the narrative saturation: too many characters, too many variables,

too many topics introduced. There are so many situations and characters to be developed that no one delves into

them (being more precise, they do not finish defining their role in the scheme), just a quick outline to go

quickly and running towards the final half hour, the only space of the footage endowed with meaning andmeaning

narrative. The rest are badly explained incidents, for the most part that only make the function, as we have already

mentioned, of stretching the product. Fortunately, several of these events are not exempt from

inventiveness and imagination, from time to time we come across powerful images resulting from a splendid staging

, and the presence of Jack Sparrow, although perhaps in this third installment it already begins to be too

repetitive in its gestures and its forms, it always saves the moment and recovers part of the original freshness. These

same defects already occurred in "" The chest of the dead man "", and we discussed it at the time, but there they had a

pass for their episode-bridge condition. Here the noxious effect of saturation and the narration run over

it ends up drowning a large part of the content, and the consequences are more serious. However, in its favor, it must be

said that the successive "" betrayals "", "" movements "", "" changes in the side "", of the characters, respond to their

nature, or to the very nature of the pirate world: the pirate is selfish and seeks his own benefit. Here

nobody has scruples if what is involved is to achieve the goal, regardless of who is. Hence the

constant fluctuation of decisions and changes of course. The idea itself is coherent and fits well with that

pirate universe, but the exposure of the emotional motives and tones of the characters is so disjointed that it

ends up saturating the information that may come to the viewer This produces an effect; There comes a time

when nothing matters anymore and you just have to surrender to the visual spectacle to see how everything ends, but you lack the

dramatic force and a human display properly exposed. David Jones was a character that could

have taken much advantage, but his profile is blurred between the whirlwind ofdisorganization

structural and narrative. Orlando Bloom, who is supposed to be a decisive hero, shows that he does not have the charisma

to embody that hero. However, in the end, the trilogy closes. correct and logical way,

too logical maybe, because there is no room for surprise (curious is that this product pretends to be

so original in its mix of textures and instead is so little innovative in the conclusion of the story).

The truth is that it ties all the ends together and builds a decent finish for the main characters (

except for Lord Beckett, his ending is as cold and inexpressive as his bearing). David Jones will always represent

the eternal soul in pain of melancholy, the hell of the tormented lover: in his last moments of

life, he pronounces the name of his beloved before his body falls and he integrate with the sea, with which

the goddess of the sea Calypso had previously also integrated, and thus, in a symbolic way, the two

lovers meet in the eternity of the ocean Will Turner redeems the crew of the Dutch wanderer and

offers his heart in love to be the new captain and king of the seas. Elizabeth, a lonely heroine by

the seashore, will guard Turner's heart and remember her beloved as she watches the horizons and dreams

of pirate adventures. Jack Sparrow puts the factory. The final plane in which we see him go away in pursuit of the sun,

alone among the immensity of the sea and traveling on a small sailboat, with a map in his hands, thinking about

his next adventure (�� "Eternal youth?"), Is the exact representation of what has always meant and

has become an icon of the current cinema, beyond his gifts of bufÃn . In fact, one cycle closes and returns

to the starting point. There will be a fourth installment, who doubts it. Resuming, more than an unclassifiable product, "" At the

end of the world "" is a reflection of the current moment within the framework of the commercial film industry, which aims to

innovate by modernizing old myths and schemes through new formulas. But if we do not take care of the structure, the

vertebration and the narrative sense, no matter how good the ideas we have on the table, theproduct

final, with its bombast of means and elements, stagnates in the indefinite n, without reaching all

his goals (George Lucas committed the same sin in his new galactic trilogy, but wetalk about that another

'llday). Hence the decline of the Pirates of the Caribbean trilogy, which started very well and could be theequivalent

currentto what in his day were Star Wars or Indiana Jones. We do not know if future generations will discover

any beauty or innovation worthy of worship in this potpourri of Kitsch styles, immortal classics anduniverses

typicalof the It was pop, but at the moment it seems that it is not like that.

" 0

" Caf��� Solo? or with them, it is simply a pathetic rubbish written by the nephew of Agust���n D���az

Yanes. If this is the kind of films that the audience likes, it is completely normal that the same public

does not like Spanish cinema in general.

The effects of the famous poll that says that more than half of Spaniards do not

like Spanish cinema are still suffering. Something like this has a lot of interpretations, analysis and opinions, but it does more than

say a great truth, like it or not, we agree or not. There are people who think that Spanish cinema only

makes the same kind of films over and over again, crazy comedies and intimate and boring dramas. To

corroborate the theory of these people, is Caf��� Solo released? or with Ellas, who coincidentally won the Public Prize

at the last Spanish Film Festival. An award that last year won the remarkable Un

Franco, 14 Pesetas, by Carlos Iglesias. It has to think, ���eh?. This raises interesting reflections, because if younot

dolike most of Spanish cinema, and you think we always do the same, why? Are the same type of

films always the ones that collect the most box office? Perhaps the problem is more basic, and is that in general the vast

majority of viewers who come to the halls are opting for consumer products palomiteros andconsumption

fastthat by the rest of the proposals, be they Spanish, European, American or Asian. There are always

honorable exceptions, some interesting, fresh or original proposals that thanks to the word of mouth come well out

of the box office. Having said all this, those who are reading these lines should think

that the subscriber has gone crazy or something like that. No, what happens is that it is much more interesting to

write about these philosophical disquisitions than about the film Caf��� Solo? or with them. There is nothing good

that can be said about such a mess, except that with luck it will become a blockbuster, which will encourage

its investors to repeat in other productions. It is not even honest with the audience to whom it is addressed, since

it does not end up being the typical brainless juvenile comedy, but it has an important romantic background

that will provoke numerous defections . Needless to say, the gui���n, absolutely infamous, is full of dirty jokes

and bad taste that do not even have the least grace. At no time in the film is

even a hint of a smile to be sketched, except to laugh at the disproportion that the projectors throw up onscreen.Caf���

theAlone? or with them, it is simply a pathetic rubbish written by the nephew of Agust���n

D���az Yanes. If this is the kind of films that the audience likes, it is completely normal that the same

public does not like Spanish cinema in general.

" 0

" Extraordinary narrative, prosaic and poetic at the same time, in which fantasy and reality form a whole in

function of which the why of a tragedy, without justifications or superfluous moralities.

When the cinema is inspired by real events, it is common for the product to take on a simplistic and schematic aspect,

which means that the representation is limited to a narrative that emphasizes the maudlin or morbid aspects to the

detriment of penetration and reflection on facts of extraordinary brutality, which would be the

highest objective in an artistic creation that aspires - or at least, it should - to shed some

light on the incomprehensible aspects of human behavior. In "" Celestial creatures "", Peter Jackson gives a whole

film and effort lesson in what is undoubtedly his best creation. The torments and the innocence of the

pulsi��� In adolescence, they are exhibited by two female souls endowed with a characterization between what is

true and what is idyllic, between tenderness and the sinister, in a descriptive narrative of a relationship. of a

progressive love obsession between two souls that hatch because of their peculiarities and longings for

freedom, which clash with the puritanical morality of the New Zealand society of the 50's. The remarkable

visual rhythm, as well as a sober and quite devoid of exaggerated artifice, result in

a narrative fluidity that unites the tones and themes with enormous versatility: the mystery of love and sex,

generational conflicts, imagination as v�� �a to sublimate or subjugate the harsh reality , thetone

sarcasticwith which adults are often portrayed in front of a naked gaze on adolescence and

its vulnerability, the magic of fantasy in the face of the sinister desire to kill in order to achieve the

freedom of acts and thoughts. Life as literature and literature as a method to idealize

one's life. Heartbreaking story about two great and hypersensitive souls that degenerate into aact

criminal and macabreprecisely so that magic never ends, the fire of eternal friendship and love, or

rather, that fantasy and hope p��� He dreams of a superior life in spite of the threat of theworld.

adultPeter Jackson does not give up and ends his story without manique���smos or easy ways of any kind, without

using other words than those of the image of two souls who suffer the fear of loss and

separation, symbolized by a forced farewell after committing an act that will condemn them forever. Itus

surpriseswhen we hear news about children murdering their parents, and we tend to simplify by resorting to

explanations such as evil or madness. Cinema, in this case, expresses to us the contradictory dimension of the

human condition, the complexity that arises when feelings clash with reason, and ideologies

against ideas or dreams of immature minds; of how magic and fantasy, and love and friendship (the

luminous dimensions of life) can take us to the most sinister corners of existence. We are

angels and demons, "" Celestial creatures "", so vulnerable, that they end up forging their own hell for

wanting to win heaven. Extraordinary narrative, prosaic and poetic at the same time, in the that fantasy and reality

form a whole in function of which the why of a tragedy is explained, without justifications ormoralities

superfluous.

" 1

" Seldom do we find a film debut with as much life and as adult as Far from It, by Sarah

Polley. This is, without a doubt, the most beautiful and sincere film that has been seen in years.

Seldom do we find a film debut with as much life and as adult as Far from It, by Sarah

Polley. This is, without a doubt, the most beautiful and sincere film that has been seen in years and, considering that it

is a beginner in this direction, one does not do I admire it from now on for such a magnificent story

that has told us with really beautiful images, sad to the point of not being able to. And it not only covers the

subject of alzh���imer in a very mature way, it also manages to trap us in a small place full of

feelings, pains, passions and , above all, eternal loves. Under an amazing, polished and very convincing guide,

Polley portrays the life of two couples who distance themselves because of the disease. One is formed by

Gordon Pinset and Julie Christie, two monsters of the interpretation that give us classes of her with absolute

mastery. Two performances that reach pure realism, magic, incredibly transformed. The second

marriage is made up of Olympia Dukakis (impressive) and Michael Murphy (who barely speaks), two other

people separated by pain who are well friends, jealousy and romance with the other couple. These four

flesh and blood humans are the center of Away from Her, which also has a direction and guiding thatlittle

hasto envy Coixet, Bergman or any other inspiration. No Polley has taken into account, no

model to follow. A touching and unforgettable ending shows us that we have attended the biggest and least lacrimgenic

cinematographic event of the past year. And it is that the proposal of thedirector

Canadian, marked by a slow pace and that turns out to be an authentic retrospective of the human being, of

loss and eternal love, is still very intelligent. . Sarah Polley does not confuse terms, she knows what she does; is, in this sense, agirl

wiseand very to take into account over the next few years. This is a sensational, adult,

delicate film, intended for anyone who appreciates life as something not too simple, something to be

fought for. And I can not forget to repeat the absolutely perfect, masterful interpretation of the beautiful

Julie Christie.

" 1

" The film, only a quarter of an hour, becomes a real torture. Imagine, there is a moment when

the protagonist, the biker, jumps 90 meters along a helicopter ...

When I finished watching this movie, the truth, a smile of satisfaction on the face. Of course, the film

did not like me (3/10 speaks for itself), I just know that suddenly I saw a unique opportunity to gut a

film that no human being on earth has been able to like it. Next: "" From how Alex tears up

"" Ghost Rider "" "It is impressive as in just one word can describe all the facets of a film that should

never have reached the cinema screens. That word is. bodrio.I'm going to start by bursting the

plot, everything that some brainless could call "" plot turns "". It's not that I want to annoy you,just

Iwant to protect you against what could be the worst way to spend money. watching "" Ghost Rider "" TheDevil

oldkills the biker's father, the biker ends up with the reporter, the one who lives in the cemetery

turns out to be a ghost rider, in the end the son of the old demon dies because the biker makes him "" the look

of no-se-qu��� "", the biker gets to jump the helicopters, the biker does not die at the end, but if he keeps

"" the curse of the motorist "" " to help people. I think this will be enough for you not to see the movie.

According to the Wiki (Wikipedia), "" A film is a sequence of images. Photographic images taken with a

camera, and presented by a projector. Using a speed of image substitution higher than 18

frames per second, creates in the human eye the illusion of continuity, without interruption between each frame

due to the retinal persistence "", therefore, and unfortunately, to "" Ghost Rider "", you can (but

you should not) call film. Resolved this doubt. Let's talk about the film. Actually, I consider myself a person with

patience when it comes to watching movies, it's more, only in a movie (of which I will not say ��� his name) left the room

before the end of the projection of it. And the truth, with Ghost Rider, I had very little to take anot for nothing

nap. It is, from the beginning, Mark Stevens Johnson, responsible for the "" creature "", makes it

very clear that we have committed a Clear mistake when watching this movie. Pay attention to the death of the father with the motorcycle.

let's be fair nobody dies for that. Even the announcements of the National Directorate of Traffic are better shot,

better mounted, and of course, they are more spectacular. Another curious detail is the "" spectacle "" of the father and

son, which demons would pay to see an exhibition that they do even in the park of side of my

house? Well, as I said. Johnson's work is pathetic, it's more, from this moment I call him my favorite to

win the Razzie to the worst director of this year (and the next, and the next, and the Next.) Let's

continue.The film, only a quarter of an hour, becomes a real torture. Imagine, there is a moment when the

protagonist, the biker, jumps 90 meters along a helicopter. Well, wellknows

Godthat my whole being shouted: that the jump is short and that the blades of the helicopter mutilate his body. Yes,

ladies and gentlemen, until that point the film makes us agonize. Another very funny thing is the little scene on the

road, when John Blaze (the "prota" "), try to make yourself again with the heart of your beloved. If they make the

mistake of seeing the film, del���itense with the scene of the kiss (which by the way, in the middle of that kiss, there is a

close-up of a cow mooing.) Do not think I exaggerate). , we could say that the script itself. without

hot palos. it's bullshit. The script is signed by the director of the film, demonstrating that it is not even worth

writing a fairly coherent script, abusing resources that make the script. It's as heavy as the repetition

throughout the film of the sentence: "You have to live without fear." Phrase that in the mouth of Nicolas Cage only

becomes a stupidity to one more than it is. Now let's talk about. of. the. Actors ?. No. How to say it? the

people that are placed in front of the camera. We start with Nicolas Cage, that man that I hate with all my soul and

with all my being. Cage, is dedicated to walk in front of the camera always showing the same expression (that

expression so hers that he uses in all the movies, whether they are a drama or a thriller). Eva Mendes, three quarters of

the same, but does not reach the end of Nicolas. As for the other actors in general. To shoot them all,

although they do it better than Cage and Mendes together (imagine the "" nivelazo "" of the cast of actors). Another aspect

"" remarkable "" are the Special Effects. It is true, they are not bad, but they are far from beingeffects

specialmade and rights. The only thing that can be saved is the Soundtrack, although people seem to be

excited about this new work by Christopher Young, it just seems normal to me, pulling for good. In

short, a film that The only thing he deserves is rotting in an old warehouse.

" 0

" The poster of the film is deceptive and inappropriate, aimed at all those who want to see meat in the

dark, accustomed to seeing Paz in all its splendor, has used the tir��� n sexy actress in order to

make the box office, would be pq knew that they were selling a shit of history, what a shame really with how

big is the story of Teresa.

Even though I've been full of emotion watching this movie, I've found myself with a bit more clutter to add to

my 2007 list of bodios. As almost everything is horrible in this film I'm going to mention how little good there is, which is

music, costumes and photography. I just put mode + Despelleje: If it was about portraying the life of

Teresa de Jes�� �s, they have covered themselves with glory, first because there is a lack of footage to tell this woman's work, we would

need dozens of films for this. Second, because the script is pathetic and third because the passage

of Teresa's life that has been chosen is frankly ill-counted. In the film school of Madrid there is a saying

among the directors "" If you have screwed, melted "" and is that abusing the melts is the attempt to cover a

loose guide. The one of Teresa, the body of Christ, is not loose is nonexistent, I could count more than 25 castings to

black (of exit) in the film. With the entrance tickets they were "" stuck "" because they last like 6 minutes,

this is unnecessary and also pre-sleeps the spectator. Even at the risk of jams they give me a role , I have to say that

fuck, that badly directed is. terrible.And with all these atrocities the interpretation was not going to be brilliant, it

is linear almost in all the characters that lack background, it is incredible the capacity of this film to seem

insnificant to characters with so much background historical So, this is hardly worth talking about, so let's

focus on the protagonist Paz Vega, whom they have directed very badly, the Castilian accent is

not achieved, Paz is �� force the most in your di ,logos, am���n that this role is not going at all. It is acharacter

very bigto build it in so few mintutos (that on the other hand they become eternal). Paz has more

characters of the type "" Luc���ay and Sex "" (Example of what is good to direct the actresses) or "" Spanglish "",

Teresa has been great to Paz , I do not know if for the nefarious direction because she has not been able to build

this character correctly, but it really is not credible and her records are too theatrical. At

least we have not had to see his feet in the foreground. Although there was to say that the physical profile did.

I would have seen better here Pilar L���pez de Ayala. The poster of the film is deceptive and inadequate, aimed at

all those who want to see meat in the dark, accustomed to seeing to Paz in all its splendor, thehas been used

sexy pull of the actressin order to make a box office, it would be pq they knew that they were selling a shit of

history, that l�� Truth of truth with how great Teresa's story is.

" 0

" The impeccable direction of Paul Greengrass is one of the aspects that would stand out from this overwhelming and

intense film. And do not forget that the final scene already belongs to the list of the best end of the year.

Unforgettable, unrepeatable.

The problem that exists today in film trilogies is that one of the three always ends up being

bad, or even bad. And they will ask: why does everyone admire Jason Bourne's? Well, very simple:

none of the three movies is bad, it's more, all of them are great. The first was good, but the second was

better. And to top it off, the third and last installment surpasses the first and the second. I call that being

smart. The palm, without a doubt, is worn by Paul Greengrass, director of The Bourne Myth and Bourne's Ultimtum

, the last two. Not that Doug Liman did a bad job with The Bourne Case. It was an

entertaining film and I think that without it nothing would have ended as it has. Thanks to the opening of the

story we enter the world of the amn���sico esp dea in a vicious way, because the rhythm and the exciting

sequences of action deserve several applauses. And that's why in the last film everything ends in anway

impeccable, all the cables come together and, by the way, Jason Bourne remembers everything. Although this is not the final

end, it's not just Bourne's Ultimtum, an absolutely trepidating action movie. The political content

is also introduced to the history, corruption and dirty laundry of the secret agencies. I confess that I

practically did not move during the whole movie. And we can already consider Greegrass as synonymous with

frenetism: the camera in hand, the persecutions so realistic, the constant plot turns, traps and

intrigue (introduced in a masterly way). Not only that, but Jason Bourne is not an ordinary spy. That

nobody is approached to compare it with 007 or others equally surrealist. Maybe he does not remember his identity, but

we, the public, will remember him as one of the best spies of the last times,

portrayed in a very realistic, personal and, above all, human way. As Damon said: do you imagine James Bond

asking for forgiveness from the daughter of one of his victims? And do not come with the excuse that now it is fashionable to

humanize the heroes. Not only because Jason Bourne is not a hero, but also because humanizing a character

is something positive and that increases the credibility of the work. Going back to the movie, to say that the amusement

spy stars in several of the most impressive sequences of action that have been seen during the

last ten years. years. Both that of the first journalist at the airport (one can not take his eyes off the

screen) and that of the T���nger (the pursuit on a motorcycle, on the roofs, the fight on the railroad?), And for not

forgetting about the latest car chase in New York. And not only does the film have action scenes and

really ingenious dialogues, but a lot of footage also belongs to the intrigues within the

department that is looking for Bourne. and company. Say that some particular scenes remind me of thecenter

controlalso masterful United 93.As as the authentic master of The Bourne ultimatum is as

dec Previously, its director Paul Greengrass. His style, his way of narrating, of communicating, of catching us,

of getting on our nerves, of making us jump the odd smile, the odd tearfulness. His impeccable and

at the same time crude direction makes us believe that more than being watching an espionage film we are living it

live and direct. If in The myth of Bourne the strong point of the film was the novelty of frenetism, here the

thing is already much more advanced, and not only is it admired the total presence of the Greengrass style throughout the entire

film, but, as we already know it, it can be seen that this is not a current film of spies. Wenot

arefacing The Good Shepherd, a work of complex plot and slow rhythm, but rather the opposite. And both

films are magnificent. Yes, the plot of this ultimatum is nothing special, but the way itotherwise it

is told is what really matters,would have been too simple. That's it, it's

not foreseeable. I followed from start to finish all the frames, subplots and traps that were entangled in the

middle, but what I did not know is what was going to happen the next minute. And I, to this, I call cinema in itsstate

purest. The ending is a clear example of all this intrigue. The truth is that one foresees more or less what is going to

happen from the beginning (due to the "" fault "" of the flashbacks), but what the spectator can not know is the

continuous change of sides between the agents and bosses and the sudden final destiny of our beloved

protagonist. As only weak point I find that some plot or character could have taken advantage of a

little more, but it is true that in a film like this can not be absolutely perfect, because what

happens is, in some way, imaginary. And perhaps also to emphasize that some of the falls, trompazos or

jumps of the enigmatic protagonist would have cost him, in the real life, a certain death. And I say that because

the scenes that surround these "" acrobatics "" are shot with a very, very realistic tone. But you also have to

assimilate that this is a spy movie and that he is Jason Bourne. What also fails me, and is not the fault of

anyone involved in the film, is the large amount of unnecessary publicity (especially thespots

telivisivos) that has been formulated before the movie premiered cula I, unfortunately, knew (not

entirely) what was going to happen, approximately, in one of the scenes "" surprise "" final (there are more than one). And

in Bourne ultim���tum everything ends up making sense, -prictically- everything ends up being resolved and many of the

characters evolve more than in the second part. It goes without saying that the dialogues that Bourne maintains,

especially with Pamela Landy and Nicky, are not only revealing, they are also intelligent. And that, in part, is

thanks to the great script of Tony Gilroy and company, able to keep you intrigued and in tension for almost

two hours. And finally , talk about the extensive and excellent cast. Start, undoubtedly, by Matt Damon, the absolute

protagonist of the film and that every time is becoming better actor. Here he suffers, but without looking

agonized. First of all, Bourne is a hard and strong spy, but nobody takes out his terrible amnesia and his constant

confrontations with fearsome characters, who, whether you want to or not, end up running out It was portrayed

realistically, of course). His interpretation is even better than those of the two previous installments. In the

first one we discovered it, in the second one it was simply correct and in the third one we realize that he knew how to

do more things than hitting smacks, he also knows how to suffer like any other person. A key scene of the

film is when Bourne enters the house of his dead girlfriend's brother (great Daniel Br���hl), where he can be seen

(as we did in the end of the second) that Jason Bourne has human feelings, that he

can ask for forgiveness of someone he has hurt. Highlight above all the secondary David Strathairn

and Joan Allen, two veteran actors who show that they are the best of the current American cinema. His

looks, his di���logos, his nervous attacks, his confrontations. He plays Noah Vosen, acharacter

peacefulon the outside but very manipulative on the inside. And she, whom we have already seen in The Myth of Bourne, a woman

who goes for all and wants, first of all, to discover the truth, however it may be. Also say that Julia Stiles is not

as bland as in the second and that here shows a braver facet, more humane. A good scene where you

can witness this change is when she appears for the first time, in a flat in Madrid, scared at the

appearance of Bourne, and then when she talks to him in the cafeteria. to. And do not forget about two veterans who do not

appear here too much: Albert Finney and Scott Glenn (this one above all). His interpretations are great, but that

was undoubted. The only actor who is truly untapped is Edgar Ram���rez, the character from whom he

could have given a lot more juice. So, the cast of this movie is yummy, with a protagonist

who is better than ever and a side of authentic luxury. Greengrass can not complain.

Bourne's Ultim���tum is a masterful spy movie, with an unforgettable frenetic tone and with some of the best action

sequences. n of the last years (always accompanied by the sensational score by John Powell). And

, first of all, the impeccable direction of Paul Greengrass is one of the aspects that would stand out from this

overwhelming and intense film. And do not forget that the final scene already belongs to the list of the best end

of the year. Unforgettable, unrepeatable. Let's thank Mr. Greengrass for making us suffer during this hour and

51 minutes full of movies, pure cinema.

" 1

" This important documentary for anyone who intends to continue living on the planet is 85%

enriching information and 15% political propaganda and although some bother this last point the truth

is that An Inconvenient Truth It is a great documentary.

It is highly probable that if you have the minimum degree of common sense, seeing this documentary is one of the

most terrifying experiences possible and it is also highly probable that after you finish see it a

sense of helplessness fill your body; this important documentary for anyone who intends to continue

living on the planet is 85% enriching information and 15% political propaganda and although some

bother this last point the truth is that An Inconvenient Truth is a great documentary, earning deservedly the

Oscar for Best Documentary a couple of days ago. For those who do not know Al Gore was the Vice President of the US

during the Government of Bill Clinton and presidential candidate of the Deputies being defeated very

closely by George W Bush in a controversial election that still causes controversy, the rest of the story is already

known as well as Gore is a much more charismatic guy than The guy who still holds the Presidency

of that country. From then on, Gore has dedicated himself to giving lectures around the world to

raise awareness about climate change as a result of human contamination and is documentary is basically the

presentation of this conference combined with elements of Gore's own life; Regarding the first point, the

documentary presents the main points of the problem in a very educational way, as well as demolishing

many myths that surround it. However, the introduction of passages of Gore's life

even when they are not too shocking in the context of the documentary and does not prevent the educational content

of this is highly valuable. Four stars and it's on DVD.

" 1

" When the talents of three geniuses such as Eastwood, Spielberg and Haggis come together, the result can only be

a masterpiece.

The Second World War has been and is one of the great reefs for American cinema. Even before the

end of the war, although with the victory in Europe secured, the machinery of Hollywood began to

make the first films, propaganda, on the contest. Once past the euphoria for the positive

outcome, the films became less pamphlet and something more adjusted to reality. The battle of Iwo Jima was

the beginning of the end of the war in the Pacific, being the first Japanese territory invaded by the

Americans. It was one of the bloodiest moments of the war, since in little more than a month the

Americans suffered almost 26,000 casualties, of them almost 7,000 dead, while the practical totality of

The 20,000 Japanese soldiers from the Iwo Jima garrison were killed. The film tells the story of the three

survivors who hoisted the flag over Mount Suribachi, instantly immortalized by Joe Rosenthal. That

photograph turns John Bradley (Ryan Philippe), Rene Gagnon (Jesse Bradford) and Ira Hayes (Adam Beach) into

heroes, and they embark on a tour to make the country believe in the hopes of victory, and to raise the

sale of war bonds. Clint Eastwood, from a fabulous script by William Broyles Jr and Paul Haggis,

immerses himself fully in the story until he makes it his own, to offer the viewer a film that will leave him

shocked and dazed. Eastwood tells the war in all its harshness, showing an almost indescribable horror, and

at the same time, the uncertainty and fear of the soldiers. The public scenes are reminiscent of Saving Private Ryan, and

rightly so, since Steven Spielberg himself is the producer of the film. But Flags of Our Fathers is not just

war and battle, its harshness is also found in how politicians manipulate three survivors, and without

scruple , they put them in a race to sell more, until they become icons of heroism. Clint

Eastwood demonstrates once more that he dominates the art and magic of cinema like few others, since the rhythm he prints is

the perfect one to the story. Not to mention its beautiful score, hopefully recognized this time in the form of

Oscar nomination. All the technical work is great, highlighting the photography of Tom Stern, and the assembly

of Joel Cox. The icing on the cake is the interpretations, excellent, especially those of Ryan Philippe and

Adam Beach. When the talents of three geniuses like Eastwood, Spielberg and Haggis come together, the result can only

be a masterpiece. And Flags of Our Fathers is. Now we only have to wait a few months to see

the second film of the project, the Japanese vision of the battle, Letters From Iwo Jima.

" 1

" A failed film, an erroneous attempt to give Spanish cinema the ultimate overproduction? that

falls short in terms of its pretensions, empties in narration and does not finish reaching the

viewer.

The Spanish cinema has been, generally, a little (enough) useless to take to the big screen stories

that know how to take the masses to the cinema. Come on, he does not know how to make "blockbusters", that is, those movies that

Americans make like churros and that are being released with a view to destroying the box office, giving the public what is

supposed to be expected and also They are launching such films with advertising campaigns that will bring to the cinema as many moreas possible

people. Removing (esperp���nticos) cases as the two sequels of "" Torrente "" or "" Mortadelo and Filemon "" in

recent years, there has not been what you can call a true " "blockbuster" "that has satisfied the expectations

of the decayed Spanish market. "" Alatriste "" was born as the film that was going to change this, the first Spanish

superproduction that was capable of facing (both at the box office and in results) tocinema

American(although it has not been possible to do without a star from that country). Seen the results

at the box office we can say, more or less, that it has been achieved. The rest is better to discuss it. I did not have

too many expectations before this movie, and the continuous negative criticism in reference to the tediousness of the

proposal, made me presage that my doubts In that respect they could be true. I would have liked to say that

"" Alatriste "" is a bad movie, a tru���o of care, but it is not like that. Of course, we are not facing a bad

movie, although it is not good either. Let's say that "" Alatriste "" is a failed film, an erroneous attempt to

give Spanish cinema "" the definitive overproduction "" that falls short as soon as to its pretensions, it empties in

narration and that it does not finish arriving at the spectator, no matter how hard its interpreters

try. "" Alatriste "" has two serious problems; the gui���ny and the assembly. From these two important

elements for the development of a plot, the film begins to make waters as it progresses and, at the

end, one is left with the sensation of having seen a set of sequences chained one behind the other

but that, in many occasions, do not have a continuity and seem to be mounted, without much sense, in

a random way. Of course, from what I have read (and using the logic) this may have to do with the fact that it

is based on several novels and, therefore, it is intended to summarize all this in 145 minutes, They do not give so

much. From this, it is logical that the characters, supposedly important, appear and disappear from the

plot without coming to mind or do not know very well where the narrative sometimes wants to take us. What

he gave me to see "" Alatriste "" was something like that of seeing a delivery of the saga "" Torrente "" but in serious plan.

Yes, now I explain. Did not you notice the interpreters, more or less known, of the Spanish panorama were

seen on the screen in secondary roles or anecdotal appearances? It's the same sensation of being attentive to

say "Look, that's the guy in the series that looks or looks at, this is the actor that". It seems that everyone has

signed up for this project, even some have been left out of the final editing (case similar to what happened

when Terrence Malick was put to direct that marvel that is "" The thin l��� red line "", with the difference that

what they wanted was to work with Malick and "" Alatriste "" I guess they wanted to point to thecart

blockbuster. "Now, not all is negative in "" Alatriste "", of course not. In favor I can say that, except for

a moment of tedium, it made me more bearable than I could expect and that the interpretations are all

quite correct, without highlighting too much in any way. In case, but they are always believable, even Viggo

Monterssen, of which he feared his American accent and, surprisingly, is hardly noticed at any time. And,

of course, the production design is magnificent, as well as the photograph (sometimes truly worthy of

reward, with these pictorial approaches), leaving see the money that has been left in it. You can tell that they have

sold this movie, the figures are there, but they still do not know how to make a great superproduction that

really is round (or at least, good) and that you key in the seat without being a failed attempt to give the

replica to the "" so criticized "" (by the academy of Spanish cinema, it is understood) Americans.

" 0

" Madrigal is a film for lovers of oddities, enigmatic and incomprehensible stories,

those that pose an infinity of incoherent questions that offer no answer, and that allow an

infinity of interpretations .

In view of the lack of originality suffered by the cinema, more and more of the definitions of the films are

referenced, homage or gui���o, in reference to scenes or very similar approaches with the of

other films. Not to mention the long list of words that alone describe theworks

cinematographic, such as sequel, prequel, remake? etc���tera.Con Madrigal, Fernando P���rez pays tribute to

David Lynch and one of his last works, the one praised by some as insulted by others, Mulholland Drive.

Come to what I mean? We have all fallen into the temptation to use buzzwords to

refer to this or that tape. But what is it that differentiates a homage from a gross, scruffy copy?

Well, something very subjective, as is the evaluation of the film itself: if the evaluation is good,, can be

the alleged lack, but poor of the director as the evaluationoverlooked. n be bad, since in that case it will be consumed

in the fire for all eternity. All this talk comes to Madrigal and its suspicious and dangerous

similarities with Mulholland Drive (we will turn a blind eye to the Ren dedica Clair dedication), especially

in its final stretch. Fernando P���rez, as Lynch already did, transforms reality as he pleases in the last act,

twisting it and molding it to his liking. The two stories that Madrigal raises are excessively gimmicky, at the

same time predictable, empty, and border on the absurd and the grotesque, in the worst sense. The film suffers from

originality, not to mention the absolute lack of rhythm. The best thing is the technical aspect, very careful, and the

interpretations of its actors, who all perform at a good level.Madrigal is a film for lovers of

oddities, enigmatic stories Ethical and incomprehensible, those that pose an infinity ofquestions

incoherentthat offer no answer, and that allow an infinity of interpretations.

" 0

" The road to Guant���namo is one of those films that justify, beyond the mere and simple entertainment,

that the Lumiere brothers invented this film .

In the past Berlin Festival, its premiere caused a sensation as the film's directors, Michael

Winterbottom and Mat Whitecross, were accompanied by the real protagonists of the film: three Britons of Asian

origin who, being in the most unlikely place and at the least indicated time, were arrested as

pro-Bali jihadists in Afghanistan and transferred to that kind of place in no part that is Guant���namo,

one of the juridical and humanitarian aberrations by which this beginning of the 21st century will be marked in the

history of infamy and ignominy. The film It has been presented as a documentary, but it is not. Nor does he pretend to

be. The actors who represent them inare superimposed on the faces and voices of the real protagonists

a precise and spectacular re-enactment of their odyssey: in 2001, invited to a wedding in Pakistani, three j���and

twentyunconscious twenties, thinking that the US threats of attacking Afghanistan they were not going to materialize, they

decide to travel to that country to take a look. They find themselves in full invasion, detained interritory

Talibanand taken by Bin Laden's followers. Alternating the testimonies in the first person of theprotagonists

realof the story with its dramatic reconstruction. Tica, shot in Iran, the film is visually very powerful,

with those images that resemble the amateur video of a tourist traveling through exotic lands and fascinating,

border and in permanent tension. Then, the recreation of the detention camps in Kandahar, the

torture, Guant���namo. all this is shocking, without the directors using any maudlin trick

to win the sympathy of the public. It is enough with the simple description of some events and deplorable acts

by who are considered the defenders of democracy and who are only getting that, the mere

sight of the flag of the bars and stars, cause disgust, fear and shame Fighting cinema,

committed, essential.

" 1

" One of the best comedies released in recent years. If you do not take it seriously you can hit some

good laughs.

This is one of the best comedies released in recent years, the really worrying thing is that it pretended to

be a horror film. Then the Irish author PADDY BREATCHNACH among other things like BLOW DRY,

apparently he took the happy mushrooms to build a totally incredible argument, the most

surprising thing is to get financing to shoot a story of hung who wander screaming through the

middle of nowhere. Four kids taken from the television to be scared seems to be wondering what the hell

am I rolling? To dissemble breaks our tímpanos with music all march, as bad as the

director, interpreters, gui���ny and everything in general. If you do not take it seriously you can stick a good laugh. A

3.

" 0

" absurd film about a boy from the deep Asturias who emigrates to the capital to become a man. The

argument is infumable, and the cast of actors do nothing but ballast more a project that should have died

before being born.

Since dawn, want. Of course the title is stimulating, but more for a film of Pajares and

Esteso than a film of 2006. And of course, if it is not full of t ���as in balls, as it seems that the subject

loses a lot. I have to admit that I have not seen it whole, given that at the time I decided to look in the deuvedeteca

another more animated, because there is nothing worse than a film of humor you of verg� ��enza ajena.La film is

about a boy from an Asturian town who sent to the city to become a man with his uncle. He

has a male nudity store, and of course he does not agree with the shipment they do. But

her next woman (Loles Le���n) appears who wants the kid to stay. And I know, is that they take away even the

desire to make thesee, Gabino Diego has stayed with Cuco de Torrente 2, and makes the same

summary. Let'sgestures as before. Arturo Fern���ndez, although he comes out with cocks drawn on his chest, continues to be superimposed until he

becomes a parody of himself. I do not like Loles Le���n very well, and she always has that role of awoman

bitterin charge of life that commands a lot and that I can not stand. Then I get the trup��� gigolos, nothing less

than the "" hard "" of companions, the "" hard "" of UPA Dance (the son of the witch Lola), one of Tuesday and Thirteen , and two

more. And adorning some other Spanish actor of these comedy that do not finish finishing. With these actors,

what do we want to come out? Caca.Resimiendo, absurd film about a boy from the deep Asturias who emigrates to

the capital to become a man. The argument is infumable, and the cast of actors do nothing but ballast more

a project that should have died before being born. Since it starts it wants to remove it.Besitos.

" 0

" A film where millions have been invested (especially in locations) to obtain aresult

pauprimo. A total disappointment! Miami Vice with m of malaza.

Some time ago I did not see such a bad movie and I feel in the moral obligation to tell them: do not watch Miami Vice

(2006). In spite of the very good cr�� �ditos: - Written and directed by Michael Mann, director of the highly

recommended Collateral (2004) and El Informante (1999). Michael Mann was the producer of the television series with

the same name in the 80's. According to the result, I think that his "" tribute "" did not do it with too much

love. - It stars as the detective Ricco, Jamie Foxx, who recently interpreted brilliantly the m��� SICO

blind Ray Charles in Ray (2004), valindole very precisely the Oscar and BAFTA (theacademy

britishaward)for best male interpretation in 2005-Colin Farrell ( The New World), seconded Foxx,

playing his work partner, Detective Sonny. Although Farrell is not an actor, he has a certain

weight in the Hollywood industry. From beginning to end the film does not make any sense.

The dialogues are bland, technical and incoherent. The action has nothing of the other Thursday. The performances are

completely irrelevant and stereotyped. The situations are full of common places. Apparently Mann

believes that the non-plus-ultra scene of eroticism should be a "" grip in the shower "" because he repeats it with both

protagonists unnecessarily. Did you want to take advantage of the shower set? Who knows, those who are looking for the

"pretty" blonde from Miami "" even if it's to please the eye, they lost. Here the sexy guy is Li Gong, what do you

think, he has his blog. To see if they understand it! She is not turkey snot either. Some may remember her as the

evil Hatsumomo in Memoirs of a Geisha. I do not understand. What did all these good interpreters do in

such mediocre production? I'm thinking of buying the script to use it for soporific in my nights of

insomnia. From what little I remember of the television series, there was nothing left. I do not remember that it was myTV

favoriteseries, but I know it was entertaining, which this film definitely is not. If it occurs to you that you still

want to go check what I tell you, even if for making fun of the bizarre eighties fashion,

characteristic of the original TV series, because they will not find that either. Here Ricco and Sonny dress like

any son of a neighbor. It is noted that it is a film where millions have been invested (especially in locations)

to obtain a pauper result. A total disappointment!

" 0

" It's a shit stuck in a stick, without argument, without effects, without anything worthwhile. If I'm honest this second installment did not call me the minimum attention, and it has been a company

that almost pushed me to see it, I did not have an excessive curiosity about the sequel, although it is true that although

I have followed the project, I have done it almost as a mere observer, without getting involved in it, and without wanting the least toWithout

see something on the screen.a doubt, make a sequel to a "" Crossover "" (a mixture of two sagas) with

two characters as emblematic. The FOX sci-fi movies seemed like a real meme, but, friends, the

box office rules. Well, the same formula is repeated, seasoned with entertainment or action films, you can

call it in both ways and it's almost the same, so we have to the Aliens without Lieutenant Ripley

(replaced by a mother, a military officer with a child in charge, hehe as in "" Aliens ""), I have

been missing her during the hour and 20 min. of footage and on the other side of the predator, what's the matter, that

more than one of them was going to budget? In the middle of a bunch of piglets that you want to be loaded as

soon as possible, because they are simple, foolish and brainless the more you can not, go of those that when they are loaded

you say! SIIII FIESSSTA! because you see that they put silly tiparracos in this kind of movies, there is never one

with whom you feel more or less identified, apart from not very well why, good part of the tape

reminded me of "" Transformers "" Michael Bay, silly boy, good luck, bugs, and other gilipolleces, just

missing the "" Rubick's Cube "". It fits in half a page, also its gui���n (in the rest of the remaining page

), the actors are there to kill them (hehe) and, referring to the phrase "" superoriginal "" of the poster , where

if they could hear my screams (or almost) has been in the room, cursing, first my partner, and then all

those imbeciles who spent their time money to see the first part and that we have been punished with this second, in

addition to that in the scenes of struggle, between so much darkness (perhaps to protect the Screeners tape) is not

achieved nothing, and one comes out of every scene of struggle more confusing than. Resuming: It's a shit stuck on

a stick, without argument, without effects, without anything worthwhile.

" 0

" How to put yourself in the shoes of a kamikazeIt is a relief that in the face of so much film dealing with the Palestinian issue in a somewhat linear way,

positioned on some side and with the political or social issue as background, we get a work like

"" Paradise Now "". The film of Hany Abu-Assad, offers, in the same way, social gaps andnotes

politicalof the Palestinian problem, but what prevails in it is human treatment (all applicable not

only to this location, but to the rest of the world) of the question And it is to be appreciated since, by much

absurd politics that has awakened in certain places (especially in the waiting room of the Oscars), the film

is totally asyptic. And that is, precisely, the greatest of its daring.the

Althoughprotagonists are in agreement with certain political or social positions, religions, beliefs or

convictions, the direction and its development are not They position themselves in no particular position. They only try to

deepen and immerse themselves in the head of the person who reaches such extremes, for whatever reason. And

that's what the film pursues: discover the reason for the actions of the kamikazes. Although it does not offer a

closed ending that makes it clear to us why. We have to be able to put ourselves on their skin and

try to understand it. Because, however much some people try to prove otherwise, there is noor

controversycontroversy in the fact of wanting to understand the actions of someone, be it kamikaze, rapist or pedophile

(for the close example of the correct correcty "" The Lector ""). Mind you, with this the fact ofis never included

justifying them. I think we are mature enough to differentiate it. It is always interesting and

productive to put yourself in the shoes of someone, to try to understand them and to suffer their fears and to feel their longings, no matter

how atrocious the crime that they have committed. Logically, and as it happened, for example, in "" The

Sinking "", not everyone will be able to put themselves in the shoes of a monster like Hitler (serve as a

paradigm) . Many will feel nauseous just thinking about it. And I can understand it. But a person withconcerns

moralwill be very productive, and, after all, and although it sounds exaggerated, that is based on empathy.

In not making distinctions of any kind. It is time for us to realize that the victims are not the

only protagonists. The executioner, in a certain way, is always a victim at the same time. Whatever your

sentence and motive. We should dig into their past. To win as individuals in a society, we have to

understand that everything has a reason why. And nothing and nobody can judge the life of another for free. And I repeat.

This is not trying to justify (can not justify OF ANY way the brutality of certain acts) nothing,

nor to punish, because we managed just the opposite effect. Correct (educate) is the most

appropriate term. Never, since Ca���n, a punishment has made anyone better or dissuaded from committing a crime. Maybe

we should face a mirror and observe. It would be interesting what we would get to discover if we look

in due depth. The truth is that the direction of Hany Abu-Assad helps a lot when it comes to treating the

film with the seriousness and objectivity that it deserves. Your camera is as aseptic as possible, just observe and

follow, without determining or judging. Although there is a very low budget, both for the camera and

for the somewhat homelike form of filming, nothing more is necessary. If you know how to say with class and subtlety what

you want to say, as is the case, there are no problems in that aspect. And the interpretations are quite

accurate too. Without doing a job that attracts attention, Ali Suliman and, above all, a hesitant Kais

Nashef, they help us to put ourselves in their difficult place. And that work of contention and expression is really

worthy. We can live, thanks to them, each and every one of the apparent remnants of a kamikaze, including their

beliefs, their sectarian religion, their family, social, political and educational environment. And we will be able to feel very

closely his fears, his desires, his feeling of guilt, his restlessness and his restlessness, as well as his doubts, his

inner conflicts, his conditioning and his horrifying indecisiveness. , which is, in essence, genesis of the

greatest of terrors. And all those feelings confronted degenerate into an emotional instability and

lack of control of their person that prevent their actions from being, from that moment, entirely predictable. But it is

something that not only can happen to them. In short, a breath of fresh air in front of the great majority

of films that flood us lately and that they have , without intending to be offensive, a certain

pamphlet character that ends up bored the spectator. Let's not forget that we are talking about cinema. And, personally,

I prefer to understand it as a projection of vital feelings and spiritual concerns. Not ascriticism. I

repetitive and obviousprefer to live cinema as a game in which the human mind and spirit are the ones that

decide, and not the hand of a director who caresses the complacency and �� Only nourishment of the ego. The true

value of the direction is that we are the ones who have in our power the last decision. He is the

artisan who makes the wicker of quality, develops the ideas and the problem from which we

are the ones that end up rooting our decision and our determination. Since, in part, we are,

also, part of their work. We are the last point in that long journey of the film, which is what, really,

every film and every creator wants to achieve. Even we ourselves can not qualify as the last

bastion, since it is the compression and the reflection. That is, in essence, to understand cinema as art. And to know

that, first and foremost, the film unmasks terrorism more harshly than any other, precisely

because of everything I've said before. It throws to the ground all kinds of sectarian and fanatic complexes that what

they do, is simply generate madness and useless injustices that only lead to globalized fear and

the desire to achieve glory non-existent. As the phrase of his father reads: "" 24 hours in the head of a

kamikaze "". With its advantages and, obviously, its drawbacks.

" 1

" Moving story of 13 women unfairly shot. These women whose memory has not erased the

story were like "" The 13 Roses "", Martinez-L���zaro recovers these real facts turning them into one of the

films of the year.

This is the moving story of 13 women who had to live a harsh reality after the Spanish Civil War

. Almost all minors were shot unjustly on August 5, 1939 in the walls

of the Almudena cemetery. These women whose memory has not erased the story, were remembered as "" The 13

Roses "" and Martinez-L���zaro recovers these real facts turning them into what undoubtedly will be one of the films

of the year. The 13 Roses, from my point of view, is the culminating film of Emilio Martinez-L���zaro, thework

definitive. Directed with an exquisite taste and accompanied by an Original Soundtrack (by Roque Ba���os) that

perfectly complements the images and transports you to a world full of textures, colors and even

smells. These girls had not committed any crime or crime except being affiliated with theYouth,

Socialistwhich seems to have served as an excuse to generate unrealistic motives and be taken to a court

martial that will judge them. He unjustly accused them of facts they had not carried out, without evidence and after

being subjected to imprisonment and harsh police interrogations. The aim of all this was to give a

warning to the whole society to persuade it not to reveal against the established regime. Account the

director, who at all times has tried to be faithful to the real facts taking as point of view for the

film converting its protagonists more into heroes, than into victims. For this reason and because it would have

been unbearable on screen, he did not want to show the details of the horror that these girls suffered. So

we proceeded to make a synthesis that allowed the story to fit with the footage. It is a dramatic

film that gets into your soul deeply. The artistic direction is outstanding, although I still do

not like Ver���nica Sanchez, overshadowed by some unstoppable and majestic Pilar L���pez de Ayala and Marta

Etura. It is absolutely linear, everything interprets the same, except certain nuances, it is as the samesaw

charactereternally but in different situations of the same life. And to top it all accompanied by a Fran Perea

who does not hit or with a tail and reminds us as not to "" Los Serrano "", a total prick in a piece of art that if

it were not for these two, we could qualify as PERFECT. Special mentions for that fabulous actor, magno and

regio Asier Etxeand���a who stars in a stellar moment when he interprets the main theme of the film in

French. Also for the rightly rescued Goya Toledo who gets the most out of her character and

demonstrating an important interpretive maturity. On this occasion I am going to let the theme of the ages of

some actresses go by because the result is so really good that it is worth sacrificing the credibility of the

youth. When watching movies like The 13 Roses, you can breathe with some relief thinking that "" By f���n something

decent in the midst of the precarious and pathetic panorama of Spanish cinema "" we are starting to make good movies and to

show, this film. As I said at the beginning we are before a very careful film, the Locations and

costumes have enchanted me, I have tried to make all the possible mistakes and I have only found thatskirt

Ver���nica S���nchezwas crooked in a sequence, but for the rest it is a wardrobe totally successful and well

documented. (Congratulations Lena Mossum). Film absolutely recommended, I think it is the best thing you're going to

see this year in the Spanish scene.

" 1

" The animation is quite successful, the dubbing, not so much Arturo Valls squeaks, and, moreover, the

jokes with shoehorn become tiresome, both large and small. you.

I always hallucinate always with the animation cinema, either a film of Sheep, or bees, as in this

case and, although the idea, and the proposal (a little copied from the excellent "" Antz "" to which Woodyput voice

Allen), is something original. That of taking humans to trial. However, after 2 or 3 good moments (all of

them shown in the trailer), the tape is deflated and one goes to the most exaggerated boredom (with yawns

included), and so the 90 min. (too many, for a tape of this magnitude) they become eternal, and that is, or spare,

or missing or bored, and / or all together. Animation is quite achieved, the dubbing, not so much that Arthur squeaks

Valls, and, moreover, the jokes involved with the shoehorn become tiresome, both large and small. Ifto that

we addthat an animated film is not only an overwhelming animation, we are facing the first "Bluff" of the

Christmas season that ends almost inagurarse.Que disappointed Holy God, what a disappointment, expecting more to

stay in much less.

" 0

" It is a minimal story but exploited in a wonderful way. Great sense of humor and humanity are

distributed in one of the most recommended films of the moment.

From time to time Miramax surprise us with good movies, and other times with a poster as

interesting as this: Robert Redford, Morgan Freeman and Jennifer Lopez. To start, touch of attention to the

distributors. I understand that the titles of the movies have to be translated by the widespread custom in

this country of adulterating a product doubling it to our language, but I do not know what. �� bitch man���a have taken to choose

titles as opposed to the original: it even goes against the film itself. We have seen how an

"" Into the blue "" is titled " "Lethal immersion" "? Come title of telefilm sobremesa.En this case, "" An

Unfinished Life "" by "" An Unfinished Life "." Any game or intention the writer, producer or

whoeverhe gave the title they go to the toilet. That's why I have titled the post as its translation "" faithful ""

although rough. The actors serve to enchant a simple story, not simple: the pain of an

accidental loss but the search for guilty is the story that leads us Jennifer Lopez who flees

with her daughter from an abusive boyfriend. That's why he takes refuge in Redford's ranch, his father-in-law. He lives with the

pain of losing his son and with his lifelong friend, the character of Freeman. ���ly Redford are

cowboys trying to continue with their lives and overcome an incident with a bear that reappears in the area.

A pseudo-ecological subplot but with a more philosophical background: the search for forgiveness.The film is

a minimal story but exploited in a wonderful way by some skilled writers and directed with good taste

by Lasse Halstr��� m. The phrases lapidary, full of philosophy, great sense of humor and humanity are

divided into one of the most recommended films of the moment.

" 1

" An innovative, eccentric, irregular, masterful film in its last two minutes and really surprising.

We are facing an innovative film, eccentric, irregular, masterful in its last two minutes and really

surprising. Sunshine, directed by the always original Danny Boyle (Trainspotting, 28 days later, etc) is, above

all, a kind of experiment, formulated with security, curious, above all, although perhaps , if we talk

about its theme, it can not seem like the height of originality. S, so far no one (to my knowledge) had

directed a movie of a trip toSun to pop and, as, produce light for a humanity that

is � being left without, but that is not what it is, so to speak, less innovative, but its plot structure,

full of topics and innovations at the same time, evenly. Although it may seem unbelievably, at

certain times, to that masterpiece of Ridley Scott, everything and this inconvenience, the film in question

manages to get away with it and be, finally, spectacular. I consider his way of expressing himself daring, more

political than commercial, more extra���ay and minimalist than, for example, Scott's film, which does not

mean that it is, Sunshine, better than Alien. I will not go into comparisons, but I will make it very clear that both

films have several points in common, such as some of the relationships between the crew (here are

nine and not seven, Eight?) or the transformation of one of them into something extremely unpleasant (here it happens at the

end and in the other at the beginning. "Great Ian Holm!). As I said, Boyle's film is less commercial,

although maybe I'm wrong, because many scenes are really well worked with computers and when the film

opts for the Finally, its most simple and poetic aspect burns in the very light of the Sun and

suddenly becomes a horror movie in the style of the most Gore Perhaps this is his greatest defect, that of

passing, without any reason, from one gender to another. The rest is, as I said, great.with his elaborate

Let's startguide, carried out by Alex Garland. Leaving aside the detail I just mentioned, the whole beginning of the

footage is shocking and when it ends is when the work is more exciting, overwhelming and intense

(the image of Frozen Syndey is impressive). It has a clear, precise structure, a typical hair, perhaps,pauses

although it never presents considerableof rhythm nor failures arguments that stand out. Maybe it's not a great

script, of those that impact as masterful as they are, for its perfection, but it's not one of those that do notyou

tellanything, that they totally lack personality. But for personality here we have Danny Boyle, the

director of the film, of Sunshine, the one who manipulates and moves all the strings, the one who, unfortunately, is

wrong in some cases, but who knows how to rectify Giving us some of the most beautiful scenes ever seen,

like the one already mentioned in Sydney, that of Cillian Murphy seeing from very, very close, the light of the Sun or when

Rose Byrne and � The latter maintain a delicate dialogue. I do not want to forget, either, the scene of the death

of one of the main characters, who suffers a "" slight "" damage to his leg. That yes, sometimes the film

loses quality, or rather originality, since the special effects appear, already poured, something that

worsens, mainly, the actoral brilliance. Another important aspect of the film, totally

remarkable, would be his interpretations. To say that Cillian Murphy is not as well (what I say well, as Oscar)

as in Breakfast in Pluto, but that nevertheless gets her interpretation is believed. and to some extent

touching. His role is one of those that are separated from the outside world and that seek a way out, a

hope. Also highlight Rose Byrne, in the most exciting interpretation of all. It is, as it were,

the melancholy of the group. Then there are the others, who do more than good at their work, like Cliff Curtis (the one who

will become the group's worst enemy), Michelle Yeoh (along with Gong Li, the most valued oriental actress

in the United States, and not for that, worse actress) or Chris Evans (maybe this is the best role of his career,

well, if can say race). And not forgetting some spectacular special effects that help and at the same time

prevent the film from looking at artistic quality and not from a splendid photography and with framing

really good, except those "" slightly "" out of focus that appear at the end of the film, when it becomes

an absurd adventure of terror. The music of Alwin Kuchler is also remarkable. As you can see, what

Sunshine highlights is its ability to tell the story, more than the technical sections. A good film,

capable of satisfying both the j Young as adults and that, above all, will not disappoint lovers of

science fiction. That is, those who expect a kind of adventure in a spaceship without any moral background or

social criticism, better to move away, because Danny Boyle's film is not suitable, then . Dannyfilm

Boyle's, in a way, is a contrast between the original and the typical, the former being the majority.

" 1

" Round movie, a stylistic exercise like we did not witness. With Desire, danger Ang Lee stood up for the second time with Len d'at the Venice Festival, and opts

Golden Globe in theof best Foreign Language film, so the wellTaiwans filmmaker

couldVolverto repeat the success of previous titles such as Brokeback Mountain or Tiger and Drag���n.Interpreted by

Tony Leung, Joan Chen, Wei Tang, Lee-Hom Wang, Johnson Yuen, Chih- ying Chu and Anupam Kher among others, It was

brought to Shanghai in 1942, when the city is occupied by the Japanese. Ms. Mak, awoman

sophisticated and wealthy, enters a café, makes a call and sits down to wait. Remember. how it all began

a few years ago, in the China of 1938. It's not really called Mrs. Mak, but Wong Chia Chi. A little before the

Second World War his father fled to England, leaving her in China. She was a university student and met Kuang

Yu Min, who had just founded a theatrical society to encourage patriotism. Wong Chia Chi became

the first actress of the company and discovered that she was able to move the audience and Kuang. The latter

convinced a group of students to carry out an ambitious plan to assassinate an important

collaborator of the Japanese, Mr. Yee. He assigned a role to each student: Wong Chia Chi was Mrs. Mak, who

had to earn Yee's trust by befriending his wife and seducing him. The young woman transformed

internally and externally to play her role. Everything went according to plan until anevent happened. The

unexpectedtruth is that my relationship with Ang Lee is somewhat strange. Despite the popular outcry, neither Tiger and

Drag���n nor Brokeback Mountain convinced me too much, I think that Sense and sensitivity gives a lot of twists to

the previous two, and Hulk may be the best treatment than anyone else. he has never done a superhero

despite dragging various blemishes starting with the unfortunate role of Nick Nolte. With a footage that

may be too much for some, Desire, danger oozes cl olor smell Basic for each of its pores, from its careful

setting, its texture, its exquisite soundtrack or the treatment of its characters, its own plot and

context, reminding us, directly or indirectly, Attitudes such as Mata Hari, Earthbound, Have and not have or

Casablanca; However, much closer in time, we find those inevitable echoes from

Wishing to love and, above all, that (almost) great film by Paul Verhoeven, which is The Black Book , whose

similarities with Ang Lee's new work seem to him to be more than merely anecdotal.

As I said, Desire, danger could have lasted perfectly half an hour less, and it would have turned out to be even more round

than it already is, but the certain thing is that the jealous detail with which Ang Lee describes the initiatory ritual of his

femme fatale does not result in any At the moment weary, catching the viewer, but with the story, with the

setting of the film itself. That's it, when plot and passion overflow, Desire, danger reaches its heights

, with a final hour of truly impeccable footage, although the contiguous and you explainscenes

sexual, far from scandalizing me, they have seemed to me a somewhat repeated mixture of the Turkish passion and a guide of the

Kamasutra. As expected, the plot of espionage loses strength in favor of the fiery romance of its

protagonists, with quite round interpretations by both the novel Wei Tang and my

beloved Tony Leung, able to amaze me in titles as disparate as Hardboiled, Chungking express, Game

dirty or 2046. In short, Desire, danger is a fairly round film, a stylistic exercise as

we did not witnessed for years, and although its duration It may not be long for some, the new work of

Ang Lee does not get tired in any At the moment the viewer, trapping it in their atmosphere irremediably.

" 1

" Totally recommended, a science fiction, not so science and maybe not so fiction.going to love

Are youall those who like movies from near futures, � ?? without ships?? �.

What a surprise! I only had rumors of this movie, and PDJames's book I did not read it, so I was notwhat to do

clear onwith it. I was going to find. And I find a good movie, with a great andatmosphere

spooky. The England of 2027, in the world towards destruction, the domination of the most

crushing, militarized and xenophobic right, is terrifying�? and horribly believable, it might not be such afuture

distant. The scene in which the refugee camp is shown wraps you completely. The story is very good,

original (although you can think it is another apocalyptic) and surprising, with a component of

mysticism, that the least relevant is the before and the after, what is really important is the

situation, not the facts. Clive Owen is the perfect actor for Theo's role, which is great, and the

act is the necessary one. I was surprised by the role of Julianne Moore (appears as headliner). The

side are luxurious, but what can you expect if you have Michael Caine as an oldin your squad.

hippieAll this we add with a good address, it makes almost two hours of film. they catch you and they

happen in an instant. The scene of the bus is wonderful. In short, totally recommendable, a

science fiction, not so science and maybe not so fiction.going to love all those who like

Are youmovies from near futures, � ?? without ships?? �. And the end, I loved it.

" 1

" More than simple romantic comedieta. Ever since I saw "" I want to be like Beckham "" and "" The monsoon wedding "" I am very interested the cinema "" indi "" or

Bollywood, as it is also called, both this film and "" I want to be like Beckham "" are not

100% Bollywood productions, since in the cinema " "indi" "what shines most are the few budgets and the

actors are completely desconocidos.Algo that draws attention the first time you see a movie of these

character �sticas is the color of the clothes (from the orange, to the green, going through colors that would not take anyone

here) to the music, and that is that the Indis are dancing and telling how If such a thing, and that is thegenre

musicalthere seems the most widespread among the Bollywoodians. In this film we must highlight the presence of

the beautiful Miss World 1994 Aishwarya Rai As you can tell from his name, Martin Henderson, who you will

remember as the father of the little protagonist of "" The Ring "" and Naveen Andrews, that many of you will nothim

know, but those who follow the series "" Lost "" we know him as "" Sayid "" the Arabic of the group. In short, a

curious film, with an amazing soundtrack (is that the music indi ), which, as you put on the poster,

will make you dance in the chair! Eye, which is a simple romantic comedy.

" 0

" A totally mediocre film, in which, no technical aspect is superimposed on a very limited ability

to suggest, a flat performance, a few pseudos actors and a children's treatment of popular legends.

James Isaac takes the reins of a new project related to the theme of the werewolves, that argument

that so many films have given, and so unsatisfactory in the majority of occasions, removing punctual contributions of

the classical cinema ("" The werewolf "" (1941) or "" The curse Werewolf "" (1961)), or estimable

revisitations during the 1980s as "" Howls "" (1981), or "" An American werewolf in London "" (1981). In this case the

picture was not very promising considering that the person in charge of trying to promote, in a modest or not,

so suggestive idea of ​​the werewolf, is a director whose previous proposal was the horrific "" Jason X "",

and that previously to this film, he had only shot one of the worst sequels of the estimable "" House, ahouse

hallucinatory"". That is why, not surprisingly, the nefarious end product that has emerged, named

"" Skinwalkers. "" The argument of the film, obviously absurd by the way, shows us a new race of humans

marked by a curse. ,N, beings that at night become werewolves thirsty for human blood,

lacking all morality on the part of a group of renegades, and controlling themselves on the part of another

faction of enigmatic race. The latter, precisely, are in charge of protecting a child who will soon

reach the indicated age of thirteen, on which day, according to An ancient prophecy of the NativeIndians reads

American, there will be a change that will give a new meaning to their species. In this constant struggle between the

protectors of a better future for all of them, and the renegades who refuse to stop being what they are,

lies the basis of the story. Isaac, in his work as a director, does not ans��� at all the gift of

originality, and it is for this reason, although it seems contradictory, where the only salvageable of the

film is found, the intrascendence assumed by the director creates a referential visual style, without any hint

personality, but it has done correctly, functional and without attempting at no time engage in

more complex tasks. To say that this is the most positive of a film, says a lot about the level of mediocrity that

distills the film for each and every one of its pores. Perhaps the acting work would have been a little more

decent if they had the chance to work with a rather more elaborate script, since we are faced

with the clear example of script written in such a way radically referential, in the bad sense of the word,

that seems to have been written with the autopilot on, or failing that, during a night watching

movies of genre, and shooting here ��� and there. In addition, with the aggravating factor that was written in three hands,being so

the proposalinsane that in addition they were radically distant writers in their approaches and

previous proposals, having worked some in films of g��� nero police or thrillers and some other

comedies of the most bland. Another desprop���sito that logically has not gone well. The acting level, does not help

too much that the interest on the part of the spectator goes up a lot, showing all the cast, and when I say everything, it

is all flatly, tremendously superfluous, aphetic and without nuances that could give a minimum of interest to the

future of its protagonists. Interestingly, it is a cast and most of it in productions ofcut

fantastic, although that if, none especially remarkable. Elias Koteas is perhaps the most gifted actor for the

performance of all the repertoire of pretty faces that adorn the story, although he is not able to

overcome a badly drawn character, horribly described in his ambiguous personality and plane as the

music of the newscast. Of the carnal Rhona Mitra, little to say, considering that she never showed the minimum

level of acting ability (and that we hope she improves even a little bit in the expected "" Doomsday " "by Neil

Marshall), although that, its spectacular beauty creates an inevitable symbiosis between the mostinstincts

primalof any man and his physicist. Of the rest of the actors, so little to say, some familiar faces of

the American television (the also beautiful Sarah Carter and the Roswellian Jason Behr), and an actress, whose

election I have been very impressed by the roles of the film, the Norwegian Natassia Malthe

(another ��� actress of powerful physical presence), who in addition to this "" jewel "" that occupies us intervened in that

television show named "" Bloodsuckers "", in "" Dead or Alive "" (the adaptation of the videogame, not the adrenal���tica

pel��� Miike's body) and eye, two sequels to shake, "" Bloodrayne II "" and "" Alone in the dark II "". Youto

havehave the courage to intervene in two sequels of Uwe Boll's films, which must be the last in the baseness of the film,

as if to change the agent ipso facto. In previous lines, it is

clearly evident not only in the film's theme, but also in plans or scenes nailed to

previous productions, above all for the eighty years for the fantastic cinema. Influences of films

like "" The Night Passengers "" and their successors (these last ones that hurt the fantastic cinema), aaspect

visualin the debtor transformations of films like "" Son-modules "" or "" Howling "" (which he referred to at the

beginning), or a tone supposedly camp in the bad sense of the word, are too heavy rumored to

overcome his own self-delineation and save this tremendously failed production., even the

Moreovermythology of the Native American Indians is treated in a superficial way. For moretreatment

effectiveof the subject, recommend the viewing of a television production of the year 2002, of the same name

("" Skinwalkers ""), and directed by Chris Eyre , a direct descendant of the Cheyenne tribe, and who also

has an interesting track record dealing with issues related to their culture throughout their limited but

productive filmography. the film, perhaps the untapped mythology that the

story required and that only appears on countless occasions, and some scene of effective action, like that confrontation

in the town, with echoes of the western chuesco and, again, a general reference of the history. In short, a

totally mediocre film, in which, no technical aspect is superimposed on a very limited ability to

suggest, a flat accomplishment, a few actors and a treatment i child of popular legends.

" 0

" On���rica, hypn���tica, ambig���a, po���tica and wonderful work perfectly basted and studied by Lynch. Thething

bestabout Mulholland Drive is the feeling of satisfaction and fullness that it gives you when you have understood it.

I do not know how to start this commentary on the unclassifiable work of David Lynch, so I'll just

say it's a great visual spectacle. Magic for the eyes. On���rica, hypn���tica, ambig���a, po���tica and

marvelous. Disturbing to infinity. Cactics in every way. It is one of those works that leaves

no one indifferent, or you hate or love her; and I am precisely one of those who love her. Do not try to find logic or

coherence during your viewing (or after), just take what you convey. Open your

mind and prepare yourself for a trip without return to the Lynch universe. And this is it, it's Mulholland Drive.

Film after film, David Lynch never ceases to amaze and passionate me equally. The strength and energy

of your images is overwhelming. That ability to mix situations and context is a genius.

The treatment he gives to music in all his films is mysterious, shocking and right. Lynch

has that innate ability in some directors to leave the viewer in shock after his films.

To let the spectator himself interpret and shape what he has just seen. Lynch gives you the canvas

and the paintings, and you are the one who must paint the painting. Lynch insinuates you interpreted. Lynch does not show andsearch

you desperatelyfor "something" on the map. Lynch gives us a puzzle, and we are the ones who must

mount it. What genius the suggestion has the best art. And that lasts for many more years. Of exciting

exciting, austere and disturbing atmosphere catches you to the few minutes and the best thing you can do is let yourself

go. I have come to the conclusion that with Lynch's cinema we must abandon all hope of logic and

coherence, stop looking for the why of things and plunge into what is vomiting us. Lynch. As for

the cast of Mulholland Drive, stands a stupendous Naomi Watts above all and all. With his double

role (TRACK) tries to deceive (rather Lynch) the viewer to confuse us and we do not understand anything. We are

in your dreams, and in your dreams everything can be possible. Then we have a very sensual Laura Helena Harring

also embroidering her role of amn���sica where ambiguity and bewilderment take over him. Fromphotography

dark and dark, play with the colors at your whim (especially blue and red, TRACK), while moving the

camera in such a subjective way, that it seems that you wear it t� En same in some moments (vagabond scene and

inside the apartment). Attention to the order that Lynch gives to the final titles (that you are pillo, David); in

order of appearance. (TRACK). With memorable scenes, such as the scathing critique of the Hollywood world and its pawns;

scenes difficult to forget and full of feelings like in the theater or in the audition; and moments of

extreme beauty such as the lysical scene, Mulholland Drive becomes a benchmark of current cinema;

full of symbolism and loaded with metaphors. In short, a story that completelyall the

destroyschronological and narrative conventions to which we are accustomed. Lynch picks up the clones and clichés

of cinema normally accepted by the public and gives them a 180 degree turn. Hipn���tica and on���rica is a

ribbon for the enjoyment of the senses. Intelligent, not able to do, and perfectly stitched and studied by

Lynch, it is most stimulating. The best thing about Mulholland is the feeling of satisfaction and fullness that ityou

giveswhen you have understood it.

" 1

" The idea of ​​young boys who fall in love and who like to steal together is not new, but you

can get a lot of profit, although in the case of this film has not been achieved .

Juan Jos��� Ballesta plays a boy who has just left a shelter and has to look for his

life, but the only thing to know how to do is steal, his mother taught him how to do it before they stopped her when he

was a kid. His life changes when he meets Sara (Mar���a Valverde) a girl from a wealthy family with whom he

establishes a relationship. The idea of ​​young boys who fall in love and those who like to steal together is not

new, but you can get much benefit, although in the case of this film has not been achieved. In part

because of the flat performance of the protagonist, Juan Jos��� Ballesta, although he is very much praised for his performances,

I can not see anything in him that I like, when he has the weight of the film. ��cula ���sta is boring, Mar���a Valverde

is the only thing that animates the action a little, that's why the best moments of the film arise when she appears

and they steal together, it is the only exciting thing, since the plot of the protagonist's mother is not very successful. Everything

is very slow in this film, from the beginning, slow ac ,mara, an unnecessary effect , since that same scene

could have been solved in less time and in a simpler way and it would have even been more intense. The

rest of the film is not slow motion, but it's almost as if it were, if you take a nap when you

wake up you will not have missed anything.

" 0

" The best spanish horror movie in a long time. Fear live The perfect mix between

(spoiler !!!) Blair's witch project and 28 days later.

Rec acojona. It narrates a day of work in While you sleep (unsettling title for a show.), A

television program that presents ���ngela in the purest style of Espa���a Directo and that this time Sen is approaching the

fire brigade of Barcelona, ​​with whom will spend a night on guard accompanied by Pablo, his camera and

main witness not to say absolute protagonist, that c��� mara and live terror are the protas of thisEntrance

story.the night they receive a call to attend the fall of an old woman, but what awaits them there

is the fucking hell unleashed. Of course the movie has a resemblance to the project of the witch, but only that of the

perspective. In that movie the characters know what they're up to and here esperangela waits as much as a

pet rescue. Balaguer��� and Plaza join forces to create with style, a lot of punch and total credibility. And just

like the witch project, that one has a CL���max ATERRADO-RA at the end and a fun

wheel of press afterwards, also with applause. I applauded.

" 1

" I think I have never seen a film so irretrievably devoted to the filling of the shelves of the

videoclubs.

I do not think I've ever seen a film so irretrievably doomed to the filling of the shelves of the

videoclubs. His colorful poster could provoke that the client recalls in the box of the DVD and rents it. I could

gather a bunch of teenagers, well-stocked with potato chips, soft drinks and nuts, who would

have a great time with this story of farm ghosts who return to the world of the living to cry out

revenge. Often happens. The most striking thing is that Sam Raimi, brave director and, apparently, producer offilms

horroralready launched, has seen something good in this infumable pastiche, which is not scary and is lost with

impudence and lack of modesty in hundreds, I said well, of films with similar ingredients. Let's name:house

spellbinding, family with problems and subscriptions of sustos. As you are about to start yourjourney

commercialon DVD, take note of the demanding reader and do not fall into the mistake that I made. Spend your splendid

time to re-read the classics or start that novel that is still untangled andunfading

contaminated by the pure andbeauty of M, the Vampire of Dusseldorf. ��� How does this title come to me?

Out of necessity, out of sheer need. In any case, the range of possibilities is enormous. Life is a delight

when one finds those little pleasures that engulf us leisure and produce those tickles in the mouth

of the stomach. The closest thing to love.

" 0

" Transformers works the first half. It works when no one knows they exist. It has become fashionable to talk about popcorn movies, made for people who disconnect their brains when they enter the

theater and gafapasta movies, for people who want to show off. Example of the second would be the incomplete "" The life of

others ""; As an example of the former, this film by Michael Bay is worth it. I have to say about this

dichotomy that does not interest me. He tells me absolutely nothing about the film, he only tells me how thefeel

spectatorsabout their own tastes. What I can say is that I do not read the critics. Ethics that say

"" cinema palomitero "". They are not cinephiles, they are cinematic snobs. They do not like movies, they like the cache that gives

praise to the big names and put them on the lapel like a medal: "" I understand Dreyer "", "" I seemovies

Bu pel��uel "", they say. Just in case someone has not read anything of what I have written, or does not know my philias,

I am disgusted by snobs. (By the way, I like Dreyer, but not as much as the Farelli brothers, to give an

example.) This is a sociological point, if you allow me, I'll talk about cinema. To

consider producers like Spielberg and Michael Bay loaded with millions and special effects is to what

extent this waste affects a spectator? There is a scene in which the whole city is the scene of a

colossal battle of the sympathetic Autobots against the evil Decepticons. If they want to hear an objective opinion,

the battle is indifferent. All those billions in CGI arouse less interest than a conversation

between a father and a son who wants to come out of the closet. For more than pretending to annihilate us with their

overproductions, yes there is a path that leads to success, and that path is that of feelings, whichnot

canbe bought with effects, final strands, or dazzling metal contraptions. At first, thecatches us

character of Shia LaBeouf, which is as common a name in her land as Jose, or Paco. There you shout "" Shia

LaBeouf! "" And they turn twenty. The young man goes to the institute and does not excel. It is cast by the pretty one of the

class, easy to understand after seeing the actress that they have hired to interpret her, but she does not know

that he exists, not even after ��s to buy a second-hand car, something peeled, with which he

believes that it will break, at last, his celibacy.While the teenager plans the way to approach the bombonazo,

the evil robots, or Decepticons , plan how to take over the Earth. The question is: the second lacks

interest! We accept the roll of the robots and save them humanities because we know that that raises the moral of the

boy, and gives an excuse for the kiss, but nothing more. It is the story of androids that should be at the

service of the couple, not the reverse. Bay forgets basic things. "" Transformers "" works the first half.

It works when nobody knows they exist. The Pent���gono knows that they have killed one of their military bases in the

desert, but they do not know who (emotion). The boy knows that his car has something strange, but he does not know what

(emotion). The parents know that something happens in the garden, but they do not see the four autobots (higher than the

house) hidden (scattered) behind the porch. The emotion of the robots does not consist in the amount of things

that they know how to do or shoot in the final battle of the film. It consists of the face that each character will put on

when he discovers them. Once discovered, the only thing that still maintains a certain interest is the curves of the girl.

" 0

" We are already fed up with American enchantments, that it seems that outside of Tennessee, Nebraska, Nevada or

Wichita Falls there is no Poltergeist nor devils. It's what happens to them for having such a short History.

As one is innocent and believes almost everything they tell him, I take it for granted that this film

is based on real events. Otherwise, the innocence is erased, the sentimental goodness that everyone

tells the truth, would think that what they have done is copy and paste scenes of the Exorcists that

are loose and from there another bad B-series tape with curses and girls that flutter in bed,

prey to some invisible form of Evil. The typic of the haunted house dresses here from enchanted house

decimon� Unique, a gothic point. Neither have been too careful to adapt the time (nineteenth century) with the

story that is told. Predictable in excess, gives a nervous camera that sweeps the screen and puts the

nerves to the patient viewer that at no time has been truly pushed to show a minimum

interest . At times I thought it was a TV premiere with a loose budget and two post actors (Sissy

Spacek and Donald Sutherland), but none of them give the story dramatic sustenance because the writers they have

enjoyed more in concatenating scenes of impact that, in many cases, are too familiar to us,

instead of basting the episode of spirits with comings and goings as they like on the stairs

decimon��� nicas.No Solomon has been able to erase from the collective cin���fila memory that grain that was Dragons and

dungeons, although the girl would lose her mind for going to the movies to her fantasy ration It was poor. The very

burned resource of the startle thickens: it embraces the idea that the horror film works with noises

and creaks of stairs, of children that appear and disappear in a swing or shots in black and white so that we

notice (it is we are idiots) that it is the ghost or the spirit or the starter on duty who looks and

we, fools, really, look for their terrifying eyes. Everything is already very Asian. Tobe Hopper is more

truculent, but he knows the subject better. Even an errand such as Sidney J. Furie made a more than appreciable The

entity, which comes to say more or less the same, but without ambientaci���n. Is that we are already tired of

American enchantments, it seems that outside of Tennessee, Nebraska, Nevada or Wichita Falls there is no

Poltergeist or devils. This is what happens to them because they have such a short History: that they have to throw out

anecdotes and turn into a national episode what is outside their borders is an absolute bullshit. We wait,

anxious, for Clint Eastwood and his Flags of our parents. That History, at least, is more forceful: itus

affectsall more. I do not want more ghosts anymore.

" 0

" Hilarious 100%. The zombies, slower than the bad guy's horse, are of continuous laughter. It is necessary to see the amount of zombie movies that they record lately. What if Resident Evil 2, what if The dawn

of the dead, what if 28 days. And to each one m���sym���s bad. But this one had another very different look. In the

photo on the cover, a guy in an elevator with a face and surrounded by zombies with smoky faces. The movie

promised And I was promising. The movie is a continuous descojono, of those that if you sneeze you have lost three

details. It's about a guy with a face like him who has problems with his girlfriend. Live with a fat pothead (fuck,

all I see are fumetas) is a pig and a guy with a bad host. And they spend their lives in a bar called

"" Winchester "". Suddenly, rightly, the girlfriend leaves him right when a virus attacks the city. Of course, the

lion does not realize that half the city is zombie until they try to bite the jugular. And he decides he

has to save the bride and her mother. Hilarious 100%. The zombies, slower than the bad guy's horse, are of

continuous laughter. A detail that made me very funny. They are attacked by zombies on the porch of their house and they say

"" What do we do? Sit down to take a tea and sit on the couch at home while the zombies drool the window.

He asks each other "" They are still there "" and the fat man gets up, removes the curtain and sees the zombies rubbing

through the glass and says "" Yes "" and sits down again. In the end they go out to kill them and start throwingutensils at them

kitchen. A colander, a funnel, the toaster, etc. As they do not kill them they leave (leaving the zombies in the same

place) for the collection of disks of the lion. And so the whole movie. I highly recommend it, but

then I do not want to hear that if the movie is a tru ,o, that if I'm an asshole, that if you are going to split my legs and

things like that. I liked it so much that I've seen it twice.

" 1

" Second installment of the creators of Zombies Party, only that parodying films of police intrigue. Very

good, with hilarious moments, but ballasted by the masterful first delivery. Highly recommended.

Director: Edwar Wrigth.Duraci���n: Dos horazas.Estreno: December 5, 2007. The creators, and part of the

cast, return to the fray after the incredible Zombies Party with a proposal very similar to that, except that

nailed in the police station. It is very difficult to avoid references to the previous one when it comes to talking

about it, given that it is not fully understood without having seen the previous one. Why? Because the absurdity

of the first one made it clear that this was a joke, and with this those foolishnesses are not detected

towards the final apocalyptic. The film deals with an excellent police It is London that a good day is destined for

a small town where the crime rate is nil. The reason? That it's so good that it's ridiculing

all the guys. In his new destination almost nothing happens, except minor infractions that he solves

as if terrorist acts were dealt with. Within this town, awarded several times as the mosttown

beautiful, in addition to the police body (joke) there is a neighborhood brigade very concerned about offenders as the

living statue, or even the kids with hood. We have more of the same with respect to Zombies Party, with

reservations. Those beatings of rhythm have been lost a bit, where we happened to be killing the undead to

take the t��� and see if these have left from the window. Here we have none of that, other than quick

camera moves and crazy approaches that end up dizzy. The script is very interesting, with a plot of

intrigue worthy of great movies of the genre and some similarity with an episode of the X-Files or even

one of The Simpsons. And all this stuffed with pussies and jokes. The bad thing is that it does not end up being a laughing laugh,

with the exception of the last half hour, where you can reach the level of the zombies, with great moments altogether. Resumiendo

, second installment of the creators of Zombies Party, only that parodying films ofintrigue

police. Very good, with hilarious moments, but ballasted by the masterful first delivery. Highly

recommendable. Long, that's it.Besitos.PD: The references to the first are several, like the scene of the

fences, in addition to the choice of the actors principales.PD2: I do not know how they will translate it, but in VO they come out

Mr. Pollas and Mr. Blowjob.

" 1

" Salvaje reveals the great problem that exists today in the animation industry. Salvaje is a hybrid film between two already known, I am referring to Madagascar and Finding Nemo, and is that the

influence of Madagascar is very clear, some animals that escape from the zoo in New York. And as for the

why of Finding Nemo, is also very clear, is the story of a father looking for his son, and although this

time are not fish and are lions, it is clear that they are telling us the same story. And the truth is, it's very

pathetic that Disney is copying to PDI and even something more surprising, that they copy themselves, since

although "" Looking for Nemo "" is of Pixar these act under the seal Disney. In addition, positions to copy also

decide to copy the great failure of Madagascar that is not to develop history in New York, but in the jungle and

for that reason the same error is repeated that the part in the big city is much more It's interesting and brief than the

rest of the movie. But hey, let's forget that Savage is a copy and let's look at the rest, what do

we find? Well, very little truth, the characters are quite bland and it is hard to believe that Kiefer Sutherland will

put the voice to the protagonist since the animation characters usually have a personality and

appearance similar to that of the person who he doubles them, in Savage this does not happen by far. The events that are

happening in history are also very repetitive of other movies, I think since C-3PO was

mistaken by the Ewoks with a god, this has been repeated hundreds of times, in fact it is curious to see how

only two days ago I saw something similar in Ice Age 2 and today I see it again in Wild. Savage highlights the great

problem that exists today in the animation industry and is that only Pixar and PDI know how to make good

movies and the rest of animation studios try to just follow these leaders doing similar movies

but that are boring, boring and at times insufferable as it has already happened with Valiant, Ice Age 2,

Chicken Little and now this. And the reality is that each one has to find originality and his own way,

not just copying the big ones. The movie is not bad, but it's not good either, it's just an hour and a half

of situations where nothing happens and only made for the children to buy stuffed animals from the characters in the

movie. And even the movie ends a little unfinished and with a final not very closed, I hope they do not

plan to make sequel. And do not be fooled, if you take a child to see this movie you will probably have fun, but

that generation will not enjoy a great animated movie like so many others They have done it. And it's

that that child will not cry with Bambi, nor be excited with Beauty and the Beast, not even have a great time

with Toy Story, just watch a movie that Next day she will have forgotten and when she grows up she will be

unable to remember if he really saw her. The only positive and remarkable detail of the film is the choice of

some very good songs (although few) for the soundtrack of the film, among which aresongs

Coldplay or Lifehouse.

" 0

" Where did the movies go like "War games", which prompted me to get involved in this? I just got home after seeing, invited by McAfee, "" Firewall "", the new Harrison Ford movie in which

the prota is an expert in computer security. Poor Harrison does not give too much, but

of a fistmost of the characters are pretty crappy. We have the unforgettable Robert Patrick (T1000) who

seems to have aged 50 years, a Paul Bettany badly bad that does not even stick with tail (at any

time it seems that he will say "" ��� I'm a ghost! "I'm a ghost!" "As if Russell was in front of you ... and a

cast that does not convince. The rest of the gang of bad guys are lads, and a 60-year-old guy can have one

with half the age in a physical confrontation (in fact, with two). It is too believable. The truth is that

the argument is not bad, but the movie is a bit of a life's trick. I wanted to leave a couple offor the end

highlights: to "" hack "" the system (to call it somehow), Indiana (I say? McGyver? I mean?

Harrison) mounts an esc� ��ner of last generation with the reading bar of a fax / multifunction and with an iPod

mini. I have no idea how it connects one thing to the other (the port on the iPod's headset is not a port

of entry, and you do not see it soldering anything at Apple's proprietary connector) but the thing shoots incredibly: it

collects the 10000 account numbers of the bank (which pass at an incredible speed by the screen to which

the reader bar of the esc is stuck. ���ner) and stores them on the iPod's hard disk in the form of images. Then

pass them through an OCR application and voila, we have the account numbers perfectly registered on our

laptop. That, and the GPS collar of the dog (to have them, eye) are two of the technical pillars

of the movie's plot. No comment. Buf. By the way, in the movie Windows XP is everywhere, except

(I think) in a small moment in which Harrison suddenly introduces a couple of lines through an int� Press

commands to show off how he controls configuring routers that seemed to me, so, at first glance, Linux,

although I'm wrong. Where did the movies go as "" War games "", which prompted me to get

into this?

" 0

" This script is for internal action, but physical movement. They should learn from it Spanish and Argentineans,

and stop making movies so extremely boring.

"" Little Miss Sunshine "" has, possibly, one of the best scripts of the past year. And I do not mean in

terms of content, that too, but in terms of its technique. The movies of internal action, like this, are much

more difficult to write. In addition to much more boring to do it. A good script is rarely entertaining when

read, because it is not made for that, it is made to be read. "" Little Miss Sunshine "" has a lot of work in

gui���n, dialogue and triangulation of characters, that's what this movie works on. Use a lot of subplots

to move a main plot "" you have to take this child to the contest. "" The screenwriter, Michael Arndt, knows it very

well. And he builds his structure on these relationships, making the trip quite frantic. These characters

live at the edge of their own lives. The gui���n is proper to study it, its structure and plots,

regardless of the moral content or not. It's a round script, like "" The Fisher King "".

To work such a frantic guide on family relationships is very difficult, you have to have some verycharacters

goodto make it work. I imagine that Mr. Ardnt had to spend hours writing the lives of each one

of them, trying to make them interesting and coherent, and thinking that he was going to put them all in a

van for a long trip. I had to have a lot of material so I would not get bored. And he gets it withenough

more than. Give a lesson how to write. The movie is fun but sometimes something ���o���a, which you forget and

forgive for how it is the rest. Greg Kinnear makes one of his best roles, and Steve Carrell is huge in his

role as homosexual crazy suicide. What Alan Arkin is another issue. It is a lesson of what it really is to

act. Abigail Breslin, the girl, makes it great in a role that, contrary to what it seems, is quite

difficult. Playing a role a billion times better than the mentally retarded Jennifer Hudson in

"" Dreamgirls. "" Everything is going to hell, is very pessimistic, but unlike many movies, gives aview

positiveof pessimism. The directors are two, a couple from the videoclip, who here forget

paraphernalia to give us a good story. Then they say that people here will not see Spanish cinema because of the

budget of our films. I do not think "" Little Miss Sunshine "" was very expensive. I just have a great script,

unlike the vast majority of our films that are antifosic. This script is for internal action, but

movement f� Basic They should learn from it Spanish and Argentineans, and stop making movies so extremely

boring.

" 1

" The best thing about these films is that the setting, makeup and scenery are exactly the

original film, the rest, the simplest, hardest and forgettable that I have been able to contemplate for a long time.

Take a good list of blockbuster films (Beginning with "" The Da Vinci Code "", followed by "" Serpents

on the Airplane "", "" X-Men "", "" Charlie and the Chocolate Factory "", "" Saw "", "" Supernacho "", "" The Narnia Critics "",

some TV shows made in the USA, and even, "" Scarface "", "" Mission Impossible "", "" Superman Returns "", the

saga "" Harry Potter "", the adventures of "" Pirates of the Caribbean "", "" Click "" and even a "" Borat "" which at the end they have

gotten with shoehorn, even some strokes of "" Past de vueltas "", "" Star Wars "" and the new adventures of

"" 007 "") The best of these movies ambientacin particles it is that, makeup and decorated Calcan exactly to the

original film, the rest, the simplest, painful and forgettable that I could see much tiempo.En

emphasize sharing the presence of Carmen Electra, Jennifer Coolidge (the famous mother of Stifler of "" American

Pie "", the cameo of Dav id Carradine, as well as Kal Penn, who also participated in one of the parodied films

("" Superman "".) In short, little else to mention.

" 0

" Without a doubt it is one of those films that will be part of one way or another of the history ofcinema

current...

I have already seen it and it is clear to me that now I have to chew it, digest it and then Surely I can meditateit

oncoldly, since, like all Star Wars movies, I loved it! It had been a while since I

moved in the cinema skipped the tears on a couple of occasions) and surely be together

as my beloved "" The return of the Jedi "" the second film with which I have enjoyed all the components

the saga. The film starts very slowly and even at the beginning it can become "" more of the same "" because in

the first half hour I felt quite confused because what was happening on screen (recommended to

see it in a room with THX Sound) but, nevertheless, as the plot progressed I felt much more satisfied ho

with what a priori believed that it was going to be the final result of it (from ���rdago). I was delighted to find

landscapes (Alderaan) and characters (Chewie) that I remembered from previous tapes as well as some I knew from

"" Clone Wars "", the Star Wars animated series. I read in a couple of reviews that the best moments were

played by Hayden Christensen (and think that originally squeaked me in his role as Anakin) and Ian

McDiarmid (Palpatine - Darth Sidious) and they are not without reason, there is perhaps between them, a series of

complicity that does not appear between Obi Wan and Anakin, for more than this he tried (for the memory the phrase of Obithe odd

Wan "" if it stays still bursts "" that has taken offsmile in the stalls). It is ""

Revenge of the Sith "" a film that managesunite everything habamos seen in previous prequels with

those episodes withcertain flavor ejo that most remember in our memora as part of our very

personal childhood; While it is true, it seems that Luca $ has bothered to listen or read (forums,lists

mailing.) to fans of the saga, answered thousands of questions that we all have ever asked

about the saga and that without However, we have never seen it on screen (and see that the so-called "Universe" is wide

Expanded.) Again, the excellent score by John Williams masterfully accompanies each and every one of the

moments of the film, from the themes already known by all the fans to others that make that at some

moments we put the flesh of Gallina.Perhaps, and as a negative note, it will put the absolute excess ofeffects

special, since as Ewan McGregor said it is not good for the actors (that of acting before the Croma Key) nor is it

good for the spectators, since although it is a Science Fiction film in which we know that 90% of

what we are going to see is not real, it diminishes the credibility of what is not real cinta.Sin question is one

of those films that will be part of one way or another of the history of today's cinema.

" 1

" It's a pity that maybe none of the ���scars he was nominated for (although we already know

how these prizes work), but his great reception among the audience was maybe It's the biggest reward you could

get.

I remember that the first time I saw "" Perpetual Chain "" some years ago in an early morning pass by La2,

there was, between the film and me, one of these "" flechazos "" "that you just notice the first images on the

screen. And there was a lump in my throat at the end, when Red and Andy finally meet. Since

then, every time the movie was shown on television, I left what I had in hand and watched it.

Finally, I acquired it on DVD. A few days ago, I went back to have a look to write this

article with some ownership and again I began to feel the old knot that often accompanied me when I had

the opportunity to sit in front of her. With a script based on Stephen King's account, Perpetual Chain, by

director Frank Darabont, it can really be considered one of the great productions of the decade of the

90s. Andrew Dufresne (Tim Robbins) It would have a lot to highlight if we saw it on the street. Correct,

incorruptible to the highest degree, is the executive of a great bank. A common face, a common life. They run the

forties. The fact is that the existence of this person takes a complete turn when he discovers that he is

cheated by his wife with a golf player. Gets drunk. He comes to think about killing her. With the weapon in his hand,

trembling, he thought whether to do it or not. But he did not. Meanwhile, the same night someone murdered his wife and

her lover leaving a lot of evidence pointing to Andy. Sentenced to two life sentences, he was taken

to prison, where his dreams were locked under seven keys between abusive guards andprisoners

violent. "" Cadena Perpetua "" could be seen as a film about a friendship, about how Andy finds in his

companion Network (Morgan Freeman) all the nobility and confidence that, in such a hostile environment, it would seem impossible to

imagine. But the truth is that the true leitmotif of the film is the feeling of hope. On

how dreams persist alive and intense for decades and years, even in circumstances under which,

hopelessness and disappointment will make a dent in anyone. footage, one of the oldest inmates

, Brooks, finally receives his conditional. What should be a reason for joy for the old

librarian ends up turning into screams and tears. "After 50 years here, these walls are all he

knows," Red would say. And that was what was happening. The world outside, for old Brooks had

transformed into a monster that devoured itself. He had become accustomed to jail. That was his

world. Those walls were his freedom. Those prisoners were his true friends. And that fear of living

outside of Shawshank's prison makes Brooks prefer to run away in another way: hanging from a rope in his

rented room, nothing more to go out on the street. But Andy did not work like that, he was not satisfied. Even after two

decades of suffering the worst abuses - both physical and psychological - to which a human being can be

subjected, the as yet He kept the flame burning. "Careful, hope is dangerous here," Red warned.

But Andy did not hear it. And I continued hopeful. He did not want big luxuries, just a simple life, a beach in Mexico,

an old ship to sail and earn enough to survive. And a beer in the sun, exactly like that one

day. Sobrea on the rooftops of the prison. Or like when Andy sneaks into the guard's booth to put on the

speakers a disc with "" F Bogaro's Weddings "" to the inmates (I do not even have the faintest idea of ​​what I sang

those two Italians, and the truth is that I do not want to know, good things do not need to be understood, I suppose

they sang about something so beautiful that it could not be expressed in words, and that That's why it made your, I

heart throbassure you that those voices raised you higher and farther away than anyone living in such a

gray place could dream. It was as if a beautiful bird had entered our monotonous cage and

dissolved those walls. And for a few moments, even the last man in the prison felt himself. �� free, of course,

the Warden did not like anything, Andy fell two weeks in the hole for that shtick) And the

same goes for him to hope: no matter how many beatings you receive, how much they humiliate you. Hope, is

always there, gui���ndote and making you move forward. And for men like Andrew Dufresne, hope never goes

away. What draws the attention of this production is the script, which is very well crafted and worked,

emphasizing the harsh reality of who is behind the walls of a prison and who has to survive

knowing that he has not the remotest possibility of going out and who is innocent above. It presents

all the situations that can occur in a prison, from the discussions between the inmates to the

existing corruption in some officials and administrators. Also one of the strengths of its history

is the way in which the prison is reflected in such a way that it is a world totally apart from the outside, with

values ​​that do not have to be equal to ours, to free citizens. As for the

characters, their dialogues are excellently elaborated. While Andy demonstrates that hope we

talked about above, Red assumes the role of the man who is there to comfort him and to show him the reality

where he lives, it is more realistic, more resigned to his destiny. And in the end he ends up getting excited with Andy,

starring at the end of the projection a reencounter that leaves him totally speechless. The conclusion he

drew � of this film is that we can imprison a person, his body, but we will never imprison his

mind, his spirit. It's a pity that maybe he did not take any of the ascars he was nominated for (although

we already know how these prizes work), but his great reception among the audience was perhaps It's the biggest reward

you could get. In 1966 Andrew Dufresne escaped from Shawshank prison. The only thing they found was their

prisoner's clothes stained with mud, a soap pill and an old gems hammer practically spent

on so much use. I remember thinking that a man would take 600 years to dig a tunnel in the wall with him.

Old Andy didin less than twenty. Andy loved geology, I guess it fit hisnature.

meticulousFor him, time went by slowly, like in the Ice Age. Geology is the study of

pressure and time and, in fact, that's the only thing that's needed: pressure and time, that and a very

big picture. As I said before, in prison a man does almost anything to keep his mind occupied,

Andy's favorite pastime was to take pieces of that wall to the patio, hand-to-hand . The night of his escape, Andy

did what he was told: he left the warden's shoes like two mirrors. The guards did not even notice.

Nor, honestly, "How much do you look at the shoes that another man is wearing?" Andy reached

freedom crawling for 500 yards in a pipe full of filth that stunk like I can not even

imagine. Or maybe I do not want to imagine. rmelo.500 yards, the length of five fields of football, almost half a mile.

The next morning, more or less when Raquel Welch revealed her little secret, a man that nobody had

seen before entered the National Bank of Maine, until then there had been nothing but on

paper. He had his documentation in order and his signature coincided with that of the man in front of him. That

morning Andy went through almost a dozen banks, in total he left the city with more than $ 370,000 of the

money he had been whitewashing the Warden Norton with an imaginary identity: his "" indemnity "" for the

19 years "".

" 1

" Dialogues have an impressive force, everything is based on them, all the sexual content of the

film is in the di���logos.

Closer is a very realistic film about relationships, usually the films that deal with this type

of subjects sell us things that are a lie, however, this film is like life itself, sad and hard.

Dialogs have an impressive force, everything is based on them, all the sexual content of the film is in

the dialogues, they are intense and so real that at any moment the viewer can feel that he has lived that

situation. For the first time, there is a clear and open discussion of sex in a serious dialogue in the cinema, finally an

adult film about love. The four protagonists are the height of the story, surprise Julia

Roberts, since we are used to seeing it in other types of films lighter than this one. Here he shows that he

really knows how to interpret beyond romantic comedies and proves it better than Erin Brokovich,

although he will take an Oscar for that film Jude Law transmits a lot with her eyes and Natalie Portman embroiders her

role as an enigmatic and at the same time fragile girl. Clive Owen plays the role of a rough and rough dermatologist rough

, by the way, the voice that doubles in Spanish seems a bit painful, is too neutral, after

seeing it in version Original and bent, I think he loses a lot with the dubbing. In short, Closer is a

highly recommended film, especially for the richness of its characters.

" 1

" The movie is a bit boring and extremely long (two horazas) and I guess it will technically be

brilliant, but my mogoll���n eyes mourned. The cinema of the future ... buf, that laziness.

There's not much difference between Shrek and Beowulf if you see both in a conventional movie theater. If

instead you go to see the last movie (!) Robert Zemeckis to a room that has threeprojection

dimensionalalso will guarantee unbearable throbbing brain during the first five minutes, until

the human being gets accustomed and manages to focus with both eyes. Then he has some small detail, but do not

believe you will see how a sword approaches you and the face and such, that is in the amusement parks.

Beowulf is the Cinema of the Future. and that scares me. The story is already known to us all and we know very well that it is

quite heavy, so the suspicions are confirmed fast. The movie is a bit boring and extremely long

(two horazas) and I guess that technically it will be brilliant, but my mogoll���n eyes mourned. The

characters are the living image of their real interpreters except the prota, which is a fat man and that did not

end to catch him. The big question is. Why does not it last eighty minutes, Robert?

" 0

" Movie of parody of the series the Team A. As a film it is bad, but since it is well set,

you know what you expose yourself when you see it and have jokes that of how bad they are they make a lot of laughter, because it lets itself be seen.

For lovers of the genre.

Director: Jos��� Truchado Reyes. Duration: 84 minutazos.Estreno: 1989. I do not know if I told you about the book thatme

the Magi brought. Nothing less than "" The guide of the Spanish cinema "" of one Carlos Aguilar. Basically it is a

review of all the Spanish films of history, more than 6000. In the commentary of this film, in all

the book puts Mariano Ozores to birth, he goes on to say that if Mariano Ozores' cinema does notMariano

suitOzores, imagine Jos��� Truchado. Heh, hey, I like the comment, which is partly right. The film

is about a group of soldiers who, after fighting in the Vietnam War, are selling themselves as soldiers

of fortune. . Well, they really have different jobs, but it's my little tribute to the authentic Team A.

Total, that they have to help one of their old company that is being harassed by a woman to

sell her a horse. Script of high standig, as you will see. By the way, the script is part of Antonio Ozores. The film is

the truth that is supermalo, but am��� these movies make me funny. It has a very silly development, with many

patochadas, but from time to time they make a joke with which you laugh. Especially those of Antonio Ozores, which is

a big gag humor. The characterization of the people of the parody is quite good, overactive,

but good. The sets and costumes also remind of the original series. Resuming, parody film of

the series, Team A. As a film, it is very bad, but as it is well set, you know what you expose yourself to when you

see her and she has jokes that of how bad they are make a lot of laughter, because she lets herself be seen. For lovers of the genre, of

course.Besitos.PD: In the cast comes "" La Bombi "" that the young people will not have the remotest idea of ​​who

PD2: By the way, strangely does not leave a tit ;-)

" 0

" A madman on the road is loose and looking for sexy prey (an attempt to summarize a film without meaning and

with little argument ...)

" 0

" Charming. Juno has left me with an infinitely better taste than I expected. In the entry about

Oscar nominations, I called her Little Miss Sunshine this year, but with that, they have nothing in

common, except that it is a comedy more or less "" independent "" - "" indies "" of these that are so fashionable now

(Little miss Sunshine without going m�� Far away). In addition, it is much better film and is better written, although that is, it is

less fun and crazy and. But, what do I do sharing? Anyway, let me take it. The fact is that I

thought it was a lovely film, and I did not expect it, really. It has taken me completely by surprise. It's a

joy to see a movie with a simple sea story, but it's built around a very good

script by Diablo Cody (his first script) , his first nomination to the Oscar), of some very good actors (huge and

majestic Ellen Page, what a shame that he has enough raw to win the Oscar to the best leading actress for

whom she is nominated, although everything is possible), and an even better direction by Jason Reitman (also

nominated), which brings a rhythm soft and constantly balanced. Something in which he hits a good kick to

Little miss. Will it be possible? I continue to share them! In addition, when dealing with the issue, it does not fall into cheap demagogies

or pamphlets that are too recurrent today, which is appreciated. It's just like life itself.

No important hit to be discussed. Well, I know, sometimes it makes you feel that the story is

tumbling to find a particular destination, and that the resolution of a character could have been

better. but nothing serious.Recommendable.

" 1

" Authentic adventure film that, although it remembers slightly to the first delivery and weakens in its

beginnings, will leave you with desires of more. The third part of the saga is expected apothetical.

I'm sure more than one of them will crucify me for what I'm going to say next, although I hope a little

indulgence. I'll go: the film seemed to me very good, BUT I just liked your second and fourth hour.

The first 75 minutes have seemed very lazy for what I expected (and desired). For this reason I am going to divide my

criticism into two very different parts, depending on the hour (and quarter) valued.that it is convenient to remember

Beforewhat the argument is of "" Pirates of the Caribbean: The Dead Man's Chest "": Pirate hunter Lord Cutler

Beckett (Tom Hollander) of the East India Trading Company, and Captain Jack Sparrow (Johnny Depp) are

obsessed with getting the so-called Cofre del Hombre Muerto. According to the legend, whoever owns this Chest will be able to

control the pirate terrorist Davy Jones (Bill Nighy), the master of the depths of the ocean. With this

precious object, Beckett intends to exterminate the last pirate of the Caribbean and dominate the port trade,

and Sparrow tries to get rid of the debt that is pending with Jones to avoid being condemned to

eternity to a life at his service. Both will use Will Turner (Orlando Bloom) and Elizabeth Swann (Keira

Knightley) to achieve their goal. But to reach the Coffer, it is necessary to overcome numerous dangers that

none of them could ever have imagined. The story on paper is promising; however, once put into

practice, it sinks in the bow, and floats insultingly and spectacularly at the stern. The first hour and a quarter. The

(inevitable) need to chain the first installment of the franchise with the second, and the excessive duration

that has been used for it, has seriously damaged this part of the tape, since The continuity between

both films seems forced. In most of the sequels it is vital to remind the viewer how and what

the characters of the original film are to situate them in the new plot In some occasions, thedifference

temporalbetween the premiere of that original film and its sequel, or between sequels, is minimal (one year, or at

most a��� and a half ), with which the viewer perfectly remembers those characters, and, therefore, the

footage that has to be used to place them in the new adventure is reduced. However, in this case, they have

passed about 3 a��� between: The curse of the black pearl and The Dead Man's Chest; so, it was

irremediable to refresh the memory of the public on the previous adventures of Jack Sparrow, Will Turner and

Elizabeth Swann. Unless one has spent the DVD of the first installment so much to see it, or one of those

fans who has signed up for the Pirates of the Caribbean marathon organized by several movie theaters in the country. (S (are

the two filmsscreened consecutively). But that memory did not need to be extended so much.

During the first sixty minutes, events occurred in the first film are recalled and cited in a

way that is too closely spaced. Once you reach the initial 75 minutes, approximately, is when

the new adventure really begins. On the other hand, there are too many preliminaries. I guess it's because in this

second installment there are already three Hollywood stars consecrated, namely Johnny Depp, Orlando Bloom and Keira

Knightley, while in the first was Depp. Therefore, the producers of the film and its director Gore

Verbinski have been forced to give more to all of them, so that their fans can

enjoy more of each one of them. that I have explained previously, this part of the tape becomes

eternal, and one becomes impatient waiting to see when the action begins. The second and fourth hour. Here is

where the tomato starts . Spectacular, disturbing, with rhythm and with many surprises that I can not reveal. This

is what I wanted to see (and I'm sure more than one of you) during the whole footage. In this part of the film

it has absolutely exploded everything pruning s give this new adventure. And, on top of that,has been reserved for this

the best and most impressive and amazing filmmoment: the KRAKEN, a giant octopus that destroys

any ship in which it is found. Jack Sparrow (or anything in his dress). I have been fascinated by this

second and fourth hour. I did not want it to end. And, on top of that, it has a piece of end, which is going to make you fall on your

back. Perfect surprise to link with the third (and last?) Delivery of the Pirates of the Caribbean, and thatyou

leaveswanting more, and more, and still For this second hour I give the film a rating of "" very

good. "" And for the performances of all the actors throughout the film. You can not forget any

of the main ones: Johnny Depp is the authentic and genuine Jack Sparrow. I do not see any other actor taking

this role with such success and genius. Although we already know the character well, and this makes him

lose the magic of his discovery, Depp continues in the same line of interpretation that has established him as

one of the most relevant actors , eccentric and influential Hollywood. Without that film, it would be quite another. Orlando

Bloom takes one more step in his career to consider him as a prominent interpreter. His role as

Will Turner has expanded and has allowed him to display his different interpretative facets (which from what I have

seen are quite and surprisingly varied). He mixes the moments of drama and comedy with mastery, and that

has favored him to be recognized as the great gal of the film, surpassing the classics. Keira

Knightley is attractive, sensual and, at the same time, very warlike. Her role as Elizabeth Swann has also expanded and

she has been given more scenes for herself; so she has learned to take advantage of them, and she has shownwith grace

her talent as an actressand passion. But the rest of the cast is equally superb: Bill Nighy as the

terrifying Davy Jones although his whole face is full of tentacles; Tom Hollander as ruthless Lord

Cutler Beckett; and, of course, Kevin McNally, in his magnificent line as the inseparable Gibbs companion of Sparrow,

and the crazy pirate couple formed by Lee Arenberg (Pintel) and Mackenzie Crook (Ragetti), now It's

ingenious and crazy. And some others that I left intentionally without naming so as not to reveal surprises. In

short, an authentic film of adventures that, although it remembers slightly to the first delivery and weakens

in its beginnings, will leave you. with wishes for more. The third part of the saga is expected apothetical.

" 1

" A mess for drug addicts with little imagination. The fountain, by Aronofsky, deals with the fear of, the fight against and the very concept of death, in a

film divided into three parts. They are essentially independent, but two of them are subordinated, from the

meaning to a main one. Here are the reasons why this film is radically horrible, hackneyed,

stupid, cheesy , unbearable: 1. The two minor narrative lines function as anallegorical representation

obvious and unnecessarythat underestimates the viewer's capacity for understanding, which should not only see how they are

repeated in the form of allegory (that is, one-to-one correspondence of the main elements of the central plot

and these two) exactly the same meanings as in the main one, but, as if that were not enough, in this

same part listen, from the mouth of a supposed scientist, atrocities (for lack of plausibility I

say) such as "" death is a disease like anybody and I can cure it "" (Come on? we already understood that

death is the man it does not feel good, but do not stop saying those things) .2. The eighties-futuristic aesthetic in one

of the minor stories causes nausea. It seems we are watching a low budget video clip by Daft Punk

instead of a film by Aronofsky.3. The radical mixture of concepts, beliefs,tendencies

religious-philosophicalthat operate in the film as a "" everything does not matter "". The important thing is to oppose

western scientism (bad bad bad) anything. And then we put the Maya and a peeling meditating

like the good ones, total? the post is to accept death, the rest are unimportant details (which makes me

doubt the seriousness of the treatment of kabalah, of which I know nothing, in Pi). The tritetheme

romanticista-antipositivista(that is, at most, nineteenth century, seÃ ± ores) anchored in a hackneyed love tragedy,

without contributions of any kind to any of the two clichÃ� ��s (Except, of course, that in one of the three stories

the man transforms into a peeling and the woman into a small tree) .5. Several monkeys seem to have been tortured

during the shooting. In short, a mess for drug addicts with little imagination.

" 0

" Badly lit, without rhythm, pretentious, with some pat���ticos di ,logos, failed, full of clich���s, boring and

even embarrassing in many moments

With so much fan���tico of the comics and so much geek of the superheroes in the network, I am very afraid that this criticism willme

sendto the hell of the non-modern and anti-cools. But folks, I can not help writing that "" V de

Vendetta "" it seemed to me "" Truly a shit "" I know, I have not read the comic by Allan Moore, that

I have hardly gone from the "" Mortadelos and filemones "", to "" Spiderman "", "" Superlopez "" and del "" Jabato "", but it does not matter.

I went to the cinema and tried to entertain myself without an instruction manual. What I found was a pedantic uncle,

escaped from the Garci gatherings, disguised as a fox and wearing a mask. A badly lit movie, without

rhythm, pretentious, with some pat���ticos di ,logos, failed, full of clich���s, boring and even embarrassing in

many moments. As pel��� action, defraud. Too little chicha and nothing new. (To lovers of

movies about future authoritarians with a good action-style "Matrix" ", I recommend

" "Equilibrium" ".) As a superhero film, walk closer to "" Catwoman "", "" Daredevil "" or "" Scooby-Doo "", than of

"" Superman "", "" Darkman "", "" El cuervo "", " "Batman" "or company. In special effects they do not stand out at all. The

camera work and the staging is little more than regular, flooded with medium and short shots,

with smoke machines on the sides working without rest and with a general whiff to study. As I said before, he can not

find an original or novel look, despite having ordered everything that appears on the screen

in gray and black. "" Sin City "", I bet a lot more courageously, to put an example right on theside

opposite. As for music. buff I even prefer the techno musical "Blade". "The actors,

well, to report that Natalie Portman is also very good with her hair as shaved as Sidney

Oconnor's. That John Hurt always appears very angry and inside a TV and that the others, basically, passed

by there. The love story is stuck at the end of everything, as of refil���ny and is not believed neither by the scriptwriter, nor

the director, nor the Wachowski brothers in the production. The story is a pupurri of intentions, a pastiche

between "" The beauty and the beast "", "" The fox "", "" The ghost of the opera "", "" The fight club "", "" The count of

Monte Cristo " ", any of the numerous existing and less original productions about future

authoritarians, and" "Bamby" ". Come on, a desprop���sito.Edo is predictable, l���nguido and syrupy. Everything is so

incredibly absurd, so unlikely and so cheaply boring, that some scenes are up to cosmic

without pretending it. Like the sultry little scene and all those other numerous flashbacks that catapult us

the shame of others, without any mercy, at levels in which we discover, suddenly, in the cinema pressing

hard, very strong teeth. And where on top, they give us everything ridiculously chewed. Or like all those

scenes where the visual always prevails over the common sense and the reason, and where, moreover, ifcan be

nothing elseexplained afterwards. It does not matter, either, such moments in which you have to believe yourself, no more,

than that gentleman, disguised by obligation, and in search and capture in a militarist, police and dictatorial state,

manages to manufacture 300,000 masks and capes and, in addition, to send them also to each private house, every office and

joint in all of England alone, without removing the mask and without catch. Or having to witness how

our countryman entertains himself by forming a figurine with which he draws his V-shaped logo with the help of

10,000 pieces of dominoes (which he wrote), for, only, knock it down after being alone, in the best

style "" dominoday "", and for your only onanist enjoyment. And so everything, one after the other, gentlemen. And yes, I know that the

individual in black is supposedly a hero, and that there is always a certain amount of ghost in these

films, but here, many times these acts, they also have a specific weight in the central plot.

It provokes neither more nor less than a revolution, and I would only wish that they sold me the move in a

more intelligent and curred way. (As in the "" Fight Club "", as I mentioned before) But no, here there are only

inexplicable attacks, without dead, in the style of beautiful fireworks lighting the balconies and under

the m��� Tchaikovsky's music There is only a myriad of incoherent actions andimages andat our disposal. How do

photocopiedplotsyou sell all this then? Well, we added an attack in London and

to be able to be precisely in the subway, then we talked a little pseudo-philosophically about the symbolism of

demolishing representative buildings, four phrases more allegedly witty and stylish "" The ideals are

bulletproof "", a bit of avian flu and a little bit of bacteriological warfare, and then

everything is supposedly very fashionable and, in addition, we get to have a whole mass of incrims who will believe

and defend this project as modern, courageous and innovative. In short, a complete film disappointment. It did notme

surprisethat the two little brothers of the Matrix have decided, at the last minute, to better collapse their second

assistant. Can something even worse be done than the Matrix sequels? Yes, friends, you can. Of course it can.

" 0

" Bad, very bad. Disconcerting and deceptive. Almost two hours of blood without any explanation, although I never

needed it, and with a mandas and manidas ways to finish off the characters. Hopefully it is the end of

a saga.

I do not remember very well what the documentary was called, but many years ago it was broadcasted on TVE and it was a

kind of compilation of the best scenes of the cinema of fear of the 70s and 80s. Appears "" Halloween "",

"" Nightmare "", "" The Thing "" and a host of other movies. The image that most impressed me was that of Leatherface

behind a blonde who screamed like a pig in a slaughterhouse, in the original "" La Matanza de Texas "". How far

is that already, and what they have done with the saga, god m���o.��� "" The Origin "" of what? This is an argument to try to

endow a research into the origins of the killer of the mechanical saw for a film that tells the

same story as its predecessors. Do not be fooled, the birth of Leatherface lasts 30 seconds. Its origin,

vague of explanation. Its development, was already seen in the remake, but with different girls. A road, a

sheriff who catches the kids and a succession of races and escapades by the adjoining and interior of that

house that is unmistakable That is not the origin, but the same mechanics that were used to kill 70

people, and from which we can do 30 more sequels, to the rhythm of the dead we carry. I have not heard

why Leatherface killed him, what led him to have his face so disfigured, nor his obesity to cut the meat.

Why? �� Was a butcher ?. How, so easy, what a scam. I can assume that the mask that accompanies the sic���pata is that

of the face of the first dead youngster, played by Matt Bomer. I must assume that, because it is not that I

see it clearly either. Gentlemen, this is not a film of origins, it's a film that continues the franchise

unnecessarily, and from which we can not expect any surprise , since, being a prequel, it is not going to die the

caracuero, evident. The girl, Jordana Brewster, very cute, seen in "" A todo Gas "". The boy, Matt Bomer, seen in

"" True Calling "". His papers, in line of flat encephalogram, with the sole objective of staying alive

as long as possible. The other two co-stars better forget them. The two best: One, R. Lee Ermey, as

Sheriff Hoyt, of whom we know his way up the police corps; and the other, the sound of the

mechanical saw, brutal until the end. Maybe that's it, the end, the unique highlight of a film that no longer

scares anyone, and where the blood, in abundance, is not that much disgust.Mala, very bad . Disconcerting and

deceptive. Almost two hours of blood without any explanation, although I never needed it, and with a mandas and manidas ways

to finish off the characters. Hopefully it is the end of a saga, although I doubt very much that,

not being dead skinny, the butchery does not continue?

" 0

" With a bit of Asian terror (shadows that walk frame by frame, glups!) And a lot of cool modernism

tries to look like so many things that it ends up being a complete mess. The mushrooms and the tension do not combine

well ...

Alexandre Aj���, Rob Zombie, Adam Green (Hatchet) or Zach Snyder are talented directors. Paddy Breathnach is

a director without too much talent who has shot a movie so that the kids are scared with the brutal volume

of the "" scares. "" With a bit of Asian terror (shadows that walk frame by frame, glups !) and a lot of

cool modernism tries to look like so many things that it ends up being a complete mess: two couples of

yankis and a single girl who has her churri in Ireland travel up there for? eat mushrooms I could accuse

such an argument of being supine stupidity, but Eli Roth used it in Hostel and it worked, because that's

what I believe. Who does not want to go to Holland with colleagues to smoke a good bit of money? I know people

who go up for mushrooms, they have never caught an airplane for such bullshit. Well, the fact is that the grandson

of John Huston explains to them that there are some debut mushrooms, a cursed orphanage, ghosts and some mushrooms thatnot

shouldbe eaten ever: they cause almost fixed death. If you survive the mushrooms the side effects are

"" spectacular "": ability to communicate with the dead (���), uncontrolled aggression and force, the ability

to change shape (���) and finally, But no less important, the ability to see the future. There will be more,

but surely gut a movie that has no interest no matter how cool the dossier that we have received

in the pass. Things like that do not help the genre to be respected, because Jason already had a sack in the

chola before putting on the mask, native timid ones we already saw them recently in Calvary and the rest? Well, you

could say it's a movie about how a blonde girl gets dirty in the woods. There are more plagiarism, but it would

become a spoiler if I tell you it ends up like? quiet, kidding.

" 0

" Discarnate critic of Injustice Rated as demagic by the most rancid sectors of criticism,

the film resists any destructive analysis with his sober treaty of social radiography of a time.

1. The birth of a nacinAhora that cinema has passed its first century, well being (to

complete the urgency of recent CuO to make balances and compose loas) recall the two trends on

that its matrix and its subsequent propaganda device were forged. On the one hand,filmmaking

documentary, un���vocal, sober, naturalistic, that films the exit of workers from a factory, I put for case, and

on the other the creation cinema. ,N, a vivid mixture of literature, visual entertainment (the audio came later)

to decimate the pockets of the proletarian worker and greedy of those new leisures that have just come out of the The factory

must have come after this first vocation of invention to entertain the masses and

procure them, amid so much misery of the last century, a distraction, a powerful stimulus to renew the

capacity of astonishment of the citizen. This declaration of principles is appropriate to place the grapes of anger in its

precise context. The film is born in a splendid Hollywood that begins to be considered what has been:

dream factory, epic industry bigger than the life of the style What the The new

public is torn between surviving the Great Depression and coping with the glamor of the new times, an

incontestable melting pot of opulence and luxury. This is why the film may not have been born: not having

been thought, produced and invoiced in a time of such fragile temperament as the late thirties and

early forties were in the United States. The foundational premise of the Steinbeck novel on which it is

based (and in addition the Ford film) is the criticism of social injustice, manifested in the Joad, an

Oklahoma family that migrates to the golden California in search of work after the mechanization of the

countryside scares them all hope of progress and that a company expropriates their land, ancestral

symbols of its roots in the world The ruin and the hunger push them to the West, the land ofprompted

idealizationby the new batch of rumors that draw an Edón to discover for the brave who embrace it.

In this, Ford feels comfortable because, deep down, what we are talking about is the transfigured,presence

metamorphosedof the classic western with its useless heroes they sacrifice themselves to see a country being born and to be

part of that fundamental foundation. This stink of novice Americanism is still evident in the 21st century, butnot get

let'sout of the argumentative line.2. The bald journey The grapes of wrath is, as we have said, a rarity. Itnot

doesseem easy to make such a contemporary film, stuck in such a narrow margin ofdifference

chronological: that portrays the miseries of a country and its precariousness work with such a degree of verismo.Es a

film-mirror: a discarnate critic of Injustice, that is, the absence of laws to govern a country.

Rated as demagic by the most rancid sectors of American criticism, reduced to melodrama of

easy fire, the film resists all an� Destructive analysis with his sober treaty of social radiography of a time.

There is a period of History from the same History: John Ford takes it to term in the middle of a

Depression. n economic lacerating so that the film acquires, in its genesis, in its context, a character

preeminently testimonial, documentalist, truffled with a veracity that reality does not discuss because it was,

at times, cruder, more atrocious than this fiction of a family that seeks its place in the world after having

been dispossessed of the one that, in truth, It belonged to them. These dispossessed, these declassed, these pariahs of the

earth are the Joad of the film. Archetypal characters who take on the compassion of others, who have nothing and

who do not want much, but who lick to find a place on which to build their new existence.

Tom Joad (a sublime Henry Fonda who he did not earn a deserved ���scar) is acquiring a civic and political awareness,

social and even union in his trip to the promised land. There is a typical of the working class

exciting, felt.John Ford opts for a realistic point of view: it suits the plot to dispossess it of all

artificiality. What the director is going to narrate is an eviction, an exodus, so he has to adopt the

road-movie technique, which then did not exist as a concept. narrative of the film (hence,novel

Steinbeck's) is a song to the human. No Joad, nor the troubled Tom, so hermetic in his tormented

complexity as a failure, seeks a benefit other than love, tenderness, terroir (more ���� Intimately).

John Ford being a catholic of militancy and an avowed republican, there is no other vision of the matter. Besides, it

does not fix a culprit of this misery. The culprit (tells a character) is a bank in Tulsa, but

there is only one administrator who does what they say. A ���se (a���aden) we can not put a shotgun in front of him. It is

an errand. A worker. Other.The trip, finally, run over by climatic inconveniences and

transport (that rickety truck where everything fits and where such an intense microcosm is shaken!) is

bald. The trip to nowhere, what our Fern���nG���mez would say. A journey that progresses towards a destiny that we already

intuited: corruption, deception, racism. California is Oklahoma, but two hundred humiliations go on there.ago

Not longThe grapes of anger disturb, shocks. That is the perfect definition to which I adhere.

It shakes especially the sweep of faces that Ford's camera (with the very precise photograph of Gregg

Toland, then Welles collaborator in Citizen Kane) makes in the camp of illegals, of theirmisery

simple and withoutimposture, of the infamous barracks. Ma Joad, at the end, says: "We are the people. Weexist

always"". His son, Tom, the ghost (there is even a disc of Springsteen that takes up this idea: of the

spectrality of the anonymous and unsuccessful hero of Tom Joad) wanders a changing country, ut� Typical, lyrical, brutal

that is represented clearly in the figure of the disenchanted preacher, who hangs up the habits and clings to the

new faith, to the labor activism that later became what we understand today as unions. From the acclaimed

reception of the film in that year's Oscar (best director for Ford and best supporting actress for Jane

Darwell in the role of the tender mother) it is inferred that the times were changing and that America (that part

of America, more properly) condescend���aa look at the navel and declare itself unstable, corrupt, but also

hopeful and exciting. It was a country to be formed, involved in a war and renouncing aeconomic disaster. The Joads

devastatingwere there to raise the flag of their homeland. John Ford, let's not forget, was an

unredeemed patriot. No adversity was going to bother them excessively. That is why they are heroes and for that reason one

attends this formidable show with a shrunken heart and with the secret idea that the world, in spite of

its frivolities, of his incontinences and his penalty (so much to die to die one, says our Miguel

Hernández) is worth it and in the trip, in the transit, there is the joy of life. The history we see is the

history of man: of his achievements and his hardships. Universal cinema, imperishable.

" 1

" The idea of ​​showing special effects through the camera of an amateur conveys that sense of

reality that has long been lost in the cinema, accustomed as we are to any kind ofeffect

digital.

The Cloverfield experiment, consisting of narrating the destruction of New York through the camera of an

amateur and from the point of view of young people who were in full celebration It is very

rewarding. After so many months of bombarding us with advertising on the internet, the film had

become one of the most anticipated of the season, with all that implies, but This time it has

been up to such expectations. We meet at a farewell party for Rob, who goes to work

in Japan the following day. This prologue of the action, although it may be something long, is absolutely

necessary to know the characters, their relationships and motivations, and then develop the story

once the attack started. Once the destruction begins, the film advances at a frenetic pace with hardly any pause. The

greatest achievement of the film is precisely in this massive destruction, the idea of ​​showing theeffects

specialthrough the camera of an amateur conveys that sense of reality that has long been

lost in the cinema, accustomed as we are to any kind of digital effect, every time It is more difficult to

surprise us and make us feel that what is happening is real. Cloverfield achieves that very thing without having to

show us the destruction to the detail, but with abrupt and unfocused camera movements, although it also has

to be said that there are many more effects, and very good and effective, of which in principle it was possible to wait. As for

the script, one has practically resigned himself to accept that in every film there must be Historiapicastory

lovethat moves the main character and that is the central axis of the gui���n. But in this case it is not that it

bothers too much and if something can be reproached is an end as predictable as dull. Cloverfield is a great

movie, it leaves you nailed to the seat thanks to its impressive images, and although it explains the same

story of personal sacrifice in search of true love, at least it is told of spectacular way and

manages to make all that destruction is taken very seriously. That's it, go prepared to the movies because the

sensation of dizziness during the whole film there is no one to take it away from you.

" 1

" Ginger Snaps was a real surprise in 2000 bringing a freshness to the genre that in those moments

after successes of the saga type Scream lived its lowest moments.

Few adolescent horror films are capable of conducting a study outside the topics of that crucial

step in life. Perhaps one of the most outstanding was CARRIE de BRIAN DE PALMA. Nor did the sub-genre of

lycanthropy offer too many joys, howls or an American werewolf in London are the light within

the shadows offered by this type of film. GINGER SNAPS was a real surprise in 2000 bringing a

freshness to the genre that in those moments after successes of the SCREAM saga type lived its lowest moments. Although

the proposal seems to be In the typical adolescent horror film, she stands out from the beginning,

offering an odd relationship between the two protagonist sisters played masterfully by EMILY

PERKINS AND KATHERINE ISABELLE who would repeat their roles is two sequels that although minor are still

interesting. The strong part is the transformation of GINGER that goes from being a dark adolescent to attracting

all the boys, unleashing an appetite for blood and sex in she narrated with the entra�as by

JHONnewcomer FAWCETT disappointed in his second film THE DARK.Su impressive soundtrack is another

aspect tohighlighted, with special effects his great handicap especially in the final part where the

transformation reaches its end with somewhat mediocre results. However, this is not enough to taste one of

the best films about lycanthropies and adolescents carried out with a force thatmovies

horrordid not bring.

" 1

" It has undoubted narrative vigor and its cl���max is enveloping, thanks above all to the impressivephotography

black and white. First openly anti-Nazi film by Fritz Lang.

"" A hunter moves to Germany with the intention of hunting some deer, for example. One day he seesat the top

the figure of Adolf Hitlerof a hill, he points at him with his telescopic sight but does not shoot because he is not a

murderer. However at that time he is captured and tortured by the Gestapo. He escapes and returns to London, where he will

continue to be persecuted. "Interesting film by Fritz Lang, the first of his films that openly

touched the anti-Nazi thematic. It has undoubted narrative vigor and its climax is enveloping, thanks above all to the

impressive black and white photography, very suggestive, and sinister shadows. The staging is

magnificent. However, and perhaps because of that, because it is somber, it is somewhat oppressive in the sense that it

could turn out to be a feint spectator. But the film is very popular because it is admirably narrated and with an

in-crescendo rhythm that becomes passionate at times. Very good Joan Bennett, excellent as always.

" 1

" A decent entertainment and politically opportunistic but "innocuous"? The V is not only the initial Vendetta.Tambi���n is Vigoroso: the film It is made with a large

technical invoice. Although the film lasts about two hours and fifteen minutes, it does not get long. The action sequences

are spectacular, the fights are well done. It is a worthy entertainment, above the

standard, which has an amazing cast. For starters, Hugo Weaving in a role not very grateful for the

actor, but interesting as a character's composition by means of corporal expression. That is, those of us who have

seen the bent version have not had occasion to see their work in reality. It is also a pleasure to contemplate

the beauty and great talent of Natalie Portman .?Vacuo: a priori, the most controversial element of the film was the

gui���n . The ideological-political discourse is an advertising incentive that can predispose the most reluctant or

"revolutionary". However, the film mixes so many concepts, it represents them with so much manique���smo and

solves them with a fantasy so typical of a c quemic that it is as substantial as the popcorn that will be

consumed watching this movie. The totalitarianism, fascism, freedom, terrorism, justice, revenge and fear are

represented with a proper depth to a society "" botellonera "", so that anyone who is not

used to pose daily for these issues the pel�� �cula will seem like an encyclopedia full of values.

In fact, the most incisive and harsh criticism that the script could do is the great forgotten one, but it is given such a

condescending end that it does not stop looking like a c ���mode pamphlet to the Eisenstein, yes, with a

musical accompaniment magnificently chosen and tremendously emotional and gimmicky. For not forgetting that great

guiding trick that benefits the protagonist by joining his revenge with his particular revolution. Thecharacters

main, both the cultured, refined, generous, kind terrorist and that does not kill innocents like the girl who

learns to lose fear to finally act as a lever, make a trip in the name of justice that

is really to settle accounts with the past. The director invites us to this trip, with great musical taste and

good craftsmanship in the staging. Let's not forget that there are the brothers (a brother and a sister)

"" Guachosqui "", those who wanted to start a philosophical-virtual movement and ended up with chucher branches " Intragastable

digital .as. Maybe this is the rumor that Alan Moore did not want to know anything about the project

as soon as I read the script?

" 0

" A very good movie that does not deserve the little diffusion it is having. Hurry if you want to see it, because Inot

dothink it lasts on the bill for a long time, especially now that more summer blockbusters are approaching.

Compare? History of a Crime? with? Truman Capote? it is something totally inevitable, since they are two projects

that were carried out at the same time, and both are about the same thing: the facts that led Capote to write "A

Sangre Fr���a ?. Even so, why one of those films scored a critical success more important nominations to

the Oscars, with a merecid� ��simo prize for Philip Seymour Hoffman, and the other dela��� its premiere, producing

this almost of tapadillo, is something that escapes to my comprensi���n. Because? History of a Crime? (ridiculous

translation / dubbing of the original:? Infamous?) is superior in many aspects to Bennett Miller's film, which,

being good, was a little cold. The argument leads us to see how Truman Capote, at the height of his

career, decides to investigate a murder in a small American town, focusing on the consequences that the

horrendous crime had for the small community, and write everything in a newspaper article. The capture of the

murderers, and the possibility that Capote can interview them, leads him to decide that he has to write a

book. This book would become one of the most important and influential novels of the twentieth century, making

Capote inmortal.?History of a Crime? It is much stronger than "Truman Capote", making the central character

much closer to the viewer, to the point that he greatly sympathizes with him. In this respect,can be

two truly prodigious elementscited. One is the excellent interpretation of Toby Jones, who had it

easier than Hoffman, since he looks physically more like him, but like here He is superb, and although it may

seem otherwise, never falls into the excess or the histrionics, composing a character full of nuances, and

in which passes easily from the funny to the emotional with astonishing ease. The second element is the humor

that pervades the entire film, in which reference is made to Capote's sexuality. A humor cleverly

inserted in the plot, which never falls into the easy and that is done with great respect, also helps the

viewer to integrate even more in the story , which will soon become hard until difficult limits to be

endured. And anyone who has seen the impressive film by Richard Brooks? A Sangre Fr? A ?, knows what I

mean. By the way, the comparison with Brooks's mythical film is also inevitable. The film has a

truly exemplary artistic direction, and a vision In the American life of the 50s, it was totally accurate,

with all those parties that were held in the houses, and in which someone used to be the center of attention.

Sensational the sequence in which Capote earns the confidence of the people in those parties telling their

anecdotes in the world of celluloid with people like Bogart, Sinatra, Jones or Huston. Detail This is not

in the story only because it is, but it is used very correctly to explain othervery well

things, for example the beginning of the relationship. Den de Capote with one of the murderers, Perry Smith. Even though the

film focuses on the years it took for a coat to write? A Sangre Fr���a ?, it can be said that it covers more

aspects of his personality, thanks to the moments shown as if it were a documentary about his life, in

which several of his friends talk about him, scenes that are They could be considered a stumbling block in the narrative, but

I personally see them as successful as they help to understand the character. The same could be said of the

relationship established between Capote and Harper Lee (the writer of "Kill a Ruise���or?), And the one of Capote with Perry

Smith. Both are very well displayed and described. In the first one an extraordinary Sandra Bullock surprises,

yes, yes, I have said extraordinary, standing out above all in those documentary scenes. And in the second,

what is probably the best of the film: an impressive Daniel Craig, who here comes out a little

makeup. Incredible the moment in which he interprets a song while he plays the guitar. The rest of theactors

importantis something totally anecdotic, except Jeff Daniels who plays the policeman that he took �� the case, and that

also forged a curious friendship with the writer. But both Sigourney Weaver, as Isabella Rossellini, and

Peter Bogdanovich, have short interventions. Even the case of Gwyneth Paltrow is still curious, since

it only comes out in the initial credit titles, interpreting a song, moment � This is where

something unpredictable, unexpected, sensational and unique happens. A small magical moment that manages to thrill as

few and that for a server is already one of his favorite moments of the last years, and that is also ��� Cleverly

used to learn a little more Capote, while capturing the attention of the viewer by

hooking it to the end. A very good film that does not deserve the little diffusion. What are you having? Hurry if you

want to see it, because I do not think it lasts on the bill for a long time, especially now that moreare approaching

summer blockbusters.

" 1

" Political intent also mixes the many, in a story that shows the valuesexalted

of Spartan, militarist and authoritarian society. There you with the true Yankee intentions and the

movie itself. Or is it too thin?

It is always a challenge to move Frank Miller's comics jewels to the big screen, both because of its great and

ostentatious graphic style as well as its non-color and good scripts. 300 is a comic from 98 ', after his

famous Sin City from 91'. Even the productions that do not name it - Daredevil, Batman - have their mark. But

one thing is the adaptation of a comic and another very different language of cinema. Already proved in the

irregular Sin City (Rodr���guez, 2005) .300 is faithful to Miller's original (there are traced paintings), but it is

mastod���ntica due to its rigidity due to being filmed almost totally with blue screen background, for hisheaviness

oral, for bringing the slow Matrix camera to unsuspected limits (I think it would last 30 minutes less without it).

Until the sex scene is in slow motion! The picture is as impressive as Sin City, lavish

and monochromatic, but it ends up being anecdotal because of the weight of a script with phrases "" ��� picas "" to repetition. The

battle of the Term���pilas and its veracity are not in discussion (it is a version of the comic, not on thestory

real), but Snyder is not deprived of putting the monsters that were so famous after the Lord of the rings.

Let's say that within its genre, it will be more honest than Gladiator (2000) and less passionate than the Great Alexander

of Oliver Stone (2004). The intention pol��� It also mixes a few, in a story that shows

the values ​​of Spartan, militarist and authoritarian society exalted. There you with the true

Yankee intentions and the movie itself. Or is it too thin? The criticism in the north treated him as a

fascist, the most gay movie in history, a bloodbath Rocket. It is not so much. People

made it the most seen in the US. That is, the same story as always. Let's agree that it's not a lead

either. 300 can be seen, it has the necessary action and also monochrome performances, costumes andbodies

unreal masculine, endless battles in idle and it is laughable and caricatured at times. In short, the

theme is that the film after his vision, becomes a true pity for what could have been.

" 0

" Ideological and pamphlet product for the rejoicing of those who do not feel embarrassed by others. There are films that want to do justice to a real event and dedicate their gui��� and their commitment to In

the case that concerns us, it is Apartheid and all the slaughters and atrocities committed. What I did not know, and

I imagine that would be so because � what the film recounts, is that when I finished all that was offered amnesty

to those murderers and torturers who confessed their crime to their victims (or those who they survived him). An

attitude quite unthinkable today but based on an attitude of perdny obtencin peace. And an idea to

convey very interesting. But the film does not help at all. The director and the screenwriter make this

film a product of foreign shame. There are two concepts to distinguish when carrying an actual event to

the screen. The fact may be real, but it can be very unlikely. And this is a perfect example

(example: sequence of the mute child before the murderer of his parents). Precisely because it deals with a political issue, it

guides it in that way and chooses two protagonists as bastions of morality, decency and justice: two

journalists (unfortunately very fashionable nowadays). One, Samuel L. Jackson, (afro) American, racist and

Washington Post journalist who passes him fatal in the USA and the other Juliette Binoche, native but white, poet

but activist and idealist up to the dummy. Both are erected as the protagonists concerned about doing

justice by covering "" periodically "" the judgments to the rest of the world. That is, both Jackson and Binoche and

Brendan Gleeson are very well, but it is useless if History does not support them. Ideological product and

pamphlet for the rejoicing of those who do not feel foreign shame.

" 0

" Grand Hotel was undoubtedly one of the best works of Irving Thalberg and one of many classics emerged

from the MGM factor���a. Essential.

A former waitress who had worked in luxury hotels in Berlin burst onto the German literary scene with

her work Grand Hotel. In 1929 Vicki Baum achieved a great sales success with a description of the events and

characters that can be found in an establishment of such characteristics. On the other side of the Atlantic,

a skinny and sickly young man put his eyes on this work even before it was translated into English. At the

MGM studios the young producer Irving Thalberg, infallible creator of ��� successes both for criticism and for the

public, I was looking for a new project. Through a synopsis Thalberg came up with what he was looking for, but there was a

problem: a small Broadway businessman had taken over the rights to the novel. But here the businessman was

looking for investors for his work, and Thalberg took advantage of his portunity: he gave him 15,000 dollars to do the work, and he

paid another 20 thousand for the cinematographic rights. graphics. And by the way, he already had an adaptation of the novel that would

eventually have great success in theaters throughout the country. After polishing the script, the producer got down to

work. The first thing was to put a face to the main character of the work, the dancer Grusinskaya.

Immediately Thalberg thought of the brightest star of his time, Greta Garbo. At first, theactress

Swedishrejected the role, believing that at 27 years was too old for the role. But finally the

producer convinced her, and "" La Divina "" would be the dancer come to less. With the approval of Garbo, Thalberg

put Edmund Goulding behind the scenes, reputed to be a good actor director. And that was what was

needed, as Thalberg had in mind a very strange idea for its time: to gather five of the most

important stars of Hollywood in a single film. So strange was that the producer had to convince the

all-powerful Louis B. Meyer that it was a good idea. Grand Hotel would have five great characters

interacting with each other, each with their own problems and interests. Apart from the aforementioned ballerina, we have

a ruined aristocrat turned into a thief, a tycoon anxious to finalize a merger, a poor

taqu���grafa to the orders of This and an employee of the tycoon who has little time left to live and decides to

spend his savings living big in his last days. For the role of male gallant, the baron Von

Geigern, Garbo wanted John Gilbert, with whom he had already worked in the past, and with whom he had had some

short romance . But Gilbert had more and more problems with drinking and his career was going downhill, so

Thalberg proposed that he change his mind. Who did not change was the usual camera operator of the Garbo,

William Daniels. Looking for the gal��� and the sick man, Thalberg thought of Buster Keaton for ���ste � Last

character, but Meyer vet��� his proposal. It was in another production of Thalberg, Arsene Lupine, where the producer

found his gallant: John Barrymore (Drew's grandfather). Barrymore agreed with the condition that his brother Lionel also

participated in the film. Thalberg agreed, but made John sign a three-movie contract with

MGM. Lionel Barrymore would be the terminally ill Kringelein, and John Barrymore (known as "" The Great Profile "",

if you see the film you will know why) Baron Von Geigern. The cast was completed with Wallace Beery as the

businessman Preysing. Beery at first rejected the role, but Thalberg convinced him by assuring him that he would be

the only character to speak with a German accent. The challenge seduced the actor and accepted the offer. For the role of

the sensual taqu���grafa Flaemmchen the decision could not be more successful; Thalberg signed another great

female MGM star, the talented and beautiful tiger beauty actress Joan Crawford. To avoid egos collisions,were

the characters of Garbo and Crawfordprevented from coinciding in any scene. In addition, it was arranged that Crawford would

roll in the morning while Garbo would do it in the afternoons. A small role would be left for Lewis Stone, a

former silent film gal. After saving some reluctance, Barrymore and Garbo got along very well on the

shoot, to such an extent that Barrymore, along with the Actress Noll Gurney subsequently organized the funeral of John

Gilbert to the satisfaction of the Garbo. Lionel and Beery went to his, and Crawford, typical of her, was

worried about standing out in some way. Certain day Crawford faked a disease to shoot in the afternoon and

coincide with Garbo. What could have been a disaster remained in a brief greeting. Even an entire Joan

Crawford was finally intimidated by the presence of "" the Divine "", but Garbo was kind to her and asked

her how she was doing. Quite a rarity in the Crawford's psychic record (famous was her eternal battle with

Bette Davies). Well, with such a cast and a good story behind, nothing could fail, and nothing fail Grand

Hotel is a watchmaking machine where everything fits, the rhythm is as perfect as that of a well-engine

oiled, and the characters come and go in a totally natural way. La Garbo shines, once again, with

its own light, and with its deep voice captivates the viewer, leaving a phrase for the story, I want to be alone.

John Barrymore, although initially could already seem too old for the role, perfectly fulfills

being able to be romantic and hard at the same time. His brother Lionel makes us laugh and cry at the same time, while the

brute Beery intimidates with his presence. Finally, Joan Crawford, wonderfully sexy, reminds us that she was

also a great actress. Grand Hotel was undoubtedly one of the best works of Thalberg and one of many

classics emerged from the factor ���a MGM. Essential.

" 1

" Under a crude appearance, beats a product of gratifying consumption, able to move the greedy public of

ideologically strong experiences and the other, who only wants to see a well-made film that distracts

two hours of the deadly tedium of some winter evenings.

Behind V for Vendetta is Orwell, who took my first serious readings. There is also a healthy exercise of

contravening rules that seem fundamental in the Welfare (technical) society ofcivilization

our. The legitimacy of a State is contravened (although it is of Law and apparently democratic formulas in

its exercise) and terrorism is given a quarter: it is credited as legitimate and we even agree that, in Sometimes,

all words appear hollow when they collide (frontally and brutally) against the blind inertia of a

rotten Power, of a rogue State that has betrayed its privileges, its basic organizational structure for the sake of barbarism,

whatever it may be. its visible mask. ��� And then what are we talking about? ��� V of Vendetta vindicates fascism, the

individual decision making that affects others because of an unjustified sense of order that

probably nobody else shares? In order not to excessively scandalize the thinking minds and thepockets

distributors'that are going to release the film, the work of Alan Moore, graphic artist on whose work they

were also taken cinema The league of extraordinary men and From hell, is noticeably lightened: it

disarms its bad mood and invests a mediocre (but tolerable) rebellion against the Government, which

strangles the citizen, seg��� We see, and roguely rogue freedom. Without falling into the pop pose, which would have

been perhaps the most predictable, V de Vendetta uses a rich visual structure where the ideology prevails over the

action and where the characters, without being either profound or worthy of Shakespeare, satisfy theviewer

demandingwho seeks a dramatic sediment according to the risk of the proposal. This modern Robin Hood who is V,

self-declared liberator of the oppressed people and boldly decided to put a train of bombs under the British

Parliament, is also the forced guardian of a pure Evey (Natalie Portman) and neutral, which ignores the

folds of politics and ends, as we felt throughout the footage, identified with V to the point of being

able to continue his work in his absence. All very subversive, although flavored with a very striking cast (

Hugo Weaving, Natalie Portman, Stephen Rea, John Hurt or Stephen Fry). All very an���rchico, although relativized

by the evident stench of political correction in these turbulent times. Written by thebrothers

Wachowskyand directed by James McTeigue, assistant director of the famous and overrated series Matrix, V de

Vendetta is a regular work that moves and provokes a dialogue. As there are few regular films that

move and provoke a dialogue, I declare V de Vendetta one of the best films that thisviewer

reasonably criticalhas seen in the ��� last times, although this time it was the intermediary dvd and not

the appetizing big screen. For the rest, chapeau.

" 1

" A movie with which the boys have a good time and the girls, although they enjoy the presence of

Law, will look at their partner with a certain "bad" face. "

Based on that I have not seen the original film, although I do not know why this was quite interesting

(perhaps because of the attractive presence of Marisa Tomei and Susan Sarandon, as well as ��s of Law, of course), and although in

some moments I have had enough complicity with "" Alfie "" I know that feminists can feel insulted by

their egocentrism and their nose. How would it be an "" Alfie "" female version? Although it finally ends up being a "hunter

hunted" "the film promises more fun and more depth than what finally ends up giving and although the

performances are sober and well-taken, especially the one of Jude Law, the movie looks like a tourist guide to NY

(quintessential city very cinematic). By the way, Sienna Miller, Law's new partner, was previously

married to Sadie Frost ( of which it has its name tattooed) !! It is very, very good! In short, a film

with which the boys have a good time and the girls, although they enjoy the presence of Law, look na your

partner with a certain face of "" bad grape "".

" 0

" The film entertains and will delight fans of the Japanese feudal genre and manga lovers, although the

film, as we have said, is half-hearted in all its purposes. sitos.

In the year 1614, the Shinobi are ninjas with special magical abilities that make them superior to theman

ordinary. The Shinobi are trained since they were small in two small villages, the Kouga clan and the Iga clan, and they are

acrimonious enemies since a long time ago. The two villages live in peace as the emperor forbade war

between them, but now decide to confront the two villages for the purpose of choosing a successor to the throne

depending on the outcome of the battle. Each village will choose five of its best warriors that should be

faced at the whim of the emperor. Gennosuke, of the Kouga, and Oboro, of the Iga, are two young men who

fell in love in peacetime and now head the two teams they have to face, fate willthem

taketo the fight between they must choose between love or death. Shinobi, based on the popular manga,

does not stop being another one of those films of the feudal Japan seasoned with fantastic dyes, because their samur���is

own different powers that make them special . The film is based on a fairly simple plot and despite

the complicated names and the initial story in the credits one quickly enters the plot and

understands it, and also the movie �cula is more aimed at action than great philosophers to whichus

the Japanese have accustomed, which are two points in their favor. But the film lacks something that does not quite

work and is its inability to thrill and identify with the characters. Already by

itself, the love story of Romeo and Juliet is lacking in sparkle and naturalness everywhere, the battles

are fine but without being as spectacular as you would expect and one is left wanting more, you

notice a limited budget, of course. The lack of good and bad, neither of the two clan can be defined

as such, makes the viewer does not end up taking sides by either side, which

battles fail to involve and leave quite indifferent. The villages remind Naruto, with the children

training Ninjas, the warriors remember superheroes, X-Men with some of their powers and even

Spider-man when they swing hanging by a thread. The film entertains and like aloversgenre,

feudal Japaneseand lovers of manga although the film, as we said, it remains half in its propsitos,

the scenes of struggle do not get excited, the love story does not just work and the film itself does not

achieve, except for a few moments like the end, get inside the story.

" 0

" How does one go from being a woman of flesh and blood to being a maniac on catwalks, brands and size

34?

The Chinese tangerines had the habit of reducing the feet of their children after carefully breaking

the bones, the giraffe women have rings that are added around the neck until the cervical

splits completely. Westerners are size 34. Beauty, it seems, has to be accompanied by sometorture. There's no

kind ofdenying that fashion has its appeal, but I think the fashion that is �� ah��� to

attract the opposite sex does not entail such renunciations. "" The devil wears Prada "" speaks of the obsession with fashion

and thinness to be at the height of a boss and a cosmetic empire, as is the fashion magazines. The

women of the film have disconnected with the first purpose of fashion, taste, and have entered into thespiral

manic-compulsiveof the unpronounceable proper names and the catwalks. "" The devil wears Prada "" is the

story of a simple and careless girl who enters, in spite of herself, into the world and discovers that she has to

choose between him and his private life. The discourse shakes the predatory habit, common in companies, of

stepping on the next door to climb positions. I would have preferred that you skin that other custom, that the

film contemplates with indifference, of confusing the employees with the domestic service. ProtagonThe protagonist does

not complain about having to look for an editorial novelty before it goes on the market for the daughters of the great boss!

In fact, these insurmountable proofs are the key to explaining the

abduction of Anne Hathaway. How does one go from being a woman of flesh and blood to being a maniac of catwalks,

brands and size 34? How does one go from interesting to flat enefalogram? It is done with tests. It's enough that

something costs us to forget ourselves. Once abducted it does not matter to speak of a size, a small foot

, a long neck, win more than the neighbor, win in a tournament.

" 0

" I'm sure you'll have your detractors and your fans, it will be those movies that you either love or

hate, but will not leave anyone indifferent.

The film, in the projection of this early morning, has ended up receiving, after a fri��� and t���mido

beginning, enough applause. To begin with, it is necessary to say that it is not an easy film or that it is understood at

first, in fact I do not think it is necessary either, and that a bad critique would be the option Easy,

to call him Aronofsky's mental straw incomprehensible and so panchos. But the film deserves to be revised and revised to

appreciate it in its entirety. It should be noted that the film is impeccably beautiful, from the mostscene

everydayto the futuristic images that are really beautiful. The storyline takes as its base thehistory

presentand takes us alternately to the past and future. The doctor's struggle to find thecure

experimentalthat saves his terminal wife from a tumor shows us the two options against death,

acceptance and denial. Accept death in a natural way and as a symbol of humanity or cling to

life and fight against the end with all means. The man, in all his times, will be the one who seeks thatlife in

eternalfront of the woman, the opposite pole, who will be the one who tries to convince him to finish something that is unfinished

and that could only be ��� finish accepting the final truth. All this I already commented when I did the review of thenovel

graphic, which the film shortened in the stories of the past and future, perhaps s for not having more time or for not

having a larger budget, but the important points are practically the same. Whatwants tous

Aronofskyshowis death as a way of creating life, death is not a nothing but a whole, that assays

religion, you are dust and you will become dust, and that the fact of eternal life leads only to

acceptance. end of the cycle that life supposes. And all accompanied by the hypnotic and precious music of Clint

Mansell that brings back to life the images of the director, as he did in his previous films,

this It's time for a more intimate and delicate style, as the film demands. We could give rise to many

interpretations and debates about the film, but I do not want to eviscerate too much before I see it. is, and

maybe that's why this criticism sounds somewhat cryptic. I'm sure you'll have her detractors and admirers, she will be one

of those films that either love her or hate her, but will not leave anyone indifferent.

" 1

" La Huella is an unnecessary film, which aims to update a masterpiece by

Mankiewickz, but which gives us an extraordinary performance by Michael Caine.

After its presentation at the last Venice Film Festival, one of thefinally arrives on Spanish screens

most awaited films of the year for Spanish cinema lovers, The footprint. Strictly speaking, we can not speak of

remake, since both this new version and that of Joseph L. Mankiewicz (authentic cinematographic jewel) adapt

the theatrical work of Anthony Shaffer. However, talking about the modern version of La Huella without having

Mankiewicz's formidable work in mind is practically impossible. Andrew Wyke (Michael Caine) is a successful novelist

who invites to spend a weekend in his mansion Milo Tindle (Jude Law), an unemployed actor who has

run off with his wife. Between both a twisted game is developed and of dangerous consequences for which it

loses it. Kenneth Branagh makes an effort worthy of praise to modernize history, but

sometimes he goes over the line and crosses the threshold to pretentiousness. In several fundamental scenes of the

first act, the action is narrated so hastily that it does not give the viewer time to assimilate what he

sees. However, the worst mistake of the film is the Harold Pinter script. It is incredible that an author like

Pinter is responsible for a text like the one in La Huella. In his effort to make Shaffer's work his own, he

transforms it in such a way that it overturns his own intentions and meaning. The best of the film are

undoubtedly Michael Caine and Jude Law, who clash in a magnificent but unequal interpretive duel. Andis

thatthat Michael Caine performs an interpretation as memorable as the 1972.La Huella is a film

clearly unnecessary, which aims to update a masterpiece of Mankiewickz, but that gives us an

extraordinary interpretation ��n by Michael Caine. The rest, except for Jude Law, borders on the most absolute

mediocrity.

" 0

" When the taste for the classic and the contemporary are associated in perfect harmony, a director of the stature

of Scorsese surprises us with a film that, above all, , It entertains us.

When the taste for the classic and the contemporary are associated in perfect harmony, a director of the stature of

Scorsese surprises us with a film that, above all, entertains us because It has the necessary elements

for it: an interesting story, an organized narrative structure, a good dose of action, some

actors that convince us, a perfect use of the times (so much so, that a film of two hours and a half is not

heavy) and, as a final shot, it also has an excellent soundtrack. If anyone doubts the

interpretative capacity of Leonardo DiCaprio (something he will not understand since was unbeatable in "Who doeslove

Gilbert Grape?"), possibly after seeing this fantastic story begin to give a vote of confidence.

Although, if you know little by little do not worry because, they also highlight an intelligent and irreverent bad, of those

who like, interpreted by a mature Jack Nicholson and a noble and elegant enter���able police in the hands of

Martin Sheen.A Scorsese likes classic detective films and that's something to be thankful for because in that cinema,are cared for and

all the charactersspoiled (even the most despicable), and that makes the movie ��cula not be huñrfana of

intelligence and feelings, that yes, wetting and pointing with the finger what is not of common sense in a group

( is that it is one thing for the bad guy not to be an idiot and quite another for him to be a blessed one.) Unlike other

genre movies that more explicitly detail the organized world of the mafia (something that the samealready did

directorin Gangs of New York, 2002) in Infiltrados, the narrative will far exceed the information ,N, although it

contains some guidelines that will make us return to the harsh reality for a few seconds. Without a doubt, a great

production, typical of an industry that understands cinema as an entertainment that it must also be profitable

(something that Europe does not always happen).

" 1

" The story is perhaps too simple, this time it is suitable for all audiences, without double reading as it happened

for example with the great Shrek.

The person in charge of The Ice Age - his first episode - Chris Wedge, returns to give us another fun,

funny movie, as rhythmic as lack of heart and a gui�� Not very solvent and attractive. Characters more flat than

their funny prehistoric bugs, these robots are mocks of humans who sleep, work, eat, need

money and all the boring things we do not want to see in an animated movie . More reference to

excellent films in this genre that is not worth enumerating. The story is perhaps too simple, this time it is

suitable for all audiences, without double reading as it would happen for example with the great Shrek. Child / robot / poor person who goes

to the big city to succeed (will he achieve it?). It is not that Robots lacks rhythm much less, adrenaline is enough.

At times it seems to be one in a game of an amusement park. The beginning is auspicious and even

recalls the start of Spielberg's Minority Report (mimicking his idol Kubrick), for a shade between sombre and

sinuous and a future mechanized, metallic and cold city. The gag of the birth of the protagonist, is the most

achieved within 91 minutes of a film tacked on them. But it's just the beginning.Played withquotes

Cinderella-the music of Rocky, the tin man from The Wizard of Sickle, several (too many) to Star Wars-,stands out

the gag finally-in truth very funny - that carries the music of Britney Spears but like everything in the film, with

pleasure to little. In comparison, it is lower than the level of El Espanta sharks, Madagascar or Bichos, and this is already

saying a lot. It could only be improved a bit by listening to an impeccable vocal cast -see file below- in itsversion.

original, we really could not enjoy Better to put on Daft Punk and dance with Robot Rock.

" 0

" There are no aspects to highlight, except the artistic direction, which recreates a kind of Amish civilization, and

the locations, since the rest of the film, Being very demanding, it could be burned at the stake.

Again, the trailers play a trick on us again. And I say this because we are getting tired of seeing

films that are not what we expect. There will be people who say that this is marketing and that they have achieved their goal:

to buy the product (in this case, go to the cinema). Well, on the one hand their maneuver is effective but it

is also negative for them because it can cause many people to take the type of trailer backwards and if they

know how the film is going to be. ��cula could have come to see her. I have to say that The Wicker Man is

another remake, in this case a 1973 film, which I have not seen. Well, the fact is that the trailer of

this new version sells you tension, scares, spirits and other elements of horror movies and all of this so that

later you find yourself with a story taken to the screen that do not have any of the cited ingredients. The

beginning seemed promising, since in the credit titles we can read the participation of Nicolas Cage, Ellen

Burstyn, Kate Beahan, Leelee Sobieski in the interpretative section and Neil Labute in the direction. Apart from

what we have been able to read, the initial images also present us with a situation that could have been much

more so. Nicolas Cage, who plays a cop, Edward Malus, can not rescue (from a traffic accident

) a child or his mother, who end up burning after exploding the car in the one they meet. After

this, Malus, has hallucinations and is off work, until he receives a strange letter from his expromet,

which asks him to help him, since his daughter has disappeared. Up to now everything is normal, the "" paranormal "" is that the child

who died is very similar to the daughter of her ex-girlfriend, since she has sent him a picture of the child. to. So the good

of Cage, after ignoring the advice of his friend, decides to go to the enigmatic and mysterious island where

he lives. There you will discover that they are a kind of sect, but I'm not going to tell you more. At all times you

expect something to happen that was promised in the trailer, but nothing at all. So the rest of the

footage passes seeing Nicolas Cage investigating and looking for the happy child by the meadows and houses of the

island. The truth is that there are no aspects to emphasize, except the artistic direction, which recreates a kind of

Amish civilization, and the locations, since the rest of the film , being very demanding, could well be

burned at the stake that both the protagonists of the film respect, that except for the producers and some other

involved, we would not cry for the loss.

" 0

" When was it? Nano? If you asked me what my favorite movies were, I would answer without thinking

twice about him? Batman? by Tim Burton (another great visual gem) and this first Verhoeven film. Almost like going

back to my childhood.

Absolutely flippant I stayed when, in 1987, I discovered the visual marvel of Paul Verhoeven. The

truth is that when I was "" nano "" if you asked me what my favorite films were, I would answer you without think

twice that the "" Batman "" by Tim Burton (another great visual jewel) and this first Verhoeven film and now that

taking advantage of the trilogy of Robocop has fallen into my hands the trilogy ��a DVD I chose the first of the

saga (the best of all) to return to view. Saying that maybe it has not moved me as I was excited at the

time, although there are phrases that I remember from the tape as "" there is a new guy in the city, it's called

Robocop "" or almost at the end of the film when he confronts "" the bad guys "" and says "" you were looking for me? "" Hehe, what a

flipe! Great, on the other hand, Peter Weller and Nancy Allen's performances would continue throughout the

saga as Murphy's partner (aka Robocop) however Weller only made the first of the films and then

It was replaced, although I have always seen him in some other film I have not been able to forget this

role that marked my childhood. The main theme of the film is also an authentic past, and although in the

film it is repeated over and over again (maybe that's what it is) it does not get to stick in any way. At the moment an

almost typical melody that accompanies excellently the action of Paul Verhoeven's film.

" 1

" One is saddened by those children who are subjected to a cruel brainwashing and are forced to

follow, with suffering, the unhinged principles of this new formula of Western fundamentalism.

Imagine that one day, while watching the news or a documentary on the History channel, you are puzzled by the

homogeneous and radical formation of the Hitler Youth or, in the present tense, by some Muslim children

trained by Taliban. Probably think that it is horrible to educate the innocent mind of a

child in the middle of the training phase in that way, and also think for yourself what it will be. It is impossible to apply

similar practices among children and adolescents in our 'advanced and democratic' societies. But if you are

lucky enough to be able to watch the clairvoyant and splendid documentary Campamento Jes���s (Jesus Camp), nominated for the

Oscar of its category this year, all the above seems to you of the most controversial. The documentary by Heidi Ewing and

Rachel Grady is filmed in the USA. and it focuses on the rampant and powerful community of citizens created around

the Evangelical Church. Specifically, the film tells how children aged 10 and under are recruited

for the North Dakota camp, Kids of Fire, led by Becky Smith. Once there, one

presence, with no less perplexity than previously seen in the initial capturing phase, how these children

are educated in 'supposed' Christian values ​​with a ���cticas own radical religious fundamentalism.They

urge to regain control of their country, to the cry that they are soldiers of Christ, to avoid 'contamination'

from non-Christian ethnicities as Muslim or of another kind. They venerate which step of Easter Week a

photograph of President Bush (declared a follower of the evangelicals) and ask Jesus to enlighten him to

put the whole nation under God ("" one nation under God ""). All these messages are presented in spectacular

'shows' similar to a concert, with sound and light effects, to children who come to enter a trance at the

peak moments of the act. You can see them crying when they pray or repent of their sins, or you canthem

seeconvulsing their bodies as if they were giving them the San Vito dance when the Holy Spirit goes to enter them.

But the documentary goes further, and shows how, after all this religious movement, there is a manifest

interest in monopolizing the political control of the main institutions of the country In fact, it is ���se, and no other,

the main message that machaconamente repeat in much of the acts of cerebral centrifugation, asking the vote

in a blatant way for groups of power similar to the one that Bush leads in the White House. Thus, in these'shows' there

religiousis talk of more power and of identifying the enemy (all those who do not embrace their faith,is

that, the different ones) in order to homogenize the whole society around them. his evangelical principles. So you do

not see many differences between movements like this one and, for example, others like the one of aria supremacy. In the

documentary, the counterpoint to this group is put from the influential radio program Ring of Fire, Mike's

Papantonio and Robert F. Kennedy Jr. In the space is warned about the brutal growth of this movement, which

reaches between 80 and 100 million Americans. It is denounced how this group breaks down thedivision

constitutionalbetween State and Religi���nyc���mo, taking advantage of the tender minds of the children to spread their

message of division. Entren between future generations. Once the documentary is over, one rethinks, between hallucination

and dread, about the fact that someone with similar ideas is the president of the main power in the

world. But, above all, one is saddened by those children who are subjected to a cruel brainwashing

and are forced to follow, with suffering, the unhinged principles of this new fundamentalism formula.

western.

" 1

" An expressive film, hard, with an ending that may seem typical, but which is undoubtedly the most appropriate.

If one wanted to make a film about the traffic of diamonds in Africa, a profound drama about

humanity, about ourselves, about our behaviors, and that, moreover, I had good and numerous

doses of adventures, what director would I choose? I, of course, would separate Edward Zwick (The Lastfrom my list

Samurai)and this would lead her to Feranando Meirelles, who directed a wonderful film also denounced

entitled The faithful gardener. But as we all know, people can change and therefore, Edward Zwick

has also changed. The director of the most acclaimed Legends of Passion offers us with Diamante de sangre, without being

pessimistic, on the contrary, a bit softer than Meirelles in Ciudad de Di���s, a true show of cinema of

adventures, of conflicts, and above all, of denunciation. And here, three seeminglystories

unrelatedcollide like a bullet in the chest of a child, spontaneously and unexpectedly. From a

smuggler with no apparent scruples (superb DiCaprio) to a fisherman who loses his family (magnificent

Hounsou) and comes a "lucky stroke" or a journalist (stupendous Connelly) interested not only in his

report, but also in the world around him. These three stories, so distinctive and so similar at the same time,

come together, initially, for the main case of one's own interests, but as the film

progresses, a relationship immediately emerges between the three. n that goes beyond interests and politics. From thereRetracting

arises friendship, love and hatred, sometimes.a subject so hard and so difficult makes

many directors do not want to approach or touch it, since, for their own reasons, they do not dare . But

there are a number of daring, those who, not only fight, in a somewhat commercial way against the traffic of

diamonds, weapons, whatever, but also They do not believe that the public, in one way or another, will be interested in the

subject. Personally, I was greatly attracted by the already mentioned The faithful gardener, a personal adaptation

of Le Carr���'s homonymous novel that dealt with the illegal recourse that takes place in Africa withproducts

pharmaceutical. In Diamante de sangre, medicines become diamonds, but the message is the same.

On the other hand, it is convenient that a story like this one is interpreted in a convincing, realistic and,

above all, dramatic way. And for this Zwick has a trio of actors who already would like to have any other. They

are Leonardo DiCaprio, in a sensational role (especially in the final part) and very convincing. Then

there is the great Djimon Hounsou, in the role of the fisherman, the nucleus of history and the one who brings the most

drama of all, in an exceptional way, without a doubt. And finally, highlight the wonderful presence of the increasingly

better actress Jennifer Connelly (recently seen in secret games), in an emotive performance and

performed with great talent. Also highlight the no less excellent music by James Newton Howard, with antheme

incredibly emotive main, and the photography of Eduardo Serra, with some very beautiful landscapes and

others that express perfectly the feelings of the protagonists. Nor should we miss the

way the action scenes are filmed, which are not only action-driven, but contain considerableforce

dramatic. (Attentive to DiCaprio and Hounsoun's son trying to escape one of the guerrillas). In short,

we have a great movie with several dominant genres, such as adventure, denunciation or pure drama and hard.

It is, Diamante de sangre, an expressive film, hard, with an ending that may seem typical, but that is undoubtedly the

most appropriate, and with some magnificent interpretations.

" 1

" intolerable cruelty. As surreal and tronchante as hard and geek. If you have not seen her, it's taking

as long as I did not see her new movie !!!

Despite being on vacation I have been very productive for a week and I have not been able to seesecond feature yet

Santiago Lorenzo's, something that I will do soon. So I've taken advantage of a free moment to play Mam��� is boba,

a movie that does not have too many differences with the films of Wes Anderson or Todd Solondz. I remembered it cruel and it

is, it's fucking bad. Toribio and Gema are Mart padresn's parents, a boy with problems at school. They live in

Palencia and are, in their own way, happy. A good day the local TV appears in their lives and starts the nightmare.

Eduardo Antu���a at the helm of an absolutely delivered cast, the good guys and the bad guys. Mart

Diveny's funny story and mention part for the orchestra of the party, nor Todd Phillips would have been able. So surreal and

tronchante as tough and geeky. If you have not seen her, it's taking as long as I did not see her new movie !!! In case

you have not been clear, the movie is a punch in the lower abdomen, but absolutely necessary.

" 1

" The message is a song of conformism and frustration, a song of disdain for the rebellious and the

individo. The film, in short, is no more than a defense of submission to power, worse, against

any power.

The empress weaves desperately chrysanthemum flowers. The chrysanthemum is a symbol of rebellion. The

emperor's soldiers all wear the same unpolluted red, the adversaries are golden, they move in unison

in a dance and fill the immense courtyard of the forbidden city. Yimou's movie is full of symbols, and

I think it's the first time I've written it down as a defect. The idea of ​​a plague defines the aesthetics of this Yimou,

the abuse of colors, of myths, of armies. Each element is there to crush the viewer with

excess. Run the tenth century of our era in the court of the Chinese imperial family. The Empress has to

rush medicine to the bottom. The emperor puts his honor at stake in enforcing the rules to the

last detail. The spectator soon discovers that the Empress is being poisoned. The three children

have to choose between their ambition, their love for their mother, not always perfected, and blind obedience to a

perverse father. Yimou's approach bothers me deeply, and it is not the first time. Behind the

sumptuous sets to the vortex, the carnival costumes, the indecent pageantry, thecourtesans

pneumatic, the choreographic, the Macedonian of Greek myths and Venezuelan soap operas, of Oedipus and a

restored Macbeth, behind the palace intrigue and paternal tyranny, behind all the veils is a

monstrous message. The message is apt, only, for alienated spectators, capable of making pants for

five euros and growing economically at eleven percent per year without making a holy strike. The message is a song

to conformism and frustration, a song to the scorn of the rebellious, and of the individo. The film, in short,

is no more than a defense of submission to power, worse, against any power.

" 0

" The main fault of 2 days in Paris is the obsession of Julie Delpy in emulating Richard Linklater and his

work, that being honest is not that it was any jewel.

It is ironic to think about the amount of actors and actresses who in recent years have decided to make the

leap to the direction. Not because of the fact itself, which is a natural step, but because of the surprise and even indignation

that this provokes. Here we have Julie Delpy who presents us her first episode, a story that looks

suspiciously like her works at the orders of Richard Linkleter. The ironic thing is that before

becoming an actress, Delpy studied directing and scriptwriting, and that in these years she has not been able to get

financing. n for his projects. That the success of Before Sunset, including his nomination for the Oscar for Best

Original Screenplay (of which Delpy himself was partly responsible), has propitiated the realization Two days in

Paris is more than obvious. It is a story with clear similarities and parallels with that, a

couple as epicenter of the plot that wanders through a city and their sentimental troubles. These troubles

become tedious after a few minutes, the spectator arriving at a deep sleep from which it is difficult to

recover. The tape is full of worn-out themes and, as expected, adds nothing to an out-of-date and

extinct genre. Only the appearances of the characters of Albert Delpy and Marie Pillet (the best of the

film) manage to improve the panorama infusing it with a small dose of humor very necessary Through

the film, Delpy offers a portrait of part of the current French society, although he fails in his attempt to be the

taxi drivers of Par���s his only samples of study. Days in Paris is the obsession of Julie

Delpy in emulating Richard Linklater and his work, that being sincere is not that it was any jewel. We will

have to wait to see the real director Julie Delpy, in a more personal project and not in aassignment

commerciallike 2 Days in Paris.

" 0

" Red Road is first of all a film that is not very honest with itself and with the spectator, full oftricks

unnecessary artificialthat divert attention from its main virtue, history.

The theorem that says "" to all reaction follows a consequence "" is Physical, and also Philosophy, elementary. In

recent years, the film industry has followed in the footsteps of large productions replete witheffects

special, putting the spectacular and dividends at the box office before a good story. One consequence

of this was the independent movement, innovative proposals, and another way of seeing and understanding cinema. Red Road

is part of the Advance Party project, a very interesting a priori proposal, which consists of making three

films based on the same characters created by Lone Scherfig and Anders Thomas Jensen. Pear premium

Andrea Arnold, winner of the Jury Prize at the Cannes Film Festival 2006, is the first of these tapes.

Jackie (Katie Dickie) works at Glasgow City Hall keeping a close eye on the images of thecameras

securityscattered throughout the city. One day, he sees Clyde (Tony Curran) on his monitor, a man he

hoped he would never see again in his life. Thus, slowly begins a story that shows full and without taboos the

misery of the human soul, which gradually capturing the attention of the viewer to submerge in a spiral

from which it is impossible to escape. At least, it would be impossible to escape if the film did not transmit thatfeeling

annoyingof artificiality. Amdrea Arnold tells the story with a dropper, feeding theintrigue and

spectator'sanxiety, but he does skip some rules. The gui���n is full of tricks and blows of

effect to cause confusion, make believe what is not, diverting attention from the really important.

When the curtain of smoke woven by Arnold dissipates, there will be someone who finds it deliciously perverse, or there will be someone

who feels moderately cheated. And it is that Red Road hits in the background, but fails miserably in form.

Red Road is first and foremost a film that is not very honest with itself and with the viewer, full oftricks

unnecessary artificialthat divert attention from In its main virtue, history.

" 0

" Interesting adaptation of RowlingNo's novel. This time I will not use a film as a pretext to expose my ideas or thoughts that are more

insane / rational / foolish. This time, and I swear to Lovecraft's sacred Necronomicin, I intend to talk about

the film itself (for the first time and hoping that it does not serve as a precedent), although I think it is clear that

I prefer a film makes me reflect on any aspect that is mentioned in it. Maybe one day I'll

talk about everything that the Rowling novels saga means (I do not have things to talk about)

from a less mythological and more profound perspective. I assume that I am a true fan of

books, I adore them, I think of the best that has come out in fantasy, with a reallymain character

interestingand tormented at all levels for all that his non-existence is implying. I start from the

base, that when a book is adapted to the big screen, what less interests me is its possible fidelity or not

(although it would be a real hypocrite if I denied that I do not give a damn). I start from the base, that what Imost to

likesee in an adaptation, is to see reflected in images what the books suggested to me with words. After these

premises, I indicate as a prelude, that the adaptations of Columbus seemed to me quite interesting, according

to what the books narrate and reflecting in images everything that I enjoyed in each of the two volumes

taken to the big screen by the director of only at home. I would also like to point out that the third

film, directed by Alfonso Cuaron, although at the technical level seemed quite surprising (except for

that anorexic werewolf), I did not convince myself, in fact, I disappointed a lot, because I did not see the spirit of

the novel reflected on the screen. Rowling can say that the film loves it and a thousand other things, but if

I put a check of 10 million dollars on the table, I say if it is necessary that God exists however much he

betrays everything that the novel implied. brief reviews, and as indicated, after the fiasco suffered with

Harry Potter and the prisoner of Azkaban, I went to the cinema, without any information (I did not want to feel

influenced at any level, nor predisposed to feel disappointed, or predisposed to feel satisfied) to watch

the fourth film of the orphan magician. What have I found in the movie? Well, not much, whatme most

surprisedis that a book of 650 pages, even having overlooked certain passages, was more than

correctly synthesized in 150 minutes of film, I have met with a director, Mike Newell (director

among others of Four weddings and a funeral, and a priori the least indicated for a film like this), who has

known how to transfer the global idea that inspired the novel to 35mm. Amazing without a doubt. I have

also met with individuals who represented in the previous films the characters of the

novels acting minimally, although Daniel Radcliffe has less talent than the ara���aa which Mad-Eye Moody

throws the unforgivable curses. A lot of visual effect -inevitable-, absolutely overwhelming and

sometimes excellent (with special mention for the Hungarian tail), good narrative rhythm, and some scenes

that needed more footage (especially the attack of the Death Eaters, which great that its entrance is

in scene, one wishes much more). In USA the film has been rated PG-13, in Spain PG-7. Well, it is true that it

is very dark (something else inheriting the spirit of the novel - and I am repeating myself with the fucking

spirit -), has "" terrifying "" moments like the aforementioned appearance of the Death Eaters in TheWorld Cups

Quidditchand have fun times. That's the movie, the most radical Harry Potterlove it, the

fans willmost purist fans will repudiate it, among the less radical there will be people who like it and another one who likes it. leave

indifferent, and those who have not read the novels because it seems entertaining. Me, that being a follower of

books, I prefer to place myself in a middle term, or as incredible as I am reading there, or as bad as

you could expect coming from the director who comes. An interesting film that in my viewimproves

greatlythe Cuar���n fiasco. In any case, in 20 years, we will see if the cinematographic saga of themagician

Londoncontinues being remembered or will remain in the most absolute oblivion. It will be worth seeing, if I am allowed

a quick reflection ... I am one of those who think that films will not stand the test of time as if

novels would. And finally, recommendations for the producers, for the order of the fenix to forget you of David Yates

and hire Guillermo del Toro, for the half blood prince I would bet for a Shane Carruth (director of

Primer) and for the seventh book, even without it read, Darren Aronofsky, which once again claimed the

urgent premiere of The fountain, server, since he saw Requiem for a dream, eager to see the third

masterpiece of this director so destroyer.PD: In case of not being Aronofsky, a Takashi Miike would be tremendous.

" 1

" A deliciously well-portrait of deep sensations, of conflicting feelings, of

realities crudely exposed

paintedonly an accident, a whim of fate, a clash, perhaps that of two cars in a city like that of

the angels, where one without a motor with wheels is practically nobody, is today capable of making the

personal universes of each citizen meet. Only violence is able to wake up a city

of the dead in life. Crash is a choral film, where several stories are interwoven, following the pattern of "" Grand

Canyon "", "" Magnolia "", "" Crossed Lives "" or "" Amores perros "". In this case, all the stories are well measured andpainted

collide pointing to the same place, in a deliciously well-portrait of deep sensations, of

conflicting feelings, of crudely exposed realities. A sincere and disturbing portrait of a city

characterized by the ethnic mixture of ethnic groups, by racism, fear and lack of principles. A superb

portrayal of the anguished loneliness of those lonely souls and prisoners of a destructured society,

violent, armed to the teeth, sadly dehumanized and where all turn out to be victims. But Crash also

tells us about intolerance and the loss of innocence. Of how there is room, in spite of everything, for

hope, for magic, and how the possibility still exists in us, the freedom to always be able to give

the worst or give the best as Humans. It also reminds us that man is a very complex being who is

shipwrecked in an impersonal and hostile society. Where, victims of confusion, good ones also turn out to

be discovered or discovered as bad and bad, at the same time, as good. Where the moral line and the ethics of the

current North American society seem to be erasing dangerously and irremediably like the stroke of a chalk

in the rain. And at the same time, this is a portrait also of modern societies around the world. Paul Hagiis,

who made himself known for writing the script of "" The million dollar baby "", realizes here a low-

budget film without technically being noticed at any time of the footage, full of intelligence and emotion. With

a casting that works, superb performances, a round and perfectly structured guide, alook

successful, a very successful and consistent atmosphere and a well-managed rhythm, which maintains the tension

required and it gives us glorious moments. A breath of air for the predictable and boring Oscars and

a pleasant surprise that shows again that, from Hollywood, between both boulder and mud,

some pearls of the seventh continue to arrive art.

" 1

" Although I admire the daring of Branagh, able to dare shamelessly with any classic thathim

putahead, the marriage between opera and film is complicated and in the case of this movie is tedious.

Go ahead that although I've seen several ���peras, I'm not the number one fan of Teresa Berganza, that I know

all the lyrics of? A penguin in my elevator? and none of Cos ar fan tutte's arias. Although I am not

profane on the subject either, I knew a girl who spent years thinking that Pavarotti was called Tutto. Once this

confession is made, I can say that La fluuta m�� Magic, the adaptation to the cinema of Mozart's famous opera, bored me

to the point of satiety. The marriage between opera and cinema is complicated and in the case of this film is tedious. Although

the precedent of the director is the very superior Hamlet, which lasted almost four hours, in this film almost

reached three hours of duration and trance, is far from bearable. The main problem that v���

It was the cast. Not all opera performers are great actors, except for honorable exceptions such as the Otelo

de Pl���cido Domingo. This fact, perhaps, goes unnoticed in the stalls of a theater - if the armchair

is cheap, of low visibility - but in the foreground there is no one to resist it. The singers

display a series of gestures and grimaces that seem more like hawks than soldiers of the First World War.

Another flaw is that the original story - pretty silly in my humble opinion, although God frees me to criticize to

Mozart is not taken any yslo rhythm wakes up from slumber at peak times such asto do

Papageno and Papagenaand the aria of the Queen of the Night. The scenarios that situate the action in the First World

War are theatrical and of the most relaxed what does not contribute to maintaining the interest and visually they areAlthough

atrocious on the screen.I admire the daring of Branagh, able to dare without shame any with any

classics that put him ahead, knowing in advance that the followers of the original will go to stone. Whether they are

adaptations of Shakespeare, Shelley's Frankenstein or in this case, the super-pedal, the soporific and the

megalomaniac flute.

" 0

" It is appreciated the ambition of originality that overflows all the work of malague���o, but so much af���n

po���tico converts the set into a luxury package too cold. �o.

I applaud the risks in the staging, the directors able to use visual lyricism to

back their stories and, thus, escape the conventions of the almost always effective classic narrative.

But I understand that to resort to elaborate settings, slowdowns of images or the filming of on secuenciasricas sequences

must be justified and should be linked in the set of the film with softness. TheAntonio Banderas

directorlikes to take risks as shown in this film in which he uses narrative formulas diametrically

opposed to the views in his work as an interpreter. You notice the tables of an outstanding student who has

learned in the best possible school, the American cinema, but perhaps lacks the necessary restraint to

balance form and content. In The Way of the English, a film that narrates a conventional story fromunconventional

anpoint of view, is beset by visual excesses that, perhaps, have been more contained or

have sustained a larger story , they would have completed a round movie. But,

unfortunately, the result of the second job as director of the malague���o has been halfway. The

way of the English is an introspective portrait of young people whose lives go through the trance that

half of youth and maturity, a stage of elections, but, above all, of resignations pushed by the positive clash

with reality. The protagonist, Miguelito, will change his vision of life a cultured man to meet in the

hospital during his appearance after a kidney operation. . This man at the gates of death will

show Miguelito the way to an inner world to which he is given access to reading and poetry. Upon leaving the

clinic, he will meet again with his world, with his work in a hardware store and with his friends in aneighborhood

Malagain the late 70's. But in the relationship between With them something has changed. He is determined to be a poet and will

repeat it to everyone he sees as he walks his inseparable copy of Dante's Divinia Comedy. His gang of

friends also goes through existential doubts of different caliber, but they share with Miguelito the af���n of this for

feeling life with the sparkling intensity of youth that they still treasure . That is to say, that facing a reality

that repeats to them machaconamente how little they are and how little they will become, they cling like a nail

burning to their dreams. The election of a The distribution of young and little-known actors is also a

risk, which, in this case, has been able to take advantage of the flags for the implication that they all each

sequence. Alberto Amarilla, of well-known television past, and a great Ra���l Ar���valo, already discovered in the notable

AzulOscuroCasiNegro, embody the main male roles, while debutant Mar���a Ruiz and Marta

Nieto assume the Weight of the female cast. In addition, secondary luxury like Victoria Abril or Juan Diego

complete an acting work that, in general, borders at a great height. In the same way it happens with the score

composed by Antonio Meliveo or with the precious photograph signed by Xavi Gim���nez. Both elements, together

to the assembly of the tape, the aesthetic framing of some planes or the repeated inclusion of on secuenciasricas sequences

, turn the tape into a personal bet that Banderas may not have been able to contain enough.

As I said at the beginning, the ambition of originality that overflows all the work of the malague���o is appreciated,

but so much af���n po���tico converts the whole into a wrapper too cold luxury.

" 0

" With permission from Jason Bourne and the city of T���nger, the best action sequence of 2007, aof

rushadrenaline and a little moral lightness.

Who was going to tell me that with everything that he vomited about Dead Silence and its director was going to start the year

saying that his last movie touched the genius ? A couple of seasons ago our mentor Tarantino added a

phrase from him in the promotion of the trepidante Running Scared that said: You will never be ready for a movie

like this Now it's me who he appropriates the phrase to recommend Death Sentence: the grossest commercial movie

seen in a long time. The proof of the crime was macarra, Death Sentence is brute. Considering that

the plot is not the typical story of revenge when in reality it could be the mother offilms of

revengethe new millennium will not go into details of the plot (Traders) because if you stay away from

any trailer can even get to surprise at several points, seriously. The first thing is to tell you that the

best sequence of 2007 (ah��� ah��� with T� ��nger) is between the 42nd and 51st minutes of the film, a sequence to be

called chase and parking. Well, we can only applaud the bastard Saw gave us for planning and

executing with a bracelet for which De Palma a couple of decades ago would have given his good hand : in a false

plane sequence (the false is the least, I insist that if it is not the best sequence of action rolled

last year little is missing) located in a parking lot action It happens at a frenetic pace in which the viewer

enters the head and where he who has heart problems is going to be fatal, this is cinema that they

say is done now that the cinema really is dead and where the influences go from Siegel to

Stranglehold, is that understood? More things. The character of John Goodman seems to come from a script of the 90 of

those that QT wrote for Oliver Stone or Tony Scott (or for the one who wanted to buy them) and gives a break (false)

in a plot that is a shot of adrenaline as politically incorrect as perhaps extremely melodramatic

after dinner: the family part is so terrific and so hard that at times you do not know if you are seeing one of

Bronson or one of those What Rob Lowe does now and that goes from families, leukemia and / or Christmas. Of course, he can

be accused of the general ambiguity and the Pilate syndrome, but I still think that we do not

I would like cinema so much if it were not for the blessed political incorrectness lost decades ago and that, with dropper, it

can be seen today in film. so nasty as Death Sentence, which still has no release date in

Spain (Vigalounge, you're not alone) It does not matter, the DVD is on the way and I end up with a couple of questions:

Who is the genius who decides to change 75% of the cards / posters when they appear in thesector

domestic? Or why in Sitges did they not program Death Sentence instead of Dead Silence and so, probably,have

the whistles wouldbeen changed for some delivered applause?

" 1

" Tru���aco tremendous of a director lacking resources and ingenuity, which has decided to pull the pull of the

original to sneak this. I just recommend seeing the "" achieved "" special effects, which are to die of

laughter.

I was so calm at home when my friend Benito Trujillo tells me that he has Transformers on DVD,

that's it, with subtitles. Very soon it seemed to me, that still has not been released worldwide, but my friend

Beni almost never lies. So I quickly set out to see her. Evil begins when I see that they destroy the

atmosphere of the Earth, and worse when the first shot of laser beam, painted with t���mperas in the

frame. Bad, bad. The film is about a future apocalyptic, where after having contacted the

aliens, they annihilate us (as we would do, nothing new). After 300 years hidden in the entrails

of the Earth, Humanity is ready to reconquer the planet, so they take aout of the freezer

guy(microwave return). And that's it, as I do not tell you the end, a little more is left

engraved on me. The film reminds me of a friend who said "I take it out and if they suck me, well that's what I

won "". I have not seen such a peculiar character for a long time. Those smartasses have brought to the shadow of Transformers,

this tru���o of colossal dimensions. In case some unsuspecting bites and swallows it bent like a server. The

argument neither feet nor head, the special effects to die for and the protagonists the monda lironda. As

noted, two curious things. On the one hand, that the protagonists are lesbians (nothing of lesbian sex, my

pajilleros readers). And the other one when they shoot the shots are painted with a Bic pen (this I had already

said, but it is deadly and veridical). Resuming, tremendous tru���aco of a director lacking resources and ingenuity,

which has decided to pull the pull of the original to strain this. I just recommend seeing the "" achieved ""effects

special, which are to die of laughter. What I could say with the mundanales effects.Besitos.PD: The end

should be a tribute to Blade Runner, but as if I say that my balls are a tribute to the monster of

cookies (so hairy, that everything has to be explained).

" 0

" A film that becomes heavy and that sings a shabby copy of style from those years of great cinema. It is necessary

to soak the film much more in the essence of that cinema.

Remakes, tributes, copies, plagiarism? all these words enter the vocabulary of a cinema increasingly

saturated with repeated ideas and the recovery of styles and arguments. Steven Soderbergh, who seems to be doing what

he wants, now sells us a film of presumed classic cut simply because he uses black and white and

a music inspired by great scores of other cinema times. ���ficos.La rocambolesca plot of this

film painted with black and white and some actors trying to emulate the American cinema of the "" Casablanca ""

seems that they are the only claim of a Director accustomed to doing what he wants. Recovering the curtains, the

music of rich orchestration and a black-and-white photograph to disguise a history of conspiracies and

secrets does not serve to make a film. Moderately interesting. In fact, all that style that aims to

wrap the film like a "classic" clashes frontally with many interpretative and staging

aspects. A film that It makes heavy and sings a shabby copy of style of those years of great cinema. It is necessary to

imbue the film much more in the essence of that cinema. To emphasize, as always, the great work of Cate

Blanchett and the loabl attempt of Thomas Newman to sound some notes according to the style that the director has

imposed.

" 0

" The splendid script allows you to dive into that world of feelings with great versatility, real characters such

as life itself that at all times follow a development adjusted to the millimeter.

The film by Cesc Gay (2003) immerses us in a collective soul affected by the atomization produced by

internal isolation, self-deception and the fear of revealing the intimate needs of relationship and affection in

certain anemic circumstances. It represents the way of life of the Barcelona middle class with a group of

men and women whose sentimental evolution draws parallel lines, while divergences occur in the

motives that affect the decisions and the points of view that enrich the pulse of the narrative. A film in

which the silences and the thought of the hidden heart behind them have their choral voice inspired by thereality

dailyof today's society. The words lie, or they say truth. The society of the middle classes. The

story and concise visualization of each scenario places emphasis on the uses and customs of astratum

particular social, characterized by the breadth and dynamics of sustained social relations in a way that

conventional and accommodative life; work (liberal professions, mainly), sof���, bed, cafeterias,

restaurants and parties. Throughout the film we see some characters who, apparently, can not avoid

being imprisoned in this flow of conventions that leads them to judge by lecturing on the intimate life of the neighbor,

while continuing to hide the own deficiencies. Thus, it is a human group enveloped by stability and

wealth in the material order, but unstructured and empty in the spiritual aspects anddevelopment

personal. Affective life is the anguished pulpit that cries out for an examination of consciences. Film,

therefore, markedly sociological, so frequent in Spanish cinema, whose thesis does not go beyond a

budget of common knowledge in our days.Now, the splendid script allows you to dive into that world

of feelings with great versatility, real characters like life itself that at all times follow a

millennium-adjusted development. ��metro, according to a pattern defined from the beginning to the end of the narrative. It is

effective to structure the progression of the collective drama starting from a succession of sequences that show - in

a segmented way - the vital state of each of the characters, until the final scene in which everyone

converges around a round table, at which point the pulpit (l��� grimas) of a key character, ignites

the feeling of what, until said scene, remained hidden. The last shared silence expresses and

synthesizes together what in the previous development was atomized. A bitter end but, also,

hopeful. The tears are a signal that everyone recognizes, regardless of the specific andreasons

idiosyncratic.

" 1

" Eragon is a real disaster. An authentic heresy committed against the original of Paolini. Apparently, "" Eragon "" can rise already as a real heresy committed against the original written by the

young man. ���Simo Italian Christopher Paolini. The trilogy of "" The Legacy "", whose first book is the one that now jumps to

the screens with a marketing worthy of a whole Harry Potter, is called to occupy during the next four

the Christmas calendar of the Hollywood industry, and much will have to see its box office figures this

weekend, or what is the same: your support, and for now not I see precisely happy? The truth is that,

as far as argument development, "" Eragon "" is a real disaster. During the first half hour everything is

run over and with hardly any explanation. The scenes can last basically two seconds, going from one to

another with a real hurry to remove the proleg���menos of the middle story and go directly to what

the p quiere wants. �lbico: battles and more battles. This has a direct consequence: you do not connect with anything. The

magical capacity of the protagonist appears without rhyme or reason, there is no initiation whatsoever. There are characters that run

more than a flying dragon and situations of authentic danger end up practically leaving the

main door without any opposition. A madness. I must confess that the beginning of all this mythology is pure

"" Star Wars "": Eragon lives on a farm, with his uncle, after being left there by his parents, and in the face of an unforeseen

fate, he will find his mentor, who should guide him towards the rebels and initiate him into his powers and

the future that awaits him. You were not surprised because finally Galbatorix, the bad guy of the film says "" Eragon, I am

your father "?" Drinking clearly from the universe created by Tolkien (it is spoken in the film of elves and

dwarves) , the aesthetic becomes the same, and that is a handicap for the film. With the exception of that beginning

Luke Skywalker, the rest of the story turns to be about tyrants, subalterns sorcerers and rebels

against the dictatorship. With a fregadito there and there, everything is turned into a product that half

entertains, but does not dazzle. Of course, I do not look at the film with the eyes of a reader predisposed to analyze

the adaptation, since I have not read the original work, and from that distance I can appreciate that, for the sake of to turn

the legend of Eragon into a commercial product, its leaders have extracted the passages with more action,

losing in the way other aspects that would have easily could correct if not for theduration

unfortunateof the film: 1 hour and a half in which everything has to be condensed to the beast. Perhaps the best choice made

by the director and his team of casting is the main actor himself. The boy does not do it badly, and at least he is not

as clueless as our friend Daniel "" Potter "" Ratcliffe in his first film. From there to being an Elijah

Wood there is a stretch. Jeremy Irons in his line, passing the trìmite, although far from being that actorazo English

that captivated us in the 90. I have lost the respect and that is fatal for my opinion At least it is who more

monopolizes screen time, because John Malkovich and we do not smell and Djimon Hounson barely appears 2 minutes.

Let's reserve them all for the sequel. Separate mention for Robert Carlyle, who in his role as the villain Durse is

the only one to seem coherent with the entire film set. And we could give the movie approval case

that the special effects, specifically the drag, would have been the novam���s. Well, not for that, since

Sephira, the dragon of the film has enjoyed a CGI of everything to a hundred. With the time that has passed since

"" DragonHeart "" or "" Harry Potter and the character of Fire "", and I find their dragons better realized than theclaim

mainof "" Eragon "". ��� Evolve Pokemon Blue ?, we will check. In short, bad direction,

dialogs enclichados, a mediocre wardrobe and special effects in the average of a direct DVD movie.

"" Eragon "" has been sold as the event of the year and is anything but the fantastic trilogy of the future. A

tweens 9 to 13 years like them, but to looka big decepecinms Uruk-Hai and find

with soldiers mask. To pass the time, but for God's sake, do not deceive us with comparisons, which in the endnot

areodious: they are annihilating.

" 0

" It will not go down in the history of animated cinema (that's for sure), but, once again, it will drag the kids to the

movies.

Since "" Shrek "" burst the boxof half the world, with its original way of destroying fairy

officestales, more than one producer, has tried, thanks to the animation, to follow the play, some with dubious success (for

example "" Hoodwinked "" that was released last year), and others, like this one that brings us today, with more or less

success, repeating situations already seen Previously. And the fact is that the "once" penalty is not only in

the argument (little elaborated) but in its simplistic animation, which is not to be belittled, noooo vaaa, but

seeing works of people like Pixar or Dreamworks, one sees in this tape a "" I want and I can not "", wow, that even

a tape made with 4? and with peanuts (I mean the strange "" Cries in the Hall ""), attracts my

attention, one of the few positive points that I give is that at least dubbing is not full of

half-haired famosetes. In VO we count on the voices of Sarah Michelle Gellar, Freddie Prinze Jr., and Sigourney Weaver.

By the way, the stepmother reminds me a lot of the latter, seems to be the only one that the animators

have had some consideration, since the protagonist more than look like Sarah Michelle, she reminds me of

Winona Ryder, and given her bad reputation in Hollywood, that's a bit of bad milk. Oh! by the way, another tape

that must be added to the list of films of quasi-ridiculous duration, and is that, in hour and 15 minutes, little more can

be In short, summarizing, it will not happen to the history of animated cinema (that's for sure),

but, once again, it will drag the kids (and their parents, uncles, cousins, accompanying all of them together) to the

cinema. What else can we do? Suffer it with patience, there is no other.

" 0

" Balaguer��� should consider a Spanish cast of good quality if he has no money to hire him

out

Yesterday I saw "" Fr���giles "". I must admit that I am an enthusiast of Balaguer��� since I saw "" The Nameless "", with a

fantastic cast and a very suffocating atmosphere that left me to the sof�� � throughout the film.

"" Darkness "" I also liked, and I provoked that pleasant feeling of fear that does not let me sleep in peace,

feeling an invisible presence next to my bed.But "" Fr� ��giles "". buf, I expected much more. And I did it because

this director has accustomed me to a quality that does not match yesterday's. Callista, without a doubt, makes me

laugh when she does comedy, but in this role she is very "" plastic "", I never feel real, but interpreting a

horror film of Serie B, which I think was not the goal. I do not know if because of the direction of Callista's

own talent, but the truth is that there are some details that bothered me a lot. For example:

when she starts to destroy everything on her table, it seemed so unbelievably unreal that she only

managed to make me laugh, taking me out of the "" drama "" that was supposed to transmit that scene. Afterwards,someoneme

canexplain towhat makes a floor full of dust and crap on top of a hospital floor? I do not think it's

credible. Not to mention that they had to hire a substitute for a couple of days to be 6 children.

I expected much more, the truth, and maybe that's what bothers me and dislikes me. Perhaps, if this film had

been directed by another person, I would have missed the mistakes. In short, not many scares, not much news,

a rather mediocre protagonist (who does not get transmit to 100% his chemistry with the protagonist child) and

some details off-site. I liked it, that's it, the elevator scene. I suffered with the poor child who broke

bones. Apart, nothing. I think Balaguer��� should consider a Spanish cast of good quality if he does not have the

money to hire him out.

" 0

" It's poor, but funny. They are neither Granger nor Barker, but there is Cameron, a nice actor who in the

forties and fifties did some good roles as a tough cowboy. Funny gui���n. Beautifullandscapes

Yugoslav.

"" The fearsome bandit Cyrus is willing to disturb both the peaceful inhabitants of a section of

the western town and the Indians of Winnetou. This, with the help of his inseparable friend Old Firehand, will try

to prevent it. "Continuation of the sympathetic adventures of the Indian Winnetou and his friend Old Firehand, entertaining

adaptations of the immortal works of Karl May Here, the reins of the film are in German hands, with

which the quality goes down considerably. It's poor, but funny. They are neither Granger nor Barker, but there is

Cameron, a nice actor who in the forties and fifties did some good roles as a tough cowboy.

Funny gui���n. Beautiful Yugoslav landscapes.

" 0

" Being a documentary about Sigur r���s we already knew that it would be unstoppable musically. What we did not imagine

was that he captivated with such strength, achieving so much with so little.

Heima is the spectacular documentary by Dean DeBlois (Lilo & Stitch) about the Icelandic band Sigur

r���s, who during 2006 went to his homeland to offer a series of free concerts without

prior publicity I was worried about another documentary a little bit of a lot that really did not show me more than chuler���a

cool (it goes by the one of Oasis) molona and horny, but chuler���a cool at the end of the day, and I find myself with one of the

most relaxing style exercises of the last times and with a crazy desire to go live there.Heimanot

isa follow-up to the use, a report or a "" documentary about a rock band "" The feelings that emerge in

a concert of the band are reflected in powerful images and a brutal beauty, a little "" rebusc��� "" at the

beginning but that little to little take possession of your fucking head, as the memorable Von that are marked in Gamla Borg,

moment of absolute brilliance z melancholy commanded by that Orri to the battery with a T-shirt in which

we can read SADNESS.

" 1

" Eran Kolirin's first feature has already won many awards but the most important prize she has already

won is to give the viewer something to think about and a story to enjoy. .

The journey of a band of musicians from the Egyptian police to Israel serves as a pretext to narrate another

less concrete and deeper journey: the journey through the life of each of the characters. We discover in the

experiences of each of the characters that many times our history is parallel and similar or can

help others who are on the road. Lost in a small Israeli town by various

avatars of the destination, the charity of some locals make it possible for them to spend the night indoors. It does not happen more in

history. Apparently. Because after this simple surface were Kolirin, also writer of the script, has

known much more in his debut as a film director. With the mastery of the mastery of small

things, Kolirin tells us about how these musicians influence and feed the parishioners, and how the locals

also They influence and evolve these musicians. Ultimately Kolirin focuses on the richness of

human relationships and gives us a small moral: every human being has something to contribute. The

actors are very well chosen and embroider their interpretation , filling with life the phrases of a realistic guide and care.

Kolirin has opted for a sober realization, without technical bravado, and with abundance of medium andplanes

Americanto do more. It's realistic and close to this story. With his style, he gets hilarious moments and others that are

truly emotional and tender. In addition, the hard and sharp photograph of Shaiis especially accurate,

Goldmanforcing us to delve into the apparent hardness of the characters to discover your inner garden.

It is also very successful (and in some truly memorable moments) the music composed by Habib

Shadah, which immerses us almost without realizing it and without shrillness in the story. Without doubt it is a

film This film should not be missed in 2008. Not only the spectators are able to appreciate its beauty,

but the critics and the juries of many festivals have already given numerous awards to this co-production. Entren

between Israel, France and the US He has won prizes from the isreal��� film academy, in Cannes he won the prize

"" Un certain regard "", his director took the prize for best director revelation in the awards Europeans of

cinema, has won the best film award in Tokyo and in our country it was made at 52

International Film Festival of Valladolid with the Award for Best Direction n Novel and the Best Guide. Without a doubt, they are not

the only prizes that you will reap. But from my point of view, the most important prize that has already been awarded

is to give the spectator something to think about and a story to enjoy.

" 1

" A film, in short, that defeats the filmmaker's detractors, who always think that, even

with a refined style, the director of El Club de La Lucha obtained to better results invideo

Madonna'sclips than in the finishing of her films.

Neither, of course, the argument, nor even the narrative approach of Zodiac are unknown in cinema.

However, Fincher is the first to rescue the combination; reason that is worth the recognition of

international criticism. The invention is complemented by the improved technical and artistic ability of the director of

Seven, to achieve a hypnotic result and, indeed, masterful. In movies, few stories are as fascinating

as those extracted from real events that make allusive cases open about unsolved murders.

Based on this, "" Zodiac "" is no more than the excuse that Fincher uses to make known a psychological thriller

that owes much of its narrative structure to the best political thriller from the history of the seventh art, to JFK

(or, at least, that we support the followers of Oliver Stone). An idea, without a doubt, brilliant, that links

the recurring argument of unpunished crimes (however true they may be) with an accurate and effective

approach close to the documentary. A precise and perfect execution work, which shies away from thespectacle

morbidto rely on the austere rigor of a shoot that has been advised by the principals

protagonists of the real events. A film, in short, that defeats the filmmaker's detractors, those

who always think that, even with a refined style, the director of The Fight Club obtained to

better results in Madonna's video clips than in the finishing of her films. And that convinces those who,

mistakenly, we are glad that it was not witness to the death of Betty Short, The Black Dahlia, which would go

to the credit of Brian de Palma. The main attraction of Zodiac, therefore, It is the application of that

"innovative approach" that revolutionizes the genre. If it was not because that approach already gave it to Cold Blood Richard

Brooks. In any case, this is not the only success in a tape full of them, which raise it to the

category of indispensable. Following the maximum that ensures that there can be no Good film without the

support of a gui���ns���lido, Fincher completes the adaptation that Vanderbilt makes of the books of Robert

Graysmith with the compilation of interviews that he makes the direct witnesses who are involved in thecase

Zodiac. The result, rich in information, constitutes a saturated argument base, which is not the same as

the stories of the genre and which, when leaving the cinema, satisfies the most demanding of the ���filos, that sees his

satiated curiosity. Gradually, to the macabre psychotic proceeding of the murderer, the fren���tic journalisticis incorporated to him

workto unmask him, to which he joins the police activity. From that moment on,

in three different frames, the story follows the rhythm of the research, alternating the different scenarios and

characters that make up the puzzle, dragging the viewer towards surprising findings and enclosing it?

few occasions- in authentic blind alleys, which lead to the point of departure. All this with an

excellent measurement of the times, an overwhelming assembly, and a manipulative direction, expandable to the

stalls. Zodiac becomes, in effect, a collective obsession. Almost as much as the one that Fincher shows for

the small details, the impeccable staging and the creation of an environmental tension that ratifies the

growing social alarm of the time. But Zodiac is, above all, the sum of a multitude ofgeniuses

cinematographicthat do not go unnoticed. The camera that, imperturbable, follows the path followed by the

first inslite missive, the origin of the event, since the "USA Mail" delivery route "deposits it at the doors

of the Chronicle, until it reaches the editor's hands. The scene of the house with s���tano, in which the

caricaturist interrogates a possible culprit, who reproduces an exact photogram of El Malvado Zaroff, a film

from 1932 that is mentioned in a cryptogram by the psychologist. �pata The inclusion of a child among thecharacters

central, which synthesizes the childish pénica that the Zodiac killer raised in a whole generation (in which

he finds himself). Fincher), when threatened by who said he would kill them on the school bus. The trick of the gui���n

that picks up the police investigations, oriented towards the premise that we remember from The Silence of the Lambs:

"" they envy and they hate what they see every day "", that we leads to the conviction that serial killers

always know their first victim. Then, apparently, killing is easy. With a visual aesthetic care,

inspired by the films of the 70s, which is extracted from The Conversation from Coppola; the music of David Shire,

author of the best soundtracks of that decade; the unforgettable performance of Robert Downey Jr., the praiseworthy

artistic direction, and David Fincher orchestrating, the 158 minutes of footage will know little. Therefore,is

a second viewingrecommended, which will corroborate that this is one of those good films thatmemory

cin���filaalways uses as a reference. Welcome to that imaginary firmament.

" 1

" Honoring a person who has lived things that nobody should live is not a guarantee of a good product.

The films have to be worked much more, spinning a film argument, not a documentary, making the

characters seem real (although they are, they do not seem so), etc.

There are films that you want to see in order to criticize them, not to put them to give birth, if not the

opposite. I usually hearafternoons in the afternoons when I come home from work, and I had been listening for some time as they

foamypraised their own film. They took those from the soundtrack, said C���ndida herself, and everything looked

great. So I was looking forward to the moment to put it through theand talk about a delicious

roofvital and energetic comedy. I do not know why I'm still biting into the same old thing, anyway. The film is about

a woman named C���ndida who lives happily despite her miserable life. A child drug addict, another schizophrenic

and one that comes out little but better not to leave, is the sweetener of his life as an eternal cleaner. The plot

runs linearly over a moment extracted from his life, which has been this as it could have been another. Look,

if I have to be honest, the film seemed like shit. And I say it with all the pain in my heart,

since that woman falls in love with me and makes me feel equally. But the film they have made about it is not worth

a pepper. To begin with, it is not a film, it is a simple happening of events, each one more sad, but without

a logical beginning and an incredible ending (which I do not care if it is real). , the reality surpasses fiction and I

do not believe it). It's a drama, but a very fat drama, told from the Fresser filter that I like so little when it comes

to making movies. And the jokes are not such, sincerely I thought that all the grace was laughing at how bad

this poor woman talks, which I found very cruel. That's not humor, and people laugh at that, not at

situations. Saving the moment that the TV is going to recover, the rest is not funny, if not very

sad. Resuming, paying tribute to a person who has lived things that nobody should live is not a guarantee of a

good product . The films have to be worked much more, spinning a film argument, not a documentary,

making the characters seem real (although they are, they do not seem so), etc.

" 0

" Clearly focused for all those who enjoy the comedy "absurd" The fourth installment of this peculiar saga has as main references to the following films: "" The

war of the worlds "", "" Saw " "," "The forest" "," "Brockeback montain" "," "The curse" "and" "Million dollar baby" "among

others. The challenge was to try to make an argument capable of putting together such disparate films, to create a new one that was

not a mere program of sketches like Cruz y Raya or los Morancos, but unfortunately they have not

succeeded, since Scary Movie 4 it is a succession of rather loose jokes, among which there is some pearl. The

director of this new release is David Zucker, a veteran in the world of comedies, as he is one of

the directors of the cult work "" Land as you can "" and that later he was in charge �� of "" Add it as you can "" and

of the previous installment of "" Scary Movie "" among others. This new release is clearly focused for all

those who enjoy the comedy "absurd", which makes them have a good time without expecting anything else, and "" Scary

Movie 4 "" is going to provide, since apart from some very spectacular special effects, has several

moments that make it worthwhile to have spent 75 minutes of our lives in seeing this film

starring again by Anna Faris and that has the participation ��n by Leslie Nielsen, Charlie Sheen,

Shaquille O���Neall, Carmen Electra and Chriss Elliott among others.

" 0

" With a few careful dialogues (although sometimes they are a stupid movie), and with aargument

predictable, so much half-open plot deserves an end m��� It's remarkable, it shows us what is so well known that "all

wehave secrets", it's still less.

I'm not very sure why I was interested in the film, maybe because I love the poster, and

seeing it with so much prize and so much hype I said to myself, I sure like it, once contemplated alone I think I

liked it 50% and it is that I expected more from the 2nd film of Todd Field, a drama with several stories

intermingled very much in the style of "" Crossed Lives "" by Robert Altman (RIP), a reference in this type of

gimmicky stories. To begin its excessive duration, for my taste prolonged ad nauseam with that

indecent narrator, who remembers more a story that to an adult film, and where the passageis too noticeable

from the novel to the cinema, sometimes it is better to intuit than to tell us loudly. I have to break a spear in favor of

Jennifer Connelly and Kate Winslet. Last maybe the best of the film, what Connelly is amention

separate, and is that only appear, although it appears poc or, I'm drooling with it. With some prettydialogues

careful(although sometimes they're a stupid movie), and with a predictable plot, such a half-open plot

deserves me. at a more remarkable end, it shows us that so well known that "we all have secrets" ", it is a pity that in

some moments, the caller gives, taking his actors to situations limit of which they do not always know how to

leave with ease. In short: a good exercise in cinema, very poorly solved.

" 0

" The comedy of the year and one of the best movies seen this season. They do not stop with their heads while you

do not know if they will hold their hands to their heads.

Jason Reitman debuts in the long with a huge movie that even his father could not match (which is not saying

much, I think the last good movie of Reitman father was Ghostbusters.) Thanks for smoking becomes the

comedy of the year and one of the best movies seen this season. Bad host in abundance from the first and

antolÃgica scene and characters defined in such a perfect way that, even if they only have one scene, they hold in

the memory as much as the one played by Aaron Eckhart in, without risk of being mistaken, the best interpretation. Den of

his career. The secondary ones are all outstanding (and there are many: Sam Elliot, David Koechner, William H.

Macy, Rob Lowe.), The only negative is that Maria Bello comes out. dressed It's about the adaptation to the cinema of

Christopher Buckley's homonymous novel, which is not published in Spain (I think, I mean it's not edited in

I think), and it has the sharpest dialogues of the last few years. They do not leave you head-headed while you

do not know if I'll re���ro take your hands to the head. It would be a pity if you missed it, I'll tell you that it's the

best on the card. Super credits, outstanding photography, great compositions and a

surprising rhythm. A 9.

" 1

" It must be recognized that Sandra H���ller does it very well, but when the movie gets interesting, it goes and

ends.

Best film, actress and prize of the critic in the festival of Sitges. Silver Bear for the best actress, Sandra

H���ller, in Berlin. 82 points, over 100, is the average of North American criticism in Metacritic. And I

have everything ready to go on pilgrimage Lourdes, because this kind of "" The exorcist: before the

beginning "", in version "" Breaking the waves "" (���sta Yes, Masterpiece), I thought it was a championship tost���n, and

that does not last for an hour and a half.It had been sold, I do not know if for advertising or strategic reasons LessVerismo's

materialistic, such asresponse to "" The exorcism of Emily Rose "" by Scott Derrickson. Although

it is not necessary to specify that any proposal is more "" realistic "" than a North American film designed

for mass consumption. It is inspired by the presumed case of possession di������ Bolica documented, and recognized by the

Church, of the young Anneliese Michel, who died, in 1976 in the population of Klingenberg, by malnutrition,

exhaustion, wounds and exorcisms practiced.Fantas� Vs.a Realidad.Y what in Derrickson's film,

another pe���azo, with some effective scene, was the popular and fantasized version, where the religious author of the

exorcism was the good one; here, and because it is the opposite, the author's version and close to the facts, the young

priest who intervenes gives more grimace, "Let's go!" a doubtful fanatic. In contrast, anotherappears

priest also, more veteran and focused on his tasks. At a time when neither science nor Faith could possibly

help her. Too much, the disease, or the evil, of Micaela (epilepsy, schizophrenia, paranoia?), attacks your

nerves and your mind in such a way that you not only have trouble adapting to college life or to

sex. It will affect the rejection of the Catholic conservatism that has instilled in him, above all, his possessive

mother, and that feeling of sin and punishment, which makes her feel a death. if she thinks she sees (or sees)

demons, souls in pain and saints, it is because of that education, that if she had been born in some Asian country, instead

of , what would appear to her would be pale, long-haired girls scratching walls and floors. At the suggestion

of Schmid.The German Hans- Christina Schmid, debutante, he films a psychological essay that refuses theeffects

special and soundin favor of a supposed greater emotion and authenticity. And he does it in a 'dogma' style, that

is with photography It's possible natural, camera in tow,? Zooms? Apparently improvised, abruto editing,

and everything as a documentary to introduce us better in this piece of life (fateful). And although the

dogma productions have given very good results, it is not the case of "" R���quiem (The Exorcism of Micaela) "" It must be

recognized that Sandra H���ller does very well, especially when he seizes his hands by the nerves, or that

repel���s that he transmits to us when he can not approach a cross, or sticks out his mother's tongue. But when the

movie gets interesting, it goes and ends. And what has been said, we have witnessed a piece (cracked) of life, but

without it being able to touch its history, by sopor���fera, and leaving half to develop both in the treatment

of gui���n as the secondary characters For the moment, the procession of Lourdes is the same, and in

its place I put two candles to Santa Catalina, for which Micaela felt devotion. 'R���qui���scat In Pace'

(Rest in Peace).

" 0

" Fresnadillo faces the challenge of continuing a product and not only exalts it but also enriches it, fleeing from

the typical horror film guides and, in particular, v�� Ulcers and blood.

His ���ptica has led him to relate the desire of beings infected by a lethal virus, a drama that comes from

afar. The beginning of a catastrophe has its continuation, but we warn, then we drop the blast: it is not

suitable for all tastes, much less if we talk about the most refined. It is true that to hold the footage

of this film, still closing your eyes, you have to have a stomach, but who likes movies with rhythm,

scares and the epidemiological cut, I know you can "" enjoy it. "" End of 2001, Intacto gave the surprise: a

gui���n with substance, a met���dica realizaci���ny and actors like M���nica L ���pez and Leonardo Sbaraglia, dancing to the sound of

a new director. He did not know, but it would not take long for theeyes to

iconoclastic Danny Boyle'snotice an orchestra conductor who introduces us to rock himself. s hard that

delights us with sones of new era and flees from the typical manidos of horror movies, since the 70s, intended for

adolescent consumption. Only it could be done charge of a catastrophic history raised from the vertigo, the

verismo and the rhythm of videoclip. Terror of author is what this filmmaker proposes that, dignifying the field

sown with sequels, he handles the technique and he lifts the most commercial cinema up to the peaks of his own seal and

quality. Throughout 100 minutes, the studied photography of London never ceases to amaze us, in each

plane it warns us of the immensity of emptiness, of restlessness. And it is only an example of what he achieves, without

entering into parallels with reality and apocalyptic visions of what awaits us. He was unconditional 28

days later (premiered in 2002), and it shows the devotion to not massacre its essence, something imposed on the other side.

It is true that already the first part, original, what is said original, was not. Just take a look at classic

B series titles such as The Last Living Man on Earth and The Night of the Comet. From that

premise, we can now launch ourselves to praise this unpleasant, excessive, disconcerting exercise and, I keep to

the consequences, more than convincing in their thesis. It is true that it costs to close the story or maybe I did not

raise it at any time. That being the case, there are some who would not have left it open so shamelessly, but we

appreciate that you do not take us for fools, that you do not insult our intelligence as spectators, although it is

true that as the footage progresses it loses so much bellows � �� Impetus and ends up diluting in pursuit of a

resolution as poor as it is correct. You are forgiven for carelessness in the gui���n by that search for truthfulness in

what seems more a fictional documentary than a fiction story to use. If what I wanted was to innovate and

contribute substance to the genre of terror, combined with an excellent soundtrack and careful plans that

contain choreography of the wildest, without He forgets the rabid camera, Juan Carlos Fresnadillo has

achieved it. How would this author write an intimate story, without the need for special effects, with everything? sa hand?

We questioned it after seeing the tone that permeates a product so deliberately commercial. What's more,

hopefully the next project will lead to a change of registration to confirm, in case anyone has doubts, that

we are facing one of the most intelligent views of the European cinema. Author, yes.

" 1

" Portrait of the people in whose hands was the destiny of the world but who could not govern their own.

Or God or the King, the fact is that there is an anonymous army of faithful servants, priests or shoemakers,

mercenaries who sacrifice personal life, their intimate avatars, their honest desire to be happy in this

world, for serving a necessarily higher reality that, in the movie of De Niro, is the homeland, the

bars and the stars, all that conglomerate of codes �� Ethics that make up the invisible framework on which

our society sustains. What it is about The good shepherd is not of the CIA and its origins, it is not a

prospection on the ���ces of espionage in the US or is not, at least, just that: it is a very long, in

its absence, story about the gray and almost always little appreciated weight of the official, who is who , at the end, it is

delivered in body and soul to the deliberate movement, thoughtfully designed of the pieces on the

board of the world. The character of Matt Damon, Edward Wilson, is the quintessence of the indispensable pie, of

that soldier who not only fulfills the orders but finds in that obedience a kind of intimate

relevance that makes him, without hesitation, sacrifice marriage, children and life. There are no moral dilemmas in the

evolution of the character: the cobbler of the king, as in a beautiful piece of the film are named spies,

dehumanizes his soul, clothes it with the v� The pain of work and loyalty to a cause always necessarily more

important than their small desires and their small domestic life. The CIA was primitively formed by

fundamentalists of good social class, white, not necessarily Catholic, but cultured, aristocratic andpatriarchal

conspired to safeguard an obscureprinciple that has been inculcated into them from the childhood, when

the values ​​begin for which they are going to be recruited and put at the service of the cause. De Niro sticks his

finger in the wound, but it does not hurt. It is contained. He prefers to reason the nature of the shepherd, his

invisible guiding condition of an unprotected flock before the affective deficiencies of his mission, his amoral acceptance of

a destination and the abandonment of everything that is outside the main lines of that company. All those sewers

of the State, significantly the true good shepherd, must contain hundreds of stories that De Niro could

have used to offer us a showy spectacle of spy movies and we do not doubt that beautifully, but he

opts for the emotional plane and, without renouncing certain moments of sharp thriller, gives the spectator a

powerful portrait of a country, his, although there is a fascinating comment that Wilson makes to an American-American (

played by a great, as always, Joe Pesci) who attacks him with the idea that allgroups

marginalhave something in their hearts: the Jews have the tradition; the blacks, the music; the Italians,

the family. but what do the Americans have? And they have America ... and a vast expanse of the world subjected to its

ideological and commercial dictation. There is even a crucial scene in which, by Christmas, all clustered around

the tree and the spoiled happiness, some sing "" You've got the whole world in your hands / You have the

whole world in your hands "" , the classic piece of the American songbook, while Wilson and a colonel depart with

muted whispers about the destiny of the world and what piece must be moved so that the game continues.

Ambiguous, gray, bland , the character of Damon, his records on the screen, are perfect. They

immerse themselves masterfully in the ironed suit of the official Wilson, who goes from one corridor to another, occupying offices,

traveling the world to finish alone, with the duty fulfilled and the sensation that the world, In spite of his

effort, he does not turn as he does for any of his efforts and his expertise. The laconicity of its staging is

appropriate for the story: its classic frames, its slow visual silversmithing, its fabulous ambience. What is

no longer perhaps not so convenient is the story itself - here De Niro has a minor fault - that lapses due

to the excessive footage (167 minutes) and the ambitious construction of a n� ��mero of interesting stories

that end abruptly and do not curdle in the plot unit of the film. Perhaps this is why it is not

a masterpiece but only a good or very good film. De Niro, in this second raid after the

camera, has given an honest, very brave, classic film to the way in which I understand certain movies of the 40s

and 50s that obviated any commercial concession and only allowed an licenses that reincided in theitself

film. This does not happen in the cinema now that is gestating with the viewer in mind, what he wants and how to give it to him.

" 1

" Wild and sprinkled with black black humor, The Departed is the best film cooked by the

DiCaprio-Scorsese company.

Scorsese returns to the streets with a brutal blood bath of frenetic rhythm. There is no truce in this film

where the violence marks the house of the New Yorker pervades all the footage. Supported by a strong cast

in which DiCaprio proves that, without a doubt, he is one of the greats (I must confess my reluctance with him at the

beginning of his career) and in which Nicholson has been left unleashed for his most savage histrionics,

The Departed is a whole lesson of cinematographic rhythm, an exhibition of mastery in the use

milim� ��trico of the narrative elements. Maybe, after looking for some 'but',may be considered as unlikely

some sequences, although the result of this film (based on the classic of the police cinema) Hongaco

hongkon���s Infernal Affairs) does not stop being magnificent. His argument proposes a game of 'topos'

infiltrated in two opposite sides: that of the police and that of a gang of Irish mafiosi. The two

protagonists are presented to us schematically and effectively in a brief exchange of sequences placed in

parallel. If Billy Costigan (Leonardo DiCaprio) was always stalked by the delinquency of his mafiosoenvironment

family, Colin Sullivan (Matt Damon), on the other hand, was attracted to the world of crime from a young age in view

of what easy to make money on the side of that environment. Both entered the Police Academy, but if

Sullivan's success comes with amazing ease, Costigan will go through a via crucis to overcome his

family heritage and prove his worth as police. Between them is the ruthless mafia boss Frank

Costello (Jack Nicholson); Costello sponsored from small Sullivan and had all kinds of deals withuncle

Costigan's, another legend in the world of organized crime. Alone and determined not to approach that environment

following the isolated example of honesty of his father, Billy will be forced by his superiors (Mark Wahlberg

and Martin Sheen) to infiltrate the organization of Costello to help dismantle it. But his work will

be continually sabotaged by the blow of Costello in the special group of investigators that goes after him, hisSpecial mention

godson Sullivan.deserves the role of Nicholson, unleashed as time ago he was not seen in a

role of doctor, womanizer and amoral consummate that, given the own biography of Jack, comes to him as a glove

. However, I did not finish convincing the love triangle between Sullivan, Costello and the psychiatrist who

treats this one, Madolyn (Vera Farmiga). The aesthetics of the plans or the choice of musical themes, with the

repeated appearance of the Guimme Shelter of the Stones, carry the unmistakable factory of the perfectionist

Scorsese. Wild and sprinkled with dark black humor, The Departed is the best film cooked by the

DiCaprio-Scorsese company. Gans of New York remained halfway to excellence, although it is a remarkable film, and from

The Aviator I would only rescue some aspects, such as the deepening in the paranoia Howard Hughes.

When asked grimly in case this year the Oscar will finally touch him, Scorsese replies that

he cares that his work pleases the public to continue working. in new projects. I believe him, because it does not seem

easy to make auteur films in these times in which the industry has resumed the control of thewith force

studies. Therefore, it is to be happy that the Italian-born filmmaker stays in such good shape, as he

will be able to continue exhibiting his cinematographic wisdom in future projects.

" 1

" When a historical film passes the historical rigor through the noses, it is frankly difficult to

concentrate on the rest.

The Indian director Shekhar Kapur brings us the sequel to Elizabeth, masterfully played by Cate

Blanchett who overflows to build this character, endowing it with all the claw and magnetism that thefigure

historicaldeserves. I have to say that if something is worthwhile this film is only to see Cate in such a

beautiful exercise because in essence, the film is unsuccessful.When a film hist��� Rich is passed therigor

historicalby the noses, it is frankly difficult to concentrate on the rest, it is true that the

locations and costumes are remarkable but sincerely the story has many black holes. If

you are a gourmand of history, believe me, you will not like it. To mention the role of Jodi Moll��� that little gives us to

enjoy.Acompa���aa Cate an increasingly interesting Clive Owen that after ���s de "" Sons of men "" seems to

have made an accurate leap in the Hollywood starsystem, but whose performance in this film is not even

necessary to talk about his character as well as the rest are a mere ornament of the character of Cate that is

the one that carries all the weight of the narrative pulse.

" 0

" I know for a fact that the Stasi violated the privacy of the Germans, and that the vendettas of the Mafia are

perverse. But I do not want a director who comes to judge them with his catechism of values. I want a director that

I enter in those hells without prudent censorship.

Take for example The Godfather. Any director of medium hair in charge of that story would have condemned

the Corelone, so that the spectators would learn to be good children, or so that we would not relate to him,

to the director with the mafia. Coppola dares with the morlaco, identifies with the mafioso until the end. That's why he

is one of the greats. Not because he chooses nice chords in the soundtrack or because he places the camera in aplace

more chiIthan the others. It is useless to continue reviewing the technical file of the Godfather, hanging

praises, we will not find the explanation that makes it so tremendous. This step that Coppola gives is the one that does not give German

films. .N Hirschbiegel makes a film about Hitler with the sole purpose of not understanding Hitler, Henckel

von Donnersmarck analyzes a plot of the stasi with the sole intention that we do not understand what he felt an

agent of the stasi. An expert in espionage of the East Germany receives the order to watch aauthor

theaterand his lover. After spiking the whole house the spy discovers that deep down they are two victims of the

system and that the minister himself abuses his power to get the favors of the woman. From that

moment on he changes his attitude and collaborates with them. The problem is that from that moment the character stops

making sense. The character is faced with all the regime that maintains it and against the work itself

, which sounds very good to a spectator today, but does not tell us anything of what happened in Germany

. so. If the public were catholic, the director would have filled the protagonist with crucifixes. It's away

quickto win over the audience. But lack the audacity that was left over in The Godfather. I know that the Stasi

violated the privacy of the Germans, and that the vendettas of the mafia are perverse. But I do not want a director

who comes to judge them with his catechism of values. I want a director that I go into those hells without

censorship prude. I liked the setting, East Germany very sad with wallpaper and scratched

sof���s. The beginning is sublime. The protagonist explains his methods to a class that listens to an example of how

an interrogation is made and stays electrified, just like the public.

" 0

" New vampire movie gore and expendable. You will like it if you are a lover of the genre without prejudice and you will

hate it if you are looking for something more than entertainment in it.

The cinema of vampires and monsters is back in fashion. In this case we return to talk about the adptation of a

comic, the one written by Niles and Ben Templesmith and that Sam Raimise has commissioned to remove thefrom the paper. This

celluloidfilm tells the story of an Alaskan city in the that during the winter, there are 30 days in

which they do not see the sunlight. With this starting premise, it is not strange that a group of vampires discover

"" by chance "" this small town lost in the middle of nowhere and decide to bleed all its inhabitants

to have a great feast. .N Will any of its inhabitants survive? You'll have to go to the movies to

discover it because I'm not going to tell you. I personally found it a boring and predictable movie.

I had hopes for this film because its director, David Slade, was also the creator of the

disturbing candy "" Hard Candy "" and he trusted in his good work after the c� ��maras However, the guide uses

many topics on the subject, in this case without delving into the psychology of the aggressors. It does not explain where

vampires really come from or what they intend to do with this action. The action advances by leaps and bounds, free of charge and

from the point of view of the realization of the action. There's nothing really remarkable. The actors are correct in some

roles with little dramatic depth. The most remarkable of the film, the 4,000 liters of artificial blood, 280

tons of snow and five tons of propane gas used. Given these figures, the avizado spectator knows that

we are before one of those products a little gores and facts for the fast consumption that will not pass the annals of

the history of the cinema, not even of the g��� nero.You will like it if you are a lover of the genre without prejudice and you will

hate it if you are looking for something more than entertainment in it.

" 0

" The ambience and the beauty of the locations are the most striking of this torture called "Hostel 2 ?,

which we hope will not have continuation.

I did not really want to see Eli Roth's new proposal, but the inertia led me to see it. Myfeelings

previouswere confirmed. The movie is bad, pretty bad. Starting from a similar scheme to the previous one,

instead of being carried out by three boys, now they are girls who will know what it is to be tortured and to be

afraid. Through a beautiful woman, the girls agree to go to a spa in Slovakia, and of course, we already know

what will happen. The innovation of this sequel is that Roth shows us the side of two torturers,

two rich Americans who will enter the ranks of the hunt for the first time. �lite.After that,

topics and masks wrapped in a wording, if you can call it that, I do not understand how they did not return to

rewrite, since it leaves much to be desired. The best: some black humor hits, like the one that takes place at the

end of the movie, and that is played by those little devils that "" Hostel "" askedfor chewing gum. It is

touristscurious how the protagonist is treated with excessive respect, she does not get to see her in a bikini

(and even if she is in a spa), and instead we are shown many other things. There are some cameos and gui���os in

"" Hostel 2 "" that deserve to stand out, like the one related to Elisabeth Bathory. As for the actors, none that stands

out especially.The ambientaci���ny and the beauty of the locations are the most striking of this torture

called "" Hostel 2 "", which hopefully has no continuation .

" 0

" The film knows on numerous occasions to pay tribute to the film by John Carpenter and his guide, making

numerous guides, and even adapting his plot in a very similar and reliable way. I take my hat off to

this phenomenal and intense job of Rob Zombie.

I know that some of them will hang me by the big toes of the feet of the top of a ship's flagpole. But I

know what I say and why I say it, and even more so considering that I am a fond fan of John Carpenter, of

all his work which I venerate, and of his unforgettable night of Halloween that I have seen countless times, but this

precle-remake is undoubtedly superior to the original. For me the historical director Rob Zombie, eccentric

and crazy as few, has reached a point of maturity and talent already very evident, forgetting his previous films

mixed theater, antics and gore. Taking charge of a film like Halloween Night was not a turkey moque.

We speak of a classic among the classics among modern horror films, so having so many fans and fans,

after 29 years reaping so much admiration, adorers and In love with criticism, reinventing the franchise, and more the

classics that originated it was not easy. Rob Zombie focused this remake with a series of veryquestions

interestingposed by the original. What can drive a child to kill his sister? Because that's what we

see in the original film. In the remake he exterminates his sister, his boyfriend and his father. Michael Myers is a young man

who lives in a broken, unstructured home, full of misery, insults, violence, humiliation and pain. The

child also does not have much shelter in the school where he is mistreated and persecuted by abusive partners.

Michael explodes in that hell in which thousands of people live despite himself, and unfolds his mind. First he

satisfies his frustration by killing animals, which relaxes him. Those attacks of violence make you feel better.

That's why he then brutally kills a schoolmate in a forest clearing. Then he slaughters

everyone in his house, but leaves the baby alive. We see that Michael is not a drugged or dumb nut. He is

a sensitive child, with a broken mind and very bitter. Then he is stopped by the police. Entered in acenter

psychiatric. How was a child going to be a lot of silent years and looking through a window? This prequel tells us

about a parent-child relationship between Dr. Loomis and Michael. The doctor understands that apparently

Michael is a good child, with a good heart and even something shy. But he knows that it contains a dark and wild side

that unfolds when putting on a mask, which is its dark, uncontrollable and homicidal side. Michael's mother is

next to the boy trying to help him. But after a visit session the child brutally attacks a

nurse, slitting her throat. After that tragedy and four deaths, Michael Myers is declared of high danger. The

mother sees how the child's brain has burst, burned a fuse, possessed by the dark side, and

then enters into a state of shock, remaining mute and even somewhat stunned. The mother is broken by family tragedy

and her life commits suicide at home by shooting herself. The boy grows up and becomes a bicharraco who does not enter

through a door, played by the actor Tyler Mane, a former wrestler of 2.03 meters in height. And

here begins the film Halloween Night, taking about an hour to tell us why Michael Myers is the

monster he is, his motivations and why he massacred his family . Just in the middle of the film begins the film

by John Carpenter, which of course, with the current cinematographic language the length of the original film, 91 meters,

would be very long or very slow, at the hands that counts as stories are told now and that means

greater rhythm and plot density. That's why the second half of Halloween supposes to condense very accurately all

the old film by John Carpenter. At that point I will not eviscerate too many things since I have revealed many around

the first hour of film, but I will say that it is excellent and vibrant. Michael Myers is a homicidal and almost

mythological monster at the height of the original, leaving in the crap all his past incarnations in a lot of

sequels of various luck. The film knows on numerous occasions to pay tribute to the film by John Carpenter and his

guide, making numerous guides, and even adapting his story in a very similar and reliable way, but he also

knows how to take its points of distance and originality that do not clash, to give it an added

interest to the film. The movie has many impressive moments. The tension is brutal and the murders are

very realistic and hard. The murders of the child are chilling. Wayne Toth's makeups are

impressive. I know that John Carpenter's film is elegant and mysterious, and that the blood (in spite of

several deaths) is conspicuous by its absence. But this remake-prequel has remarkable doses of gore andhardness

visual, but I think they are adequate. The film is presented as a trilogy if it has success, which is why

all the actors have signed for three films in their contracts. I hope everyone does Rob Zombie and have thelevel

qualityof this powerful film that I loved during its almost two hours of duration.new

Without a doubt, amodern classics. Despite having been pirated on the internet, it is having excellent

collections in the USA, which the film deserves without a doubt. I take my hat off to this phenomenal and

intense job of Rob Zombie. Do not miss it!

" 1

" More than a fiction film should be considered only as an exemplary testimony of the

reality of a good part of Spanish youth. current wave, and as such it is worth seeing.

There are some filmmakers who for one reason or another, because of the talent they have, the themes they deal with, or a mixture

of both, never leave anyone indifferent. In the Spanish cinema there are many filmmakers that fit this

description, and the Catalan Bigas Luna is without a doubt, a clear example. Films such as The Ages of Lul���,

Jam���n, Jam���no Eggs of Gold are already part of the mythology of Spanish cinematography (not only for

having discovered and consecrated Javier Bardem and Pen���lope Cruz), and they supposed a new way of understanding the

narrative in the cinema. Now, five years after Son de Mar, Bigas Luna presents to the public his vision of the

icon of the modern Spanish woman, the Juani. With this new film, Bigas Luna also sought the discovery

of a new actress, and it was dedicated for six months, looking for the perfect interpreter to give life to

this new icon. La Juani (Ver���nica Echegui) is a young woman who dreams of becoming an actress and being a great

star, despite her father, who is sick, and from the neighborhood where she lives, a depressed area on the outskirts of a

great city Her boyfriend Jonah (Dani Mart���n) is passionate about tuning, to the point of living dedicated to it

body and soul. La Juani and her best friend Vane (Laya Mart���) decide to go to Madrid to succeed, although once

there they will discover that success is not achieved so easily. The best quality of Bigas Luna in the film is

to portray a social reality that a large part of the population does not know or that looks elsewhere.

The characters, their character, their environment, the way they express their dreams and ambitions, through tunning,

are reflected to perfection. However, we must recognize that the fiction that arises on that

recreation is quite flimsy, without force or emotion. The script is simple and predictable, the characters neither

advance nor evolve, and the plot is incapable of hooking or the viewer more predisposed to it; that yes,

sometimes it is immersed in a visual and musical unbridled without end apparent. The intention is to notice

a second part, if the blessing of the always changing public accompanies. On the other hand, the actors

are in general in a medium-high tone, although without great boasting on the part of any of them. I am the

Juani, more than a fiction movie. It should be considered only as an exemplary testimony of the

reality of a good part of the Spanish youth today, and as such it is worth seeing.

" 0

" Entertaining, impeccably directed, self-critical and reflective storyThe Munich Olympics in 1972 went down in history for the killing of 11 Israeli athletes by

the Palestinian terrorist group "" Black September "". Directed by Steven Spielberg, the film begins by describing

the event, but only to give rise to what came after, the consequences. This is where Avner appears (Eric

Bana, who rose to fame with Hulk and Troy), Mossad agent, Israeli secret service, chosen to lead

a group of five men that aims to kill to the Palestinians responsible for the tragedy, who

are in different European countries. The way in which the film develops, on a superficial level,

could make some unsuspecting think that Munich is a film of action. Clearly it has all the

ingredients that honor the genre: a main character almost heroic, still with its weaknesses and

miseries, a climate of tension that does not fail in any way. moment of the film, missions in the style of Mission

Impossible, and even moments and magic dialogues and must-sees, including an unforgettable scene, verystyle

Spielberg-, where Palestinians and Jews meet by chance in a house that they rented from an informant and

they have no choice but to share a room, listening to music together, hiding their true

identities and, who will say a, having a good time. But no. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict is a sensitive and

always controversial issue. Munich does not escape that, and it is here where the greatness of this

film is found: in its reading, in its treatment on the subject, everything is considered if its director professes the

Jewish religion. �a, which hinders impartiality, a goal too high to which any director could

aspire. Spielberg almost succeeds, with an entertaining story, impeccably directed, autocritical and thoughtful.

Highly recommended

" 1

" These types of products can be approached in two ways. Searching for truthfulness or simply offering a

drama of tome and spine type telefilme.

Antonio Mercero had an important success with plant 4 that reflected the cancer theme alluding to the easy

flint in pursuit of a caramelized commerciality. In this type of products can be approached in two ways. Looking for

the truth or simply offering a drame of tome and spine type telefilm with famous actors to hook

to the box office. Unfortunately Mercer returns to re-offend in the same way, the interpretations great performances

of López V���zquez and Manuel Alexandre are expected from interpreters with the quality shown over the years

taking out a slice of papers for personal brilliance. We are facing a cheating film where everything It is

superficial without the least dramatic interest or contributing anything positive to such a serious case. Afterwards, it is

a film with good intentions, but that is not enough to make good movie theater.

" 0

" Excellent western that, in its day, was misunderstood for its plot ambiguity, as well as for its

violence, armagegas and quite stark and cruel.

"" Arizona, 1874. Link Jones, former gunslinger dedicated to banditry, is today a regenerated andmarried man

happily. So much so, that the community in which he lives has commissioned him to hire a new teacher, for

which Link has embarked on a trip by train with six hundred dollars. "" Excellent western that, in his ���a, she was

misunderstood for her plot ambiguity, as well as for her violence, blasphemy, and quite stark and cruel.

But it is a good film, strong, dynamic, yes, somewhat obscure and particular. The characters are

never one piece and all have a dark past. Biting and steely dialogues, trickster photography and,

above all, an unusual staging for what is required if it is projected by television, itsformat

full-screen, something that almost never happens . Very well, Gary Cooper and especially Lee J. Cobb, in an abject role,

enormously physical and as an actor.

" 1

" The best English film of the year There are moments in life when cold solves problems better than heat. To lock oneself in oneself and go

through a copious snowfall becomes a solution to evade matters that are dizzy in the head and

heart. For those moments when the cold winter blows with force movies like "" Pride andwere invented

Prejudice "", in its most recent version, and that is, of long, the best English movie of the year. They arestories

complete, without a molecule, brilliant from beginning to end, free of faults or punctuations. This does not mean

perfection, but it is very close. Although I must admit that I have not enjoyed the BBC miniseries

that Colin Firth starred in (very reviewed by some close people), I can not hide my absolute

enthusiasm for this film. Joe Wright Due to the delicacy of her images, the purity of Keira Kinghtley,

one of those fine, simple beauties, of a disturbing smile due to her candor and, at the same time, complicity, parades. Levitate

for the exquisite rooms where the story unfolds with a unique, semi-divine grace, which is

accompanied by an interpretation perfectly suited to the role of Lizzie Bennet.More there of the unspeakable charm of

its protagonist, nominated with merit to the Oscar for Best Actress, there is a cast of commendable artists.

From the shy look of Rosamund Pike to the powerful presence of Judi Dench, not forgetting the sweet Mr.

Bennet of Donald Sutherland. But my favorite, although it sounds typical, is that stretched, proud,nobleman

rational and presumptuousof Mark Darcy, who in spite of all his prejudices ends up falling in love with those who should not. Ignore

any obstacle (jump), any mistake made (try to correct them at any price), any

disagreement of their environment (expensive plant) to deliver their feelings to that unique creature found in

Elizabeth Bennet. to all this, the delicious piano music of Dario Marianelli (also nominated) and the

photography of Roman Oshin, warm, delicate, precise. My circumstances may influence excessively when it comes

to making a value judgment about this film, but even so, I think it deserves my recognition as one

of the best things I've seen lately. . Simply, a cinematographic pleasure for all the senses.

and for the heart.

" 1

" Beowulf is the next step in the evolution of the Motion Capture system and despite its obvious and

undeniable successes, it is an unbalanced film whose duration can be heavy for the viewer due to

the irregularity of the your pace.

After seeing Beowulf and start thinking about the comment for the blog I realized one thing: I've seen the whole

filmography of Robert Zemeckis with the exception of his first film, Used Cars. It is also not difficult

considering that he has worked on such "unknown" films as "Back to the Future, After the Green Heart,

Forrest Gump or Who cheats". ����� Roger Rabbitt. In his work there is clearly a progressive interest in the

technique of the medium, in making it evolve one more degree, in giving the greatest possible freedom to the directors,

in making the ���mara is the most flexible element in the world, taking away all its limitations. Something very

evident in three of his last works of real image: Forrest Gump, Contact and What the truth hides. Where

the number of planes really impossible so far is huge, with the film starring

Harrison Ford, the clearest example. This particular obsession has led him to develop with the company

Sony Imageworks the technique of Motion Capture, which allows the use of real actors to create

virtual ones from their body movement and facial expressions This technique was used for the first time in The

Polar Express, being Tom Hanks the actor who tried it in his flesh for the first time managing to play

several characters in the same film. The forced photorealism as well as the little refinement of the procedure did not

help in much the good running of the film, which turned out to be a successful experiment in many things like

the freedom with which ���a the camera throughout the footage, as failed in as many as the

general lack of expression of the characters. One year after this film, Sony Imageworks, with Zemeckis in

manufacture, volveraa the load with Monster House, much more successful than the previous, because of their particular

remoteness of photorealism, opting for a pure aesthetic cartoon for characters. That decision coupled

with a fun and interesting script was a good boost for the Motion Capture, although at the box office it was not

the great success that was expected. .Beowulf is the return of Zemeckis to the cinema and again with Motion

Capture, although much more perfected than in his previous attempt and benefited from the implementation of the system

Digital 3D in more and more cinemas around the world. Because another element not previously mentioned is that the

three films have been designed and conceived to be projected in 3D, so any analysis

carried out without having seen them in this format is always incomplete. Fortunately, I have been able to see it that way,

although in the province of Valencia only the Punt de Alzira is projected in the AEC cinemas. Having seen both

versions, I can say that seeing it in 3D is a great help to the movie. The film technically pertains to

almost the same mistakes as The Polar Express: lack of general expressiveness of the characters, much

less detail as the character's weight declines, bad animation of the characters elements not captured with motion

capture (for example, galloping horses). Fortunately, the technique has improved a lot and theactors

virtualseem more real than ever, although far from the sought after photorealism, Zemeckis also achieves a

very successful 3D effect, by using the technology as one more element to tell the story, not just to

scare the viewer by throwing virtual objects in his face, something that The Polar Express sinned. Thus, in the

3D projection, he manages to introduce the viewer into the action, moving the camera between the characters, through

the use of aerial panoramas. very successful and a wealth of resources that prove again that the disciple of

Spielberg has not lost its innovative affinity. The story of Beowulf, a classic song of deed, equivalent to

the Anglo-Saxons of our Cantar de m���o Cid, narrates the confrontation between the heroes who do not name the

story and the monster Grendel, who has frightened a village in northern Europe.The gui� ��n, the work of Neil

Gaiman and Roger Avary, shows us a dirty, violent time, not skimping on blood and on nudes, too

modest that is. For the American morale to show the demembramiento of a person is not problematic, but to

show the penis of the protagonist it seems it, giving rise to a shameful scene that seems more taken out of

Austin Powers that of a film that is pretended more serious. The development is discursive, there is too much talk about

things that are transcendental, but the characters lack the necessary expressivity to

empathize with them. Even such elements as graphic violence (it is a film not recommended for children under 18

) and details such as the arrival of Christianity in those lands, give it an unexpected look and

nothing from ���able. It is in the scenes of action, scarce but forceful where the film plays its best

weapons, constituting the best of the film, although it is a pity that this almost entirely happens in a hall

of celebrations and in the cave of the monster. The interpretive plane is difficult to evaluate because due to the design

of the characters they are more convincing when s detail present, resulting in remarkable Ray

Winstone as Beowulf, Anthony Hopkins as King Lothar or Angelina Jolie as the mother of Grendel; on the other

side of the scale would Robin Wright - Penn? like the queen, practically unrecognizable in itsincarnation

digital. The artistic design manages to translate to perfection the time in which the action takes place. And the

digital photography is very successful, despite the distraction that it is for the viewer that all the

elements on the screen are perfectly focused regardless of their distance to the objective

virtual. On the other hand the music of Alan Silvestri is one of the best elements of the film being very

powerful, without falling into formulismos tipo factor Bruckheimer. A soundtrack of those who create hobby, very much in the

style of Conan Poledouris master. In short, Beowulf is the next step in the evolution of thesystem

Motion Captureand despite its obvious and undeniable successes , it is an unbalanced film whose duration,

close to two hours, can be heavy for the viewer due to the ups and downs in the rhythm of the story.

One would wish that Zemeckis would leave the system a bit and return to the real image cinema, but it is already known that

his next project will also be in Motion Capture: an adaptation n starring Jim CarreyTale

of Charles Dickens' Christmas. Let's hope, at least, that he moves away from photorealism.

" 0

" Spectacular persecutions, shootings, some sensuality and a pinch (slight) of gui���n are the

ingredients with which they intend to sell us the return of these late and anachronistic policemen .

In the eighties few people resisted that pair of policemen of dubious taste in dress

played by Don Jonson and Philip Michael Thomas. It was enough to lean out the window during the after-hours

to hear the Corinthian tune in Miami in the nearby houses. His original approach, together with the fact thatat that

only two television channels existedtime, motivated his audiences to be millionaires in our

country. More than twenty years later, Michael Mann, creator of the series, moves his, to the big screen.

detectives James "" Sonny "" Crocket and Ricardo Tubbs, represented this time by ColinFarell and Jaime Foxx. The

action begins when these two "" garments "" learn that several people have been killed by a whiff

from the upper echelons. In their quest to clarify the matter, they will be involved in complex networks of

international drug traffickers, which will entail a huge risk that the protagonists will assume with

the character's own stoicism fictitious Spectacular chases, shootings, some sensuality and a

pinch (liger���sima) of gui���n are the ingredients with which they intend to sell us the return of these late and

anachronistic policemen. I know we are in a time when the scarcity of original ideas drives the

American film industry to transform old series into feature films, as well asAngeles

Charlie's Angels or Los. Avengers, but I believe that Don Jonson and his companion are still deeply rooted in the memory of

the majority, and that this can make us feel some disenchantment with the new ones. Interpreters. That's it, it's funny to

meet the Spaniard Lu���s Tosar playing a Hispanic delinquent from the American suburbs.

Mediocre.

" 0

" A fun, entertaining and charming film that tells a story of people like you or me and

that leaves a good taste in your mouth when you leave the cinema.

The film begins when Cundo (Javier C���mara) returns to Asturias after 10 years to attend the funeral

of his best friend, Suso. Cundo's plan is to spend a couple of days in town, get drunk with hisfriends

childhoodand go where he came from, but that will not be as easy as � He believes: ex-girlfriends, former lovers and

parents are loose ends that need a solution and to top it off he discovers that Suso had also left a

pending issue so his stay lasts for quite a long time more than I had planned. "" The Tower of Suso "" is

a bittersweet comedy, but also fun and optimistic, it is, above all, a tribute to friendship. At

that friendship with capital letters supporting the passage of time, distance, losses and routine. To that friendship

that is capable of overcoming anything and "" surviving "" even to death. The best thing about the film is

(apart from Javier C���mara ��� what you have to see c� How it improves with the years!) Its simplicity. Without the need for some

eloquent and memorable dialogues, he is able to hook you up and make you connect in some way with the

characters. And it is this simplicity that allows us to intertwine a portrait of life in mining towns with a

story about feeling lost and not knowing where your life is going, friendship, drugs or love and giving us

truly unforgettable scenes. definitively, it is not a film for those who are expecting a great super

production with metaphysical dialogues or anything like that. It's a fun, entertaining and charming movie

that tells a story of people like you or me and that leaves you with a good taste in your mouth when you leave the cinema.���As���

glad to support to the Spanish cinema!

" 1

" Len Wiseman (from Underworld and its sequel), a self-confessed fan of the saga, delivers a fourth part that, as

the world of action cinema is today, almost seems like a masterpiece.

We live a revival of old and tired heroes, perhaps because Hollywood, meanwhile adolescent, so muchso

explosive andmuch argument without head or tail has not been able to find characters (or actors) to give the

relief to the men of action of fifteen or twenty years ago (he has said I do not know what top model the same thing happens in

his field), maybe because Hollywood starts to see the ears to the wolf and is a good way to attract theaters to

spectators who already comb gray hair or, as in the case of Bruce Willis, aka John McLane, no longer combed.have

A lot of yearspassed since John McTiernan gave a new interpretation to the hero of the shirt and the

blood in abundance (in many respects McLane is the Baroque of the Renaissance that implied Indy), and that shows not

only in how the cinema has evolved or involuted in its grammar, eaten more and more the terrain by the

arguments m� ��ss���lidos and the most malleable characters of television, but in everything that has fallenas

to human beingsthen. The shadow of 9/11, which today is commemorated by the way, has greatly affected the

mass media, and if I acknowledge that it has not put an end to the power of the superhero in the world of

comics, as I came to believe six years ago, I know that it has covered with a page of impossibility and even

distancing between chusco and painful any approach to the subject of the terrorist attacks, the

organizations in the shadow and the hardened heroes who win battles by themselves when we see that there are battles

that the most powerful army in the world can not win. It is the shadow of 9/11 that makes Bond

more "realistic" and less fanciful, nothing else. We have seen McLane in Los Angeles, between airports, and on

the streets of New York. Now, recovering a certain videogame inheritance, it moves from city to city as Super

Mario could move from screen to screen, getting all the means of transport it can, surviving

and bleeding. They say that in the original version their vocabulary is quite contained, but in the dubbing of Ram���n

Langa (and recognize that without it for us Bruce Willis is not Bruce Willis) they do not cut a hair. The

director Len Wiseman (from Underworld and its sequel), a self-confessed fan of the saga, delivers a fourth part that,

as the world of action cinema is today, almost seems like a masterpiece. He presents us with a tired butMcLane

combative, aged, without family (his ex-wife is in San Francisco, his son is unknown, and his daughter

studies in New York and does not want to know anything about him It is not strange to suppose that Lucy, who inherits many oftraits

her father's, has also had an encounter with Mam��� Gennero -��� why "Jenaro" in Spanish? - and has decided to become

independent studying in the other side of the country). Expelled from a broken family, McLane hardly

has a line of dialogue to recognize that his heroics are a thing of a very distant past, and that from his

fifteen seconds of glory he has returned to his work as a police officer. It's normal that you do not encounter cases as

glamorous as we know. The film entertains, the computer sidekick does not bother (no, it's not Wesley

Crusher, thank God), the little piece of paper by Kevin Smith doing the only thing he knows how to do is not out of place, the bad one

has the package that unfortunately lacks the bad (a Timothy Oliphant that is much more disturbing doing

"" good "" in Deadwood than here of bad, and that also lasts against McLane the time of not finishing saying

yipikahei). The computer files are explained enough for us to create them like that with thesmile

condescending, and although Mclane does not swear and perjure in Aramaic, he does have some polite moment. Ethically incorrect

(the pu���etazos to Mai Lihn, f ustedesjense you, get out with a mane of hairs that pulls to the beast).

Interestingly, the perception of authority has changed in this new film. The bad ones continue to belong to

several European countries, a somewhat xenophobic characteristic of the previous films that even

emphasized their entry on stage with the Hymn to Joy that, let's not forget, it is also the anthem of the EU. But

this time the terrorist is from home, and more than from home, from the very heart of the vigilante club. It is curious

that for the terrorists that Mclane faces, there is never an ideology but an economic motivation

. Also, for the first time, the bureaucrats and bosses of the FBI are not presented as

useless squats. There are ups and downs of rhythm every time they stop to take a breath (and McLane, at this point, and it's good that

so be, you have to stop a lot to take a breath) and change vehicles and give explanations . But it is that a script

so millimetric and prodigious as that of the original film is, today, an impossibility. The physicality of the

confrontations of McLane has been replaced by motorized spectacularity. There are a couple of very good times:

the fight in the elevator, the chase down the highway irrigated with abandoned cars, and the shot against an

F-35.

" 1

" In���s Par���s renders with Miguel and William a profound tribute to the two greatest geniuses ofliterature

universal.

Comedy has always been one of the most cultivated genres in Spanish cinema, and some of the best

works of our cinematography are, in effect, comedies. Through them, many of the most great filmmakers

Spaniards have developed their wits, some circumventing censorship amparndose in the innocence of risa.Sin

But in the Last few years, comedy is a rare event in the national scene, except for theexamples

rude and coarsethat predominate in the world genre. In���s Par���sy and Daniela Fejerman have been

responsible for two of the best film works of the last few years, and now we have the firstwork

soloof a of them, of In���s Par���s. First of all, In���s Par���s renders with Miguel and William a profound tribute

to the two greatest geniuses of universal literature, to two privileged minds of the Golden Age: Miguel de

Cervantes Saavedra and William Shakespeare. He does this by imagining a hypothetical meeting between the two, at the beginning

of the 16th century, an encounter that will be possible thanks to Leonor (Elena Anaya), daughter of a rich merchant, who is looking

for an author to write a work for she and so she can fulfill her desire to be an actress. In spite of the general tone

of comedy that Miguel and William have, In���s Par���s also makes a portrait of that liguid Castile and

dominated by religion and superstition ,N, where women were considered second-class citizens; In

short, an outline of that kingdom full of misgivings recently unified with Aragon, of that embryo of Spain that

we know today. In this respect, the comparison with a certain great period production, located, is unavoidable

a century later in time, and we leave it to the understanding of each one. what movie is victorious in that fight.

Returning to the tape, it is a relative comedy, with some very humorous moments, although it is

those that are seen with a permanent smile, in some cases bittersweet. Miguel and William is aproposal

freshand different from the typical prefabricated stories about great authors of the time thatcinema

Hollywoodaccustoms us to give away. The gui���n is fragile and original, and one of its greatest virtues are the

constant references to the unwritten works of the two literary geniuses. The film has a good rhythm, as

a comedy demands, and with its precise footage it does not become heavy at any time. Theaspects

technicalare very careful, among which is a great artistic direction, which makesrecreation

historicalcredible. Among an excellent cast (say what Jos Mara Pou or Geraldine Chaplin), include a radiant,

fresh and fun Elena Anaya, confirming his great acting skills and Juan Luis Galiardo, nothing

m The screen appears full, and it is impossible to imagine someone else in the skin of the one-armed Lepanto. It also

draws attention to Carolina Lapausa, a young actress who is tanned in the theater and who will give a lot to talk about in the future.

Miguel and William is an entertaining film, which will make the spectator spend a very pleasant time, but above

all serves as a great tribute to two geniuses who, coincidentally, died on the same day, of the same month, of the same

year. And as one of them wrote, well is what ends well.

" 1

" An interesting film; a different and original way of telling a story already seen several times on

the big screen. A criticism of a youth empty and without aspirations; that of those teenagers who have

had everything from their earliest childhood.

Two years after the sweetened El Diario de Noa, Nick Cassavetes returns to the address with a title

completely opposite to this one, Alpha Dog. Inspired lightly in a real case, the director - also screenwriter on

this occasion - takes the opportunity to concoct a cruel portrait of the youngest adolescent of Palm Spring, focusing,

too, in the influence that parents exercise (directly or indirectly) on their children. And all this is

done at the rhythm of a thriller; of a thriller that at no time hides the influences of films like Dos

D���as in the Valley and, above all, of the magnificent The Chumbscrubber, a product that does not go ��� in Spain and that,

luckily, ended up being published on DVD. Juvenile mafias, drug trafficking, war between gangs, sex, violence, an

atypical kidnapping and a mortal misunderstanding, they are the main thematic ingredients on whichrelies

Alpha Dog. As happened in the failed Brick, those who handle the whole thing are young people almost imp���beres

but, unlike ���sta, does not intend any forced tribute to the black cinema, because the interest of Cassavetes

resides in showing, clearly, that the threads that move the actions of their adolescent protagonists are

managed by their own parents. For this account has the presence (almost anecdotal) of a splendid Bruce

Willis, Sonny Truelove in the film, a marijuana dealer who shields his craft using his son Johnny

(a surprising Emile Hirsch) as main camel; a totally independent young man, with a large group

of boys practicing as assassins at his service and ready to mount any chicken at the minimum exchange rate. A

new Tony Montana has just been born. Taken as a false report, Cassavetes intersperses small

fragments of television interviews made to the protagonists of the film. This is done in a moderate way,

without abusing at all and with the intention of putting the viewer on the track of what he will discover during

the next few minutes of projection. Step by step, step by step, the filmmaker is molding a tragedy

sung with some anticipation. He does not want to catch anyone by surprise. And when that moment arrives, he does it in

a somewhat surreal way, as if it were a children's story. It breaks the naturalness and the realism with

which he has sketched the whole film to, at that moment, give a touch in an extreme tone to the situation: anight

bluish and starry, a mountain Rocky and three characters face to face. Consciously, the night is achroma

sing-songand the mountain a simple decoration of cardboard stone. A curious way to soften a brutal act. Anfilm

interesting; a different and original way of telling a story already seen several times on thescreen

big. A criticism of a youth empty and without aspirations; that of those adolescents who have had everything

from their earliest childhood, and who do not care about anything other than their own well-being; a

"" well-being "" in quotation marks, the only one they have known since they were little and thanks to their "" stupendous "" (also in

quotation marks) parents. Drugs, alcohol, ultramodern mansions and luxury cars: the comfort of the

villains. Not only the purist knows how to push a weapon. And this is perfectly demonstrated by Nick Cassavetes in Alpha

Dog. The last of that mazacote of make-up and false jowls that, towards the end of the film, they encasquetan to an

aged Sharon Stone. Pity, I repeat, because all the rest (and despite its simplicity) works and fits

perfectly.

" 1

" Guillermo del Toro has managed to unite two stories of reality and fantasy with an admirable skill

I make it clear from the beginning: without a doubt, this is one of the best movies I've seen in the last

months - if not the best -. As for the gui��� and the direction, "" The Labyrinth of the Faun "" is brilliant. Guillermo del

Toro has managed to unite two stories, the "" real "" and the "" fantastic "" without either ending with the other or

becoming incoherent. A drama about civil war and a magical story. In a totally balanced,

wayso that the viewer does not know if he is more interested in one or the other and without the film becoming absurd.

Either one would suffice to hook itself, and here the two appear, perfectly integrated, and

leaving room for each to decide whether he prefers to believe that magic really exists or everything is in the

imagination of its protagonist Ophelia. Personally, I entered the cinema thinking that the first five minutes would

pass on the surface, so to speak, and the rest in the labyrinth. Nothing farther from reality. The

film jumps between the two worlds through its protagonist without any problem, with

an admirable ability. I think that few directors would have overcome this problem without the film being,

at times, forced. Guillermo del Toro achieves it as such, and ends up uniting the two worlds in the

best possible way. Much of the substance falls on the actors, of course. I start my Quinceañera of the

Goya auguring that Ivana Baquero will take one (she does it very well and it is already known that being only 12 years old

helps). By the way, she is physically strikingly similar to Ariadna Gil, her mother in the movie. And it would be

unfair to forget the interpretations of Sergi Lopez, in the role of captain Vidal, or Maribel Verd��� and ���lex

Angulo. The image is fascinating. Obviously, the whole fantastic part owes a lot tospecial effects

impressive. This is when you say: "" And this is a Spanish production? Go, go. "" The scene of the

second test, with a monster that could be in the worst nightmares of anyone, is unforgettable. But

that is not all. That part so magical can cause that it is not valued as it deserves all the atmosphere of the Spain of

the years 40, that is gotten extremely. And one warning: the movie is very hard. Much. That nobody

thinks to take a child thinking that it is a little story, that will traumatize him for life. There are

very violent images, which make you take your eyes off the screen. Is it free? That's what weourselves when we

askedleft the cinema. I do not think so. The story he's telling is trgic. The images

accompany the rawness of the situations narrated. The hardness of the war. Put to be fussy, put

two "" peros "": first, I think the story would have won if the villain had been a character with

more nuances. Someone who showed some humanity at some point and who was not so easy to hate. And,

secondly, I think it could have shown the happy kingdom of the labyrinth without Federico Luppi giving the

feeling of going to throw candy at any time from the carriage of the Magi. But hey, they are

only totally subjective details. In any case, an essential film that anyone will like.

Who likes the fantastic genre or the lover of dramas. Who likes suspense or who

simply wants to spend an afternoon. Pay attention to me, do not miss it, it's worth it.

" 1

" Michel Gondry proves that not all of Olv���date's m���rito was in Kaufman's guillotine but that he

also has a world impressive interior.

In this film Gondry shows us the two worlds in which the protagonist lives: that of dreams and the real,

mixing them with a clever montage that it causes that the spectator is, in many moments, as confused as the

protagonist, played by Gael Garc���a Bernal, whom I did not see in this role, maybe because I am

used to seeing him in more "serious" dramas and movies (Babel, Amores Perros, La Mala Educaci���n?), but Gondry

has discovered his chemical vein, and I've noticed that he can be a much more versatile interpreter than he

imagined. The director, Michel Gondry, writes his own script, proving his worth as an artist and as aauthor

film. For the first time he has not been written by Charlie Kaufman, with whom he had worked on his twofilms

previous, Human Nature and Olv���date de M���. I expected a lot from La Ciencia del Sue���oy and I have not been disappointed,

although it is not up to the previous film by Gondry; He also has a love story as theaxis

mainof the story, but unlike in Olv���date de m���, here we do not see the end of that story but

the beginning; the fears of Stephane, the protagonist, and the great insecurity that he has cause him strange

dreams and nightmares that he confuses with reality. The best of this film for me, it is the dream world in

which it submerges us and that, in some moments reminds me of Dal sur's surrealism, I almost see in this film a

work of art, when that city with houses of art comes out paper and cardboard cars, that water / cellophane and the birds

paper, I feel like I'm in front of a painting that comes to life with the charm of stop-motion,

techniquewhich stopped being used because of the digital effects. I think it's better to see it in its version. Original (although

it is always better), since in the original it is spoken in English and is important because it also contributes

to increase the confusion of the protagonist, and with the dubbing some important things are lost. The Science of

Dream makes re���ry makes you dream with impossible things. Michel Gondry proves that not all of Olv���date

's m���rito was in Kaufman's guillotine but that he also has an impressive inner world, I hopeus

you enjoywith movies like this for a long time.

" 1

" Create an imaginary able to dispute that affinity of glory the meaning has more value than it seems.

In spite of how funny the stories of Pixar are, their protagonists always raiseproblems

seriousthat can be enunciated as something similar to "" What place do I want to occupy in the world? "". "" Toy Story 2 ""

raised whether Buddy wanted to be a toy or an exhibition object, the comics of "" Bichos "" had to decide

if they were going to be clowns oh� ��roes, in "" Finding Nemo "" Nemo has to choose between a fish tank and an ocean, in "" The

Incredibles "", Mr Parr has to decide between being an insurance agent or a superhero. Lightning McQueen, the

protagonist of Cars, has to choose between the selfish life of triumph, and friendship. Ray McQueen is

mostly like the Buddy of "" Toy Story 2 "". In a world such as ours, which is so brainlessly obsessed with thefame

rapidof television, it is an act of courage to defend the anonymous life of the townspeople. Mr. Incredible was

asked by his wife why he wanted to do things on his own. What's the point of the lone hero? In a

Pixar movie the hero is always friendship. McQueen is on his way to Los Angeles to win the Piston Cup thatmake

willhim famous when he gets lost in the Route 66 and discover the forgotten town of Radiator Springs. Obliged

by the court to fulfill social tasks for an infraction, McQueen will meet a group of neighbors that has

nothing to do with his own world. Sally Carrera, the girl, Luigi and Guido, two Italian cars that only the Ferraris admire

, Mate, the horny of the place, that frightens the tractors, and the mysterious Doc Hudson.

Each character has something that makes him enterable and something that ties him to that lost town. McQueen will go

discovering it little by little. Does Spring Radiator have anything to offer him? Is there anything more important than

fame? Many reproach American cinema for its obsession with triumph. For that reason, creating an imaginary that can

dispute the meaning of a film with that affinity of glory has more value than it seems.new invention

Pixar'sis valid for all the human background and is dazzling for all the expressive vehicle that has used to

transmit it: the nostalgia of the fifties, the double readings, car-person, tractor-cow, brands,

progress , the dehumanisation of competitions, the recreation of a world made for cars.

" 1

" One of the best works of maestro Elia Kazan. "" Blache arrives in New York to visit his sister. There he meets Stanley, his sister's husband, a rude

and virile man. The man will not have any consideration for his wife. "" Excellent film by the teacher Elia Kazan.

Without doubt one of his best works and the one that gave world fame to his male protagonist, Marlon Brando.

This already played the rude Kowalsky in theater with Kim Hunter. The same as the great Karl Malden. That's why

all three are so well, because they knew their roles very well. However Kazan wanted that theprotagonist

cinematographicwas not Hunter but Vivien Leigh. I will not say if it was better or worse because you will never know, but

Leigh's work is there, for posterity. A dense, hard, inclement work, with magnificent works. ���logos,

wonderful staging and wise direction.An authentic lesson of the cinema that is never forgotten, especially its

impressive final.Excellent music of the great Alex Nort, who introduced , for the first time in cinema as the

soundtrack of a film, jazz. I did it in this film, which was a world event that, however,not

wasrecognized in the most important prizes that were given to the film. Another blemish on the curriculum of the

good guy from North, who was nominated for the Oscars no less than fifteen times, and did not win more than the honor

honor his company gave him. ��eros, who knew about the average mass.

" 1

" Medem's film has no rhythm, it is corny, mannered, forced, long, dull and boring. Nobody believes those

characters so stupid.

Well, it is well known the consideration towards this Basque (perdon) Spanish director in our country. If one looks at

his filmography, he will see an absolute obsession. n is his person because he is "" different "", because that is what is called "" original "".

None of his films is conventional or tries to be, on the contrary, all his filmography is a

huge pretentiousness. An intention to call attention and talk about the world and change it. Because

their movies are seen as pieces of life and analysis of the human psyche. The pretentiousness that this director can become

is incredible. The film we are talking about, "" The Lovers of the Polar Circle "" is, possibly, one of

the most popular films. It's boring, pretentious, stupid and pretentious in the story. Without a clear plot, itus

showsdifferent moments in the life of Otto and Ana, from when they are little until they are older. There is no

history, only moments. without any kind of argument or momentum. Try and make it interesting with many

jumps in time "" because I "", without any reason. The thing of telling a story in non-chronological order is

very good, but it has to be for something. Let's look at Tarantino, Nolan, Ritchey. his films give jumps in time,

reasoned by the story's own narrative. It has to be counted in order to have a complete sense.

"" Perfect Holdup "", "" The Barefoot Countess "". films that do what they do because they have to.film

Medem'shas no rhythm, it's corny, mannered, forced, long, dumb and boring. Nobody believes those characters so

stupid. It's like a movie about "" Guays "". The movie is not known where it begins, it has no approach or

conclusion, it tries to be, by the way, an exercise of novelty. Medem is one of those directors who believe that

being original is the most important thing. That in the cinema there are no rules .. that breaking them is good, looking for new things.

No friend, the cinema is something much more closed. When it comes to writing, there are things that go to mass. And that's it.A guide

to which you can remove and put things and does not change anything. It's like it's not about anything. You do not discover anything or not.

Medem believes that the most important thing is to tell something on a moral level, and it fills the tape with quotes, phrases and

existential conversations that do not lead anywhere. Nothing physical happens. A failed movie. bored and

nonsense, I'm left with the phrase of Carlos Boyero (with whom I do not always agree) "" is a pseudo-

moral bullshit "".

" 0

" We are faced with an "open" guide, understanding as such, here in which, offering a multitude of

possibilities, always ends up happening what does not cover the expectations m�� �nimas of the spectator moderately

critical.

Trepidante action of vertiginous pace and a waste of impossible special effects constitute the attractive

offer of this spectacular tape of Tony Scott. Some accurate claims that try to alleviate the evident

fragility of his gui���n that, cut from a brilliant idea, is busy and manages to land nowhere. In the

background, a tribute to the population of New Orleans and Hollywood's fear of calling things by their

real name: Desidia.It is possible that the cin���filos we are the beings that greater n ���mero de "" d���j��� vu "" we come to

experience throughout our life. The fault lies with too many producers, filmmakers and, above all,

contemporary writers who, for lack of their own ideas, do not hesitate to resort to old tricks that worked for them

in the past. When these facts occur, the criticism agrees unanimously to describe the

resulting mannerism as "" gui���o "" or as "" plagiarism "", normally attending to the name of the director who sign the

movie There are always exceptions, see the case of Brian de Palma, in which they have not yet agreed. In

the story that concerns us, American critics have found cinematic references. Procedentesficas

from the Laura's philosophy of Otto Preminger. A fact in which I will not entertain myself for obvious reasons: even

Tony Scott does not give a damn about the arguments of his films, nor am I either. Its peculiar universe is

based on other aspects. I think it was Robert Altman who said that the current cinema was the closest thing to

a video-clip, of course, he did not tell anyone. "" If you knew that no they will believe you when commenting on anargument

unintelligibleto which you yourself do not find meaning, what would you do? " To follow the designs of the film, my

answer is that "" I would try "". An arduous task if we bear in mind that we are faced with an "open" gui���n,

meaning that, here in which, offering a multitude of possibilities, it always ends up happening what

it does not cover the minimum expectations of the moderately critical viewer. I'm just wondering what size the

stone they threw into the river would be, not only that it lost its course , but also to move the

continent. It is too cruel to ask the Disney writers to learn to discern between

time travel and carpet flights, but I say that it should not be so difficult to recompose a story

that they themselves have broken down . It was achieved by those responsible for Back to the Future, the Passengers of

Time. The result is a product close to the delirious John Maybury's The Jacket, which neither understands the

protagonist, nor the public, nor the luminaries that endorse the libretto. I insist that Tony Scott all of this

matters to him as much as I did to the bobbin lace, that is, absolutely nothing. The filmmaker continues to fight to

overcome his aesthetic agoraphobia, and every time he rolls in open spaces, he makes sure that he realizes lining

and singing with an infinity of architectural elements, sometimes, nonexistent in theitself

plane, until the spectator has the sensation of having been swallowed by a chimney. Hence,

the list of members that make up the artistic direction of this film is endless. With that and yet,

I like this graduate in Fine Arts, for a simple question. ��n of empathy: if I had to shoot a

bed scene, I would also do three millimeters of the actors, more than anything, to twitch the

nerves of those who watched the movie. When he does it, it is impossible to distinguish a nose from a hand or from

something else. It even has an infallible trick to mislead those who enjoy a specialacuity

visual: cast fog. Do you also have a sonic pride? Undoubtedly, what you have is a fondness for your

beginnings. When making a video clip to George Michael, he discovered that a handsome man, wearing sunglasses,

becomes interesting and, since then, he has not stopped repeating the invention: Tom Cruise in Top Gun, Kevin

Costner in Revenge, Denzel in The Fire of Vengeance. Inside the cast (excellent casting), we find ourselves

with a Val Kilmer? With a loaf face- who continues to believe in the star (which has long ceased to shine) "" of

talent only surpassed by the number of zeros (on the right) of your bank account "" (this was said by Robert de

Niro). With a beautiful girl (���import her name?), With the charming Denzel, of whom I can not speak

objectively (I like it too much) and with Jim (sometimes, James) Caviezel, who refuses to accept papers that

include Sex scenes, but do not mind being the terrorist that sends 543 people (my whole town) to a

better life. ���Corious vision of Catholicism! Because of its opposition to the Bush Administration, Robert Altman, the last

rebel, had serious difficulties in financing his �� Last films. A problem that is familiar to

directors like Oliver Stone or Spike Lee. Therefore, it is not strange that the Scott-Bruckheimer conjunction has

elaborated this convoluted bullshit to avoid having to say that the tragedy of New Orleansdemonstrated

clearlythe apathy of a government more concerned in covering in other people's houses than in sweeping one's own. In

any case, "" Sat���n reasons as a man, God thinks in eternity "" and this is a production Innocent gui���n guide

and "" agoraf���bico "", candorous and videoclipero that, however, manages to entertain. Anpiece

important.

" 0

" If you already saw Truman Capote in your day, do not be too lazy to face this new vision. A parallel vision

but with very different elements. Do not miss it. Neither better nor worse than its predecessor: simply a

brilliant film.

The world of cinema is sometimes curious, not to say absurd. A few years ago, without ever approaching the

strange figure of the missing Truman Capote so that, suddenly and with little more than a year of

difference, have been released a couple of titles in which, apart from having the writer as the main character

, the construction process of A Sangre Fr���a, one of the works, is analyzed. best considered from

contemporary literature and that was brought to the big screen, at the end of the 60s and masterfully, by

Richard Brooks.Although the production of the two films was almost parallel, the first to arrive was

Truman Capote, an excellent recreation of that stage of the writer by which, Philip Seymour Hoffman, would

get the Oscar for Best Actor due to his unforgettable creation. .N Just last Friday, the Story

of a Crime was released, the Spanish translation of Infamous, a much more subtle title that, besides, ���s, in its

attractive initial credits, allows its director, Douglas McGrath, a curious joke with the aforementioned

word since, by suppressing one of his consonants, he achieves an ingenious portrait about the bipolarity

of Truman's character Cloak. Thus, I Famous, with the appearance of the "" n "", becomes InFamous

(Infame). The comparison between the two films is inevitable. This is because both undoubtedly seek the

same, although the treatment and the final intentions are absolutely different. Both are based on the same

fact: the discovery, by Capote, of a story in the New York Times that reported the

brutal murder of a family of farmers, and the fascination that it aroused. �� in the writer. While

Truman Capote was quite cold and distant with his characters, Historia de un Crime seems to wrap them up a

lot more, while his director uses his courage to dare to draw the writer as a

somewhat Manichaean, individualistic and ill of pride. His relationship with one of the two accused of the crime - whom

he questioned to obtain personal data for his novel - clearly demonstrates such a description, since it

tilts between the attraction And the falsehood. But where the film moves best is in two very specific aspects and

in which, in general, dominates a tone of comedy that can remember, in many moments, the style of humor

used by Woody Allen in similar situations. In the first place is the satirical way of presenting

the snobbish intelligentsia of the New York of the 60s, a group of elitist pedants who, in their own way and in their

universe, were no more than a huddle of doormen chafardeando in a hairdresser. And, secondly, in the

jocular game perpetrated by Douglas McGrath with the presence of a guy as unique as Truman Capote in the middle

of the small enclave of that deep America in which the bloody crime; an American who does not

understand the way and gestures of the writer and who, in their eyes, becomes a kind of Martian recentlyStory

arrived from another planet.of a Crime is an elegant film ingenious, funny and raw; very raw. A

perfectly orchestrated product that, by its treatment, becomes a magnificent complement to Truman

Capote, its predecessor title, and in which the English Toby Jones, giving life to the renowned novelist

American, has nothing to envy to the Oscar-winning Seymour Hoffman. Personally, I would say that Jones

emphasizes less the exaggerated gestures of the character and, physically, it is even more similar to the

real one. And there, next to this small and sometimes infamous man, is her: a Sandra Bullock capable of

accepting new challenges in her career and taking them forward with a high note. Giving life to Nelle Harper Lee, the author

of Killing a Ruise���or and a close friend of Capote, the Bullock is surprising and immense and, with her stupendous

work, ends up d� Giving it an important dimension to a woman who, at heart, was the only person capable of

understanding the ambitions of the writer and his obsession with create a new type of journalism. If you already saw

in your day Truman Capote, do not mind to face this new vision. A parallel vision but with

very different elements and in which, first of all, one digs into the creative and psychological difficulty of an author

for always wanting to overcome his previous work. A perfect congregation between comedy and melodrama in

which, at the same time, they can recover the presence, among others, of actors of the stature of Sigourney Weaver,

Isabella Rosellini, Jeff Daniels or the same James Bond (Daniel Craig), here converted into Perry Smith, one

of the two criminals who were condemned to the death penalty. Do not miss it. Neither better nor worse than its

predecessor: simply a brilliant film.

" 1

" Medem discovers his letters at the end and confirms that so much formal chaos hides a puerile simplicity in the

discourse.

People go and tear their clothes with 'Ca���tica Ana', the new film by Julio Medem, the poet of Spanish cinema

, the king of the palindrome. That if unrecognizable, that if chabacano, that if unconnected, that if absent from

sense. I do not know what comes so much surprise. A m���, 'Ca���tica Ana' seems to me the natural evolution of itsbet

cinematographic, that although it has moments that I have liked ('The Basque ball', something of ' Tierra ', I have

pending' The lovers of the Polar Circle '), for the most part I already seem worthy of the same apÃ © ttos that are

dedicated so happily now. I got bored a bit with 'Tierra', I got bored a lot with 'Luc���ay el Sexo', because

now I get bored a lot with 'Ca���tica Ana'.Concebida initially as a tribute to his sister, painter who died

in an automobile accident, 'Ca���tica Ana' tells the initiatory journey of Ana, a young painter who is taken to

the big city by a patron (������ ??) and discover the love, sex and a huge amount of lives (and deaths) of

young women in the depths of their psyche. Opening the doors to these women will mark their destiny as the Mother

of Good Men, capable of challenging the powerful lords of the War. That's it. Right from the,

startMedem starts using symbolisms that even a server catches the first: the falcon and the dove, the cavern and

the light, the sea as ���tero, the doors. all with that style between naturalist and pedantic that usually impregnate

the characters of the director. Afterwards, things get worse: the portrait of the young prodigies of theschool

hippiescawhere Ana studies (more than acceptable Manuela Vell���s) is frivolous and far away of extreme reality

(���Mencenas? ���Where are patrons?). Secondary characters appear, little less than stereotypes with legs: the

young Arab artist tortured / unsupervised; the friend odiahombres (normalita Bebe); the performancer

"" provocateur ""; the homosexuals in full slaughter. It gives all so much grimace that it seems that the ultimate intention of the

director is to criticize that superfluous world in which, supposedly, his deceased sister was participating. What a

tribute. After the development of the supernatural plot: Ana discovers, accidentally and in the presence of

a famous hypnotist, one of her previous "" lives "", and decides that the best thing for her is to hypnotize her to

discover ���s. The task falls on a young disciple of said hypnotist, an American who speaks like the blond

of the Morancos. In full hypnotizing work, Ana feels the urge to break everything, and suddenly

(literally), is on a ship to New York, where he ends his search in a grotesque scene

that hides everything that, in reality, Medem is interested in telling: "" I shit in the USA "". And they say that Tarantino is

empty. Of course, there is no shortage of references to 9/11 (with a metaphorical plane of the twin towers destroyed

included), since it is set in 2001, to the war in Iraq, nor to the Sahrawi conflict (also the fault of

the States). Medem discovers his letters at the end and confirms that so much formal chaos hides a puerile simplicity in

the discourse. But at that point, the truth is that Ana's vital adventure mattered to me very little.

Technically, Medem is able to mix powerful images visually (the "flashbacks" of Ana, the

paintings) with the shabby look of low-end digital video, something that David Lynch has also done recently.

The difference between the two is that Lynch builds an atmosphere thanks to that material, and Medem jumps format

in format, without more. For a little more this' Ca���tica Ana ', one of the most popular slips ofcinema

recent Spanish. I, for my part, hope that Medem will be able to make a film for someone more than

himself. A 2.

" 0

" Apocalyptic film about how a virus will devastate Humanity because we do not know what motive. A lot ofsauce

tomatomy mother-in-law would say, some scares, and a script at the height of a resecuela. I did not like it

Monday of madrugda, Madrid, end of August. The deserted city. The few seasoned drivers who

dare to step on the streets do so cautiously. They know that a vir���s is loose. Rumors have come, by the

radios, televisions, nothing for sure. I approach the concrete and crystal tombolet. At the door, a

metal voice asks for the key. "I've come to make a guard, cagonmismuertos." The gate opens. All in the dark,

a little light in the background with a seated figure. He asks for my accreditation, and I feel, when I leave, how he smiles.

The night will be long, of course. And of course I do not understand how the securitydo not shit with fear in

guardsthe nighttime guards. That canguele.La movie is about a Lord who, in front of the tirade thateat

the zombieszombies or save his wife, decides to leave it to his fate. Over time, Britain is

recovering normality after a lethal virus that makes people thirsty for blood (it's not soccer, but

more or less). They really only have a small plot secured, with snipers on all sides to

keep the zombies from entering. In these, the children of the previous gentleman decide to elope from the plot, go to his

old house, meet his mother and return accompanied to the "" fortress "". Do you want me to tell you? For me

there are two types of terror. On the one hand, that of scares and on the other that of blood. This is the second one, anddo

Inot like it. The script seems to weaken at the ends. Ahead, with the assurance thatcousin seems

Bernarda's. And from the other side, the final stupidity to tell us that as it has a box office, we have a fourth part. It has

as a positive thing that not only are we afraid of the dark, but that the zombies come out in broad daylight to

eat brains. That is positive. That's what, what do the zombies want? They give a mouth to one and go for another. That

is a marraneo. If you see my grandmother gives them a colleja that melts, por marranos.Resumiendo, apocalyptic

film about how a virus will devastate Humanity because we do not know what motive. A lot of tomato sauce my

mother-in-law would say, some scares, and a script at the height of a resecuela. I have not liked.Besitos.PD: I will

recognize it. I spent all night without sleeping shit with fear. I had to go to sleep with my baby tomyself

protectfrom the zombies. I do not see one more of these! PD2: Come on, there are two helicopter scenes that I

liked a lot. Especially the first, flying over the city, very good (although not original). PD3: The time

of handkerchief and mucus lying over a film of these, ���no?

" 0

" It's just as fun as? Shrek? or maybe it is even superior. I do not remember that the green ogre and company

made me laugh as much as the whole group of characters that in this film share dialogues in a distributed way.

Let no one be deceived by the name. The best adult animation movie is ���sta. The children will understand it

and even have a good time, but the not so young will attend a succession of dialogues that are as

hilarious as smart Nothing of cheap jokes. That appearance of CGI animation of all a hundred is supplemented

by an idea so original and well resolved that it should make your competitorsthe mouse

tremble.��� You would accuseP���rez of extortion and housebreaking ?. Well here we find a CSI mounted after the famous

scene of "" Granny, which have bigger teeth "". Of course, in this story everyone is sopechosos: Little Red Riding Hood,

the wolf, the grandmother and even the le���ador that passed by there. Technically, in terms of animation, the film is a

light-years away from Pixar, that's obvious, but the plot and its gui���n they leave behind most

of pixelated products that have been unveiled without rhyme or reasoning throughout these years. The attempt to stealRed

grandma's recipes as the main crime committed leads to the not so sweet LittleRiding Hood to tell the story

from a perspective that you would never have imagined, not to mention that the wolf has a paid profession,

the grandmother is far from being admitted to a residence for the elderly, and the lector has aspirations m�� It's

artistic to stay all your life throwing trees down. The conspiracy plotted to get the monopile of

the sweets must be resumed by a bulging-eyed commissar and porcine-looking police (���cogeis el

s���mil?). But not only the main characters live this movie. When the goat andappear in action,

its banjoyou will leave, not forgetting the spider squirrel and a rabbit with chinch���n. With clear references to

"" Matrix "", "" Kill Bill "" and the series of detective Chevy Chase "" Fletch "", the film uses continual flashbacks that

will be understood as the same story is told from all involved. Telling yourself more about the

movie would be a few surprises that should not be revealed. I could tell you that it's just as fun

as "" Shrek "" but maybe even superior. I do not remember that the green ogre and company made me laughmuch

asas the whole group of characters that in this film share dialogues in a distributed way. In short, you can

see it with a child. or in the other armchair, or without a child, because you will enjoy it in the same way. In a word:

brilliant. This is the only film I am anxiously waiting for a sequel.

" 1

" An experiment that is comically simple, and extremely mundane (and boring). The other day, at lunchtime, I checked (yes, I have a 4-hour tape on LP with a lots of

programs) of NST (Night without truce) and I found that Malena Arterio and the director of this film that

brings us today, In���s Par���s , had been invited to one of them on the occasion of its premiere in the cinemas. The truth

is that he had had occasion to see the tape in a press pass, but finally and for reasons that are

not relevant, I did not go to it, and I did not have the least interest or the least concern towards the film,

until I saw images in that program and the interview of rigor that the famous Dani Mateo did them. He says

Ines Par���s, that maybe , the tape would go so far to convince the youth, that would make them end up reading

both Cervantes and Shakespeare. Sincerely Ines, and with the hand in the heart and all the sincerity

possible that fits in my bald head, if to read Shakespeare (which I have read more than D.Miguel, and it is that

in fact the Quijote I have not read it, nor I intend to do it) movies like this are needed. Shut up and let's go; I'll take

care of the key and throw it to the distant r���om���s possible. And that is the film, starring Elena

Anaya, Juan Luis Galiardo, Wil Kemp and Malena Alterio in addition to Jos ��� Pou, is not more than a filmed farce of

those who, years ago were played in the corrals, corralas or as God called it anta���o (now theaters), and is

that, my dear, it takes more packaging than a couple of farts, rasps, poops, assholes and 4 jokes that

even appeared in the tapes of Pajares , Esteso and Ozores. In some bars of the film I had the

same sensation as when I saw the Asterix ones, and, in the script they showed us as such or it had been

"" fault "" of these French geniuses; well, in "" Miguel and William "" there are continuous cross references (and, at the same time,

invented) about the life of both and as ideas of one or the other are taken to works of Cervantes or Shakespeare,

that is worth, I understand that they are "" tricks "" of the scriptwriter, but they get tired, because of its excessive repetition. I did not want to

finish without highlighting or beating, the performances of the interpreters, that I always say with the well-known (and in

the interpretive plot), and that is, maybe I'll be left alone with Will Kemp, very nice like Shakespeare, Helena

Anaya (this girl has me won with those eyes she has.), Juan Luis Galiardo as an "" old man ""

Cervantes and, above all, Malena Arterio, whom I had used to see her in her vise and as "" good "" and

here she is the villain of the function; It's nice to see it in another plot. Regarding the wardrobe, I find it horrifying, although

it highlighted the wardrobe of "Teresa in the body of Christ", here, I think it is worthy of Agatha Ruiz de la

prada, in this case Sonia Grande the costume designer, makes the cinnamon in the clothes worn by the

protagonists, and "" emperifolla "" Helena Anaya, and Malena Arterio, and leaves with some sad and horrendous clothes

to the rest, as if trying to give Intersects the female characters, dilapidated by the gui���n, especially in that

machismo resident in the Middle Ages. In short, an experiment that is comically simple, and

extremely mundane (and boring) .

" 0

" Review of the musical under the lightest prism of the Dogma or, in other words, a film worthy of

being included in the pompous and fascinating History of the Seventh Art .

Turbulent atmospheres from which the miracle of the image is born: Dancing in the dark is a

breathtaking visual poem, a delirious iconographic cacophony where it matters less the trajectory of the characters that the

sensations that they feel and how they explain them, in what way they capture the attention of the spectator and dupe him (

that must be pure cinema or pure literature: deceit, conjuring, prestidigitation, fantasÃa assembled with

sanity) until, in the end, ecstatic by the flow of emotions, they leave it in the armchair,

knocked out. Lars Von Trier closes the Trilogy of the Golden Heart (Breaking the waves, The idiots and now this

Dance in the dark) with this melodrama with musical borders or this musical melodramatic,vehicle

fascinatingfor a novice actress, although plenty in a role designed for your Histrionic and shameless

divismo. Bj���rk is Selma, the blind Czechoslovak immigrant who breaks down in pain so that her son does not suffer from his

own disability. The greedy neighbor steals the money he had saved. Selma murders him. And it is tried in an

American court. That does not seem like I'm telling the movie: nothing has been said. Nothing that does not come more

extensively developed in the lapel of the DVD or in the usual criticisms in the magazines or in the network. What

fascinates of this tape is its premeditated despojamiento of all artifice esc��� nico Not Dogville-like or his

logical continuation, Manderlay, but obeying the same visual patron. Von Trier's heroic tricks (

Breaking the waves is an ingenious hybrid between religious, erotic and feminist cinema between Bergman and Dreyer)

are angels who aspire to heaven and must travel a certain distance on earth to deserve that award.

Selma seduces by its ���pico character: Bj���rk uses what he does best (composing, singing) to

spice up the dramaturgy of the film with poetry dressings. The very face of the Icelandic singer is the

best claim of innocence, kindness and ingenuity of Selma. We would not understand the film without the

winged, fluid, almost plastic presence of this unexplored actress, who has not returned to the cinema and who was

perhaps only destined to represent her Selma , to the alter-ego who lives his happiness in his own way, eyes

inward, in fantasy and in his pure love of mother-courage that struggles to overcome the convecionalisms, the

severity of society and the injustice of the system . In spite of everything, there is no political edging. This is a

musical: an original to the point of weariness. The candor of the human, the beauty of the soul and the fragility of the

human emotions confronting the tenebrism of fear, the darkness written by man for the suffering of man.

Or life is very sad, in the background, and requires the striking of the numbers of dance and melodic

lyric to return the joy escaped. It is only necessary to see in detail, delighted in the detail, the scene

of the train with the circus dancers on the road, to let us already convince that the musical genre can be

rewritten at times that it is necessary and did not die in West Side Story or in leaden designs for teenagers like

Grease. There are films that are never forgotten, you like them little or they fascinate you. It deserves to enter the chapter of

immortal films in memory. For the pain it causes. For the reverberating condition ofskin

Selma'sto the artificial screen of a cinema and then, in acrobatic pirouette magic, to the most sensitive neuron that

you have. Or you will all melt them.

" 1

" Filled with vulgar jokes, incoherent dialogues and abrupt changes of plane, Snakes on the plane

is a film so grotesque and ridiculous that curiously provokes just the opposite of what you intend

Sometimes David R. Ellis has directed films that have at least been entertaining, as were the

cases of Cellular and Final Destination 2. This time he has placed himself behind the camera to shoot Snakes on the

plane, a film whose only incentive lies in the presence of the always correct Samuel L. Jackson, and if theyme

squeeze, in the curiosity of seeing Elsa Pataky tried to show that besides of pretty is also an actress. And

I say this because we are facing one of the most absurd and ridiculous movies imaginable. The

argument is surreal (giving Surrealist a tremendously pejorative nuance), as it narrates the adventures

of a policeman who guards the witness of a murder during a flight. To avoid his declaration, the criminal

fills the plane with snakes to make sure they do not arrive alive at their destination. With this crazy

approach, the more than one hundred minutes that this desprop���sito makes lose to those who see it, are taken up. Filled with

vulgar jokes, incoherent dialogues and abrupt changes of plane, Snakes on the plane is a film

so grotesque and ridiculous that curiously provokes just the opposite of what it pretends . And it is more than terror,

what it gives is laughter to see huge amounts of snakes moving through the interior of an aircraft

causing the hysteria of the passage; the hilarious lies in the implausibility of history. Plagued by topics

and oriented to an adolescent audience, it fits into the genre known as Series B, and while it may arouse

some curiosity at the beginning, its interest goes away. diluting as the footage progresses, to the point that

one ends up asking for the time. Although of course, as they say, the book of tastes is blank.

" 0

" agile, exciting, spectacular, fast-paced and entertaining, ideal for these afternoons of African heat and

far superior to the great majority of blockbusters.

Forget about Scientology. Forget the placentas. The best Cruise returns After giving a month to

all the kids who had done the dozen who packed the cinemas, I went into a totally empty room, as I had

supposed from the beginning. (Tuesday, 4:30 p.m.) to see the "" Last superspection Made in Cruise "". and I liked it veryI

much.consider "" Mision Impossible "" a masterpiece and one of the best tapes of my beloved Brian De Palma

and, after the blow of the delivery of the past big John Woo ("" Face to face "" is his best movie besides an

absolute masterpiece) was quite reluctant to see the third, finally signed by JJ Abrams instead of the

initially planned Fincher or Carnahan. Abrams, creator of "" Alias ​​"" and "" Lost "", passes the test with a note,

although I do not know if he will become a great director, his next movie is "" Star Trek XI "". SPOILERS (If you have seen the

trailer you can read quietly) But let's go to "" MI3 "", the "" personal "" adventure "" of agent Ethan Hunt, who must

rescue his beloved from the clutches of Owen Davian. Start in a masterful way in media res, making my

ass (and millions of asses more in the world) did not move a ���pice of his seat with a sensational scene

between the villainy , a great son of a bitch Philip Seymour Hoffman and the most heroic one solved in some

great close-ups.FIN OF SPOILERSThe case is that there is action during the two rounds that lasts and a lot

of intelligent turns of gui���n in which Abrams moves like fish in the water, since in that aspect it is somewhat

televisive. (but quality television, that is, if you like "" 24 "", "" Lost "", "" Alias ​​"". you will love it

"" MI3 "" Cinematographically, Abrams is not no prodigy, but it is appreciated that you do not use the ""system

videoclip"", arriving at times to the first filmimposible, especially the part of the Vatican reception, primahermana

of the party that abr��� to the original of De Palma. ���gil, exciting, spectacular, exciting and entertaining,

ideal for these afternoons of African heat and far superior to the great majority of blockbusters. 5.

" 1

" As incredible as it may seem, "John Rambo" is the splatter movie of the year, since Braindead did not see anything

like it.

Twenty-five a��� after its first delivery, and almost twenty years after its third installment, Rambo 4, or

Rambo: back to hell, or John Rambo, as it will be titled finally in these parts, it comes to stras screens

next February 1 with more violence than ever. Directed and starring Sylvester Stallone, who is

accompanied by Julie Benz, Matthew Marsden, Graham McTavish, Reynaldo Gallegos, Jake La Botz , Tim Kang, Maung Maung

Khim and Ken Howard, this fourth installment of the character created by David Morrel shows us a veteran

ex-green beret John Rambo who now lives a lonely and peaceful existence in the jungle of northern

Thailand, fishing and hunting cobras to then sell them. But everything changes when a group ofmissionaries

Catholicneeds to guide them to the border with Burma to provide medicines and food to

refugees besieged by the Burmese army, which has made the tortures and the murders something usual. Rambo will have

no choice but to get involved again. He will be obliged to do what he knows best, because in spite of himself he

has war in his blood. A novel company specialized in CGI wants to promote himself by offering his new and

revolutionary software specialized in bloody disintegration of human bodies at a price of balance If

you want to take advantage of this impressive offer, just contact us at 555 - 12 34. In addition,

if you call before the next fifteen days we offer you, completely free, two dozen cobras. Exhausted the

promotion of pythons.To this phone of the Telemarketing lam��� Sylvester Stallone late at night to

order the visual effects of John Rambo, film financed, probably, with the money saved

taking advantage of the 2x1 offer in Botox that promoted the branch of Corporación Dermoest���tica in Los

Angeles. And that is, Gods, often a movie What is John Rambo? Let's clarify things: if we speak in terms of

physics, John Rambo: back to hell, is an insult both for the seventh art in particular and any

intelligence m�� Normally rational in general, because its plot is practically nonexistent (in short, thepremise

usualof all the sequels of Acorralado), its completely archetypal characters, and itsdevelopment.

deliberately obviousBut, for me surprise, I have found with which we could certainly catalog c As the

best splatter movie of the last fifteen years. Come on, since Peter Jackson's Braindead, a server had

not enjoyed such a dose of wild and gratuitous violence: dozens of exploding heads,

hundreds of amputated limbs, rapes everywhere, bodies that vanish in a hugecloud

bloodafteran antipersonnel mine, infanticide, skulls pierced by arrows, massive spreading

hittingof internal organs, mines that trigger (almost) in atomic explosions. All this and much more, in ankey

explicit, is what John Rambo offers. As I said, the premise is outrageously predictable, thecharacters

archetypalcan not, and Sylvester Stallone spends all the film or killing indiscriminately or

losing his gaze on the horizon thinking, one of two, that his circle of violence has beenclosed

permanently, or that he has forgotten again to buy bacon for breakfast, it's something that a server has been

unable to elucidate. So, ladies and gentlemen, buy a bag of giant popcorn, some soft drinks, keep

the worst hooligans you have, and get ready to enjoy, laugh and applaud in thatspectacle

violentand gore without equal that is John Rambo: return to hell.

" 1

" David Slade has composed one of the best thrillers of all time, capable of causing tachycardia

to sensitive people or people with heart problems. ���

How complicated to talk about Hard Candy !, after watching the film, I do not know if the title in English is a subtle

irony about what awaits us in the next 100 minutes of footage, because Hard Candy is a verycandy

difficultto digest, very difficult and anguishing. Pedophilia is a very complicated subject of try in the movies, very

complicated because the simple act is already creepy to think. The film begins with a conversation in a

chat between Hayley, a teenager of 14 years and Jeff, a man of 32 that hides a dark secret . A

conversation loaded with a tremendous sexual chemistry that never had to have doubled as well indicates my

good friend Cinefila Alazne. They decide to stay and from the first moment some roles are established, Jeff is a wolf,

a sexual predator, a potential pedophile, and Hayley an innocent girl, a kind of red riding hood that

goes to the mouth of the wolf. Jeff coaxes her and takes her home, Hayley lets herself be done, and even begins to

prepare some alcohol cocktails to pave the way to the lion. What the lion does not know, is that under the

small lamb hides an authentic ferocious wolf. Hayley drug Jeff, and in a tense plot twist, the

roles are exchanged, the pedophile is the victim, and she is the executioner who seeks revenge. And this is where

the real film begins. A tense psychological thriller, that without blood, without sex, without visual effects, only

with the interpretation of the two actors, make Hard Candy into a perverse movie, oppressive, uncomfortable

and difficult to digest. We are probably talking about one of the most unhealthy movies from

Hollywood. The game that young Ellen Page submits to the pedophile is distressing, as Alazne says again, in the

line of Haneke's cinema, impossible to stay still five minutes in the chair. What stands out most of the

film, besides a solid script without fissures and from that hour of buclically unsettling atmosphere, it is

undoubtedly the leading actress: Ellen Page. His interpretation as a sweet child turned into a

psychopath is not great, it is ANTHOLOGICAL. She alone is capable of making the film, she alone in each of the

planes eclipses the rest of the footage, literally eating the actor, mixing malevolence and a macabre humor

that causes nervous laughter in the movies. Ellen Page is the movie, she is Hard Candy, in an unbeatable debut,

the actress presents her letters to be called to become one of the greats of cinema, and she is only 19

years old, she is the best debut that server has seen in years in a movie. I do not want to continue gutting it, the end

is simply creepy. David Slade has composed one of the best thrillers of all time, capable

of causing tachycardia to sensitive people or heart problems. To abstain prim, Hard Candynot

isa sweet but poisoned candy, that eats you the entra���as until such a point that in the middle of film you do not know

where to get into the cinema. An authentic jewel.

" 1

" A first half of truly attractive footage, a sort of portrait of manners ofEngland

working-classin the eighties.

Directed by Shane Meadows and interpreted by Thomas Turgoose, Stephen Graham, Jo Hartley, Andrew Shim, Vicky

McClure and Joseph Gilgun, This is England has been one of the most acclaimed films by critics. British film, in

addition to obtaining the Best Film Award in the last edition of the British Independent Film Awards. The film

situates us in Thatcherian England of 1983, and the schools are on vacation. Shaun, 12 years

old, is a lonely child growing up in a very gray coastal town, whose father has died in combat in the

Falklands War. Over the course of that vacation, he finds new male models when he

adopts the local skinhead. With his new friends, Shaun discovers a world of parties, meets his first love and

discovers the charms of Dr. Martens boots. That's when he meets Combo, a racist skin much

older than him, just out of jail. While the Combo band harasses local ethnic minorities,

everything seems set for the start of a maturation process that will lead Shaun from innocence to

experience. Being picky, we could say that This is England is a mix of theaesthetic

Trainspotting(despite being located a decade later) and the American plot. History X. In fact, the

fourth film by Shane Meadows has enough (and inevitable) points in common with that little wonder that

Tony Kaye directed in 1998, both in the correlation itself In the events as in their many

symbolisms. Odious comparisons aside, This is England is indeed a great movie, although not the

wonder that some British critics have wanted to see: History does not bring any novelty in itself, although

the setting is very achieved, with these industrial zones as a backdrop, the reggae music, the

war of the Malvinas and the Iron Lady on TV sets. But let's face it, any degeneration of the

national uprising in favor of racism contains the same elements, whether it be called National Socialism, Fascism,

Nazism, Francoism or National Catholicism, so the discourse of This Is England loses some of its charm

to be already known. On the other hand, what the film by Shane Meadows offers us is the counterpoint of the

original skinhead, embodied in the characters of Woody and Milky. So, This is England is very well taken

and, above all, it is very enjoyable, with a first half of really attractive and interesting footage, a

kind of portrait of the working class England of the eighties that, unfortunately, loses (some)

force with the arrival of Combo, not because his character lacks interest, but for the mere fact that it does not

bring any novelty. In any case, it is a fairly round movie.

" 1

" A film that, despite bringing the recurring ends of the battle of the sexes? and to contain the

most memorable discussion of the History of the Cinema, never came to have the consideration of other comedies of his

time.

"" New York, the city in which even the truth, in contact with the earth, becomes more false than aeye

glass. "" Some critics of the 1930s they popularized the belief that Hollywood had transformed

a vulgar brunette into the most sophisticated blonde. They referred to Carole Lombard, whose elegance was evident, and to

whom the reputation of "" vulgar "" came to her, logically, not because of the color of her hair, and ... � for the language he

used to joke with his castmates. The undisputed Queen of Comedy, protagonist of mythical

titles such as Being or Not Being, or At the Service of Ladies, (for which she would be nominated), she had to show off that

great sense of humor that characterized her to share screen with an actor she despised, Fredric

March, in Nothing Sacred. The script of this film, based on a work that had been published in a

major magazine of the time, was written entirely on a train and was designed precisely to be

interpreted by the actress. The argument, full of social s ,tira, already in 1937 spoke of characters that sell

stories invented to the press to be famous, of media that do not contrast the information

received because their � Only concern is to print sensationalist headlines, and the strangevibration

morbidthat this type of gossip causes in the population. With this component b��� SICO, wild Bill (William

Wellman), design a product in the line of known comedies "" screwballs "", in which no falt acide

CDSCEthics to the people of Vermont and an insinuating sensual background. A film that, despite takingto

the recurring "battle of the sexes"the extremes and containing the most memorable discussion of the history of cinema,

never reached have the consideration of other comedies of the decade such as A Great Report or La Fiera de mi

Ni���a.The cast, which contained one of the best performances of the spectacular blonde, who ��� eclipse,

even, a star named March, on and off the screen-, featured attractive stellar appearances, such

as that of German chemist Sig Rumann (for whom David O Selznick felt weakness), the wicked witch of The

Wizard of Oz and the "" Mommy "" of Gone with the Wind; works that would arrive to both of them two years later. At technical

level, their main success lies in the use of the new photography in color, in the

original music of Oscar Levant that emulated the great Broadway musicals, in the quirky costumes

designed by Walter Plunkett for his heroines, and in the personal touch that contributed to the film Cameron Manzies

as director of the second unit. The story failed in 1953 in theater, and was taken back to the cinema in

1954 in a curious version that, under the t� The title of Living Your Life, starred Jerry Lewis. The Queen

from New York, Carole Lombard, lost his life in a terrible aviation accident in 1942. He was only 33 years old.

He left a famous widower, Clark Gable, a total of 75 films (he could not attend the premiere of the last one), and one of

the greatest talents known by the Optimum Art. .

" 1

" It is an exceptionally entertaining film, with memorable sequences and great Spielberg style.

Spielberg is in a stage of intellectual maturity and I think he wants to reflect it through science fiction.

After the insufferable bodrum of Artificial Intelligence and the magnificent Minority Report it is the turn of a

catastrophic science fiction film. If the first one posed the possibility of feelings in

robots, the second one reflected how to improve our security with an almost infallible prediction system (although

the film is totally reactionary), in this third speaks of our extermination. Come on, what would happen if the

cousins ​​of ET were bad and they wanted to kill us all. It seems like a wonderful idea to

recover a story of this style and take it to the big screen again (still I have not seen the version of

1953). Although it is a revision of a classic novel, it is a great deal to have taken out this project because it is

original. It is an exceptionally entertaining film, with memorable sequences and great style Spielberg

(another author) . Tom Cruise is as always (note that I do not make valuations) and Dakota Fanning also

(wonderful) although in a somewhat more repellent role than in Man on fire, and attention ,N, already second in the credit

titles. John Williams is by compromise (he only makes incidental themes, without any recognizable leit-motive)

and would even have been more effective without music. It is a film that does not give up and with which you have a

great time. As always Spielberg gives a bit of lime (some cruelty) and another sand (resolutions of frames

too "potitas" ").

" 1

" A fairy tale during one of the hardest moments of the Spanish post-war period. It can not be denied that Guillermo del Toro is interested in fantasy and science fiction. n. In all his

films (Blade II, El Espinazo del Diablo, Mimic, Hellboy,.) The fantastic has a very important role. The

difference with respect to other creators is the concern to establish a nexus of union with reality. In

his films, Guillermo tells things that we know are not true, but he tells them in a way that could

be true. This magic is what causes the desired effect on the viewer, be it the fear or the illusion

that what he sees on screen is something that can happen. In The Labyrinth of the Faun, the Mexican director takes the

post-war civil Spanish as a canvas to paint his fantasy, as he did with the civil war in El

Espinazo del Diablo. But if it was a ghost story then, now we have a story that could

have been signed by Tim Burton himself. Ofelia and her pregnant mother arrive at a mill taken by thetroops

Franc, from where they fight the maquis that hidden in the mountain still offer resistance to thearmy

fascist. The reason that a woman about to give birth to this place of nightmare is that her husband,

Captain Vidal, is responsible for the troops of the mill and wants his son to be born where he is. ��� his father. Among his

little luggage, Ofelia brings some stories tied with a leather strap. Soon she will become the

protagonist of a tale of princesses and enchanted kingdoms, those that start with a "" once upon a time. "" The

main virtue of El Laberinto del Fauno is skillfully mixing cruelty that is lived in a scenario in

which there are two sides that kill each other without contemplation with the fantasy Ophelia lives. In this case,

the real part is more frightening than the fantastic part. Good part of the little one is of some actors whose work is

outstanding. From the Mercedes played by Maribel Verd���, continuously on the edge of the knife for being

assistant to Captain Vidal and collaborator with the maquis at the same time, even the captain Vidal,

masterfully played by Sergi L���pez. It is clear that this man is good at the role of a good-looking cabrio

and on this occasion he embroiders it. More thin than usual, it has a bearing on the screen that creates a

ruthless character, but without falling into the caricature of bad bad. The rest of the actors accompany

perfectly and each one with their work contributes weight to the plot, which allows us to glimpse a magnificent work of direction.

Regarding the fantastic part of the plot, it is technically correct, although some aspects may

be improvable. In any case, it is a story and realism is sacrificial to provide even more

contrast. Interestingly, this part of the film should not reach half the footage, but in the trailers

seems to occupy almost the entire tape. It can be seen that Guillermo del Toro has drank from sources as diverse as the

works of Tim Burton, the black paintings of Goya or the Alice in Wonderland of Carroll, but

creating a style of his own in which reality and fantas���a mix with armon���a.En summary, The Labyrinth of the Faun

is a story that takes place in a place and a historical moment in which the harsh reality left little space for

fantasy ��a. And, as in any story, in this there are adventures, happy moments, sad moments and a heroine

named Ophelia who shares with the viewer the illusion that beyond our senses there is aworld

different, in which the actions of people have their fair reward or punishment. It's just a fairy tale.

" 1

" A pity that a film with so much priority interest has ended up becoming one of the great

disappointments of the season.

Steven Soderbergh is one of the most intelligent directors of today, among other things, for his

ability to survive in the industry alternating commercial tapes, personal and even

experimental. "El Buen Alem���n" (The Good German), in my opinion, has tried to combine both facets,

disguising as commercial cinema what it supposes, in reality a nostalgic experiment. The result is somewhat

disappointing. In fact, the most important thing about the film is not its plot of espionage, based on the novel

by Joseph Kanon, and that places us in the ruins of the post-war Berlin of the Second World War where

US Army journalist Jake Geismar (George Clooney) will meet Lena Brandt (Cate

Blanchett), a former mistress whose missing husband is wanted by the American army and the

Soviet army. The important thing about the film is the revisionist exercise of Soderbergh, which has created a film from the

40s in the 21st century. The retro look of the film is so careful that even in Spain the credit titles have been translated

, just as it used to be done in those years. The problem is not that the transparencies

sing or that you notice the differences in photography between the scenes shot for the film and those from

documentaries of the time . These flaws were present in Hitchcock's cinema, to give an example,

and they did not matter at all. The problem is that Soderbergh seems to have forgotten that, among the great

virtues of those films, was the concisi��� n narrative, the pulse, the emotion. Elements that, in this "" The

Good Alem���n "", are missing. Before these problems, really serious, little can do some actors

delivered but somewhat lost that wander trying their charisma is enough to fill the screen.

Unfortunately it's not like that. It's a shame that a film with so much priority interest has ended up becoming

one of the biggest disappointments of the season. We will have to wait for another occasion to see if we can enjoy

again with the Soderbergh that made us vibrate with "" Traffic "" or "" Ocean? S Eleven. "" Rating moonfleet. is: 4 out of

10.

" 0

" The adaptation is good, very good. But, I think some licenses that the scriptwriters or thehave taken were

directornot necessary.

"" El Perfume "" narrates in third person the life of Jean-Baptiste Grenouille, born in France in the s. XVIII in the

middle of all the most detestable smells that may exist. I had an uncertain future, I did not have manymyself

chances to survive. I was going to entertainto explain the plot of the film, but I will not. Well, I've fought a lot

with the film and the book. I prefer to comment on the impression that I have taken, I hope you do not mind that

this time my criticism is that, pure and hard. That's why it took longer to write it, because when I thought I had it

done, I decided to re-write it. The film starts with a scene that is almost at the end of the book , revealing a

little the filnal that spits, or not, our protagonist. Begin by commenting on my impression of the

actors. A 10 for English Ben Whishaw. It was not an easy role, because before the film was released, the

producers were accusing the director of not getting the olfactory effect that the writer of theachieved

bestseller. And I think it embroiders. Another big movie that embroiders his role is Dustin Hoffman. Great role of

old perfumer glory, which takes advantage of the poor young "deodorated". Short paper, but enough to

show off. I remembered in some moments to Garfio, of "" Peter Pan "", another great personage who gave life, because

Baldini happens to be missed by the young talent, to be rewarded to be delighted to finish being

plethyric. A whole repertoire of expressions, go. The young Laura is very correct in her role of "" little lady "",

without the intention of offending. And is that coming from family well, everything in it must be correct. So, his character

is just that. Anyway, I liked their scary faces. Not all actors / actresses know "" to be

afraid. "" The rest of the characters, I found "" normal "". They did not call my attention, either for good or for

bad. To tell the truth, I was surprised that the first victim was by accident, and after have made a

deal. The adaptation is good, very good. But, I think some licenses that the scriptwriters orhave taken were

the directornot necessary. And this is one of them. It did not cost anything to reflect the murder in the frame that

the book describes. Like the second, I do not remember any passage in the book that explains how Jean-Bautiste

pays a female prostitute to let her put on the fat. I was also surprised that Madame Arnulfi was ignored.

widow, when wearing black and that Druot was her lover and not her husband. Because, if I do not get to know the story,

I would not have guessed. It seems silly, but the author insists a lot on that and on how Druot treats the

young apprentice. It is the only beating (which unfortunately is repeated many times) in the movie. cula: that there are details that

are not true to the book. And they are minor details that do not change the thread of the story, but they make the

adaptation move away from the story that Patrick S���skind describes in his work. But, of that, only We "" complain ""

that we have read the book, because they do not affect the course of history. Although, I miss a scene

that the writer reflects in the book in detail. And when Jean-Bautiste is in the mountains, he

discovers that he has no smell. But, it takes several years to "" discover "" that. The writer is entertained to

describe every odor that the protagonist discovers in the mountain, in the cave or in the entrance of the same. When

descending, it lacks smell and this is clear, because they confuse him with a man of the mountains, and even use it

as an example of a study. I do not want to go into much detail, for those who do not know the work and maybe

want to read it. This scene helps a lot to understand why our protagonist becomes obsessed with the search for

his odor. Pity that they have shown it in the film as something so fleeting, for me it is one of the most

important. On the other hand, and after having seen the famous and pol mica scene choreographed by the Fura dels

Baus, I am glad that I was not caught in the casting. Not because I'm not worth it, huh? But, for not wanting to teachbuttocks

my pretty, as they would say in more than a western.Sincerely, in the book is very well explained

why people go crazy pleasure and a massive org���a is mounted. In the cinema, when listening to the comments

of the people around me, and after intuiting that they had not read the book, it should not be understood well, something must be

missing. Maybe it's true that when seeing the film the spectator is not able to "" smell "" what the director

explains, which the author of the book manages to do. Easy, the truth. Reading a book the

mind "" plays "" a lot with the imagination and is able to "" fly "" far and far away. Seeing a scene, no

matter how explicit it is or how much information we are given, we are not able to imagine the same thing as when reading the book.

Regarding other aspects of the film, and leaving "" to destroy "" the gui���n, from affection, as a

friend of mine would say, I want to praise the music. Agree with each scene. Really, it gets tense when you have to be

afraid, and it produces tenderness when you have to feel it. That's what a wait for a good soundtrack. The

costumes I found very detailed, very careful. And the few special effects that I saw, I found very

realistic. Because the baby was a doll, I hope. I suffered a lot in that scene, because if it's a doll, I got

confused. And if it's a real baby, I do not know how the parents agreed to let their newborn film such a famous

film surrounded by so much dirt, no matter how much copper. "What a baby, man!" Well, I have not destroyed her

as much as I thought I would. A tip, read the book, before or after going to see the film, but do it.

You will understand many things better and in a better way. And you will enjoy the description of the smells.

" 1

" I do not know who the director is. I do not know who the actors are. I do not know who the scriptwriters are. The only thing I

can do to motivate them to see her is to tell them that most of them would like many of now to have the genius of those that

used to, because if something is on the tape, it's about their genius.

I saw Laura because they lent it to me. I saw Laura out of boredom. I saw Laura without enthusiasm. I saw Laura without desire. I saw

Laura. And after seeing Laura, I'm just saying that I would buy it on DVD, that it takes away the boredom, that ityou

excites, and that I could see it a thousand times more. Let's go Part by part. I do not know who the director is. I do not know who

the actors are. I do not know who the scriptwriters are. I do not know who composed the soundtrack. Excuse my ignorance.

But the truth, I do not think it's necessary to enjoy this movie. The truth: I'm a bit lazy about talking about

this movie. In addition, the note I have given speaks for itself. And I think it says. Shut up I can not hear.

says .. WHAT IS A PELICUL���NY is a film in ALL (I said all) aspects. Direction, gui���n, actors.

All. The most remarkable thing about the film is that (like almost all the great films in history) it has not

lost its strength. It's more, it keeps it intact. And with that strength he hit me. I'm not going to reveal anything about the

plot, but I hope you see it. The only thing I can do to motivate you to see it is to tell you that most of you

would like to have the genius of those before, because if you something makes the tape is of his

genius. A genius that knows how to treat the viewer and how to shred the story so that the end

is exciting. And together, so that the film passes to posterity by its own merits.

" 1

" The cruelty of the captain knows no limit, it starts being gratuitous and ends up being disproportionate. The

fantastic world of the princess and the faun contains no such terrifying being. Maybe that's why it's less

exciting.

On the plane of the real, a captain of Franco's army leads raids to destroy the maquis in the

north of Spain. It runs the year 1944. His pregnant wife arrives at the barracks with her daughter from amarriage

previous. The baby he waits is his obsession. In the plane of the fantasy, the daughter is guided by a fairy to the

lair of the faun that proposes three tests to become princess. The cruelty of the captain knows no

l�� �mite, start being free and ends up being excessive. The fantastic world of the princess and the faun

contains no such terrifying being. Maybe that's why it's less exciting. In "The Time Machine" by Welles,

the protagonist returns from the future without being able to prove that he has been there. It could have been a dream, but there is a

loose end, bring a flower of your trip. That is enough for the reader. Del Toro seems less concerned than

Welles because we believe in his fantastic creatures. Probably he was hypnotized with his monster, that

perverse Francoist soldier until the mulad. That makes me wonder how much spell would have been lost if the

film had remained in the pure reality.

" 1

" Really well done and staged that despite having some time of low meets expectations

and will not disappoint the fans of the book, a pity is a step away from being a great movie.

Jean-Baptiste Grenouille was born in the most foul-smelling and dirty neighborhood of Paris, in the middle of the waste of a

fish market and is abandoned by his mother. Picked up by a hospice and raised in it, he will soon realize

that he is not the same as the rest of the children. And he has an extraordinary sense of smell that makes it

special and different. Later sold to a tanner, he spent his childhood and adolescence surviving

badly. One day, attracted by the smell of a beautiful woman, you will discover that your mission in life is to

capture the smell of things and preserve it. His desire to create the perfect perfume will lead him to commit

murders of beautiful women to use their smell, once distilled, as ingredients. Tom Tykwer is in

charge of directing this European superproduction, with a great staging and characterization of a

dirty and unpleasant Paris, it also got, and it was not easy, to make Cre���ble, sombre and distant to Jean -Baptiste,

the interpretation of Ben Whishaw manages to convey all that and create a repulsive character and at the same time

connects with the viewer and awakens a sense of grief despite their atrocities. Tykwer opts for a

faithfulness to the book worthy of praise but that in turn is what turns the film at times into something tiresome and

too long. Ah��� lies precisely its virtue and its defect. Its virtue because everyone who in his day

enjoyed the book, among which I include myself, we appreciate that history has been respected as it is and the

changes suffered are really few. And its defect because the adaptation of a book of such magnitude supposes

an excessive duration that, especially in its second half, comes to have moments in which one begins to look at the

clock. This is due to that it is not possible to maintain a constant interest in the film throughout its length,

since the film combines moments that are really achieved, especially in its first half, which is practically

perfect and flies by, where we attend the birth and life of Jean-Baptiste and how he becomes an

assistant to the perfumer Baldini, with a Dustin Hoffman in a short but great role. But it begins to decay when he

arrives at Grase, where his murderous career begins, which the film resolves very quickly and contrasts with

somewhat slow scenes of his attraction to the young Laura, a young Rachel Hurd-wood of great beauty andeyes. As

beautifulI am among those who in their day enjoyed the book, I can not, despite everything, be

happy for the choice made to be faithful to the book, especially to its final. A really overwhelming scene and where you

can see that the film is a European production, since I am totally sure that we would have had aending

much more sweetenedto be a Hollywood film, even though I did something long and that

can be ridiculous depends on how you look, although I liked it. A film really well done

and staged despite having some At the time of download meets expectations and will not disappoint the fans

of the book, a shame is a step away from being a great movie.

" 1

" At all times transmits a halo of romanticism. A good story, well told and entertaining: it

is worth seeing.

Have you ever witnessed some live magic show? I can assure you that it changes a lot

when you watch it on television, in fact, it has nothing to do with it. When you are seeing it with your own eyes,

you feel like a child again: excited about the fantasy of being able to believe in magic. And that is precisely

what the protagonist of our history gets to reach unsuspected extremes. Based on thestory

homonymousof the American Steven Millhauser (Pulitzer Prize in 1997 for the work Martin Dressler), The

Illusionist is located in the Vienna of the late nineteenth century, place where politics, love and magic will play

a very important role. To Edward Norton (that sad-faced boy) the role of Eisenheim fits like a glove

, although we should not forget Rufus Sewell's interesting work as pr�� �ncipe Leopold.The film

transmits at all times a halo of romanticism intrinsic to the theme itself, which is also reflected

in the perfect atmosphere helped in Great part for a few decorated extras, without forgetting an elaborate

costume work. The assembly is very dynamic and adjusted so we will not have the feeling that we

lack or there is too much information (something very much appreciated in these times). As for the necessary use of

special effects for some scenes, not having abused them has allowed them to stabilize two universes

without the viewer feeling expelled from the plot. In short, a good story, well told and

entertaining: it is worth seeing .

" 1

" Michael Clayton is a conventional thriller that yes, maintains the interest and the suspense, but of such a gelidity

that does not manage to move at any time.

In recent times thrillers with political overtones have proliferated like mushrooms, some better, others

worse, but such proliferation is in itself good news. And it is that the cinema of intrigue and suspense has

reached a stalemate in which the original ideasby their absence, and all the films

are conspicuousremind others, or directly are crude copies. And unfortunately, despite of the good aspect that it transmits,

Michael Clayton remembers in some aspects to Erin Brokovich, of Steven Soderbergh, which isproducer

executiveof the tape of Tony Gilroy. This and other h���ndicaps, such as the fact that the film starts practically with a

flashbck, weighs down a story that, on the other hand, also fails to excite completely. It is a well-plot

constructed, although there are some details that no one can create, which is well narrated despite some

ups and downs in the rhythm, but completely asymmetrical and incapable of transmitting emotion. some to the viewer. If the

film remains standing it is partly because of the simple curiosity of what will happen, and this despite theflashback

initial. It is true that the story gains in intensity in its final stretch, but what has kept it standing

at that point is the work of the actors, including a brilliant George Clooney and an

incomensurable Tom Wilkinson.Michael Clayton is a conventional thriller that I am, maintains the interest and

suspense, but of such a gelidity that does not manage to thrill at any time. Nor is it an original story

precisely, but it fulfills the task of distracting and entertaining the viewer.

" 0

" When the cinema takes a vacation. The fever for Christmas borders on the collective madness, and the mecca of the

cinema, as a diffuser on occasions of the North American values, is dedicated to sell to the rest of the unhappy its

vision of the festivities.

Some months ago we announced the need to create a new genre or subgenre in the cinema, that of

Christmas movies. Before the crisis, and if it continues much longer it will become terminal, scarcity ofideas

originalin Hollywood (either for lack of original proposals or because nobody dares with them ), all

types of prefabricated films proliferate like mushrooms. In the United States, the fever for Christmas borders onmadness

collective, and the film mecca, as a diffuser of American values ​​at times, is dedicated to selling the

rest of the unhappy its view of the holidays. A vision where everything is rosy, people laugh in the

streets and there is no hint of despair or worries. And for more inri, if the person in charge of transmitting

the message in a film is Nancy Meyers, a well-known baker, the final result can be truly

devastating. In his previous work, when you least expect it, demonstrated his ability to sweeten a tape

that during his first hour was entertaining and rarely, fun. It is unlikely that maybe, just maybe

, Jack Nicholson and Diane Keaton collaborated on the potability of the film. But let's go back to whatnow

we are dealing with, to these Holidays; Amanda (Cameron Diaz) and Iris (Kate Winslet) are two women who do not have

Practically nothing in common, except that both have suffered recent disappointments in their love relationships. Through the

internet, they decide to exchange their lives, taking a deserved vacation. The proposal is

quite simple, as expected, there is no guide to grab it, it lacks any grace, which is a

romantic comedy should not be It would be cause for amazement. The characters are flat encephalogram,

not to mention situations, as predictable as if the spectator had a crystal ball in their

hands. In case there were few incentives to run and not look back, the more than two hours of

footage are capable of knocking down the most seasoned spectator in such conflicts. The height is all what surrounds the

character of Elli Wallach, a true subplot of help to the next and overcoming made in USA. Given such a

scenario, nothing can do Cameron Diaz and Kate Winslet, absent from start to finish, or a lost Jude

Law. But we must recognize a point in favor of Vacation. Given the proximity of the food excesses of the

Christmas holidays, those who go to the movies will come out with so sweet arteries, that the only fact of

seeing nougat or marzipan they will cause cold sweats and an impulsive desire to put dirt in the middle.

" 0

" Despite being an explicit homage to genre classics, it is sometimes interesting for a filmmaker to

cook a dish with the same ingredients and using the same recipe.

The debutant Koldo Serra always made it clear that he wanted to make a film about the incommunication that

ends up generating confrontation: in the couple, between different social classes and between cultures. The starting

point, although recurrent, may be attractive. In fact during the whole footage we can remain

motionless, expectant before what is going to happen, deceivingly abstracted. A pity that so much tension goes

to hell with a badly resolved story that of course we will not reveal. It is more, we will not wield the pen to

dismantle the work. We could do it because flanks to attack has this first episode, although

the wide sleeve is given to so many stupid, stereotypical and absurd productions, here � We are going to

defend the indefensible for a reason: it is a cinema model that has a tendency to improve. It tries to innovate,

giving back to established patterns. Ah��� is the fact that the good ones are falling like flies,

the main actors are the ones who look less at the end and the psychic substrate is given to certain

characters to be analyzed by a therapist specialized in family . Despite all the efforts, it does not work as a

product, perhaps mixing so many aspects and then not dissecting them well along astoryline

linear, with few unexpected peaks of emotion. The supernatural stories, with mysteries or starring

murderers of the most bizarre find in the forests of northern Spain the best environment. But the

scenario does not serve much when there is more action than content and so many doors are kept open, which is

why we feel a little cheated. Neither contributes the roster of stars, which also makes up a

substantial interpretive material wasted on a course that seems irregular and poor. We still

assure you that we must follow Serra's steps. No one has bought the opinion or the undersigned

has gone crazy: this budding creator promises although his debut is not at all bright; He does it to

risk, even if he is wrong. It is not comparable but at times its creature reminded me of the magnificent "Who

Can Kill a Child ?, by Narciso Ib������ez Serrador, where the harassed became They were executors and it did notus

seem strange to.

" 0

" If the prospective spectator has children, give him a hero's rationale. If you do not have this profile, go see Zulo,

which is about something else and it is also cinema. And good.

This Blockbuster film can lead to confusion because it contains the seed of a franchise, with everything

the business the cinema is capable of producing, and also certain features of well-made movies with remnants.film

worthydealing with a product so premeditamente perge���ado to the chiquiller���a greedy of flying suits and

supernatural powers hidden under a raincoat. And Bryan Singer, fetish director of the comic world with

his two competent X-men (not so the third, groped by a raven Ratner, sneaks in two and a half hours

of any footage evidence of his particular vision of the hero, we do not know if, with the consent of the producer,

he could see the box in danger if Superman gives us a dramatic dialogue or a gur��� of postmodernism,

Singer does, there is nothing, a religious Superman, adult and even weak, that is, human, Singer wants to show

that it can be perpetrated a film of superh���roes without lowering the trousers excessively and it does it with aof

well-sought-after groupactors (Donner's Superman was not one-sided in this aspect) and a milim� gui���n tric

locking merely visually (bait eaters comic books, put per case) with metafsico background. S.

what happens is that all this architecture of purposes is dismembered when the film takes twenty minutes and

we have already seen practically everything we expected to see. Kevin Spacey, who leaves his London theater to

inflate his account with a nutritious character, is a Lex Luthor closer to the Hannibal Lecter more morbid than the

bad-bad, soft in the background , caricatured in previous installments, to which we were accustomed. Saturated

merchandising, but this is inevitable. More when the premiere is in summer and the tails of the cinema are

full of whole families in search of two hours of plentiful daytime truffled with a couple of kilos ofeffects

special. My son enjoyed the beautiful. The father acted as a responsible father and remembered that at his

age, too, he was taken by a t veroa to see the film of the first Christopher Reeves. If the prospective spectator has

children, give him a hero's rationale. It is an icon of this last escaped century. If you do not have this profile, go see

Zulo, which is about something else and it is also cinema. And good. Or turn on your home DVD, activate 5.1 and be

emotionally quiet to get excited with Apocalypse now, by Coppola. A few days ago I did it, anddearis still

mymemorygrateful.

" 0

" The gui���n, in addition to trampling the original character, tramples itself. The characters are all

incredibly bad. The protagonist has intellect and di���logos own of a border.

"" Ghost Rider: The Ghost Rider "" is the latest product set in the Marvel universe that comes to

our screens. Starring Nicholas Cage, a big fan of comics, who seems to have even

"" helped "" with the gui���n. Such is his fondness for comics that one of his sons has named him Kal-El (the

original name of Superman). If you have been able to commit that cruelty with a poor child, imagine what you

can do with a movie. In short, the film tells the story of Johnny Blaze (Nicholas Cage), an

acrobatic biker who, to save his father from certain death, makes a pact with the devil (Peter Fonda).

In exchange for salvation, Blaze becomes Satan's minion, whose job it is to collect the souls that

the Lord below requires. On motorcycle. When a powerful contract written by the sale of aappears on the scene

thousand souls, which both Mefist���feles and his son Blackheart (Wes Bentley) want, Blaze has to replace them to

save the file, kick the back to the bad and link to Roxanne (Eva Mendes), and all without

dropping the wig. Because you hear, Nicholas Cage wears a wig that looks like he's been smeared bald in tar and

forced to run for a gentleman's hairdresser. Frightening. The director and screenwriter is Mark Steven

Johnson, those who follow the genre of superheroes will remember him as the perpetrator of "" Daredevil "". Here he

goes back to doing his. Any glimmer of interest there beyond the special effects that thecharacter

Ghost Ridermay have, has gone down the toilet. The original story, which was developed largely

around a man who had sold his soul to the devil but who found forgiveness before God thanks

to true love, a theme that has led to great Classics of literature such as "" Faust "" or to some

extent "" Don Juan "", here becomes a ring of ridiculous fights. But what is expected of a man who has said

about his character: "" a vengeful demonic hero, a sort of Orpheus or Faust "". Defining Orpheus as a demonic

vengeful hero comes to be like saying that the Caponata Hen is a bird of prey, more or less. The

gui���n, In addition to trampling the original character, he tramples himself. The characters are all incredibly

bad. The protagonist has intellect and di���logos own of a border; Eva Mendes is limited to showing the

neckline and looking silly. Satan looks like a TV presenter and has less authority than an

urban guard. Blackheart, the fearsome antagonist come from the same hell, is as threatening as a

man with a very bad hangover. In addition, none of them seems to have clear motivations, or at least the

film does not bother to show them. For what? The case is to remove many motorcycles. The development of the story is

very irregular. It takes a long time to start, after a long presentation of characters that is useless, because

although it raises the basic relationships between them, overlooks insignificant details as why

Satan� He chose Johnny Blaze, or what he did to him, or for what. Of course, all this will be clarified

later, when a character explains it out loud. The real antagonist appears well after three

quarters of an hour, and everything ends up resolved quickly and quickly, when all the protagonists are less

when they turn a corner. At the visual level, "" Ghost Rider "" is a Authentic horror The film's greatest creation

, the Biker, is frightening, and has proportions that more resemble the Ghost Rider, make

it look like the Microcephalic Motorcyclist. The special effects are pretty poor. Not technically, but in its

design. All the demons, spirits and ghosts that swarm around seem to have been taken from other

movies, and nothing surprises at any time, except Nicholas Cage. Look at this p ���gina we always expect

little from Cage. We hope it hurts a little to see it on screen. But in "" Ghost Rider "" he graces us with what is,

without a doubt, his worst interpretation to date. It is absolutely ridiculous. His two characters are a

lonely and taciturn motorcyclist and a demon whose face has a skull covered in flames, and Cage gets

both have the same expressiveness: that of a lighter. His body language is that of Elvis at his worst,

and above all it seems that he does not quite take the issue of his aging, which motivates ridiculous plans in

which he teaches his powerful muscles, hides one of the sides of his face (which gives me that he has gone through the

surgery, very badly), wears a horrible make-up, or directly they put a stocking in front of

him. �mara.Your sharing partners do what they can. Eva Mendes has a ridiculous character, the quintessence

of the female vase character who laughs thanks to the protagonist and who has to be saved. Peter Fonda,

who has seen you and who sees you. And then there's Sam Elliot, who does what he always does: a cowboy who

spits on the ground. In short, a boring movie, worthy successor to "" Daredevil "" in the race of its director.

Recommended for those who have put the Metra-Kit on their scooter.

" 0

" Adventures for the whole family, the children see it and the parents stay friedFear what fear, imagine that you open the door and you find that you are in the interplanetary space mounted

in your own home and with a brother you would strangle. And with Tin Robbins as a father. The film is about an

unstructured family in which the father and mother take turns offspring in a regime "" a week t��� and

another I "" . A six-year-old son, a ten-year-old son and a late adolescent girl make up the trio of horrifying

children who have to discover that the family is the most beautiful there is. Total, for reasons that are

irrelevant, discover the small game called Zathura, which makes your home is transported to space as ifa

it wereship. What adventures await you? Can they come back safe and sound? Who knows.Buf, the idea is

fine, but it becomes very heavy and completely loses interest as it progresses. It is thought of as a

story told by a small child, in which coherence does not exist and anything goes. As a fantasy, this is

fine, but as a film it takes you far from the plot and you only see a succession of special effects without

a clear nexus of unity. .N The characters are excessively prototypical, with a divorced father who gets along well

with his ex and works until Saturday, a horrible son, another murderer and a daughter to stamp his head

against the bid��� . And the end very absurd and excessively moral. Resuming, fun for the little ones.

For the elderly a little heavy, with a lot of moral burden and too many emotions without rhyme or reason.

" 0

" The enormous capacity of Truffaut to build characters endowed with a humanity as real and dynamic as

life itself and as the intricacies of the art of representation, provides the documentary with a metaphysical power rich

that is constituted in the emotional dimension, romantic, and ultimately, deep discourse that encourages

between the smile and the smile.

When life ceases to have meaning, the cinema has the power to prolong the illusion with itspotential

expressive, as a game of representations as a catharsis. Or maybe, cinema and life are one and the same

, we are interpreters of ourselves in the great theater of the world. The universe proposed by Francois

Truffaut looks at us through three eyes: the eye of the spectator and the eye of the camera that looks at the other camera that

is representing another universe. If we include the spectator, we have three representational realities

synthesized in a cinematographic whole that derives in a metalanguage for the debate between any lover of the

seventh art. It is obvious that in this film the intention and the documentary style prevail, and for that reason it constitutes a

cin tesfilo treasure that lends itself to many readings on the cinema understood as an industrial product and subject to

the commercial rules, or as an expression aesthetic, or a divertimento for his perpetrators, as part of his

personal accomplishment. In fact, the greatest movie in the film, and it is in this sense that the mere documentary

reaches the stage of dramatic work that symbolizes the emotional problems and the contrariety of the characters,

is their ability to synthesize the life represented with the "real" life, the effort to perfect thework

interpretivewith the effort to improve on a human level (or rather, one thing carries the other). It is a

film about people and about characters, which, with or without a mask, remain what they are, or what

we all are. The enormous capacity of Truffaut to build characters endowed with a humanity as real and

dynamic as life itself and as the intricacies of the art of representation, provides the documentary with a

metaphysical power that it constitutes in the dimension emotive, romantic, and in short, deep of a

discourse that encourages between the tears and the smile, in which the same int��� Interpreters question theirinstincts

vitalin relation to the demands of the office of actor or director. Truffaut's great film, although perhaps

it extends too much in some passages that do not finish arriving at significant port, and On the other hand, it leaves a

little in the air other aspects from which more juice could have been extracted. He won the Oscar for the best

foreign film in 1973, and is the best French author's film according to the opinion of an important sector

of specialized criticism

" 1

" Too many visual pretensions to disguise a scant work of documentation and, gentlemen, in this case

the genre that appears to us is a biographie.

I remember the criticism that, a few months ago, I received the film "Goya's Ghosts"; most were not

very good and almost all were based on a false concept according to which the work was intended to be a biography

of the excellent painter and, of course, from that point of view it was poor and, even, wrong At the time,

I already said that the film was not, under any circumstances, a biography, but, based on the philosophy and

life of the painter, Milos Forman, was able to introduce a historical character in an imaginary plot (something

that is not as simple as it seems). Having said that, you will all ask, cuen and what is the next thing?

Well, very simple, those same critics who cursed Mr. Forman's address so much, spoke marvelously after

the "Klimt" press release, a biography Pretty much about one of the most prominent painters

of the nineteenth century. Well, my first recommendation is that if you do not know the work and life of the painter, you have two

options: either is documented about the life of Klimt or you are not going to see the film. I warn him, if he goes in

to see her without knowing about the artist, he will come out with the same notions, well, no, I exaggerate? You will know something

more: she painted naked ladies, she had a great friend with the right to touch, her art did not like some of her

contemporaries and the symph ������ Seriously your nervous system. In addition to this content, you will appreciate

an impressive artistic work. Both the photograph and the colors are very careful to

introduce us into the symbolism of Gustav Klimt but, for the rest, the film has more s mistakes that are

right: It is true that this painter was known for his love of the female body and that there are lots of

drawings and drawings about the woman's physiognomy in great detail, but it is not less false that not only

selected for thin young people but also, showed us the body of the old women or the

roundness of pregnant women. It is true that he had a great friendship (maybe something more) with Emile Louise Flog��� and,

for that reason, it is said that when the painter died of an apoplexy attack PIDI to bringto his side,

data that has not interested director you so l Klimt died saying "" flowers "". Klimt tena a great cari or his

mother and after his death, his palette became more sober and dark, as Raoul Ruiz is not important,

is more, the only thing we deduce from movie is that mother and sister shared disease and hallucinations. We

could follow a few more points but I do not intend to bore them too much, so, for To summarize,

too many visual pretensions to disguise a scant work of documentation and, gentlemen, in this case the

gender that appears to us is a biographie.

" 0

" Those who love scuba diving may like it, but let's see if you are doubtful, as I was before

seeing it! Run away from it like the plague! (Vaaaamos).

They talked to me about the film a long time ago, in the editing of the page in which I usually collaborate, and

honestly, when I saw the trailer this summer I did not get too much attention. ,N, even though I had heard many

opinions, some very good and some bad (of all as in pharmacy) however today that I had atime

freeI have willing to see it and only I can say that I was disappointed a lot; made withimage

digital, last milestone in the cinema and last nonsense that many directors have taken to show aimage

much more real, and above with the everlasting BASED ON REAL FACTS to give us almost the title of "" dogma of faith "" an

argument to follow at face value and that at times is simpler and more boring than I expected

when I started to see it And that only lasts 79 min! (but surely I fall asleep in the chair). The

tape only has a couple of remarkable moments and in some moments it has even reminded me of the myriad of

tapes that I have to see every time I go to visit some friends (reci�� �n married) to their homes after a

vacation / honeymoon or something else. Perhaps the epìlogo is the most striking and the end, somewhat

unexpected a priori has been what has made me be able to change position in the seat in which homer

Simpson was already doing a small Huecoo hollow to sleep.Lastly "" Artisan "" (an independent distributor and

that shone not long ago with its high quality tapes) is making me see every truyo of dimensions

! Csmico! Finally, if you like diving, maybe you like it, but let's see if you are doubtful, as

I was before I saw it! Run away from it like the plague! (Vaaaamos).

" 0

" A tape that will crush the box office, but that will stop the fans of the novel on which it is based,

among which I include myself, and that is f��� easy to leave the cinema saying the usual "" I liked themuch more

book... ""

Will Smith is here to thwart the Christmas box office, taking advantage of the tir�� " In the novel by Richard

Matherson, much more recommendable than the film, we have Mr. Smith in his next film where he acts as the savior

of the world, although this time, it is a little different from everything what has been doing for a while to this

part, although, after precedents like "" Independence Day "" "" MIB "" and similar one expects much more of Will (even

that his dubbing is the same as always , which does not happen here). We are faced with, as I said in the firstbomb

box-office, but trying to treat equally the usual consumer of action cinema palomitero, with the

reading cult of novels, at the exit of the cinema I have found the tessitura of listening to the 2 sides (

who had loved it, since they had not read the novel) and those who left horrified by the little affection

with which he had transferred the letters of Matherson to the screen. It is also true that, in this case, in the

trailers already showed us perfectly what they were going to teach on screen, and that is that, as my best friend

Isa says, today's ad, those "" mini-yo "" de pel��� They show more of what would be interesting to see or know about it (it is

appreciated that along with the projection we have put on the excellent trailers of "" The Oxford Crimes "" and "" The

Dark Knight ""); Should I start to boycott the production companies of Trailers? The cast is short, apart from

Will, we find Alice Braga, niece of the famous Brazilian actress Sonia Braga, with whom she shares

artistic name, and the little ones Charlie Tahan and Willow Smith, it seems that Will is gradually getting his

children into the worm for the interpretation, the first was his son in "" In search of happiness "" and now your daughter,

that, that, sweeping for home. It is true that the tape is full of visual effects, since both thetrickery

New Yorkdeserted, and the "" Seekers of the darkness "" they need this type of effects, and they manage to

impress (and scare, in equal parts) the audience, but if we only manage to save a film by "" a

few things "" bad we are going. Ah! I can not forget "" The Last Man Alive "", which was the first adaptation of the

novel that now brings us, and where a great Charlton Heston to the honors killing vampires (which even

gave me It's bad news that these). In short, a tape that will crush the box office, but that will stop the fans of the

novel on which it is based, among which I include myself, and ��� that it is easy to leave the cinema saying the usual

"" I liked the book much more. ""

" 0

" High-level film of Spanish cinema Queol that shows us that a good idea can have a low

budget. Social criticism that makes us feel very alive and shows us a world unknown by most. Of

impossible utopias and indispensable utopias.

The first time I had contact with November was thanks to the neighborhood video store, dead and buried someago

time. It was one of those films that you see to cover your own quota of home cinema, that you take because you do not find

anything that you fancy less, or because you have a silly day and you want to redeem yourself with the world. Now I have it,

since it left me so perplexed, that I needed to have it. As an anecdote, I did not realize that it was a

documentary invented until almost the end (neurons, come back with me !!!) The film is about Alfredo (Oscar

Jaenada) who is a young man Murcia who arrives in Madrid to study Fine Arts. Soon after being in school,

he realizes that he will not learn what he wants there. He is interested in another type of art, an art

that really reaches the public, away from the commercial, that you can find anywhere, at

any time. In short, a free art, only subject to the creative capacity of the authors. Little by

little, his idea is gaining followers, to form a theater group that will call November. What more strange

film and original. The way of recording it is documentary, although what counts is invented. Aperson

boldwould realize nothing more to start, given that the dates do not match, it cost me almost ninety minutes.

The argument is very original, showing some utopian ideas taken to the extreme getting an awakening of

the senses The cast of actors say that it is assortment, on the one hand the consecrated ones that are those that tell

the documentary and on the other the young people, who are curious to see by the evolution that they have followed. On theside

negative, it has a small rhythm loss, perhaps caused by an excess of representations.

Resuming, a high-level movie of Spanish cinema that shows us that a good idea can have a low budget.

Social criticism that makes us feel very alive and shows us a world unknown by most. Of

impossible utopias and indispensable utopias.

" 1

" Although their stories are small and they are stuck to the real thing like a tire to the asphalt, in 'Mataharis'

is approached from the lucidity of the suggestion many and varied issues of eminently human content

The cinema is wiser and more artistic as it suggests, shows or suggests that when it indoctrinates, moralizes and

sentences. Probably the truth of his story is also more adjusted when he creates his characters and stories

under this premise of honesty. The cinema of Ic���ar Bolla���n seems to evolve, and for good, for this path of

minimalism in which arguments are posed without offering the viewer definitive answers.

Mataharis, his last film after the successful film of social denunciation that was Te doy mis ojos, delves into

this polyjuric v aam���s at the time of talking about the characters. Three actresses (Najwa Nimri, Mar���a V���zquez and

Nuria Gonz���lez) embody so many other women in different stages of their lives, generationally different

from each other, who have to make decisions about how they want their life to be or how to bring it back

to their current situation. This issue, that of our decisions at specific crossroads as a vital chisel,

seems to be present at all times in the film. ���cula. An example of this is found in the invaluable dialogue

between the character of Nuria González, private detective and work partner of the other two protagonists,

with a client who has requested the follow-up to his wife of whom he suspects an infidelity. When this is

confirmed, the man, between astonished and dejected, asks himself aloud: "" How could you have done this to me? "

Carmen detective, to customer SAZN friend, he blurts: "" The important thing is not whether or not is anotherthing

importantis why "" This sequence bound. other of the film, delves into another story axis: how a

person with whom we have lived for years can reveal itself to us as an alien and almost alien to our

existence, confirming the cruelty of a solitude accompanied.It is clear therefore that, although their stories

are small and are stuck to the real as a tire to the asphalt, in Mataharis is addressed from the lucidity of

the suggestion many and varied issues of eminently human content. Maybe it does not reach the masters, but

this new work by the Madrid producer confirms it as a more interesting voice among our

filmmakers.

" 1

" It may seem like a good story with a deep message included, but it's just a littlestory

boringwith a really endless end time. As heavy and redundant as its title.

Whoever says this is better than the wonderful Charlie and the chocolate factory is making a mistake. It may

seem like a good story with a deep message included, but it's just a little boring story

with a really endless end time. As heavy and redundant as his title, Mr. Magorium and hisstore

magical(the redundant comes by his original title, Mr. Magorium Wonder's Emporium), he gets that as

he goes (with an unbearable rhythm) we move further away from her and end up feeling a null interest. Dustin

Hoffman as crazy crazy owner of the store is great (probably the most remarkable of the tape), and

his partner Natalie Portman quite correct, but I can not believe Give me your paper. Undoubtedly, the cast is

clearly altered by Jason Bateman, an actor without charisma who only has a good scene in the whole movie,

and also his role is really wasted It seems like the magic of Burton's film, it does not become what itat

seemedfirst and two or three well-executed sequences and a funny protagonist are not enough. To this

film what is really missing is a good director, and Zach Helm (screenwriter of the wonderful M���s extra���o that

the fiction) was not the m��� It's adequate for this. Keep writing.

" 0

" Popcorn, giant coke, and a cushion for the moments of drowsiness. Many special effects, but little

gui���n. Was it necessary for him to come back?

Look, I loved the Superman, he never called my attention. To begin with, he is very limited as a character,

given that he is invincible. In other words, in all episodes we need Kryptonite to defeat him. Then it is

remade and fused to the bad guys based on mamporros. Your love problems are foolish to me, not being able to. And

then, the theme that his great disguise is to take off his glasses to change from a timid reporter to a superhero damages

human intelligence. No, I do not like Superman. I prefer Spiderman, who always cries, Hellboy who is

a bitter of life, the X-Men are varied, etc. The film is about an extraterrestrial superman who

after five years of retirement looking for the remains of your home planet, return to Earth. When he falls, heresumes

quicklyhis life as a journalist at the Daily Planet, hoping to return to the woman of his dreams.

But not everything is as he expects, given that she has a partner and a child, so she focuses on two things, saving

the world from the ills that torment her and trying to link to her reporter. On the opposite side, Lex Lutor (

bad bad guy) has come out of prison for reasons of form and is remaking his empire of evil and terror.

Can Superman against the new threat that flies over the United States, I say about the World? This .

let me think. Well, I think if.Buff, this is hell. Let's start with the good things. The sets and

special effects are delicious, with the highlight of the scene being that Clark continues with his supermirada to

Lois through the elevator. Everything is mounted very carefully, especially the city. In this aspect I

liked it a lot. On the negative plane is the gui���n, which is a twist to a character that I consider

very limited, to be able to be defeated by the Kryptonite. For starters, what does Lex Lutor intendassociate

towith that bunch of incompetents? In addition, to become a town planning councilor to earn money, which Superman does not

put his hand on. Then, I can understand that Superman flies and is invincible, since for that I'm going to see a fantastic

film. Now, that Lois is shaken in an airplane, hitting against everything and leaving without a scratch, Inot

dobelieve it. It is simply, absurd. And what about the Superman cape? Has a life of its own. If it goes down, the layer remains

firm undulating. What is in space? It undulates like a flag (although there is no atmosphere).it

Whileseems science fiction, but with some reality. And well, the final reel of the film has nowhere to

pick it up. Oh, and do not expect such action of the X-men type, which reminds more of Hulk and his problems

for getting the package fattening him in the same way as muscles Speaking of packages, it is rumored that they

have had to digitally cut the aforementioned to the main actor, given that they say that in that aspect if that

is Superman. And I say, should a superman not have a super member? I think so. By the way, they have

taken this Superman to a much more metrosexual plane, fleeing from the muscled aesthetics of the comics.

We would say, that they have even aflauted you too much, with that crystalline face. Resuming, big bidet of

popcorn, giant coke, probe (which are 150 minutazos well served) and a cushion for the moments of drowsiness .

Many special effects, but little gui���n.

" 0

" Infiltrated is the most overrated movie of the year. With good performances, but without atmospheres or

compromise.

Who compares infiltrated with good boys should see it again. Infiltrados is the most

overrated film of the year. With good performances, but without atmosphere or compromise. The perfect edition of

Scorsese's right-hand man, Thelma Schoonmaker, makes each scene worthwhile on its own, but the speed with

which the scenes take place does not create the necessary environment for the commitment of the spectator with any of the

characters. They are very short and full scenes (but full) of diÃlogos many unnecessary times. Nicholson returns

to give us one of his characters runaway, historical and insecure. Di Caprio shows his talent not so

easy to sprout, Scorsese sees in him the successor of De Niro and gives him a lot of rein to develop his character.

Damon does not have a handle with his impeccable smile to convince him to be an inflitrado gangster in the police of

Boston and Whalberg always in pose, never hesitant. The characters are one-dimensional, impossible to give them a

complete figure, positioning them in spaces that give them motivations and / or reasons to do what they do. Their

actions are because they are, with no place to meditate why. The scene of the rat walking on the balconyshows

clearlythe concept that Scorsese has on the public (American perhaps ?) Everything easy, served on a

platter, obvious. A film with great actors (stars), understandable and that does not disappoint in terms of

action (shots, blood). An Oscar film. The criticism has not been ben���vola with "" Marty "" lately and it's time

to compensate for the mistreatment. If we add to that an impeccable casting and a blockbuster soundtrack, we are

facing one of the films with the most nominations for the awards ceremony in February 2007.

" 0

" We are in front of a movie. ��cula saturated with topics and plagiarisms to their precedents, and you can not say much more than

you would say about any telefilm minimally elaborated, to see, enjoy for a while, and forget

forever.

New twist to the artistic myth, from an idea inspired by Manfredi's novel, tells us

the wars between Romans and Barbarians from a mythological perspective, without worrying about theveracity

historical���rica, with which this will be a minimum factor when it comes to rating a product that has nothing new to

contribute to the genre and that aims to establish itself with a certain commercial appeal by imitating to some of the

films that have had the most commercial impact in recent years. Specifically, with regard to the

characterization of characters and elaboration In the plot, baby of the trilogy of The Lord of the Rings by

Peter Jackson or The Phantom Menace (or Pirates of the Caribbean), and so on, we see a Ben Kingsley

playing a new Merl���n-Gandalf-Quigong-jinn and the child actor Colin Firth- Frodo Bols���n- Anakin Skywalker

representing the chosen one that will restore the Roman hegemony according to the prophecy of turn. That is, a hodgepodge

of magic, pseudohistory and cheap philosophy put together with the sole purpose of entertaining spectators who are not

demanding. And the truth is that Doug Lefler achieves a film for a decent pastime, without detriments that

are too ridiculous or excessive pretentious ornaments, a simple story told through astyle

discreet and conventional visual, the battles remember the style of Jackson in the two towers and the end affects

the eternal theme of the need to believe in heroes and legends. It is obvious, in any case, that we are

facing a movie. saturated with cliches and plagiarisms to their precedents, and you can not say much more than you would

say about any telefilm minimally elaborated, to see, enjoy for a while, and forget for

forever.

" 0

" Ang Lee revisits himself and shows us a world as contradictory as his own figure, a world of

infiltrators who play the masks of personalities and who end up being lost in a sea of

emotions and unanswered questions.

Say at this point that Desire, danger is a return of Ang Lee to their culture after the adventure of

Brokeback Mountain or that with this new work proves to be not only chameleon but goes on tiptoe for the

concept of autor���a, it is nothing when it comes to talking about a director who is characterized by the

(alleged) contradictions in his career. Lee is, as was Hawks or Ford, a film artisan but has more

of an artist than many others despite being an independent soul within the non-author directors, a

concept that is hard to understand but that looks confirmed film after film. With Desire, danger Leeus

showsa world as contradictory as his own figure, a world of infiltrators who play at the masks of

personalities and who end up being lost in a tidal wave of emotions and unanswered questions. The

film pushes us, with an incredible initial sequence, to immerse us in this world full of complexities

armed by a myriad of intricacies among which the (hidden) desires of its characters stand out . In Desire,

Danger Lee returns to the subject that underlies most of his films underlining the twoconcepts

complementaryof the title: desire and danger (to desire). A young student infiltrates a

world of political bosses through a theatrical game of cries, becoming locked in a vicious circle

between the theatrical plots of Lubitsch and the darkest cinema of Master Hitchcock. Ancombination

explosivethat in the hands of a director so concerned about the static setting of the scene becomes a

dangerous cocktail. And, despite the fact that correct final result, Desire, danger ends up leaving thecold

viewer, as lost as the protagonist can not but see what happens on the screen as something that is

totally foreign. It is perhaps this obsession with medicine and perfectionism that leads Lee not to allow

his scenes (and here I speak especially of sexual scenes) to transgress the danger to become wish.

Everything in "In the mood for love" was of so-called desire, in Desire, danger remains a simple

babbling attempt despite the incredible performances of its two protagonists Maggie Cheung and

Chow Mo-wan (also Protagonn protagonist of the Wong Kar Wai film, which Lee looks askance at in this

revision to the world of carnal desires). It is precisely this coldness in the scene that makes the 157

minutes of their footage become excessive for a story that could possibly have been treated in less

time, without underestimating the fantastic at any time. The montage of the man who reads Lee. All the beauty that

comes out of his plans and the rhythm of some of his scenes (which explode in the global of the film as

authentic fireworks) are worthy of saying that Desire, danger is a great film. ���cula. It's a pity that wenot

canignore that it's Ang Lee and that at this point, Desire, danger seems like a second (or

third) part of something we've seen before in his filmography.

" 1

" Guillermo del Toro's film is an absolute prodigy, an enchantment of one hundred and twelve minutes, a

rise to the sky of fairy tales and a descent into the hell of the human soul.

Ofelia has a chalk that opens doors on the walls of a rural house that serves as a barracks for adetachment

national. Outside, in the forest, are the maquis and a labyrinth with a faun and fairies. There is a captain of

Falangists who, in reality, is a demon, although he shaves with delectation and care, cleanswith exquisite

his boots of command and listens in a rickety copla record playerneatness. The mother of Ophelia is pregnant with

her second husband, the captain. The next child has her sick. A mandr���gora plant bathed in milk that

Ophelia places under her bed can cure her. That remedy is confessed by the faun to the ni���aa change from

focusing on his true mission: to overcome three tests. In test one, there is a toad. In the two, a pale man

with eyes in his hands. In the three, a labyrinth. The film by Guillermo del Toro is an absolute prodigy, an

enchantment of one hundred and twelve minutes, a rise to the sky of fairy tales and a descent into the hell

of the human soul, contaminated by the barbarism of war, but Ophelia's fantasy, her world ofinsects

enchantedand portals that give the happiness of another world, overlaps with the real and overlaps it so

that what happens in one ends modifying the events of the other. Del Toro masterfully brings these two

tones, the adult and the child, and there is no fracture in the narrative fluency of both. The actors are in a

state of grace. We have not seen Maribel Verd��� work like that. Nor Sergi Lopez. Ariadna Gil, in her briefest

paper, embroiders her mother tormented by well-being and sacrifice. Alex Angulo, the doctor. And we can not avoid

mentioning Ivana Baquero, the girl who was going to be a princess and remains in the stepdaughter of a fascist captain: she makes a

portentous interpretation. Guillermo del Toro tells that he had to revise it seventy times (!) And that he cried in

the same scenes in each pass. It will have been one of the last Spaniards to have stepped on a movie theater to

see it, but it will also be the hope that many people that before they retire will pass again. by box office andleave

very willinglythe euros of rigor to return to feel the same emotions, the same pain, the same

feeling of uncontained happiness. Im���tenme, please.

" 1

" Portrait of a sunken man who spent thirteen years among bears. The best documentary of the year and

probably, one of the three best films.

An impressive documentary by the German director in which he tells us about the last years of Timothy Treadwell, a

freak who spent thirteen years among bears, doing the chorras. Almost all the footage is video footage of this

character, who wanted to live among his brothers bears denying the man, whom he hated.Muri��� destroyed and

devoured with his wife by a bear he did not want To make friends with him. At the beginning of the documentary we believe that

Treadwell was a nice guy who was looking for a relationship with nature, but as the minutes passed

we almost identified ourselves (the director included) with those who claimed that he was like a watering can. What I

have seen is a portrait of a sunken man (attention to the key given by his father in the interview with

Herzog) that lost his head with drugs and drink. Moments of superhuman beauty, such as the first

contact with the fox, go hand in hand with other really frightening ones (from the forensic statements to the

bereaved bears, the whole sequence of the frenzied attack, including Herzog shuddering listen to thetrack

audio, recorded in the victim's camera) to achieve the best documentary of the year and probably one of

the three best movies. A 9.

" 1

" Simplistic and Manichaean vision, halfway between the palomitera superproduction and the cinema with message, of

one of the classic science fiction In the last century.

Adapt: ​​Modify a scientific, literary, musical work, etc., so that it can be disseminated to the publicone.Attention

different from the one to which it was intended or to give it a different form from the originalto the acceptance of

the RAE, we could say that 'I Am Legend' by Francis Lawrence meets at least one of therequirements

necessaryto be considered an adaptation of the superb novel by Richard Matheson. But one Alfred

Hitchcock, expert in adaptations, came to say, more or less, that "the secret of adaptation is to understand

the main idea and ignore the rest". If we pay attention to this, 'I am Legend' is nothing more than a dull (and

neat, that's it) remake of 'The Last Living Man', the macarrada seventies by Boris Sagal and Charlton Heston.

Because it falls in the same tic as the previous version: forgetting why (and for what) Richard Matheson wrote

the original. On this occasion, Robert Neville ( a more than acceptable Will Smith) is a military virologist who turns out to

be the only survivor to a devastating plague that destroys 90% of the world's population and turns the

rest into Inhumane predators with alopecia problems and extreme sensitivity to ultraviolet rays. His

only vital impulses are to find a cure for the virus, to contact other possible survivors and to see

a whole video store in alphabetical order. Until one day.Francis Lawrence has billed a harmless

blockbuster to the greater glory of Will Smith, but following the post-apocalyptic line of the 'Omega Man' of Sagal

and introducing with shoehorn a strong religious element in the last section of the film. In addition, it turns

the violent but rational vampires of the original of Matheson into a mixture of bloodsucker, zombie and skinhead

that come to his hair to put another little message about racism and xenophobia. Curious point ���ste: while in

the original book the protagonist happens to be from monster hunter to monster hunted, in this 'I Am Legend' not

only does not change his point of view, but he allows himself the luxury to make a speech against racism and

violence after spending three years, three, crushing the new species to "cure them". Poor andpacifist

military, riddling "" bugs "" with his telescopic rifle. And the script that Markhave written

Protosevich and Akiva Goldsmanhas several minor inconsistencies. �s (SPOILER: if Manhattan was isolated from the

rest of the country, how does Anna and her son come in with their brand-new SUV?), But their biggest sin is to be more of a

variation that an adaptation: empties the original, grabs the shell and adds what is most convenient at this moment. The

emptying is such that until the title loses all its meaning, resorting to an embarrassing final paragraph

to try to fix it. On the other hand, the technical invoice of the product is quite good, with a successful

photograph of Andrew Lesnie and a remarkable production design by Naomi Shohan. The digital effects are more

debatable, with a design of creatures rampl���ny and very linear (even the orcs of Moria were more varied). In short

, we will never know c� How would this project have been with Arnie Schwarzenegger at the helm. We have this

simplistic and Manichean vision, halfway between the pomomitera superproduction and the cinema with message, of one of

the classics of science fiction. n of the last century. Having seen it, they could have changed the title. A 4.

" 0

" Sorry waste, money, effort and overall of a character, so special, so different, that

exceeds the inept that made this film attempt.

This movie you've been following since the end of last year, when you had to release it, has been

one of the biggest cinematic disappointments of the last years. With a story like Klimt's life, it was not

necessary to invent delusions, hallucinations, or extravagant attitudes. It often happens that reality

surpasses fiction, and in this case a figure as suggestive as Klimt's has devoured both the director and

the actor who gives life to him, a John Malkovich, who only thinks about his brilliance personal.With a scenario like

the capital of the empire at the beginning of the century, with the first world war, with the universal exhibition of

Paris and all the artists that were there, with the movement of the Austrian Secession, with Shiele and with Klimt.

With the sensuality of his art, the beauty of his allegories, with his unique style, with all this. Why? Why

do we need to invent so many other things? Focus on unimportant things with the sole intention of

impressing the viewer, which actually ends up being bored with such mediocrity, while trying to

see some of Klimt's works in the background. Trying to follow the film is impossible, because there is no such film,

only a suction of scenes without any thread that unites them, only a John Malkovic, who never gives the size. In addition to being

able to admire some of his works, and the continuous parade of naked women, there is little more interesting in

this film. And now I understand its delay and the fact that it is only projected in two halls of Madrid. Regrettable

waste, of money, effort and above all of a character, so special, so different, that it surpasses the

inept people who made this movie attempt. A missed opportunity to make a great movie. That in addition it

would have been very well received in Madrid after the two recent exhibitions of his work in the

capital, the Juan March Foundation and the Mapfre Foundation .

" 0

" This third part is a little better than the second. The argument is still not taken by any side, but at

least it is something more linear and less convoluted. Some action scenes are well resolved and others are

pathetic.

I must admit that this third part is a little better than the second. The argument is still not taken by

any side, but at least it is something more linear and less convoluted. Some action scenes are well resolved

and others are pathetic, such as "" the wedding "" in the middle of the battle of swords, and three hours of film is

still It is of great gratitude that the character of Jack Sparrow

recovers the charisma of the first part, starring a couple of excellent and surreal scenes with a multitude

of Sparrows on the scene simultaneously. . Precisely the scene of the boat in the desert with stones and

crabs is the best of the movie. Equally a success is the recovery of Barbossa, one of the best

characters of the first part. Who I expected much more is Chow Yun-Fat, who plays captain Sao

Feng, and in addition to having little charisma, in the movie looks rather good . And over the grantee to put Keith

Richards, well I find something left over, but not out of tune as I thought. What I do know is the

scene where the nine great pirates of the seas appear, not so much because of the scene itself, which is funny because of

the characterization of each one of them. the pirates, their ships and their crew, but for its consequences: an

alleged naval battle incredibly large by the number of ships in dispute remains in nothing because the

battle, without stopping be spectacular, it is fought only between the two main ships, and the others are pure

comparsa. That kind of thing, in addition to the main characters changing sides according to the wind blows andlogical

without anyexplanation is what makes the argument absurd. It's a movie, like its

predecessors, of great plastic beauty, and here I include everything from sets, make-up and costumes to

photography, special effects and Total music, if you like the previous two and you want to see three

spectacular hours, go ahead: go and see without remorse, you will like it the same. By the way, they say that,

as in the first, there is a guide at the end of the credit titles, in case they want to wait ten minutes more to

leave the room, that does not come from here.

" 0

" Joe Wright is not limited to creating images as beautiful as superficial (for-that-fits-well), or a

cheap mix of poetry and romanticism of perfume advertisement, but it is They are full of meaning and content in

this portentous film.

I have not read the novel by the British Ian McEwan, although it has been described as one of the best works of

the last years, and (almost) impossible to adapt to the cinema. Instead, I know I've seen the Joe Wright movie. And

you can guess that the starting material was not easily translatable to the big screen; but at the same

time, it makes one wonder why it was so difficult to adapt it, because Joe Wright's talent achieves the

result, relying more on the images than on the ���logos, be extraordinarily cinematographic.

Making qualit��� movies, with the British stamp, and at the same time commercial can bring you not a few enemies, and more with the

impudence and effrontery that Wright tries to join the two elements. But one can not surrender to the

results achieved. A single vision of the film is not enough to unravel even half of the

virtues and secrets of that staging full of visual ideas, and that it also dominates the montage and the

inserts of flashbacks to the thousand wonders. From the luminosity of his first act, to the gray tone of the second and

the darkness (with light at the end) of the third, Atonement is shelling several themes: desire, guilt, pain, ���tica,

ability to fiction, even the lust represented in a chocolate tablet !, in a thread of situations

threaded by a twelve-year-old girl, Briony (Saoirse Ronan), disturbed by scenes, letters and words that she

does not know how to interpret and that will cause the conflict that will mark her protagonists. Also her older sister,

Cecilia (Keira Knightley), be delivered to their chores and illusions, wrapped in bouquets of flowers, or

drowning in their tribulations and thoughts in silence, while exhaling the smoke of a cigarette,

becomes another example of a magnificent character portrait. Displaying an overwhelming amount of resources, Joe

Wright even allows himself a curious choreography during the presentation of Briony at 18 years old (Romola Garai),

among the rest of the nurses' corps of a war hospital in London. A Briony that, later, we will verify

that it is almost not capable of speaking, but of barely whispering phrases. Or the final line, with a memorable monologue

interpreted by the veteran and reputad���sima Vanessa Redgrave.Even in its middle section, the least grateful,

placing Robbie Turner (James McAvoy) in full contest of the II World War, on the French front, and

dotted with a superb sequence shot on the beach (Wright brand), where the defeated English army waits

to return to its island; the force of the narrative, leaving basically the image, and not the words,

those who transmit, seems the best despite the fact that it can lead to the (false) idea that the main story,

between the three protagonists, has been stagnant. No less brilliant is that cheeky detail of a movie

screen that projects a scene between two lovers, and in the midst of which the silhouette of Robbie is torn

between despair and the need to resume his life, in an exercise ofcinematographic vampirism.

unusualA few examples with which to show that Joe Wright is not limited to creating images as beautiful as

superficial (for-that-stay-okay), or a cheap mixture of poems� Romanticay romance of perfume ad, but

they are full of meaning and content in this portentous film of guilt and redemption, and fabled abilities

, in its double edge: for better or for worse .

" 1

" On the other hand has the virtue of not being excessively long, barely lasts an hour and three quarters, or

pretentious so that as entertainment for a silly afternoon could be worth. View in group and with a

disposition to laugh at it, it sure improves.

Everybody wants to take advantage of the success and desire of fantastic cinema for Christmas, created by the saga of

"" The Lord of the Rings "". Hence, last Christmas was released "" Las Cr���nicas de Narnia "", which threatens

to become a fairly long serial, and this Christmas we have reached this "" Erag���n "" of which we have the

consolation that there are only three novels. We'll have to get used to it, since it will not be the last film of the same

style that comes to us. "" Eragon "" is the directorial debut of Stefen Fangmeier , former supervisor of

visual effects. And in view of what has been seen it seems clear that his adventure has been, at least, unfortunate. The

direction is very flat, lacks life, personality and, because of it, the film lacks the claw and

strength that it should have. It is not that the gui� It was a wonder, because it is ultimately a

remix of elements of "" The Lord of the Rings "" and "" Star Wars "", but with a direction powerful would have been

something else. At least, maybe it would not have had the shabby look that it has, terrible detail in a film that

is sold as a Christmas superproduction full of special effects and heir to milestones like the ones already

mentioned .Little bad that Jeremy Irons passes by there and offers us some moment of charismatic,hearted performance

half-because his character does not give much, but above his company ���eros. Djimon Hounsou and John

Malkovich pass by, but little is seen, while Robert Carlyle is seen more but the truth is that it

is a painful film. What is a total disaster It is the choice of Edward Speleers as the main actor.

The kid is handsome, you can not deny, but acting is not his thing. It is difficult to understand that a woman like that

played by Sienna Guillory can be interested in such a small thing (for some reason from the first

moment she sees him, she looks at him as if she were going to brush it there). Same). The main actor is so bad that the

dragon acts better than he does. On the other hand, he has the virtue of not being excessively long, barely lasts an hour and

three quarters, or pretentious in a way that as entertainment for a silly afternoon could be worth. View in group

and with a disposition to laugh at it, it sure improves.

" 0

" This Spiderman is a hero for children, dull and infantile, and convenient to watch after

teletubbies. He just lacks the strong hug at the end. But what a goddamn guy!

Taking advantage of the output in dVd of the film, it is time to review one of the great premieres of the season. This

spider-tru���o of Sam Raimi continues in the downline of quality to which he already tries to accustom us from

his first part. I'm not sure if it's a children's film or directly a scam. For my part a zero

insurance. Another two hours and a continuous tru���o. If we remember, the first part had a first half

hour frankly good, with a presentation of characters quite adjusted to the comic. and a little more. In the second

at least we are presented with a bad guy with charisma (with the great Alfred Molina) and a tremendous scene (the one that stops

as a mono-rail can) and again little more. But this third one has nothing to hold onto. There

are no peak moments or bad ones with charisma. even Peter Parker himself is unbearable. But the truth

is that for some time now I have not expected anything from Sam Raimi, an individual who works better as a commercial than as a

director. He started doing gore and ended up selling his soul to the industry. He had already started with television

series for children, Hercules type and his cheerful company (series that go very well to see with your children of 8

years, all must be said). But now released to the superproductions with the Spiderman series, whichus

threatensto continue and continue until the exhaustion, makes waters everywhere. First the story. fuck, they are

super-heroes and it can not be very deep, but in more than two hours you have to tell something with a little judgment,

not just pile up characters that change sides as if they change their jacket. Explaining a little what

happens is not usually bad, Sammi. The argument is lamentable and is dedicated to dizzying the viewer: the sand man

seems good but then it is bad and in the end as he repents. then the goblin is bad, then loses the

memory, then bad again and finally good until he dies. The black spidy is bad until it has no

powers. The relationship between them is not achieved and with each one it seems that somethinghave been done more.

couldThen the special effects. go shit effects t���o. Even my 4-year-old daughter realizes that it is a

cartoon. It is very badly done. And the action, let's not say. All the while receiving blows against pipes.

LonClonk! Fight with the sand man. clonk fight with the goblin. clonk with the black spidy. clonk There should not

be a whore pipe in all of New York. That's it, everyone rises as if nothing, total, as they are

super-heroes. The fights are too confusing and do not contribute anything. I personally got pretty bored during the

whole action. Finally the characters. although it is true that they do not usually have too much depth here,is

the curlcurled and they are absolutely flat and linear until exhaustion. That Spiderman has it very believed ..

because it becomes unbearable of the belief that he has it, that if the bride is sad because she does not succeed. for the whole

film unbearably sad and ���o���a. If anyone has doubts about what a lineal character and

flat development is, he only has to see this film. Very bad, and the characters are emetic. The actors

adapt perfectly to the paper doing a frankly bad job, it's time to renew the faces of

the protagonists, because those now have no margin for deterioration. This Spiderman, is a hero for

children, bland and infantile, and convenient to see after the teletubbies. He just lacks thehug

strongat the end. But what a goddamn guy for god !, in the comics at least has some sense of humor, but in

the movies is a terrible tru���o. And the bad thing is that we will continue to have to endure it for a long time, since

despite everything has been one of the successes of the season. The thing is so bad that it scares to think how it will continue to get

worse in the next part. Summary: the story does not interest, the characters provoke disgust and the

effects are shit. guess the result.Puntuation: Zero stars ()

" 0

0/5" Beowulf is a milestone in the evolution and development of digital animation, but as a film it turns out

to be the most bland and anodyne, lacking in a surprising way the grandeur of the typical song that adapts

. Behind the premiere of Beowulf, there are many voices that suggest that ��� This is the future of cinema, which is the

beginning of a new conception of what cinema is in itself. Maybe that's the case, but when Final

Fantasy was released, the same thing was said, and six years have passed since then, and with the exception of Robert Zemeckis. ,

cinema is still what it was. First of all, Beowulf is a visual prodigy that shows in all its splendor the

almost unlimited capacity of digital animation, and without a doubt it will become a movie. reference for

it. However, Beowulf, as a film, leaves a lot to be desired, and it is that when it comes to the adaptation of a

typical song, the story is totally lacking in greatness and precisely in elements � Icos. Instead, it has

all the usual Hollywood mojigaterÃaa, and is that a tape of the characteristics of Beowulf, to be

credible, cries for the director to show the harshness of a battle and is not worried about looking for the

perfect pirouette so that the hero does not see the shame (ridiculous scene where there are). Faced with such a

scenario, interest is lost very quickly, and perhaps the only thing that keeps the public in suspense is the much

anticipated, promoted and publicized apparition. Deln the character of Angelia Jolie, mojigater���as aside, one of the

highlights of digital animation in the cinema.Beowulf is a milestone in the evolution and development of

animation. It's digital, but as a film it is the most bland and bland, lacking in a surprising way

the grandeur of the sing-song that adapts.

" 0

" Extraordinary comedy by the great Fernando Fern���n G���mez, fun during the entire film. "" In the year 1895, in Madrid, the situation Ethics is unstable, with continual changes in the direction

of the nation taking place. People do what they always do, gossip in visits, try to meet a good boyfriend girls,

and in the back the boys. However, a lady, virtuous, but brave and determined, is not ��� ready to lead

the lives of the other women, playing the fool, smiling incessantly at the stupidities of men. And not

working. So, that neither short nor lazy, he goes to the Ministry to ask for work. Such a fact, with noprecedents

known, will lead to a national level discussion on whether women should and / or can work together with

men. And in addition, of civil servant nothing less. Well, she is accepted and begins to work in theoffices

post, being infinitely more diligent and hardworking than men, which will cause both praise and

strong hatreds. "Extraordinary comedy by the great Fernando Fern� ��n G���mez, hilariously all the footage. You laugh a

lot a lot of scenes (all those that happen in the post office, with Erasmo Pascual

simulating first), and you smile all time. Marvelously directed, with superb interpretations

(Erasmo Pascual, Anal���a Gad���, Joaqu���n Roa at the head), a perfect setting for the great Santiago

Onta������ n, and a beautiful black and white photograph of Ricardo Torres. It leaves a place of well-being difficult to

achieve in the cinema of today.

" 1

" Emotive, Martian, hard, aggressive, fast, humorous, fun, real, scathing, ironic ... all that in little

(very little) more Eighty minutes.

Mr. Baumbach was known for making films with Eric Stolz, go curr���culum. What happens is that the

shadow / influence of Wes Anderson is elongated, and after working together in the gui���n of The life aquatic, Noah

Baumbach has directed his masterpiece.Emotiva, Martian, hard, aggressive, r�� �pida, en���rgica, fun, real,

scathing, ironic. all that in little (very little) more than eighty minutes. It is a lucky remix of Husbands and

women, The Tenenbaum and Kramer against Kramer, which a priori seem a lot of inconveniences are transformedactors

into an honest proposal of well-understood indie. Stratosphericall in some roles that they are made

to measure and in which everyone, including the children (enormous the minor, Owen Kline) give everything. Thephotograph

16mmof Robert D. Yeoman, usual for Anderson and now in Manolete, gives him that eighties touch in NY that

inevitably evokes Woody Allen. The soundtrack is also very Tenenbaum. Quietly one of the

best movies of the year. A 9���5. (and what a Baldwin comes out) Why are movies that are much superior to American

beauty (see The Ice Storm or this Brooklyn Story), they run so different fortunes?

" 1

" Visually very well worked, with a great work of direction, but a guide that never focuses or

manages to get hooked.

I imagine a film producer, with a wink on his desk, thinking: this movie is going to be the second

LA Confidential. It could have been, but it lacks a little detail, the actors with charisma, with presence

on screen. The small detail is that in addition the script is not exactly a marvel. The story, the

plot, is good, but when it became a wink, it was completely destroyed. They are a lot ofsequences

loose, which jump from one to another, maintaining a skeleton of history, but without actually materializing at

any time. The recreation of the time is great, the photography very good, even the assembly (if you like the

style with jumps) is very good, and all the work of directing It is very good, but the film that promised so much

does not just fit all its pieces. As I said before, the actors, even without doing it badly, can not

fill the screen, they do not have the strength to impress as tough guys, femme fatal ormurderers

intriguing. I do not like to refer to other films to make a comment, but in this case the similarities

with LAConfidencial are very great, to create a complex story that is giving loose pieces at

first to mount them all at the end. While in LA we followed three characters at different times, the

strength of the actors who played them (Spacey, Pierce and Crowe) joined to the relatively simple

stories, whose grace required in how they were told. , without tricks or excessively complex stories, it gave us

a perfect film, while in La Davide Negra, with a single narrator character that guides us through

the story, we completely lose the history. The problem with the Black Dahlia, is that the end does not make much

sense, and the motivations that led some characters to act in certain ways have no meaning, and

the mysteries that end without solving are more interesting than what you end up discovering, that

always disappoints you. In summary: Visually very well worked, with a great work of direction, but a guide

that never focuses or manages to get hooked, and above all, with actors, that even doing it well, they do not

transmit the force, the intensity, the greed or even the madness of their characters. It does not bore, but it does noteither

hook.

" 0

" A lot of action, many deaths, but it leaves the feeling of existential emptiness in the face of such violence without coming to

mind. In other words, I have swallowed a pound of kilo without eating or drinking it.

Legend has it that in the inscriptions of the sword of Miss Violeta (that the ultra does not know what is

coming) the formula is written to create gold, the secret of who mat� Ke Kenedy, as a simple waiter in

Spain, may in a few years become one of the greatest fortunes in the country and things like that. But nobody who has

approached enough to the edge has managed to stay in one piece and then tell it. They imagined what

the movie was about. The film is about a future world, in which a vir creados created by man to make soldiers

kill more and better , has turned a part of society into hemifages (who eat blood). As often

happens in these cases, a union between the military and doctors has resulted in a dictatorship that handlesvery

the designs of Humanitystrictly. And for a change, those who want to exterminate have put on their hands and

are dedicated to slaughtering humans. From the hodgepodge comes Ultraviolet that kills in all the film to not less than a

thousand human beings. What can I say that you do not suppose already? Let's start on the positive side. I

liked a lot of small details, such as the mobile phones of the future, and in general the little things that will be

released when the virus spreads. The action of the principle is quite good, although it ends up

exhausting, giving way to an absolute blow, in which the cruel and ruthless murderer brings out her

feelings towards a child. To all this giving wiggles of the sword to everyone who approaches. And finally it ends

in abrupt jumps between the exciting action and the no���eces that do not come to mind. And the script does not kill, no.

In addition, it is too predictable. Resuming, a lot of action, many deaths, but the feeling of existential emptiness in the

face of so much violence without coming to mind that it leaves you, has made my inner peace is cracked. Or,

in other words, that I have swallowed a pound of kilo without eating or drinking it.

" 0

" The house of your dreams is a film as ruinous and shameful as the title house. We are a few hours away from finishing one year and starting a new one, and It is inevitable that people at this

time make a certain balance of the year that is going. This year has been good, not to say excellent, for the cinema

that we have seen in our country, both nationally and abroad. If you have to put a but, is the

shortage of comedies of height, with the exception almost annual Woody Allen. In this aspect, little or nothing can be

expected from Hollywood, in 2006 the Spanish cinema has focused more on dramas, so the door has been wide

open to European comedies . It is, therefore, a genre almost in extinction, since incinema

modern, a good comedy is more rare than finding a tree with four leaves on the roof of any

skyscraper. The house of your dreams was the last of a long list of French comedies released in

our country this year, among which is that great Francis Veber fiasco called The Game of

Idiots, and that more than acceptable tender and romantic story entitled You're Very Handsome. One of the most popular topics

related to comedies is that it is harder to laugh than to cry, and hardened by experience

one has to give in to the evidence: Certainly, it is easier to make them cry desperately and bitterly,

especially if they see tapes like The House of Your Dreams. There are comedies that not only do not have the least

grace, nor entertain, but serve as a cruel martyrdom for those most in need of distraction and

laughter Dany Boon, a popular comedian in the neighboring country, debuts in directing with the adaptation of a play of

his own, which narrates the misfortunes of a poor guy when buying a country house. It does not take

many minutes for the viewer to realize the scarcity of originality and mediocrity of the proposal.

However, there appears a faint ray of hope called Daniel Pr���vost; with each appearance of his character the

film seems to go back slightly, but more for the skill of Pr���vost and the memory of a certain tax inspector

and his drinks of a wine "" pele�� �n "" that by the Boon script. And then comes the cosmic core of

history, the reforms of the country house. Suffice it to say that the dialogues and situations of any chapter of

that series by Vicente Escriv��� seem to come from a film by the Marx Brothers in comparison with

such a succession. Desn of despr���positos. If the calamities offered by the film were not enough, the

inexperience of Dany Boon in the direction provokes a total absence of rhythm, not to mention his

flat interpretation of the protagonist. . The house of your dreams is a film as ruinous and shameful as the title

house, and from here we strongly recommend that all those unhappy who sweat blood to

pay a mortgage refrain from seeing the tape, since it will provoke a furious anger in them, and they will leave the

rooms with their eyes bloodshot and a great thirst for revenge.

" 0

" Given the expectations created and the precedents ... fiasco. I do not feel like rolling up. If I had not raised so many expectations, was the face of history and was

preceded by 2 quite good parts, we would say that it is an entertaining movie that is worth seeing.

But with such precedents, I dare to say that it has been a fiasco. And I admit that I lack

technical knowledge to justify it. Because special effects and history is not lacking. However, it hasme

leftcold. Too bad (up to 4, including himself) that become good and vice versa. I liked the

music, and some scenes like the creation of the sand man. Others, like Parkerpimp or

acting like adancing, seemed ridiculous to me. In short, he just keeps hanging out and nothing else.

" 0

" Bond plays much more skin and is less predictable. Even the love story has a few drops

of truth that one does not expect from this immaculate dandy.

Casino Royale begins with a statement of intentions. 007 discovers the traitor of the organization and

while the villain lectures him about how difficult it is to kill a man, he blows his head. Bond is not,

in this installment, the unblemished man who only returns the blows without getting his tuxedo dirty. In this installment, he

seems to be competing with Ethan Hunt, and he almost wins hard. This is the Bond they would never have charged Roger

Moore. It's called "" Casino Royale "" because Bond plays a fortune with a criminal who handles the money of the

terrorists, Le Chiffre, in a casino in Montenegro. Le Chiffre is a much more real bad than the previous ones in

the series. He does not build immense futile fortresses for Bond to tear them apart. He does something much easier

to understand and to believe, while keeping the money of criminals he plays it in the bag and the cards. If he

loses the game, he knows that they will make mincemeat.Bond chases a petty criminal in Madagascar in a

collection of antichological acrobatics and pulls the line to discover a conspiracy. Enn in an airport, also

antol���gica. So he arrives at Le Chiffre. When Bond's persecutions had fallen into routine, one already knows before

entering that he is going to lose his Aston Mart���n in a ravine, the Those in charge of this delivery have decided that they could

still surprise us. Bond plays a lot more skin and it is less predictable. Even the love story

has a few drops of truth that one does not expect from this immaculate dandy, dips���mano lover of martinis.

The scene of the girl under the shower by the weight of her conscience would have signed Truffaut. There is arule

guidingthat says the second act can not end well. If it ends well, something terrible is going to happen.

Haca not really need the rule. When the protagonist has achieved what he wants and the phone does not fall, one is already

preparing for the gale.

" 1

" I do not know to what point it is worth spending the money of a movie ticket to see such a

scoundrel. Borat: The new Torrent of Kazakhstan?

Perhaps he expected a more crushing criticism of the traditional American system. Maybe I expected to re���rme more with

this surreal story that is sold as a politically incorrect comedy but that is not much more than

a succession of gags escatlogics that fall into absolute ridicule and bad taste (even came to

remind me of Jackass at times). For those who still do not know, Borat Sagdiyev is a fictional

character from British television played by Sacha Baron Cohen. Borat considers himself the secondjournalist

most famousin Kazakhstan whom they send to the US to learn about their culture and political system. This is howstarts

the surrealist film, whose main objective seems to be to criticize the most traditional and deepvalues

American. A type of the most peculiar whose hobbies are based on ping-pong, wrestling, dancing

disco music and shooting dogs.Borat is a political character, mainly because constantly he manifests his

anti-Semitism, his blatant misogyny (women are for him only prostitutes his intolerance and lack of

respect to any type of collective (he dares to get even with the handicapped), however, Sacha

Baron Cohen is judo. thatwhy Cohen advocates say that the attitude of Borat can not be

considered racist but embodies a parody of antiSemitism in American society. what is not

so clear it is whether majority public that will go to the cinemas to see the film, the one of the adolescents, it will be

taken as a parody or if the story will contribute to reinforce the stereotypes and the prejudices that they may

have with respect to the countries of I am European. Personally, what I liked the most was not so much the

scatological humor or the antics but the fact that Sacha Baron Cohen, with her character, highlights

the hypocrisy that breathes in American society and serves as a vehicle for reflection on what we

consider a civilized society. The scene in which Borat finds himself in the middle of the amazing

celebration of a meeting of fanatical Catholics is to shake if we stop to think that they are the

same individuals who vote for Bush in presidential elections and those who are exasperated byfanaticism

Islamic. The system of irreverent interviews adopted by the top reporter manages to bring out the

lowest miseries of the Americans. The last joke lies in the contradiction that the movie �cula is

sweeping through the North American box office, precisely the place to which history is heading its criticism. The

truth is that the character can not leave anyone indifferent, but I do not know to what extent it is worth

spending money from a movie ticket to see such a racket.

" 0

" A film that offers a banal show, but entertains from beginning to end. In truth, fans of John

McClane do not need much more than this, but the gui���n lacks wit and the characters are pure stereotype

without personality.

The sound of an airplane landing reopens the story, John McClane waits for Holly at theairport

Washington, again we are at Christmas, and without time or respite, the same elements appear in theJungle

Crystal( Die Hard). Men decked and armed with an impeccable plan that will not leave anything to chance. The

passages, fumes, electrodes and odds and ends of the Nakatomi building are replaced by those of an airport that

at times becomes (again) the interiors of the Nostromo ship (Alien aesthetics). And finally, McClane

is the smartest in the courtyard and he's the only one who seems to realize what's coming up in front of a policeman who

spends the whole movie screaming until the shrapnel of blancheo turns on the bell. The bad, in

this case, does not pretend to emulate the polydrial evil of Hans Grubber, intentionally turns into a

muscle with skull face, bland and predictable. In principle, the sequel that directed the very mediocre Renny

Harlin, has all the evils that a sequel can have: repetition of the scheme and the elements of its

precedent, but subjected to a banal treatment, it is reduced to the cliche, to the predictable and self-complacent,

just what opposed to what the second parts must offer; a progression towards some area of ​​meaning,

exploring the possibilities of a specific genre that had founded the new idea of ​​a hero of

action.McCtiernan, by means of a superb script and a meticulous and evocative performance, created an actionepic

film(perhaps, Crystal Jungle can to be defined as the first - and only so far -

show of action film ���pico) in which the different characters and elements harmonize in a fun and

breathtaking "" action-��� pear"". Renny Harlin almost limited to filming a vulgar film of shots and blows, which could

not be differentiated from any cheap telefilm if it were not for the reference (John McClane) used and

for some moments that reach a praiseworthy tension. Dramatic, or revisit the profile of the hero with

dignity; perhaps no other scene better defines McClane's profile than Generallanding moment

Esperanza's, when he opens the door of the airplane and says: "" freedom "", then intervenes McClane before the look

at���nita del pr���fugo, "" but who are you? "" The man who arrives at the place and time less opportune, but that,

misfortune of some and fortune of others , is the element that breaks the course of the established. And that's the kind of

hero defined in the Die Hard saga, someone who works wonders from his humanity. And in the same order of things,

we can say that at least it respects the essential personality of McClane and the images of collective hysteria at

the airport recover part of the triangle sense. In short, film that offers a banal show, but

entertains from beginning to end. In truth, fans of John McClane do not need much more than this, but the

gui���n lacks wit and the characters are pure stereotype without personality.

" 0

" The Golden Compass is Hollywood's last attempt to copy the monumental success of The Lord of the

Rings, but that remains in attempt for such a poor story that offers, devoid of all magic fantasies.

The monumental, and for many unexpected, success of criticism and public of The Lord of the Rings has caused

that the studies are sent to the desperate search of new sagas-franchises similar to the one imagined by

Tolkien. This explains the proliferation of more successful films such as The Crónicas de Narnia or Stardust, and

others totally dispensable as Beowulf, Eragon or The Six Signs of Luz.La Br���jula Dorada adapts the

first volume of the trilogy The Dark Matter, by Philip Pullman, a fantastic work but with deep

metaphysical and religious references. But as it is a film converted into a children's story,have been

mentions of these thorny issueseliminated, which has won the animosity of

fans of the Pullman saga. That said, La Br���jula Dorada is a fairly simple and vulgar story, which

does not stand out for its magic or fantasy or for its originality. Even the most cheerful will soon get tired of such a

childish plot (said in the worst sense) that if it were analyzed in depth it will provoke more laughter

than amazement. The brief appearance of actors like Derek Jacobi or Christopher Lee suggests a moredevelopment

dramaticin the next installments, but even that does not recover interest. Visual and

narratively, La Br���jula Dorada drinks from innumerable sources, such as Star Wars (attention to that

final moment of The Empire Strikes Back), The Crónicas de Narnia or El Se�� �or of the Rings. To make matters worse,

the role falls on Da Kota Blue Richards, which at times becomes abolutely unbearable. Although for

unbearable, we already have the appearances of a Nicole Kidamn and her digitally blue eyes. It is a pity that

they have not given more presence to a Daniel Craig that is the best of the film, as well as his short film.

The Golden Compass is the en� Hollywood's attempt to copy the monumental success of The Lord of the Rings,

but that remains in attempt at the history so poor it offers, lacking any fantasy or magic.

" 0

" Simply a summer surprise that as an excuse to take the kids to the movies, we can always see

the older ones and marvel at how well done they are.

As much a servant, as the other critic of Muchocine.net that accompanied me to the pass of press we were quite

discouraged to this press pass, in fact in some moments we made fun of the recent fashion of make

movies with penguins (animal that I adore), but that seems a persistent lack of ideas in the industry, in

fact at some point we confused Happy Feet and the nice penguins of Madagascar with these other birds

protagonists. However, once the tape begins, with the Greenday Soundtrack one begins to feel

quickly in tune with the protagonists, to fall in love with the whole story, and laugh again and again (with

elaborate jokes and nothing silly), with everything they tell us on the screen. I already commented that both the careful

animation of the water, and the fur of the penguins rubs both the realism as the perfect perfection, andis

that, there is no doubt that the liquid element is perhaps the most difficult to capture in terms of digital animation

, times are advancing, which is an outrage, without a doubt. History, with its final morality It's pretty

well captured, and the characters have all something to tell us, from Cody the protagonist to the friendly

surfer chicken that accompanied him, in some moments we will tear off the smile and in others they will make us shudder,

and even empañear our eyes, go, we all have in one way or another our corazoncito.Simplemente a

summer surprise that as an excuse to take the kids to the movies, we can always see the majors and

marvel at how well done you are.

" 1

" Well-intentioned but mediocre film, where it is a matter of looking back with a praiseworthy attempt to

pay homage to an already extinct world, that of the incipient sound film shot outdoors and in conditions, sometimes,

precarious

"" A young man who wants to be a writer of western novels, in the manner of Zane Gray, moves west to see

in situ the cowboys, Indians if there are, etc, to soak up the idiosyncrasies of those good and honest

people which they admire so much. However, their arrival begins with an attempted robbery by two

malefactors. In his flight, he catches them, without wanting to, money, so he will be followed by them. Meanwhile, he meets

people from the cinema who rolls western, starting a new life of extra "" Well-meaning but mediocre movie " cula,

where it is a question of looking back with a praiseworthy attempt to pay homage to an already extinct world, that of the

incipient sound film shot outdoors and in conditions, sometimes precarious. Through humor we

see parading characters , some entrajeables, others a little chorras that disappear from the movie without leaving a

trace, and a few customs that could be curious. But all this under a television plan, with

an address It's quite flat, with a not too lucky script, maybe emotional, but without a spark. There are

some good things, like the interpretation of Bridges, Blythe Danner, the mother of Gwylneth Paltrow (by the

way, Danner in this film is the vivid portrait of his daughter and how is the latter now), and Alar Arkin,

like the cantankerous director who tries to get even the blood out of his extras. No, nothing really

remarkable is this movie, although it contains at certain moments a A rather naive humor, like the

moment in which the good Bridges presents himself as a volunteer for a dangerous scene: jumping from the top of

a saloom to the saddle of his horse. Needless to say what happens when falling from a lot of height to the chair.

"" French omelette "", in effect.

" 0

" Bathed in sinister tones at the same time as buffoons, it transports us to a world in which the sea and those who

inhabit it give life to a universe with which to dream. As in a book by Stevenson, as in goodfilms

adventure, the important thing is to give a show, a show with a soul.

When The Curse of the Black Pearl hit the billboards around the world, a certain state of mind had already

been fixed in the minds of the moviegoers. The decade of the nineties, insipid as far as cinema

is concerned, left us with a bitter sensation (in favor of supposed vanguards of high intellectual copete,

with Lars Von Trier leading the new moves) and the eighties began to be erected as the golden age to

which to pay a cult of nostalgia. In the eighties they saw the light of the three great trilogies that, since then,

were and should be the model to follow, the canon for a well-made entertainment cinema: Indiana Jones

(Steven Spielberg), Return to the future (Robert Zemeckis) and the original Star Wars trilogy (George Lucas, Irvin

Keshner and Richard Marquand, plus the priceless work of Lawrence Kasdan and Leight Bracket in writing). In

2003, the movie Gore Verbinski's movie ended a wait. In general, the comments of a large

part of the public came to say that of "" finally, a film of adventures in conditions "". In conditions,

I stress. The conditions are the canon. And the adventure genre has some golden rules that never fail: it is not

necessary to be original, give life to the characters, breath typical of the plot and that the camera

translates into a Absorbing visual style (montage, rhythm, framing). The fun is served. From an

immortal icon, the figure of the pirate, of great relevance in both the history of cinema and literature, the

industrial giant Jerry Bruckheimer fabric��� a product thought and designed to become one of the

biggest blockbusters in history (it is on its way to becoming one). It is not a question of tastes or tendencies

that the icon has a fascinating power that tunes in a special way with the adolescent and

youthful public. The pirate, as an icon, as an idealized and archetypal figure, brings together the concepts of rebellion

(enti���ndase, for the juvenile sensibility of our times, wildlife, anarchy, "" hooliganism "" ), freedom

and adventure. Not in vain, in one of the scenes, Jack Sparrow (Johnny Depp) runs in palaver thatus

remindsof the famous "" Pirate song "" by Espronceda. The pirate remains a hallmark of

romanticism, that magic, that mystery and veneration mixture of admiration and contempt for an immoral andlife

adventurous, tune well with the young public assiduous popcorn and the pastime without setbacks and with

people of all ages, all included, those who grew up in the heat of Errol Flyn's sword and those who

did it by pushing Luke Skywalker's lightsaber . Bruckheimer's sense of smell was not mistaken: Jack Sparrow,well

asas the remaining cast, is a firm embodiment of the romantic archetype of the pirate. But under a

new varnish, more pulp, more Kitsch, trivializing -it is only an assumption- the figure of the pirate forconsumption

quicker and easieraccording to the structure commercial of cinema in our days. It's nothing new: the key to

the success of the original trilogy of Star Wars was to play, based on ingenuity, heart illusion, with

archetypes of the story and legends universal but "" putting them in drawers "" to the taste of the consumer as a

function of a very specific socio-cultural moment. We can not say too much about Verbinski: he demonstrates knowing the

field in which he moves and is a correct executor of the idea made by Bruckheimer, inspired by a

Disneyland attraction and a videogame, "" Monkey island "". The story: between the legend and the historical pseudo

follet���n, we are told a story about pirates and pirates. The small Elizabeth Swann (Keira Kinghtley)

opens the function while reciting a song of exaltation to the life of the pirate. It is the sign that tells us what

the closing of the narrative will be like, in which the same representatives of royalty and order give in to the

charm of a pirate in flight, a maiden and a blacksmith apprentices in the life of the sword, the freedom, the

buccaneers and the lost treasures. As we have already pointed out, romanticism involves the narrative with the aim

of maximizing that charming halo of the pirate. The argument is based on pretite facts that are

revealed As the action progresses: a group of pirates in search of the Aztec treasure. There was a motive to banish

Captain Sparrow, who will be abandoned to his fate on a remote island. William Turner, known as "Bill the

Boots", decides to be faithful to the pirate code and disobeys the orders of Barbosa, pronouncing himself against the

motive against Sparrow. Barbossa sends "" the boots "" to the depths of the ocean as punishment for his disloyalty. When

the greed of Barbosa's group leads them to steal the gold, the Aztec curse falls on them. The only way to

undo the spell is to return the gold along with the blood of Turner, whose son was left at

sea ​​along with the piece of gold that will serve as connection to the past and motor of the present narration. As

we see, the story has all the ingredients of a pirate legend that could have existed in thefolklore

popularof the time. Verbinski introduces us not only in a mere history of pirates, goes beyond that and

forges a pirate legend in which the two worlds, the fantasy and the real, seem to coexist following some

rules: Will and Elizabeth are the reality of the present. Barbosa, Captain Sparrow and the other crew of the

black pearl are slaves of the past, a past of betrayals, mysteries, enchantments: the curse of

barbosa and theirs, which prevents that they can taste the rum (expressive and grotesque the scene in which the swallow of

rum slips between the skeletal guts of Barbosa) or the perennial madness of Sparrow. Nevertheless, the film

always keeps a tone humorous that refers us to pure entertainment without excessivelypretensions

dramatic: although there is something of desolation in those pirates condemned to an eternal death, the story goes

smoothly, but without wanting to be taken too seriously in the same way, in which the show reigns for the

show, the gimmicky gimmick, the socarr������ dialogue and the auto par��� gesture dico.La spectacular visual energy

shows all the unique elements of the pirate r���aa frenetic rhythm: the ghostly ships and with the sails in

the wind, the waves of the sea that strike on the pole and the bow, the anchor in the bottom of the sea , the buzz in

the duels between swordsmen, the rumble and artillery of the canyons, the paradisaic beaches of the Caribbean,

the grotto of the treasure. The proper orchestration of all of them - in a certainly irregular assembly, because the

rhythm drops are quite noticeable in some sections - translates into an overwhelming spectacle in which the

spectator can almost smell the p� ��lvore, feel the violence of the battles between buccaneers or evoke the magic of

a marine legend. The cinema spectacle, more than solid and mature contents from anpoint of view

intellectual, is composed of sensations and evocations. Obviously, each viewer lives this pirate adventure in

images in their own way, and some may even get bored on the way. But that Verbinski's film has

enough elements to evoke sensations (those that feel like a good adventure film) and

a story represented with a visual style, at least, striking , and a structure, at least,

acceptable, that is something unquestionable. Tastes, as we usually say, have nothing to do with it. It is the

characteristics and textures inherent to the creative creation that center our discourse and our

evaluation, according to the norm of the house. The film also keeps a romance between Will Turner and Elizabeth Swann, and

is solved in the most pure classical style, with a final kiss after the sustained tension. over 150

minutes, which is a virtue, eliminates any excess sweetener so frequent in this type of productions

(I love you-kiss-I love you-kiss-I love you-kiss.) In the adventure cinema, the Characters can not fail.

Genuineness, freshness, pungent dialogues. In that sense, the results may be somewhat

unbalanced. There are two actors (and two characters) who, without a doubt, fill the screen and give

character to the story: Barbosa (Geoffrey Rush) and Captain Jack Sparrow. It seems that Jack Sparrow, over

time, it is becoming an icon of the current entertainment cinema and is one of the mostcharacters

originalof today in its field (come on, a character that can not be said that is a plagiarism or

rehash of topics, to have his genuine style). Johnny Depp's eccentric and enigmatic personality comes in handy

to set up a hero-anti-hero who stands at a neutral point between the interests of

and others, endowing the character with an ambiguity that complements very well his clownish profile and his

deliberate self parody (Sparrow is a pirate of tom and loin, but, in addition, mocks his own condition. ���n as a

pirate, let the reader know that what Sparrow does is a parody of Errol Flyn, his personality embodies

the spirit of the film: an epic legend story that , at the time, it does not take itself seriously.). On behalf

of who is Captain Sparrow? We will not know until the final minutes of the film. Considering that the

adventure cinema does not need complex characters to work and fulfill its objective, a character like

Sparrow is a luxury and a highlight to the franchise. The characterization of an attraction, a few ways and aaspect

physicalthat combines the masculine and the feminine, and gives it a certain androgynous air. De Barbosa we will not say much

more: simply a bad guy with a claw, sense of humor and bad milk, antithesis of Sparrow, what in that is

bufoner���ay and parody, in Barbosa he contrasts the seriousness and traditional pirate behavior. The problems come

from here: Orlando Bloom is one of the worst actors in the current cinema, and his character William Turner,

apart from typical and predictable, suffers because of the null expressive resources of the mentioned actor. Keira

Knightley does a correct job, but his records and his physicist are exaggeratedly stereotyped, with

which the character loses a lot of freshness, and that shows in the overall result. The other big problem of the tape

has to do with the assembly work. The footage is excessive. If instead of 150 minutes it lasted about 125 it would

save some downs in the rhythm and the feeling of adventure will be emphasized by gaining in fluency and

interest. As we can see, it does not reach a perfect finish, but "" The curse of the black pearl "" is an achievement

for the recent adventure cinema, the best find in the last twenty years ( which is not saying much

considering the almost total absence of productions in this genre, and the garbage to which we are

accustomed). And for its detractors, we want to say it very clearly: there each one with your likes, but it's

Hypnotized not recognize the virtues of this film of adventures when no one questions the merits,

quality and myth of In Search of the Lost Ark. We are not saying that it will have the transcendence and

depth that the Indiana Jones trilogy had and has (time will tell), but if we look exclusively

at the properties and characteristics intrinsic to each of them, if we want to see defects in one,

we can find them in the other. Idem for the qualities. The curse of the black pearl, an adventure

about the pirates and the iconography of their legend, bathed in sinister tones at the same time as buffoons,us

transportsto a world in which the sea and those who populate it give life to a universe with which to dream. As in a

book by Stevenson, as in good adventure films, the important thing is to give a show, a show with a

soul.

" 1

" Painful sequel to a painful tape that becomes a doubly painful experience. And there will be third

punishment. Will we be masochists?

Stuck in a job, conjured to get something positive out of this mess of acoustic-imbecile inspiration - it's the

first time he married those two adjectives, maybe not the last one -, White noise 2: Light escapes the trash

of terrifying intent that meets the expectations of many teenagers abused and ���vives ofemotions

strongto free them from their insipid leisure of last generation consoles. There are no generous

-breasted barbies who run away from a spasmodic psycho-killer. There are no incipient acne babies who swing between love for the

presumed victim and the censorship of their Venoreous impulses. That is why this summer film installs us in astage

higher: that of the scarcely demanding adult who feels comfortable in the role of compulsive consumer of everything

that has a supernatural vocation. It does not matter that half-haired ghosts, esoteric plots orsecrets

Merovingianhidden in a cellar for at least a thousand years. Literaturethese

suffers fromfrivolous exercises of historical stupidity. I have said literature and maybe I should have used another lessword

noble. Something similar happens with the cinema. I have no doubt that this film is cinema, of course, but it is so

blatantly billed for its consumption and so far removed from artistic parameters that it would be necessary to go looking for another

word in which to lodge it. Cinema, cinema understood as something intelligent and beautiful, there is no or maybe I did not have

the proper day to appreciate it and, in fact, the real cinema runs through some of its

frames yam��� , what are we going to do, I got yawning, closing my eyes slightly, thinking about something

else, about friends I do not see for a long time or about the time that I do not have a museum, I put it This

story of premonitions and hearing scares more or less achieved has no heart or soul. Neither brain

with which to engage in an honest conversation. Everything is carried away by that already harsh way of nipponizing

terror and giving it packing of phantasmagoria of height, when what it reaches is to deliver an infamous hodgepodge

of mediocrities sold as excellences, of pathetic scares and of weak characters, barely supported

by an invisible plot that stretches until bored and wish that the footage ends and one can go out to the

blessed street and breathe the urban reality, which is more prosaic than the string of lies that have told us,

but that infinitely more enthusiasm. The supernatural genre, which they bang without consideration, seems to

become the telefilm balance of the desktop, although the production notes that I have read after seeing (ay) The

film insists on the novelty of the special effects and the exquisite love that the whole team professes for

this type of argument. Well, they have piffed it, and they have muddied a little more the summer billboard, which does not

shine too much. But we already knew that.

" 0

" Those who are expected to wreak movies will do better by staying at home than by swallowing this

sweetened inter-species love story.

Vivian lives in Bucharest, works in a chocolate shop and among her hobbies is practicingfrom time to time

"parkour". He also has a large extended family that likes to constantly tell him what to do and

what not to do. One night, after fighting with them for the longest time, he meets a young American cartoonist

(forgiven, "" graphic novel "") and soon falls in love of .l. The problem is that the boy in question,

Aiden, is human, and Vivian is a "" loup-garou "", a wolf-woman belonging to a race that has been around

the world the last five thousand years. As expected, the thing brings problems when the cong���neres

Vivian decide to end this romance so sui generis, since the girl does not seem to settle down (as if the

fact of being a cartoonist of c�� �mics does not ensure for itself only a large-scale family conflict). This,

in broad strokes, is the plot of Blood and Chocolate (2007), a film that has been titled in Spain. with the

dubious title of the brand of the wolf, adding to the confusion that lends itself as a genre, since wenot

arereally talking about a film of terror, no matter how much they appear in it, anxious to

sink their teeth into human flesh. As in the novel on which it is based, we find ourselves here before a

fantasy film directed explicitly at the female adolescent sector and that will tend to alienate any

another type of expectador. And is that if we add that after this film are the same producers

responsible for Underworld (2003), it is more than clear that here does not paint anything who does not belong to thecommunity

EMO. As for the similarities with the novel (which I have not read), these are apparently nil, which is

irrelevant at the moment. The mark of the wolf is, however, a difficult film to review, since it is completely

dispensable. Everything in it promises an endless series of clichés, from that photograph of the mostbuildings

emblematicin Bucharest (which could pass through a brochure tur�� �stico of the Romanian capital) until theadventures

amorousof a Romeo and Juliet with lic���ntropos of by means. The werewolves, by the way, are not shown as

monsters b���pedos, but as human beings who are literally transformed into wolves in the midst of a flash of

magic light. At first, the story does not look bad at all, showing them even as beings that impart a

certain social justice in the underworld of the city, all ruled by their leader Gabriel (an Olivier Mart��� nez

putting the accent more chungo than it goes of year). The young couple does not finish hammering, although

Agnes Bruckner leaves here much more beautiful than the schoolgirl from El bosque maldito (2006). Hispartner

casting, Hugh Dancy, on the other hand, is dull to the point that he could be called the Orlando Bloom

of the poor. The wolves never feel like threatening beings, and during the final stretch theprotagonist

maleacquires some inexplicable heroes of action that certainly do not favor him. Among the few

virtues that we can find it is that, within all, the film becomes passable and more bearable than it would

be expected. It goes to what is going and at no time tries to go through what it is not (except, of course, the

publicity that the study made of it). Those who go with very low expectations could even

enjoy it and let go of those embarrassing video-clip moments in which history sets us a

musical transition with the sole objective of advancing the plot. Everything in this film is so light and so

forgettable that it is difficult to be preoccupied with it, much less after returning from vacation. Those

who are expected to make movies will do better staying at home than swallowing this sweetenedstory

inter-species love. As a final note, I can only add one thing: to be a member of a thousand-year-old race of

powerful anthropophagic creatures and to receive a beating from a cartoonist of metrosexual comics must be one

of the most regrettable experiences in the life of any lic���ntropo that is respected.

" 0

" Unfortunately, that outburst of originality in the idea does not transform work into andocumentary

exciting.

The title and the introduction of this post imitate the provocative intentions of the film. Of course the

proposal is original. Dangerous for some. Very desired by others. In any case, a product that unleashes

curiosity to know what that moment would be like. Come on, one of the ingredients that would be necessary for a film

to become a box office or downloaded on the internet. Unfortunately, that outburst of originality in the

idea does not transform the work into an exciting documentary. The main attraction of this documentary would be to see

how the world is after the assassination of the most powerful and donkey president of the moment. But it is dedicated

exclusively to invent a theory of who is the murderer. The American cinema has taken a significant turn when

seeking enemies in their conspiracies and wars. If before it was theand Schwarzzeneggers that

Stallionskilled Iraqis and other ethnicities that hated America, now the bad guys are always at home. Some traitor. Some

madman who considers himself a patriot. Some unconscious who trains abjbaros who then attempt against them. The

documentary feeds and closes based on the figure of President Bush: his murderer is a soldier who returned

traumatized from the war in Iraq and wanted to adjust the accounts to the culprit. However, since theservices

American intelligenceare not that smart, they blame a Muslim with a dark past ofmurder. The

the president'smain attraction for this documentary would be the repercussions of that murder in the USA. and in

the world. Would Cesar follow the Iraq war? Will it expand to other countries? How would it affect the rest of the

world? Would the Americans honor and assassinate a murdered Bush like Kennedy? This documentary does not get wet and does not

answer any of those questions. A pity

" 0

" Once again, Fincher has taken another unexpected turn of the screw, has released us a new artistic bofeton

to make a true masterpiece and add it to his surprising, heartbreaking and brave filmography. to. Cinema

on all four sides.

With Seven, Fincher recovered, renewed, influenced and promoted a whole new fashion and genre of movies and

television series about murderers serially. When we thought that after the insufferable saturation of

"" ceaseies "" and imitations of that masterful proposal of Fincher, there was no breath left or creative space

for anything else, Fincher returns with the surprising Zodiac, which is also based on real events, with what we

know from the beginning the end of the film and the solution to the plot, championing again the most dif Easy still.

Fincher never loses sight of his own style, his vision, his intentions, the exact dose with

which to seize the viewer's reason. With an overwhelming talent and an amazing precision, he manages to

freeze our blood with the first appearances of the murderer or grab us to the seat in the beststyle

"Hitchcock". However, we soon discovered that the real protagonists are the investigators, the

police and all those who got involved professionally and personally in a police case, exasperating, dense and

enigmatic that was transformed without remedy in a true media show. The story is largely left to

the victims or the colorful choreographies of their deaths and focuses on universal feelings such as

despair, hope , tenacity and obsession. Fincher gives up looking for answers, or reasons, because

all these are unknown. It does not provide absolute light, because the real facts still today are still in

shadow. Zodiac has an extensive footage, and at the same time, also with a staging and asetting

rigorous, a proper and serious cast, a contained and masterful performance and some isolated flashes that

will be, without a doubt, in the annals of the history of cinema. Cinema on all four sides in almost three

hours where we immerse ourselves fully in a dark plot, in a dead way and without exit, but that manages to

keep us in continuous dramatic tension. More you can not ask for. Fincher, this time, ejects from class to its

habitual spectator, the generation of television, frenetic advertising, video consoles,

Blockbusters and video clips. That great majority used to the cataract of images, to the zapping, to the

speed, the gags, the popcorn, the lit cars and the emule.Fincher has realized here a a

meticulous, honest and precise film with the existing material, like an exemplary cinematographic exercise, renouncing

for it more commercial and frivolous aspects. Once again, Fincher has taken another unexpected turn of the screw,

has released a new artistic bofeton to make a true masterpiece and add it to his surprising,

heartbreaking and brave filmography.

" 1

" Let's see if now there's going to be an apology to entertain the audience with dignity ... Let's go in parts: this third segment of the "saga" has been dispatched by the critics Mission

impossible "" motej���ndolo, contemptuously, as "" pure entertainment "". And what? Are notpure entertainment

masterpieces such as "" Treasure Island "", "" Journey to the center of the Earth "" or "" Moby Dick ""?see if now there is going to be an

Let'sapology to entertain the public with dignity. That being said, we do not mean that "Mission: Impossible III"

is a masterpiece, far from it: it has a lot of strength in the beginning electrifying, that remembers the

sadomasochism of the best Tarantino, and continues with good pulse, with scenes of action splendidly resolved,

like the pursuit of the helicopters in the field of ghostly windmills or the attack of the fighter on the

bridge. Then it is true that the tone decays, especially when you have to start explaining the reasons for the

betrayals (what the series would be, worth the almost redundancy, without betrayals), but a� That is how the tone is, in

general, satisfactory. There is not, it is true, readings on transcendent topics, but neither was asked, as

no one in his right mind would have asked, in his time, to that splendid homonymous television series that

lulls the childhood dreams of an entire generation that today is (or pretends to be.) adult. They are, of course,

the typical ones. facial masks that hide personalities, which is one of the "" leit motiv "" inevitable in the

series, both television and film, and there are certainly impossible scenes, like the rolling of the hero

of a building another in Shanghai, with free fall through a sloping roof, a nonsense of

impossibility, but what remains of the most. So, JJ Abrams, the creator oftelevision series

cultlike "Lost," confirms himself as a man of good spirits as a director, in which he is his first

film. for large screen. Cruise is already very confident in his role as Ethan Hunt, to whom he has taken the

measure, and it is convincing. But the one who takes the cake is, of course, a Philip Seymour Hoffman, recently awarded

by "" Truman Capote "", who here makes a villain of those who leave their mark: cold , absolutely lacking

scruples and feelings, a bad beast with a squeeze that can demand a place in the olympus of the

great bad guys of the cinema.

" 0

" Spielberg has managed to reach the political correction without neglecting the necessary formal incorrectness.

He was scared but in very good company to see the new film by Spielberg. The Renoir Princesa were

overflowing. I see terrified in the tab of the film that lasts 2 hours and 44 minutes. My mother, whatme.

awaitsTo begin with, Spielberg is a great director, but as I have already affirmed on several occasions, his

films always have their characteristic stamp based on certain sweetened moments Not to mention ���o���os, taken

directly from the vital philosophy of the great Capra. Since the filming of this film was announced, I was eager to

see how to treat it. Ela king Midas a theme as rugged as current inspired by a tragic event happened in

the 70 and based on a novel. Of all the new maturity path of the Jewish genius is known. He talks about

universal themes from multiple genres such as science fiction (in AI's boilerplate as well as in the interesting

Minority Report) or picks up his stupendous vein of entertainment with films of pure evasiveness. And emotion like Atr���pame

if you can and The war of the worlds. In Munich Mr. Spielberg has managed to reach the political correction

without neglecting the necessary formal impropriety. And like any good film, it does not only speak of the Jewish response to the

murder of its athletes, but of the inner hell of a man who is capable of executing orders without

moral problems until he is in a cycle of violence and paranoia without end. And obviously begins to

question what he does. All this on the shoulders of a great Eric Bana.A wonderful movie with

some interpretations of prize but something long. His best virtue is that he has uncovered from Spielberg a newvein

creativein which he knows how to renounce, as he mentioned with Cronenberg and Allen, his words and gui���os to give

way to a cruelty and realism seldom seen in his movies. It should be noted that John Williams, prolific teacher

where they are, has achieved double nomination in the imminent Oscar ceremony, something excessive that eliminates

the possibility that other good composers like my admired Harry Gregson Williams, will make a hole.

" 1

" A telefilm without a hint of any personality, ideal for a Saturday or Sunday after-dinner. What can be expected from a novel written by a young immature year that counts the idea occurred to him at

15 years old, and he saw the book published at 20, together with what some Hollywood screenwriter can do, which he

usually treats the audience as if they did not have Is it 12 years old? And if the project is entrusted to a

director, Stefen Fangmeier, debutante, and throwing mediocre. What is the result? Well: "" Eragon "", the beginning of

a new (���ejem!) And great trilogy for Christmas. But I will skip the usual criticism to establish another

comment, by way of game. So he will go on tiptoe saying that Stefen Fangmeier is revealed as a

filmmaker without spark, a mere illustrator completely denied to use the general plan and both for action

scenes and m��� s intimate. Or that he resorts to the aerial panoramas of landscapes and to situate

the characters that Peter Jackson made fashionable with "" The Lord of the Rings "". Although Fangmeier uses them more

to make us dizzy. Or that the picture is of a monotone hue, and that everything happens, including dialogues, is

of a topicazo that pulls back. Beyond all this, I propose the relationship that follows

about the points in common with a trilogy that, for obvious , will not quote the title. Star Dracs.The entrant

20Th Century Fox producer is behind the project, and the protagonist is a young orphan farmer. who lives

with his uncle. He is also blonde and seems to have a special value. And it's not called Luke Skywalker without Eragon

(Edward Speleers). Eragon listens fascinated to the stories of a glorious past about riders and dragons who

fought against Evil, ���vaya! as if they were the Jedi in the? clinical wars. Jeremy Irons, who recites his

dialogues as if he were playing Shakespeare, is Brom, a clear-cut emulator of Obi-Wan Kenobi.Arya (Sienna

Guillory), although he does not reveal himself. n in this movie, is an elf princess. And young Eragon will be captivated

by his beauty through the dreams and visions (not holograms) that he has, and he will throw himself to his rescue. "Ahh,

we have Princess Leia!" Robert Carlyle plays the fearsome sorcerer Durza. Perhaps to express himself better

after the weight of his makeup, Carlyle, with his huge laughter makes clear to us, in case we did not have it, that he is

the villain of the function. It belongs to the category of "" shadow "", but in reality it is an excellent specimen of

sith. John Malkovich is King Galbatorix, the great evil man who has seized power. He would be like the emperor,

but perhaps his (supposed) charisma will bring him closer to Darth Vader. There is a base of rebels, the Varden, who do

not hide in the fourth moon of the planet Yavin without � in a rocky area with difficult access. His leader, Ajihad

(Djimon Hounsou), resembles Lando Calrissian. He speaks of "" magic "" as if it were "" force "". Some

sword is very similar to lightsabers, and instead of l���ser ca���ons there are flashes. There is also no missing ascene

racethrough a narrow passageway. And reference is made to the "" fear "", not as what can lead you

to the dark side, but to the courage (that not everything will be the same). The millennial dragon.A R2D2 and C3PO have been

left, but I understand that in the novel, not in the film, there appears a dwarf Orik.La dragon Saphira,

���la authentic star of the function No, I fancy a kind of version of the Millennium Falcon, but endowed

with life and the ability to speak. And Han Solo? As the projection progressed I was asked this question. And

I have to tell you that he also appears, ���s��� sir���, in the forms of a young boy with black hair. To

finish, he will resume the criticism to insist that Fangmeier is very poor in his staging, especially in the

combat sequences. And even fails at important moments like this is the first time that Eragon rides the

dragon (? ��� and avoid any easy joke about it!) "" Eragon "" is a telefilm without a hint ofpersonality

any, ideal for any after-dinner on Saturday or Sunday. And as it has sequels, a couple more in the portfolio, the

question is whether Yoda will appear in the second one. Taking into account the disappearance of one of the characters, I would

say that yes. If someone wishes to contribute, or correct me, in something else, I would appreciate their contributions.

" 0

" Work risky, reflective, virtuous, necessary and really fabulousWith a press release to release, came to see, in the morning, this tape without knowing too much about it. The

films, either reach the viewer or definitely stay on the road. "" The Lord of War "", in my

case, has managed to make a dent. It has overwhelmed me, entertained me and I have enjoyed it generously from the first

moment. It begins with an absolutely brilliant sequence, that summarizes, during the initial credits, the

global intention of its footage. An amazing subject of a bullet, from its manufacture until it manages to

take the life of a human being. Its director, Andrew Niccol is responsible for the inspiring "" Gattaca "",

who also wrote "" The Truman Show "" and "" The terminal "". In this case, he faces a very

complicated guide because of his risky and controversial subject. There were not a few American producers who came out

running before such a project, and a large part of the financing has come from foreign producers. There are

several points that they made, of the supposed success of this project, an almost impossible mission: A plot that

flirts with the documentary, despite being mere fiction and, at the same time, getting overwhelmed in thesection

visual. Mixing both formats is never an easy task and the result, when it works, is something that,amazes

personally,me. With a similar theme, but as a mere documentary, the mostus more than a year

shocking and essential "The nightmare of Darwin" came toago. Easy is to succeed in a

plot oriented by a voice-over. I suppose that the negative criticisms could arrive at precisely this point.

In my opinion, in this case it works, at least it is not out of place and it does not chirp, that is enough. Another section is

to try to achieve the necessary empathy with a protagonist who is a real despicable andson of a bitch

unscrupulouswho does not hesitate a second to trample, buy and sell to his own family to get

to rise up in an office, so morally respectable, as is the illegal traffic of arms and the financing of

wars and massacres in half the world. This character is Yuri Orlov (Nicolas Cage), a character inspired by five

supposedly real characters that here are one. A Ukrainian victim of the American dream, who once

in the New York of the eighties, manages to become a powerful and respected billionaire thanks to his

talent in black international arms marketing. An atrocious and destructive character capable of moving mountains

with only blinking and that we recognize right away, because it represents those white men thatus

Michael Moore warnedabout in his books and in his documentaries And precisely what terrifies us is to really

feel that strange empathy towards the character, and to be able to understand their motivations and their arguments: "The

tobacco companies also market with death and do not they are persecuted "" "And if my business is not currently

illegal enough to stop me, it is because who makes the laws in the world are my best clients

or my bosses" "" "What is it? Das da ?, if I disappear, another will come immediately in my place "" And so, Yuri, when,

terrified, his wife, an international model that he was worried about buying As if it were only the

diamond of a luxury jewelery shop, it asks you to please leave the business once and for all,

he replies: "I can not, because this really is very good for me "" And we also recognize ourselves immediately in the

wife of Yuri, (Bridget Mohynahan) prostituted by the luxuries, for the money, so material, but at the same time,

alone and disconsolate personally, like any real person in our consumerist, materialist andsociety

capitalist. And then there's Yuri's brother, (Jared Leto) embodying the role of the other side of the currency of

this modern society, that "" American Dream "", as a victim, as a broken and drug addict,

witness and part of Yuri's bloody business, so millionaire, as corrupted as ���ly so empty

inside. And that elitist world of power and exacerbated luxury comes into conflict with the portrait of athird

helpless, rotten and hungryworld, victim of wars, diseases and misery.

Victims of their own dictators, clients of exception of that black market and the globalization plunder of the

western multinationals. Ethan Hawk interprets on this occasion an Interpol policeman who, tirelessly,

tries to persecute and arrest Yuri. A kind of cricket pepito that symbolizes our moral conscience, a

kind of weirdo, helpless in its tenacious struggle for a lost cause. There will be those who may see here a

slow film or boring. For me, it is a risky, reflective, virtuous, necessary and really

fabulous work. The music is careful, the script works, despite not reaching the size of "" Scarface "" or

"" Goodfellas "", and the visual invoice is much better that remarkable, replete with symbolism and black humor. In

short, one of the best movies I've seen in recent years. A nice discovery with

a unique but, I have not done it.

" 1

" The overall impression left by the film is like that of a decaffeinated coffee, not very satisfactory, but

not totally unpleasant either.

In Darkness, despite what the title may suggest, a film of suspense, with dramatic overtones (or maudlin

if you will), a tale of ghosts with a dramatic tone Ethical, more than a horror movie. The

new film by Craig Rosenberg brings us back after a while without appearing on screen, Demi Moore,

who was in the not too distant past, one of the highest paid actresses cinematographic industry fica.La

successful writer's life of the character of Demmi Moore is truncated after the death of his son. After the child

's eventful death - of which the mother feels deeply guilty - Rachel's marriage is

broken and her creativity as a writer vanishes, so she is forced to move to a solitary place to

try recover your inspiration and your emotional stability. The writer goes to live in a lonely little house

on the farthest tip of Wales, on the island of Ynys Landwynn. A place of wild beauty, with long beaches and

a lighthouse that takes on special importance. There Rachel begins to experience chilling visions of her son, and

begins a romance with her next neighbor, Angus McCulloch (Jamie Edgell), a lighthouse keeper who lives in a small

Island in front of the house. Visions appear more frequently and there are all kinds of events that nobody else

can see (apart from the town's madwoman). The argument is full of topics such as the of the man / woman / family

that moves to an abandoned house and begins to perceive signs of ghosts. The film is not very original but it

manages to keep you in tension with some scares. Throughout the script there are constanttwists

plotthat get rid of the hypothesis or theory that the viewer can formulate regarding the

course of events. Especially, in the middle of the film, the argument changes radically in a

way that can be considered something forced but also takes a little away from the typical outcomes of this

genre of film. .Culas. Thus, the overall impression left by the film is like that of a decaffeinated coffee, not very

satisfactory, but neither totally unpleasant. Recommended for those who would like to receive signals from

beyond. And it is that as it says in a scene the lover of the writer: "" The dead may throw us

more than we do to them ".

" 0

" Cuar���n has achieved a balance between message and show, so rare in these days that it is

hypnotizing. If this film had been filmed by a consecrated teacher, at this point many would already talk about

classics.

2027: There are no more children in the world. The initial premise of 'Children of men', directed by Alfonso Cuar���n, is

not given to us in a sign like 'Star Wars', or by a voice-over, or the characters are put to speak

directly about it . Cuar���n lets the futuristic thesis of the original story of PD James be, simply, the

straw that has filled the glass of a world as deranged as, for example, the one in which we live. And it develops the

whole ambience of the story from that final unhingedness. Countries devastated, prey to

anarchy. Anti-immigration laws taken to the extreme. Terrorism threatening all kinds of citizens,

perpetrated both by radical groups and by the same government. Fatalism and despair in the

citizens, who know that the human race is left with only a generation of life. In this environment, Theo Faron

is more disenchanted. Official of the English government (the only country apparently in standing), resigned to the

atrocities that happen around. He has also accepted the world that he has lived. But one day he is

"" recruited "" to help Kee, an illegal immigrant, escape from the country. That day will change his life forever,

and it will awaken a conscience that has been dormant for too long. It must be recognized that theproposal

Cuar���nis a simple story, and already told . But this is one of those rare occasions when cinema

counts more through the world of the characters than through the characters themselves. The plot seems more an

excuse to take to the last, apocalyptic consequences, the trajectory that the human race we have

marked. In each general plane, in each panoramic, we find so much information that it is almost unnecessary

to advance the story through the script. Cuar���n has built a world so real that the only thinghave to

the actorsdo is to limit themselves to (over) living in it. This is the greatest of 'Children of Men': not

only part of a suggestive situation to tell a story, it develops a world based on that situation, and

makes his characters take us through that world, giving rise to the story.As���, very convincing Clive

Owen as the disenchanted Theo; effective Julianne Moore as Julian; vulnerable and emotional Claire-Hope Ashitey

as Kee; and great secondary casting, with Michael Caine, Peter Mullan, Chiwetel Ejiofor and Pam Ferris in

the lead. In my opinion, the characters are always coherent with their nature, and when they give up the

protagonism they do it before the horror that unfolds before them; What some people call blurred characters,

I call it giving importance, at every moment, to what interests us. And Cuar���n is clear when the protagonist

is that monstrous world that surrounds Theo Faron. The technical section, simply irreproachable. The comparisons

with 'The war of the worlds' are deserved, because Cuar���n, like Spielberg, plays the trick of letting theworld

createdspeak for themselves. When other films, such as 'V de Vendetta', play at the same time without showing it,

making the characters talk about how bad everything is, Cuar���n is right to put us on full in that reality,

to let us escape by the hair in each sequence. Photography, costumes, art, FX,

make-up, form a whole in which the most amazing visions are possible, from the famous giantpig

Pink Floydflying over London to a assault with heavy artillery on a suburb of the south of England

full of insurgents and refugees. And mention apart the work as director of Cuar���n, spectacular throughout

the film, but bordering on the impossible in several shots of virtuoso sequence; although I am left with an image

that summarizes the philosophy of the staging of 'Children of men': a bus takes the protagonists,

while through the windows of the same we see the pat�� The ethical destiny that immigrants can suffer in this

world. No underlines, no detail plans. Only the world through the windows of a bus. Quartz has

achieved a balance between message and show, so rare in these days. So it's hypnotizing. If this

film had been filmed by a consecrated teacher, at this point many would already talk about classics. For me it

is. A 9.5

" 1

" Repeats the same patterns of most horror films coming from the United States: atmosphere of

mystery, beautiful girls who die later than their companions - more ugly than them-, run and little else.

Wes Craven, turned into a factor���a, tells us again a dispensable story with reiterative elements

in the already classic titles of terror with and for young people. He goes back to the idea of that the dead are among

us, more than what some believe, and they are no wiser about the use of new technologies

. These beings beyond the grave already know the tricks and we, as spectators, also, although

sometimes, and that is the miracle of the cinema on the big screen, we do not have to believe what they tell us to

spend a little while. crouched in the chair and, I must admit, entertained. That's the only virtue of a title that

repeats the same patterns of most horror movies coming from the United States: atmosphere of

mystery, beautiful girls who die Later that his companions - more ugly than them -, you would run and little more. If

we took it as something original and believe me that it is difficult-, its approach engages and its conception to a certain

extent surprises when going from the typical succession of deaths to the panoramas of an apocalyptic present. Optical. The

criticism of our contemporary lifestyle is not subtle, but quite the opposite, although we already know that the

excesses do not lead to anything: the footage is dressed up in a nervousness and a static which ends

cansina.Wes Craven, forgiveness, director Jim Sonzero, not modernizes it is anchored in formulas that give

good results. In the end, everything remains in a new revision of what others have done -and many of them,

better-. The kitchens of terror adapts the action that takes place in the Japanese Kairo, 2001, and spreads the

story with the usual young university students born in the country of opportunities and scares t� ��picas of

their productions, whether in the form of dreams or through cybernetic solutions quite catastrophic.

" 0

" From the beginning one senses that this is something big, with that excellent sequence shot where we can

see the characters, the best I've seen in movies in a long, long time, in addition to the ���logos; an excellent

work by Alex de La Iglesia ...

Alex de La Inglesia (its director) said in one of the multitudinous interviews that he has given for

the premiere of this film, which was I was a bit distanced from the commercial cinema because I did not want to

always ask permission from the producers to make "their" film, I'm sorry to tell you, Mr. Church, that if

there's a film of his career how little, to say nothing, it has to do with her is this that brings us today, whereneither

wesee the phlegm geek that usually accompanies him, nor the bad slob from many of his scripts, nor that distracting air. �do and in

some moments Machiavellically illustrated of his previous films; it's more, and going back to his words, he said

that while he categorically stated that he did not want to make a Hollywood film as a proof, I'll say maybe, and of a

tapadillo this has been (along with the bizarre "Perdita Durango") the best letter of presentation of thedirector

Basqueto the Anglo-Saxon market. We must believe that a film with John Hurt and Elijah Wood (who

has been baptized in Spain as "" El���as ""), Leonor Watling, Julie Cox, Burn Gorman, Anna Massey and Jim Carter

among others. Is it only going to be seen in our country? Leaving aside that this is perhaps the most impersonal film of

De La Iglesia (only the bizarre character of Alex Cox is part of that monstrous visual imagery of

the Basque director), this is a great film. ���cula.Desde the beginning one intuits that it is before something big, with that

excellent sequence shot where we can see the characters, the best I've seen in movies in a long, long

time, in addition to the di ;logos; I had read that this tape was lost in impossible dialogues, and

yet for me all that math talk was not it is of more, in a tape where the mystery is in the

theorems and other formulas and it is said by someone who is not very expert in theorems and who will always be 2 + 2. �� equal to 5. The

setting of Oxford, that University city, that Salamanca of England is one more character, with its

wide roofs, its students from here to there and the racking, quasi-frantic of the greatcities. Of the

Anglo-Saxonactors, I stay with Hurt so much (there is nothing more on the screen to appear), like Elijah who

can not distance himself from his role as Frodo Bols� At no time like the sexy Leonor Watling that. Finally, it is

impossible to express in words what that woman transmits with her eyes and her body (and a certain part of her

upper anatomy), I ask for forgiveness in advance for such an unfortunate comment to the women. mine is what you read to me. Ittrue

isthat the final resolution (and with this I finish) turns out to be something tricky, but in the end we are before a

Thriller of mystery and always, or almost always, the culprit is who least imagines, and the resolution much more

stupid than our heads could perge���ar. In short, an excellent work by Alex de La Iglesia, outside

his usual means

" 1

" Eliminating all the "sub-frames" of the book it is clear that "Eragon" is a clear and

unabashed plagiarism of 'Star Wars: Episode IV - A new hope' as' The Lord of the rings. ' If it's

up to Fox! xDDD.

I have no idea how I could handle such a mess. It is extremely written: There is no trace

of development, evolution, background, whatever! , in the characters, and the relationships between them are

exaggeratedly forced and unbelievable. And the assembly, horrifying and confusing, does not help at all. Not to mention

the hundreds of details and basic and vital aspects of the "original" argument of the book that has been skipped.

In addition, it leaves in evidence to Paolini, since eliminating all the -aburrid���simas- subplots of the book it is seen with

clarity that "Eragon" is a clear and descarad���simo plagiarism of 'Star Wars: Episode IV - A new hope 'to the

' Lord of the rings'. If it's up to Fox! xDDDGeorge Lucas will be in his underworld, because if not I willit to me.

not explainI also used to write quintessential stories or novels, which the greatest Of

them they were also copiatas or a medley of films that by then I was crazy, the result of that

same enthusiasm cin��� edge. The difference between a server and Paolini is that he has had the courage to publish it,

and some parents willing to do it. But, well, we have to talk about the movie, not about the book: A shit. The only thing

that is saved is Saphira (which, by the way, why grows soooo quick in just one scene? Oo) and Jeremy

Irons. Yes, I thought it was Ben Kenobi. Ahem, Brom, hell. The very cool special effects too. and that's

it.���Buff! And above is a trilogy! Will they have the courage (the daring, rather) to do all three? Pray?

Not.

" 0

" Film with many and notable influences, with a multitude of layers to analyze that would lead to a great

cin���filo debate and that supposes, by own merits, one of the best films. �culas of the history of our cinema.

Throughout the history of Spanish cinema, there have been cases of works that go unnoticed in away

completely unfair, and the case that concerns us today is precisely one of those cases, a film that despite

being claimed over the years, it remains a great unknown to much of the Spanish public.

This is the extraordinary criminal thriller "" El Cebo "", a portrait about the evil and baseness that can

reach the human being, seen from the perspective of several characters, the adult look opposed to a

vision id�� �lica of the infantile world, and as the intromission of the first in the second creates absolute

aberrations.The plot of the film places us in the skin of a Swiss provincial police named Matthai, who is

warned by a street vendor , which incidentally has previous convictions for minor offenses, from

the appearance of a girl's corpse in a forest close to a small town. What follows

is the testimony of that seller, and how certain evidence seems to implicate him in the murder of the child,

despite having been the one to report it to the police. to. After a certain event, the entire

police force believes they have closed the case, except for Matthai, who still believes that the child killer, who had already a acted a

few years before, is still free. In the direction of the film we have Ladislao Vadja, a Hungarian filmmaker settled in

the Spanish cinema and that even concluded his life in our country. Author of several popular films in the late

40's and early 50's, directing one of the children prodigy of Spanish cinema as Pablito

Calvo was in pel� Words like "" My uncle Jacinto "" or "" An Angel passed through Brooklyn "", or with the seminal "" Marcelino bread and

wine "". But his creative summit reached it with this excellent work of suspense that supposed "" El Cebo "", in

coproduction with Germany and Switzerland. Much will have been spoken of this work, but it is never �� to remember the

master points of this piece of goldsmith with many subtle layers in its development. Probably what

stands out in it, in addition to the excellent and meticulous research to find the real murderer, are

the two main constants that run through the entire film from beginning to end, in the form of intromission in anworld

idyllicand that is presumed as impolite and devoid of evil elements threatening such worlds,

mainly the subject of the murderer in a place like the small Swiss towns, the which one imagines already in

itself as ideals for a simple and simple life, and the cruel, corrupt and manipulative world of adults in

the clean and without evil look of childhood. It is constantly resorted to that confrontation, being in the case

adult vs. child world, the most marked. Brilliant scenes like the one of the policemen in the school, where they

teach the children about the bad people and that in turn becomes a fight to discover more about the

murderer in the eyes of the children. ,Os, they become frustrating for the police to see how the best friend of the

murdered girl remembers the story that her best friend told her in the form of a fairy tale, considering the

murderer as a "" giant "" who gave him a small hedgehog, which then we will check how it is discovered

that they were chocolate truffles, and as the "" giant "" was not m�� It's a corpulent man. Does not end in that

scene, far from it, the vision of a story as macabre as a wicked fairy tale (which Harry

Powell in the absolute masterpiece "" The night of the hunter ""), giving rise to significant to the crusade of

Matthai to find the real murderer with a drawing made by the murdered girl and his visit to a

psychiatrist to be able to enter the psyche of the murderer by means of that simple drawing full of imagination, a

point of black humor that becomes the key to follow to find the resolution of the case. From

that moment on, every insignificant detail of that drawing will become a clue to find the supposed,

real murderer, in a titanic fight in which even Matthai will put aside his Police duties

to act as an incgngnito running a gas station on the road, through which the murderer chose his

small victims. The adult world is shown to us in a corrupt and with little morality, beginning with the

accusatory questioning of the itinerant vendor, which ends in a tragic way, giving rise to avision of life

very provincial, lacking any logical and guided more by ignorance than by the true sense of

justice, without being safe from it the locals (the scene of the tavern or the comment about themother

singleare especially significant). Even without getting rid of that vision the main character,

risking in a certain way the life of the girl who welcomes at the gas station along with his mother, as a bait

for the possible murderer who travels that road to often. Another start more macabre humor and very black that

supposes for example the scene of the construction of the house to play the girl, a few meters from the

road. All told with effective and commendable pulse for Vadja, with a narrative rhythm in its development

simply fantastic, in which these details are introduced in a staggered way giving rise to an

excellent final climax and revealing, when finally Matthai understands, in a scene of precious lyricism, that the

infantile world must remain incorrupt and clean of dark glances, preserve innocence, without being able to affirm

if it comes out of itself or of the conversation mode of slight reprimand of the previous day with the mother of the girl

when she discovers the whole thing. In any case, a new ending that brings together the macabre with the beautiful in an

extraordinary scene. The acting part is shown in a state of grace, one more success of the film, starting with

Heinz R���hman in his role Matthai, showing some extraordinary nuances, going from tenderness to dryness

in a prodigious way, from a scene of tender childhood conversation, to really dark moments in his eyes

(quote that revealing scene from when he discovers in the drawing possible clues to discover the supposed murderer,

with a look to the vacuum that denotes satisfaction without being at any time overactive). The rest of the

cast is no less excellent, both the dysfunctional family formed by the mother and her little daughter who

share those days with Matthai (excellent scene, again, which is the attempt to find out about the child).

who is the "" wizard "" who gives chocolate in the woods), like the peddler in his eternal despair,

which is heartbreaking, or, ultimately, true protagonist of the story, the true mcguffin of

all this excellent work, the murderer, played by Gert Frobe, who was pigeonholed in that role for a

large part of his career. All this contributes a great staging in each and every one of the scenes,

citing for example, the one in which the girl plays with her boat in the river of the forest, and then

the mysterious murderer appears posing as a magician, in a scene full of readings in form of

influences, from Frankenstein to Pied Hamel n, luring the girl intowoods not with the music of his

flute, but with the magic that,the eyes of the girl, is able to make our ruthless murderer. Also to

add that everything turns out to be indebted at times of Fritz Lang's cinema, or at least one server has seen theshadow

lengthenedof Master Lang in it, from the close-ups of the characters, which they remember in the form and

content to that falsely accusatory film also that it was "" Fury "", up to "" M "", with that extraordinary

rendition of Peter Lorre as a disturbed greater That is the film Vadja.In short, film with

many and notable influences, with many layers to analyze what would give a great cin���filo debate and

that supposes, by m��� ritor own, one of the best movies in the history of our cinema. Essential.

" 1

" A pesti���o that in its time should serve to refine the zambomba of more than an impenitent onanista. This did

not save her or Esteso in her best times.

The Pajares of the Costa del Sol pass, but there is no time to pick them. Maaaaadre m���a. The

film is about a girl who is the heiress of a rich landowner (Ozores) who dies in strange

circumstances. When he goes to receive the inheritance to the luxurious mansion of his uncle (the dead landlord) the

service makes his life impossible, since they want to keep them with the slice. And there comes aintern

notary(or something like that, I did not understand) that is nothing more and nothing less than Pajares, who is in charge of

telling him that he has corresponded . But the thing gets tangled and many pubic hair, breasts and impious

pangs come out. Bad, bad, bad, but bad, bad, bad. Is that there is no where to take it, since it does not make much

sense at all in the movie. It saves, as always, the performance of Ozores that kills me with laughter. Pajares does

what he always does, but dressed in period. The film is adorned by a couple of girls in porretas, which look half a garter

each and have the key to the treasure. Simple are the political jokes, the style of "" Escap���

disguised, as Carrillo "" and many similar.Resumiendo, a pesti���o that in his time should �� serve to refine the

zambomba of more than an impenitent onanist. This was not saved nor Esteso in his best ���pocas.Besitos.PD: The

inclusion of a gay werewolf is one of the most scurf in the history of dandruff.

" 0

" Improved remake species of Blind Love, The heartbreak kid is the proof that we still have the

Farrelly and that together with the factor Apaaw forms the superpopulation of superh�� �roes of the loudest laughter

of Film History.

The heartbreak kid is the best movie of the Farrelly (who close their trilogy of perfect comedies after

Kingpin and Something Happens with Mary) in a long time. The directors shed their soft side, that tontuna facetmaybe

that ruined almost all their recent proposals (exceptstuck to you), to give us raci���ny Average bad

taste and dog humor. To make us laugh and have a bad time in equal parts and forget all about

normality and correction, yupi! Eddie Cantrow is an unfortunate bachelor who spends his time with hisfather

seventy-year-oldseven years (Jerry Stiller giving free rein to his wild side) and with his colleague Ga'an always, one

of those secondary (and in this movie there is a handful of them) that only The Farrelly are able to create for the

screen. After a relationship of five years that ended in nothing, he falls in love with a perfect girl at first sight,

with whom he marries a few weeks and set off for Mexico on a honeymoon. A honeymoon that will

become a nightmare destroyer full of bad taste and so real that it hurts, as it should be.marriage

Compulsivehas been buffeted by much of the criticism and the public American for not being fun: do not

forget that there are not laughs with Woody Allen movies or flip with those of John Carpenter, so after

reading the reviews and reviewing I already knew from the movie (and I was not wrong) that I would probably find myself with a

movie- pretty sow2- pretty amoral3- pretty longSpecies of improved remake of Blind Love, The heartbreak

kid is the proof that we still have the Farrelly and that together with the factor Apaaw forms the

superpopulation of superh���roes of the loudest laughter of the History of the Cinema. And in spite of being one hundred and fifteen minutes it

happens like a sigh in part thanks to those stupendous soundtracks of The brothers, they even slip to

Julieta VenegasPD: See the credits

" 1

" The tape leaves the first part as something amazing (that it was) and ���sta in something that could be and thatnot

was... disappoints.

A priori, one of the weekly films that interested me the most and one of the summer premieres that I was most anxious to

sink my teeth into, once my opinion was may be more unfavorable, and is that perhaps, moved or

motivated by a longing and hope that it was a sequel almost as excellent as its predecessor, the

direction of Juan Carlos Fresnadillo is dull, is lost in a thousand stories that we have seen hundreds

of times in this genre (zombies, gore, as you want to call it) and finally ends up being vacuous and bland. To

begin with, there are 2 things that have bothered greatly (well 3 would be but one of them I'm sure they are not to

blame.), the first heavy and thunderous music that accompanied much of the footage ���A

melídica composition did not look good, or what? On the other hand in most action scenes the camera

moves so quickly that it is impossible to appreciate anything, lurching here and there, again and again, the third

is the cold almost unbearable that makes in the cinema in Summer and that forces me to always enter the projection

loaded with a sweatshirt, which given the summer temperatures sounds more insanity than something that can

do clearly, ah! and that the projection has been fucked 2 times, but hey, that's a lesser evil, is not it? I have to

say that when I was looking at images of the film and found � the little Muggleton Mackintosh,

wearing the shirt of my love team, I felt a chill and I said, for the first time Real Madrid does not appear in a

chorra movie by Florentino Finally, I do not want to stretch too long, the tape leaves the first part as something

amazing (it was) and is something that could be and that was not. disappoints

" 0

" ���se if it is a devastating portrait of our current society, that ideological crisis of some politicians, who are

of the sign that they are, always do the same: succumb to the tent�� �cles of power. Once they get to govern

they feel like kings.

Like the chess piece, you can walk on the board like any other piece, except the

horse. But do not give it more importance, Her Majesty Queen Elisabeth II has more appreciation for the

deer. The news of the death of Lady Diana in 1997 that shocked the British people or the immuta..pero

if at the time it mattered to him questioned his distant attitude to the tragedy. That is, there is no question of the

suitability of an institution, such as the mon���rchica, anchored in the past. Stay calm. The politicians are already

there. It was Prime Minister Tony Blair, newly arrived to power, who intervened to let theknow

queenthat he had to put aside his coldness, arrogance and indifference, and share the pain with his

people. Stephen Frears builds a caricature of power. Imitating each of the characters involved

in the story (from the Prince of Wales to the very family Blair), with the splendid performance of Helen

Mirren as queen , winner of several international awards. A caricature of those who are above, those who

represent a country, whether they have been elected democratically or not. In this way, the monarchy is

portrayed. Neither the town interests nor their responsibilities. But go hunting, take the t��� and protocol. And do

not talk about her, let her be quiet. Frears does it from within, from the everyday. Concluding that

the only objective of the monarchy is its survival as an institution in a "supposedly" modern world. The

death of Lady Di was an earthquake. And who would say it. The savior of the monarchy was the Laborist Blair

(the supposedly modern politician who came to the British government, after years and years of

conservatism ). The same one that, together with Bush and Aznar, set out to "" save "" Iraq with an invasion. If the

monarchy is a defender of its values, with the politicians who come to govern a country the same thing does not happen. There

is the real criticism of the film, centered on the political class that we choose. If it is aportrait

devastatingof our current society, that crisis ideology of some politicians, who are the sign they are,

always do the same: succumb to the tentacles of power. Once they get to govern they feel like

kings.

" 1

" One hour and thirty-eight minutes, which begin almost as they finish and one gradually comes to

understand the great failure that has been the film in the USA so much of the public as of criticism.

Bad is that at the beginning of the film you are told almost 75% of it (in text), it is bad that the

soundtrack is as loud and insipid as possible, bad is that you try to give an air "" roll video game "" without

knowing very well how to do it. Uwe Boll, who has already directed in a disastrous way "" House of Dead "" based on the Video Game

of the same name, repeats with "" Alone in the dark "" that deals with that saga of Survival horror that appeared in the

pcs long before the already mythical "" Resident Evil "", a film that tries to drink from an infinity of sources (copying

without stopping) from "" Resident Evil "" to "" Alien "" passing by "" Predator "" or by "" The children of corn "" or even the

series "" Alias ​​"" with those aerial views of LA El Prota, Christian Slater is already older (although it has been crushed

in the Gym for the film) in some scenes you see him literally "" throwing the bofe "" when he has to run or

do some other movement away from the normal, he was accompanied by Tara Reid, before your chest operation,

sincerely this girl who is limited to romantic comedy ("" American Pie "" "" Van Wilder "") and to stop

experiments like this, and to finish is Stephen Dorff that after the first "" Blade "" and many movies of

series C (of those that go straight to video) here puts on his usual mask and pretends to be "" The savior of the

cause "". hour and thirty-eight min., which begin almost as they finish and that one little by little comes to

understand the great failure that has been the film in the USA both public and critical. Not a single scare

and everything more predictable than an episode of "" Ana and the seven "".

" 0

" A film that guarantees entertainment and where, unlike so many with more name and better

criticism, not a minute left. Not missing.

Sneakers or Snooping takes place entirely in some chapter of espionage novels of the time when

the Russians were spying and Americans were being watched. Or it was the reverse, both things happened at the same time and

we put tortillo chips on the tourists in Fuengirola. Sneakers is not material worthy of a

Clancy or a Forsyth, but in movies it is a worthy example of entertainment with a message, although here everything

dilutes nicely thanks to the skillful layer of overwhelming commerciality that fills all the footage.

Hide, however, a relevant discourse on the consequences of high technology insociety

highly technicaland, put to embroider the joke, make us dive (without bottle of air, sweet hair) in the

responsibility of opening some that another civic conscience for the purpose of the desm���n that the argument proposes: a

sort of decoder that accesses any computer network in the world (here is the omniscient God , the Eye

that watches, the ancient theory of the demiurge constantly on alert for the barbarity of its creation) .Sneakers

chooses not to overwhelm with social ramifications: Robert Redford was not then like to tie the blanket to

the head after the fiascos of Havana or of an indecent proposal, and here it is placed in the hands of a

trained director, who puts on a gold tray a cinematographic spectacle Efficent, innovative, where

there are secondary Authentic luxury (Dan Aykroyd, River Phoenix before falling to the ground overestimated

adrenaline, Sidney Poitier, Ben Kingsley or James Earl Jones. ). The guide takes from here and there until the

Hitchcokian Mcguffin has charmed us and they can tell us the story they want because we already swallow. The

final inconsequence, that we do not know to what we are really playing, but what a beautiful game we have had, itus

sends(distantly) to War Games, by John Badham, but they are different films made in ��� few very

different even when there are ten or maybe even the years that separate them. That's how the times run. The writers of

that are the writers of ���sta. If Snekers had been filmed in Europe by a European hand,

we would have a more genuinely social film, a product that isto the exploitation of political

tailoredscience. �ara (to claw if they could) the consciousness of the spectator without spending excessive rooms. As the

film is made in Hollywood, more than scratching consciences, rubbing, lightly touches, bristles the skin with a lot of

tact, it will not be that the flaming fire of artifice that have sold us affects us too much and we disbelieve

the system to the point that we do not follow the current as we have been doing so far. All these

signs are evidence of the direction that the American cinema of the first nineties was taking: narrative shortcomings

compensated with br��� and trade, with chimes and expectations (almost always) measured.

Today (again) the times are They are changing. Bob Dylan said it. And Loquillo with his troglodytes. And now I say it

because having seen it a few years later gives an extra information, a kind of plus in the merely

objective, that is, in the well-founded idea that what we attend It is a good film, a good one, really,

without folds, direct, endowed with enough charms to forget its frivolous nature in the background,

even if the exposed cartoon has its crumb and bad taste.

" 1

" It is an excellent film of a black series that is affiliated with sex - and with its classical aura of fatalism and

reverse - as the apostolic engine of the entire narrative warp.

Regrettably, Fire in the body is not an erotic film embellished with a black series story, as

in the beginning it was advertised in a boast of interested informative speculation: an excellent film of aseries

blackthat is affiliated with sex - and with its classical aura of fatalism and reverse - as the apostolic engine of the entire

narrative warp. That the tragedy envelops the end of the film does not surprise: it pleases, it is a brand of genre, to which

nothing new contributes. Kasdan, very intelligent director and finest stylist of the advertising market, takes from

here and from there the sketches that he likes, the topics, the common places of the accessible inventory, and films

With self-confidence, with absolute knowledge of the cinematographic medium, a personal work, beautiful. Even though

Turner was never a saint of my devotional, here she seduces, like the concise and prudent character of William Hurt in

the role of lawyer in collusion with sin (the flesh of the femme fatale so beloved in the film noir)

to end up perpretando the foreseeable crime. One remembers the Jack Nicholson eaten of flour in The postman

always calls twice of Bob Rafelson or Garfield of the first version of Garnett or the hole Don Johnson of

Burning Lips to find an antecedent, but it is Hurt, in my way, who takes this palm, perhaps because he

who else reliably represents the role of sex and not c ae, like Johnson, like Nicholson himself, let the interveningremain

distances, in that gratuity of gestures of the first and in that strident and pathetic divism of the second.

Very recently Ed Harris comes to me, who has a similar role in Luna de Porcelain and fulfills, without more. On the

female side, Jessica Lange, Lana Turner, Virginia Madsen, Madeleine Stowe, Veronica Lake, naming women

then and now. Kathleen Turner has it infinitely easier than them: it must be for the tolerance of

these frivolous times in which the cinema not only does not cover its intimacies (genitals) but that the air:

with all knowledge of what that exhibition will bring to the box office. We are all good voyeurs when

needed. And that Fire in the body, as I say, does not abuse the easy erotic, but prefers to wander the

turbid world of feelings, of the traps of morality, contributing to the g��� But one more time than never stopped

studying the compensations and the regrets of the crime. When other sister films scratch

superficially, without deepening, here we have colorful, ambient cinema. Foln folklore (the south, the night, the

sweat, the fast spilled like gasoline in a bonfire in the dark) where Kasdan, who is an old fox in

these games, unites thriller cl�� Basic and criminalist melodrama.

" 1

" Without being anything of the other world, the film comes to entertain, but not to frighten, which coming from

a horror tape is a big problem.

Right debut and little more than William Brent Bell in this horror movie where the protagonist is a

video game that gives its name to the film. A boy dies in the same way as in the videogame he was playing,

a group of friends and fans of video games discover in their belongings the videogame he was

playing and decide to play all in a network, soon to start falling one after another one and they will discover that what happens in

the game is applicable to reality, but the game will go a bit further on. A priori the premise itself is nothing

original, We changed the tape of The Ring for a video game and we already have it. And like any film ofterror

adolescent, it is foreseeable to the core, you know who is going to die in each moment, you know who will survive,

etc. Where is the grace in this movie then? Well, no doubt in two key points, the first one is in the

short duration of the film, barely 80 minutes, which makes the scenes of the deaths of

the protagonists to be resolved quickly, as soon as you know that someone is going to touch it, it does it quickly, it does not recreate itself in

persecutions, in creating tension. Even in falling into the easy scare, he dies and that's it, which makes the movie gain

a point by not bored with more of them. The other point in favor is the last half hour, when the film

seems to be falling from half the footage in the most pure boredom, manages to lift the flight in

an interesting and entertaining media final hour in which we will discover how the game works and what is its

source. Without being anything of the other world, the film arrives to entertain, but not to frighten, which coming

from a terror tape is a great fault. You can see it if the genre goes, if you have nothing better to do or if

yours are video games.

" 0

" The story is sympathetic, will like big and small (although these will end up getting tired when the part

is called more humane and less "mousetrap?) And as they have embodied in the French capital is complete hallucination.

I had quite a lot of hopes, in this new release of Pixar, although, I must admit that when I heard

about the proposal that this time brought us the team of John Lasseter, I imagined that little (for not to say anything) one

could tell of the life of a rodent in a kitchen, and once again, once seen, my opinion can not be more

favorable. The story is nice, like big and small (although these will end up getting tired when the

part is called more humane and less "" mousetrap "") and as they have expressed to the French capital is completely hallucinatory,

especially when I was barely a year ago and see their animations are as realistic and convincing as

possible.Newly Pixar exceeds in what animaci�� �n digital refers, although it still does not overcome its

pending subject, (humans still look like rubber instead of flesh and bone), although again the

effects of the water (so difficult to achieve in digital animation) as well as the coat of the rodents are

quite successful. It is true that the film has a rather curious change of pace towards the middle of the

footage, where one wonders if the story comes to me or simply stays there, slowed down in time,

fortunately it seems that Pixar realized the "" messed up "" and imprinted the film ���cula a faster pace

towards the end of it, by the way, that no one forget the short film they project before the film because it

is amazing. The score that Michael Giacchino, is quite good, by the way Giacchino is becoming

habitual in the scores of Pixar, contributing this time certain courts Frenchified with typical music of

comedy.

" 1

" Bandidas is closer to a telefilm of a certain magnitude than to a feature film.

Mediocre.

Sara Sandoval and Mar���a ���lvarez (Salma Hayek and Pen���lope Cruz) are two girls from opposite social classes.

While the former enjoys all the privileges and leads a quiet and comfortable life, the other is the daughter of a

humble agricultural worker. Under normal conditions, due to the rigidity and social immobility prevailing during the

nineteenth century, these two girls would never have become friends; but when mercenaries kill

the families of both and steal their land to give them to greedy and greedy businessmen, they

end up meeting and fighting together in pursuit of a revenge that will end up turning them into robbers and

fugitives of justice. Directed by Joachim Roenning (producer of The Three Burials of Melqu���ades Estrada and

Transporter 2) and Espen Sandberg, Bandidas is a film half of the west and half comedy, but precisely because of

that duality it is not anything specific. Pen���lope Cruz, no matter how placed on glamorous orlists of

favoritethe public, is an actress who, with some exceptions, has done nothing to have the reputation and cach���

who enjoys; He is enormously inexpressive, poor in records and artificial in interpretation. Salma Hayek

sins the opposite of our compatriot: she is too exaggerated in gesticulation, full offuss

unnecessary. It would be unfair to mention the more than correct interpretation of Sam Shepard, who stands out from

mediocrity. His main screenwriter Luc Besson has shown on other occasions that he is able to do it much

better and in general, Bandidas is closer to a telefilm of a certain size than to a feature

film. Mediocre.

" 0

" Palm, gives us a dark film, at times too much, with incredible planes,sound

sweeping, in addition to a thousand and one notes "" of the house "", for, sadly, an unequal result

Maybe it was the film I had been waiting for most of this month, well, my dream premiere for the month of October, that is

why I gave myself this afternoon a train beating of an hour and a half (between comings and goings), to be able to see the

film in conditions, and my opinion can not be more adverse, how well it starts, that makes one get

comfortable in the chair, preparing the body for an excellent film moment, and. that damn "" braking "" that gives the tape

from the first hour, where everything becomes tedious, and taking advantage of the seal of De Palma, ac���mara slow, and

is that, the following hour, is called slow , with a development so slow that one gives time to sleep and

wake up, and hardly advances one ���pice in the footage. As an interpretive, maybe I stay with Hillary Swank,

the only that manages to make his character credible, since neither Scarlett (who looks beautiful as a girl of the

time), nor Aaron Eckhart transmit me the most, that without forgetting Josh Harnett, whom I see almost with the

same interpretative level as Ben Affleck or Orlando Bloom, come on, the same expressiveness as avault

porespan, and that is that Harnett has the same face when he is sad, that when he is happy. palm, gives us

a dark film, in some moments too, with incredible planes, sweeping sound, besides �s of a thousand and

one notes "" of the house "", for, sadly an unequal result. I expected more, and now it weighs me that hour and a half

on the road, in which I might have done something else more fruitful with my time.

" 0

" A romantic comedy that, based on a very original premise, ends up wafting through the stupid

maneuver of having to end all of them with the heavy and heavy "" happy end ""

We are looking at the typical film that will delight my wife, I am surprised to have seen her on her own and without

her usual pressure towards this type of cinema, she does not deceive us. �emos, Jennifer Garner in the poster and as absolute

protagonist is enough push to lose almost 2 hours in the viewing. It is surprising (thatalways

Iget curious and it seems that I repeat myself more than the garlic), that the tape begins in a way that is dramatic and goes away ticking and

turning little by little, in a comedy more, of the mont, and that, the original premise is quite

good; fiancée loses her future husband in an accident and thanks to his friends he begins to know everything

that, hidden by him, he did not know in life. And there are a lot of them, it's that the script is flowing, which isadvocated

too easilytowards the "" world is G���eno "" (which says Manolo Summers, RIP) and that lawyers towards the

"happy end" of this type of productions one ends the film almost with the same face, and the same

feelings, with which he began his viewing. We are of course before one of those tapes of fast consumption, with

Jennifer Garner (��� Has the noses been operated?), Timothy Oliphant (the actor who will give life to the hero of the video game

"" Hitman " "), a Kevin Smith in a state of grace (perhaps the best of the film are his many jokes), and

Juliette Lewis, as the closing of the roster. By the way, I found it fun to meet Fiona Shaw, the

famous aunt Petunia from "" Harry Potter "" as Jennifer Garner's mother-in-law in this movie. In short, without stretching

too long, a comedy romantic that, based on a very original premise, ends up making water for the

stupid maneuver of having to end all of them with the so heavy and heavy "" happy end "".

" 0

" A non does not have English elegance, he's not misguided yet, he still does not know what an Aston Martin is or a pistol

with a silencer. Deconstructing Bond, James Bond

Ferran Adri���'s deconstruction of potato omelette consists of presenting the three basic ingredients

of the Spanish omelette (egg, potatoes and onion) in Liquid in a glass in three differentiated layers, and the

whole is taken with a spoon, like a soup. The most curious thing is that it tastes like a potato omelette despite having

a presentation and eating in a completely different way than our grandmother taught us. But the originality

of the presentation and the way of eating keep our senses attentive to new sensations while

tasting classic flavors. We open our eyes to the genius of a new dish paying homage to anrecipe. The

immortalnew Bond is something similar. Daniel Craig is completely different to any of theBonds

previous, he is blond at first and is much more hollow, is not elegant, rough and even clumsy, only as an

example we observe that he is m���sh���bil throwing the gun at the eye of the enemy that shoots at him, suffers and bleedsfalls in

when he is beaten, evenlove, and often shits because this Bond thinks very little and is a

little animal, only act, sometimes awkwardly, and fall, stumble and discover him more than once. The film

itself is also something different, somehow it's slower, although that does not detract from the action scenes at

all, which are excellently well-rounded, especially the initial chase, which is like a gorilla

chasing a smart monkey spider, or a steamroller chasing a b��� lido, which manages to reach it

by knocking down trees or destroying the road, respectively. Also the final scene in Venice is

impressive. In the middle are the most leisurely scenes, the game of poker, and the romance with the Bond girl,

which is not one more, but is the first, unforgettable like all first love, but maybe it's the

substory that most weakens in the film. In any case all the Bond ingredients are there, or rather, are generated

in this movie, which is based on the first novel that Ian Fleming wrote about the character, a

character still undefined and that is created as the footage progresses. Bond still does not say "My name is

Bond, James Bond", he still does not have English elegance, he's not misguided yet, he does not know what which is an Aston Martin or

a pistol with a silencer, or a Martini with vodka (there are two or three magnificent gui���os during the scene of the

game on this subject), and in this prequel you will discover��� all this for the first time. The idea of ​​joining the

argument completely Bond with the character pre-Bond of the first novel and with a new change of actor is

brilliant and gives a necessary fresh air to the character that, in addition, gives us a magn ... and, again,

entertaining movie.

" 1

" Thank God and removing that, the tape has an entry, and a pretty good ending and it's that type of

film that one enjoys besides the actors with the excellent soundtrack, highly recommended for all

fans of the British group, it becomes so intense that it gets to thrill.

Some time ago someone told me (or maybe I read it somewhere?) The news of this pseudomusical about the

Beatles, the truth is that I found it curious m� ��Excellent when my friend Pa (now in Madrid, before in NY) told me

that he had loved it, also since one of Muchocine's critics came out delighted with the pass of press,

as well as the criticisms (the great majority excellent) that I have been able to read have pushed me more if possible to be interested

in the film by Julie Taymor. It is true that its director, saving the musical of "" El Rey Le���n "" (of which she is the

author, and, with which she has become Gold, earning the respect of to 'kiski in Hollywood), because if we

put on to look at his filmography we found clunkers like "" Titus "" an unusual adaptation of the old Rome (with

cars and motorcycles) or the biopic of Frida Kalho, played by Salma Hayek, who , to the same l that this tape has

excellent moments with others that I imagine that only the author will understand; and that is, "" Across The Universe "" is an

excellent musical, but. (there always has to be one of these to annoy a critique), has moments in

which, just like if I made a musical about REM has parts that only the author likes, and

that is lost in psychotic scrolls. �pics (at that time 70's where the Liverpool gave them to experiment.), As well

as a couple of musical numbers (the bonus and the circus character) that I did not like too much , true it

is certain that Taymor thought to extend the footage to the satiety and is that, the good one of Julie does not know what is

the simplicity neither the honesty and, cataloging itself like "" the Spielberg of the theater "" quer�� " �a give with this tape the

chime that has not given with his previous films already quoted above. Thank God and removing that, the

tape has an entry, and a pretty good ending and it's that kind of movie. ��culas that one enjoys in addition to

the actors (you have to see how well they all sing, without exception) n.), with the excellent soundtrack, highly recommended

for all the fans of the British group, not only does it not disappoint but in some moments it becomes so intense

that it gets to thrill.

" 1

" Highly recommended almost imperdible, five stars. Maybe it was better to wait until now to talk about this movie when the wave of "" ohhh a

movie about gay cowboys "" already happened, at least it is possible to talk about it As it is, that is, a

movie.As everyone knows the film tells the love story between Ennis and Jack, two cowboys who start

a secret romance and that extends for many years; logically this romance is secret and both live their

conventional lives with wives and children only meeting sometimes in the year, eventually the costs ofbelieve

doing what you most want in secret reach them. Ithat this movie has put to the test intelligence of

many people, on the one hand those who see the film only as a gay movie and therefore feel

a kind of rejection / morbid with the film and on the other hand those who believe that the best of the film is

the fact that is a gay couple and therefore see it as a kind of symbol of the cause, I think

both positions are wrong. In this sense Brokeback Mountain only presents a theme that has been narrated thousands

of times as impossible love and the impossibility of being with the person you love, from Romeo and Juliet

passing through stories of interracial love, the issue is the same only that today are homosexuals

who because of social pressure has difficulties for To be together as before were people of different

race or religion. Is it a perfect movie? Not at all, it is true that it has some rhythm problems and

compared to other movies with which he shared honors last year as Crash, is clearly less

structured, obviously Crash is better narratively, however Brokeback Mountain s�� � is the best movie

of the past year, precisely because of its imprefections and the strength of its history. Although the script has some

flaws, the film is very well directed, photography and music are extraordinary and the performances of

truth is very good, especially the couple protagonist, not only because of the obviousness of playing acouple

gaybut because they are able to reflect in different ways the same anguish and sadness, although most of

the elogues Heath Ledger took my It seems that the weight of the film is taken by Gyllenhaal, who is one

of the best young actors in the world today, especially the scenes where his character faces Ledger

due to the fact that I have been making a life together. This is a sad and fragile movie and the thought that youonly

canappeal to gays is stupid, any heterosexual or homosexual person that has not been

able to be with the person you love is able to understand this movie and feel identified with her. In short,

highly recommended almost unmissable, five stars and is on DVD

" 1

" The Shining does not become one of his masterpieces, even seems to us one of the least successful. It is the

only film in which ���ly and its camera, are not the true and only protagonists.

Five years after his first great commercial failure (Barry Lyndon), Kubrick was not going to stop thinking that

his next project should be a resounding success. of box office. And with The Shining he achieves it, and with a vengeance. In spite

of the excess of budget (spent ten million more) and filming time, they show us aKubrick

older and eclectic, not having to see nothing of it with the efficiency and aesthetics accustomed in the director

. We could say that it is the only film in which ���ly and its camera, are not the true and only

protagonists. His firm style does not fail to be noticed at all times and in several passages - the visions, the use of

the stedycam, the tracking of the ax - show us the same obsessive and unique director we know. As the child's

scene playing only on the shield and the fleeting and slow approach of a tennis ball all taken of

course, in its usual ascending fixed plane. Or the sea of ​​blood that breaks into the corridor from the

elevator. (The same scene is also the trailer of the film, one of the most beautiful that I saw for the simple and

direct). The pomp of the dance hall and the ghostly protagonists crossing each other, they would be ansample

exactof Kubrick and his physical obsessions. But in this case the film is impregnated, made by and for the

brilliance of a man named Jack Nicholson. It is said that all Kubrick films need a hero

even if it is atypical: Alex, Barry Lyndon, soldier Joker, etc. Perhaps each of them is analogous to the

director's personality. This Jack Torrance seems to be the best example of it. They all become a

version of the filmmaker's acid, a mirror of his more macabre side and that in the figure and in the representation In

Jack Nicholson's, he finds his best exponent. The character, his overacting, the unleashed fury, his slow and

progressive madness, "" devour "" the film. A psychopath always on the verge of explosion and dementia,manifest

alreadyfrom the first scene in the interview (it is said that the actor himself was going through his worst emotional andmoment

personalwith drugs ). We see how after the seclusion in a secluded hotel with his family, he shows us his

true face and personality - helped by the hotel's own ghosts - and this whole process in itself, is the most

achieved by Kubrick in the film. It does not make it explode, but it is a slow crowned tour when his wife

discovers among his things, the five hundred pages with the same text: "" So much work and little fun. n, they make

Jack a very bitter type. "" Kubrick's mistake is to "" re-define "" an atypical genre in him, onlyachieving it

partially. The idea of ​​doing it is as much for having found a good potential guide in Stephenbook

King's(apart from the economic), as well as for spite of not having accepted to realize some a� Antesos before the

sequel to the super successful The Exorcist by William Friedkin (with time turned into a classic), categorized with

justice as one of the best horror films of all history. scenes on the

dance floor and the bathroom with the specters, or the same final scene with the approach to the old photo (showing

that the evil always existed) become at its best moments. It does not stop the film from beingstriking

visually, losing thickness at moments that would have to be more terrifying, precisely because of a

too-careful aesthetic devoid of tension or impact, or the slowness of its footage, as in the

final pursuit of the protagonist's child resolving it with a fixed frame ofpetrified and frozen face

Nicholson's. Rarely achieved and effective, considered one of the best films of horror in history, in a

global balance of all the work of Kubrick The Shining does not become one of his masterpieces, until itus

seems toone of the less accomplished of the second part of his career, but he keeps the pulse and quality intact

of an original Kubrick, which is never a little. "" I think the best argument is the one that does not seem to exist. I like

the slow principles, that make it into the public and involve it in the film, allowing you to appreciate thenotes

grotesqueand the delicate tones. That way I do not have to complicate my life with plot resources and

tricks to maintain suspense. "" Stanley Kubrick

" 1

" It is a reference film in the final months of this 2007, and offers the possibility to enjoy with

one of the best performances of the year, that of a Brad Pitt who very deservedly won the Volpi Cup at the

Venice Festival, and presents himself as a serious Oscar candidate.

There are few figures in the United States who are as well known and are part of the popular culture of their society

as Jesse James. For many, the most feared and reputed outlaw of the nineteenth century, for others aidealist

disenchantedwho continued a lost war. What is certain is that a legend andwere forged around him

a myth, which have survived until our days. The cinema has on many occasions led Jesselife

James'to the big screen, so Andrew Dominik decided to give the story a new focus, moving away from the

more familiar side of James and focusing on his last months of life . He does not do it through the eyes of the

outlaw mictico, but he does it from the perspective of the man who ended the legend. Based on thenovel

Ron Hansen homonymous, The Assassination of Jesse James by the Coward Robert Ford is an approach to the man who

was behind the myth, showing his more human side, but also n their miseries and their darkest and most

tormented part. At a leisurely pace, without becoming tiresome or boring, Dominik is telling the viewer a

fascinating story that engages from the beginning and manages to maintain the attention despite its more than two

and a half hours duration. .N But over the achievements of Dominik emerges the ubiquitous figure of Brad Pitt,

who makes an extraordinary composition full of nuances through which he consolidates as one of the

best actors of the moment. Casey Affleck and Sam Rockwell perform very good jobs in turn. The Assassination of

Jesse James by the Coward Robert Ford is a reference film in the final months of this 2007, and offers

the possibility of enjoying one of the best performances of the year, that of a Brad Pitt who

deservedly won the Volpi Cup at the Venice Festival, and presents himself as a serious Oscar candidate.

" 1

" I do not usually make firewood from the fallen tree (I lie) and I do not like to go for leftovers (I lie like a lousy scoundrel)

but this is too much. Jesus, what a piece of film shit.

The Geneva Convention has a new problem and it is called The Covenant, it is directed by Renny Harlin and I hope you

rent anti-radiation suits in movie theaters where it premieres. I do not usually make firewood from the fallen treeoverboard

(I lie) and I do not like to go(I lie like a lousy scoundrel) but this is too much. Yes, it's worse than

Alone in The Dark and yes, Juan Manuel de Prada has another lover to sleep with. Jesus, what a piece of film shit

. Perhaps it is not the fault of the director who pari���ed the extraordinary (imperial, magnificent, incontestable)

Maximum Risk , that has counted on the budget of the part of the episode of Charmed before the publicity,

but very bad things should go to finish directing this pit of darkness. Disguised as a

normal movie, The Covenant narrates the adventures of four teenage wizards (and one egg: they are older than the

initial lineup of Real Madrid, but Compa���eros provoc ��� a diametral change in the rules so we went over

the topic) that face a powerful evil force that threatens to take away their powers and live like this

forever. But it is unfair to define the plot of the film like this. Let's say that once explained the calico, well

nothing, we'll explain it again (obviously, the producers realize that the thickness of the film

only covers 19 minutes and it is necessary to stretch). The torture stretches to unimaginable extremes. "" Do you want

fishing line? So take. "" From the initial credit titles, where the band Tomandandy is responsible for crushing

the eardrums to puré us and will continue to do as length of the footage, the first scene includes the

four daubs these dressed in black causing v���mitos (literally) in a high school party (of those

so cool, in the light of the bonfire) and making levitate a jeep to flee Police, who will not even bother to

investigate how the car they chase is able to jump a ravine and end up falling from thirty meters

behind their patrol car . Thus, another sequence in which a warm one is recomposed from scratch after being

stamped against a truck will hardly be a cause for concern for the passengers. Walker Texas Ranger.

Anyone can point out incongruities and pots in a movie, but The Covenant, like the best

truffles, proudly displays them. The cast. Oh. This is the moment in which Harlin, breaking again with his

line, believes himself Verhoeven. The four notes are Calvin Klein outfits and, in addition, swimming champions. Join

the points. Fair: Abdominal festival, fights in the showers with a towel, homoerotic attraction,

homocoche and. unresolved homomotorcycle, perpetual state of fornication, the girls of the film are

dressed every now and then, bodybuilders postures carefully studied to make them look spontaneous. Juani willit's

thinkgreat. The truth is that I do not care. It is the least of the problems of the film and is a

shitty joke. It is almost more painful to see how Harlin keeps something of what made him adirector

class A. in Hollywood's genre of action, like his sense of rhythm, even though his newly found

fondness for the videoclip is everywhere. The famous Slavic critic Rofl Merthinson states in his book "" Of

cinema, pr���xis and those things that explode "" that of "" if the public does not understand it , hypnotize it "", but this is

Guant���namo concentrated. See the final fight, where the good and the bad throw themselves transparent gelatin balls

that explode on contact for 10 pu���eteros minutes in a row. There is only one audiovisual production in the world

that uses this type of style. ���sta.La chavaler���a ech���ndose rites.Avoid to make much more reference

to the rest of the plot, as the mother of the protagonist, the ghost that appears and disappears, thebackground

historicalof the people etc, etc. If the scriptwriter passes of it, the normal thing is that I do it also. There is only one

last reflection to be made and it refers to the genre of terror, given the succession in diarrhea of ​​films

that are posing as scary movies. Why do you do a shitty comedy, come on, Spain, it's

just not funny, and when you make a bad horror movie, you hit the bottom of the barrel? Is this genre more

difficult than it initially seems? Or is it that we just do not get scared like before? And most importantly,

after suffering from this film scum: can someone lend me a sharp razor? Because my veins and

death have an early appointment.

" 0

" Have you ever met someone who turns the other cheek to a slap? I ask it because if

the answer is yes, it is likely that the acquaintance is the protagonist of "Lights at sunset ?.

Have you ever met someone who turns the other cheek to a slap? I ask it because if the

answer is yes, it is likely that the acquaintance will be the protagonist of "" Lights at sunset "", a film ���cula with

pseudo-intellectual pretensions and that, therefore, the rest of the mortals, away from the divine hand to

see art where there is none, we can be quite boring. The argument could be Resuma resume as

follows: a man who gets very bad with everyone but not because he sings the forty to all the

borderlines he finds on his way, he just does not do anything. He sits down and sees life go by, they laugh

at him, well, they beat him, well, they cheat him, well, there's only one person who wants it,

because it passes from that person. Anyway, as they see what is said an intelligent guy. To this interesting story

is added the great expressiveness of its actors, aesthetic features that like the silicone breasts, no

matter how they are, where they are And with who they are, they always remain the same. That's the picture, it's very

beautiful and the protagonist is very, very, very, very m������ Yes, and that's why you should assume that the movie is good? I,

personally, to see stagnant images of very m gentesera people I prefer to take a walk around the Prado Museum

and observe the Goya Black Paintings (although that's it, the argument turns out to be more It's interesting and critical.) Ah! By the

way, if you know someone like that, tell them to change because it does a lot of harm to the human condition.

" 0

" The production, direction and gui���n is from the Coens and that shows, especially in the dialogues that are able

to get a smile even though their issues and situations are anything but cerebral.

After much meditating, I decided that I really like the Coens when they get serious. If youme

askwhich film of the Coen I liked but did not blink before saying Death among the Flowers

because it is violent and attractive in equal parts. In the middle there have been some others that deserve to be seen and

treasured in memory as O Brother! (where I discovered that George Clooney could tell me everything), The great

Lebowski or Fargo. But if I have to say to what tape his new proposal looks like, I must say that it seems like a

return to the beginning, which, as you can deduce after this presentation, is more my favorite and without a doubt

I appreciate it. The production, direction and gui���n is of the Coen and that is noticeable, especially in the dialogues that are

able to get you a smile even though his subjects and situations are anything but cerebral. But there is also

something in the film that is close to the visual beauty of Fargo, a kind of implicit onirism in each shot that

gives a perfect finish in ocher and brown tones. Josh Brolin plays a poor nobody. he bumps in the

middle of the desert with the remains of a drug exchange, all the participants are dead (or almost) so

he decides that it is a brilliant idea to take the bag with two million dollars . An attack of sudden goodness

makes him return to the place just when the more leisurely, meditated and calm assassin arrives on the scene. Start a

quiet but bloodthirsty hunt to recover the money and revenge. I could not finish a criticism without making a point

in its protagonists that, although it does a little less to Bardem, they are all brilliant. Tommy Lee Jones

has seemed extraordinary to me, after a season in which he did not have much appreciation, he has

made up for it, Woody Harrelson has one of those roles that, not being short, is deserved, he almost

dares to steal scenes from his companions without blinking and well, Javier in his second scene with the wives and

leaves several things clear to the viewer without having opened his mouth. That's it, the best of the tape thebottle-weapon

killer, it's so useful that I want one for the bag.

" 1

" In short, predictable film of which I expected much more, perhaps because of the high expectations that have

been created about it. The only thing I liked about the movie is Bel���n Rueda.

I do not really think it's a film to present to the Oscars, there were other options such as "" The 13

Roses "" that would have made better paper, or at least I think so. The orphanage is championed after the noble name of

"" Guillermo del Toro "" and of course this fact of by itself already sells. However, what we have before the viewing

is a film that mixes diverse horror passages of films already finished in success with, in addition,

too many similarities with "" The Others " "Alejandro Amen���bar.A level of production and execution we are before a

round film, you can see here the hand of" "Del Toro" "aesthetically thanks to God flees from the conventionalism and

generalized cutlery in the Spanish films, which we are increasingly surpassing with greaterUnfortunately

speed.the plot has a multitude of inconsistencies, \*\*\*\*\*\* SPOILER \* \*\*\*\*\* as for

example the fact that Sim���n is able to enter the famous little house of Tom���s, avoiding the iron pipes

(which the mother herself later has trouble moving) and Above, go through the papered door without

even a tiny tear in the paper, since it is then your own mother who tear the paper from the wall

to expose the secret door. AH! and of course Sim���n does not have the knob of the door thatthat the

isthing is even more complicated. Are we facing a child that goes through walls and doors? Or do we have to suppose that since it

is a ghostly subject, everything is possible? \*\*\*\*\*\* SPOILER \*\*\*\*\*\* In short, predictable film of which I expected

much more perhaps because of the high expectations that have been created about it. The only thing I liked about the

movie is Bel���n Rueda.

" 0

" Except for the first words of Maggie, the film does not bring anything new, in fact it could be a

chapter of TV, but it is never � other enjoy on the screen win something we like.

It is difficult to write about the most famous family on the planet without getting carried away by the feelings accumulated

during the 20 years of its existence. While many will think it is appropriate to go to the cinema to see something they can

watch on TV, it is no less certain that we are the ones who support the launch of this film, which is absolutely necessary

for the Animation world and of course, it is worth seeing. To all those who were concerned about

the new voice of Homer in his Spanish dub, I have to give them a relief plaster on the back because it does not

detract from the voice in the cinema at all nor does it have anything to add to the previous one. Except forfirst words

Maggie's, the film does not bring anything new, in fact it could be a film. ��tulo more than TV, that if, is never more

enjoy on screen win something we like. The movie does not disappoint, I think it is very up to the task and it

makes us laugh a lot.I want to highlight the moment "" Spider Pig "" that for me is one of the best in

the movie, In fact, if you stayed to see the credit titles (where you can see Maggie talking), look at

the closing song Spiderman but Tuneada and the coroso say "" Spider Pig, Spider Pig "" XD, very

good yes sir. Do not deceive ourselves, the true protagonist of the film, is the piglet. What I think is a play

very smart is how they have used the characters and the typical gags to do subliminal marketing

about "" why it's worth going to the movies to see something you can see on TV "" (example: What Homer says at the

beginning or the signs announcing the programming of the Fox), it could be despicable but they can

afford it.

" 1

" Psychological thriller that does not distress and terror that does not excite, no matter how hard they try to plug heavy

metal into the action scenes.

The Spanish cinematographic industry of the moment? Altristeces apart - seems to have only three legs:

1) the nostalgic? intimate, 2) the generational comedy and 3) horror movies. In this last case, which is the one

that concerns us, it is too frequent to find the typical American template of the killer movie and the

footprint of Amen���bar in the pretension of a psychologist twist. In Skizo we find this along with

some awkwardly patched thriller ingredients. A couple of guys plan an absurd number that leads to

an absurd kidnapping that expands to the total incoherence in the home of the murderer, a boy to whom the

vision of the violence of others transforms in psic���pata (so his parents take the therapeutic decision to

lock him in a cellar full of sharp objects and delight him with sessions of sadomasochism). The main asset

of this movie is Jaenada, who does not try too hard with a role that forces him to be m��� chungo and to be

m��� crazy half the time and to look like a teleserie clown the other ("" �� "The size that matters!" ",

Jokes about some ganz���as). The rest of the actors, as if they only passed through there. Psychological thriller that does not distress and

terror that does not thrill, no matter how hard they try to plug heavy metal into the action scenes and makeroar

the little killerlike a velociraptor. The end of the line, the authentic sign of the point at which thecan come to get

desperationrid of a film, seems only to awaken the viewer .

" 0

" A pure and hard musical, made with exquisiteness and passion, and savor with the same requirements.

Along with the western in its purest form, the other cinematographic genre that does not enjoy at all the favor of the

current public, especially not American, is the musical one. If you are not a lover of the musical, the odds that

you like "" Dreamgirls "" are reduced to the .nfimo.And by the way you have all the possibilities of missing one of the

best adaptations of a Broadway musical to the cinema, in this case , inspired by the trajectory of the

Supremes. It also presents another obstacle, the baj���n of notable interest from almost starting the footage, towards

minute 20, dispersing in terms of characters and situations. But, by magic, and against all

odds, manages to rise spectacularly before the hour of projection And this thanks to the talent of a

choreography, sets, costumes and poses so studied, showy and imaginative as placed at the service of

history. And also, without what "" Dreamgirls "" would be nothing, thanks to the talent in the staging of Bill

Condon and the performances, especially Jennifer Hudson, new star from American idol, the

OT to the American, and that stars in a number, the one of the separation with the rest of the group, which leaves her only

exhibiting her arts. Elegance and passion. What is involved is to stage the passion for music, even

despising, or going on tiptoe with slight brushstrokes, with what was the tumultuous historical context of the

time: Martin Luther King, race riots, Vietnam, youth protests? ���Nothing !, the plot and the

characters go their own.Relentless, possessive and inhuman musical producers, incarnated in Curtis Taylor

(Jamie Foxx), who make us see the coldness and lack of scruples towards people , not the money, the

savvy of the discographic world. Or the contrast between true talent, embodied by Effie (Jennifer

Hudson), overshadowed by the beautiful image she can sell, that of Deena Jones (a dull Beyonc ��� Knowles). If

even Eddie Murphie is sober and restrained in his interpretation (it does not deserve the ���scar), putting all

the meat, and voice, in the spit. To highlight the look of determination and helplessness, when he proceeds to

inject coca before his friends, which sums up all that is fragile in his character. (Attention: spoiler!)

Later, left behind by his musical protector, Curtis Taylor, a black fade will be dedicated to him, which is the

premonition of a fall of the fulminating phone. (The end of the spoiler) The worst, a disjointed assembly, that jumps, or

dance, from one character and made to another, which makes the years go by without being disturbed. But a puremusical

and hard(the sequence of the "" robbery "" of the song is antol���gica), made with exquisiteness and passion, and taste

with the same requirements. Douglas Sirk would be proud.

" 1

" What were the people in charge of casting thinking about when they entrusted that role to Timothy Oliphant, an

actor who, more than afraid, is willing to cradle him?

How easy it is for the critic to load a movie like this "" The jungle 4.0 "": is no longer a sequel, but the

fourth part of a successful commercial saga but of little draft in cin���fila class; the director has only to

his credit, until now, the dptico (next tr���ptico) of "" Underworld ""; stars Bruce Willis, who in

recent years almost all critics (including myself) are giving him a stick somanta for his declining

career. But, if we make a m��� minimal exercise mental gymnastics, the truth is that this fourth installment of a

saga is no longer a good commercial product, properly dosed in its constant "" crescendo "" of action

that seeks massive segregation of adrenaline of the spectator (and, probably, of testosterone?), but with a

decrepit hero, prematurely aged, who has to finish his exploits based on a lot of pain and blood,

in a sort of indiscriminate, indiscriminate, masochistic instinct that makes the protagonist detective experience his

particular "" via crucis "" throughout the thousand and one catastrophes that follow him. There are, in addition, some details

that are at least curious: on the one hand, the fact of entrusting the role of director of the FBI, a man ofpower

almost absolute administrative, to an actor with Arabic features, although really be neozeland���s. So the things,

we have that the head of the federals has a look of quite striking Moor, which, as

things are, I do not know if it is a stroke of humor or, why not, an anti-empirical claim that we would

have to applaud. The theme of the so-called Total Chaos (theory that imagines an absolute collapse of all computer systems

on Earth) is also interesting, although it is not especially original, and even less so. n

literature (see, without going any further, the last novel by Stephen King, "" Cell ""). But the general tone of this

"" The jungle 4.0 "", which announces the disaster (the "" crack "" computer) against which to fight in its own Spanish

title, results acceptable, with a hero who is falling apart as he has to break his face with the

bad guys, a teenage daughter and with the revolted hormones that (not without some reason) hates him, and a pipiolo that willhim

serveas a helper with a rebozo of radicalism, sixties-old, more or less brought up to date.Len Wiseman, the

director, confirms that he is especially gifted for the action. ��billy choreographed, fleeing the

current tendencies to the embarrassment that are destroying the genre; Probably we could call it

virtue comes from his past as artistic director, but the truth is that it is appreciated that our pupils do not

have to do overtime to find out what is happening on screen in the scenes of ultraviolence that

are the hallmark of the house in this type of cinema. The gradation of the action scenes maintains a certain

plausibility (always within the usual implausibility of the genre), until, with the hilarious

sequence of the protagonist's persecution the fighter, the credibility goes directly to the gare, to

say another word of equal number of letters and more forceful? We must also mention the evolution that the

character of John McLane himself has suffered in these almost twenty years since the beginning of the "initiation". The

glass jungle "" by John MacTiernan. Then he was a thirty-year-old with sentimental problems with his wife (or

ex-wife maybe already: do not ask me for such details), but still a man who faces life from the

"" pole "", if you allow me the fashionable car so fashionable. Now, almost two decades later, that

thriving man, with a considerable pile of hair and wanting to eat the world, is a fifty-one rickety, whohair.

shaves hishead to hide your problems of alopecia, at the end of the road and with retirement as the next

horizon. That big boy has become a cynic, a skeptical cured of fright, two beings in the

same body to whom, however, only their torturing suffering joins them to overcome the bad and his bad

relationship with his ex-wife and his almost-ex-daughter. Speaking of bad guys: what were the people in charge of thethinking

castingwhen they commissioned that role to Timothy Oliphant, an actor that more than fear what they give is the desire to

cradle him? Man, please, the supervillain of this fourth installment can not be a guy that seems to come from

"" The blue lake ""? Well, nothing, to see if we fix it for the fifth part (which would be, surely: the

box office does not lie?).

" 0

" In the Kovak box the rhythm is in grave danger, because even in the seemingly interesting ending it lacks

entertainment and ends up being, nothing more and nothing less than a simple and blatant "" tribute "" (copy, plagiarism ...)

to the most classic thrillers.

The main mistake of Daniel Monz���n's film is that it looks good, or thinks it's good. Already in the beginning you

see that tremendous ability to start counting events (���extra���os or fictitious?) And then leave them in the air. And that is

where the second and gravest problem arises: these events are neither well explained nor end up beingco-efficient

resolved in away. And this, in a film of intrigue, is fundamental that is well carried out.

In the box Kovak the rhythm is another serious danger, because even in the apparently interesting end lacks

such entertainment and ends up being, nothing more and nothing less than a simple and blatant "" tribute "" (copy,

plagiarism.) to the most classic thrillers. What's more, this bland outcome is, in contradiction to its apparent appearance,

too grandiloquent. So suspense little, final ridiculous and, of course, frightful guide. I would highlight

only a Timothy Hutton capable of entertaining the viewer without being embarrassing and with rather good scenes

like the hospital or the home of that partner. His companion, a soda and agon���as Luc���a Jim���nez, does not manage to make

the grade in his first incursion in an English-speaking film. His performance is tiresome, but I think that

he owes it to Monz���n, who has led painfully. It is one of those characters that end up tiring the

viewer. The rest of the cast remains in the Hutton line, because they are not too annoying. They only

complement. And it is already half a film you realize that this is a mixture of movies (very badly

mixed) and that, not only does not have neither feet nor head, but also It lacks personality. And you only have to see

several of the sequences where at first you have to witness that Monz���n touch (excuse me if it's

too ridiculous), that, feeling it a lot, only he is present in a scene (if that is histouch

personal): that of the terrace of the bar and the fall of the protagonist. And I say this because of the way it's shot, a

"false" sequence shot of remarkable quality. The rest, disappointing. A bad movie capable of surprising us

for the disappointment that it becomes, more than anything because, I at least, I expected something much better. And

I've never seen such an incoherent and failed ending like this one! I hope that next time this guy Daniel Monz���n

knows what he's doing and that he rolls the scenes with a little common sense and, above all, personality.

" 0

" Intriguing, dramatic, perverse, crude and essential story of a guy without smell that extracts his

youthful young people to obtain "" The Perfume ""

Notice to navigators, this is a cr� Film ethics, not literary. I have not read the book, nor would I think of

making references to it. I only say that to my half peach, that if he has read it, he also liked the movie.

By the way, I do not forget, if you arrive ten minutes late to the movies, nothing happens, except thatwill be mentioned to

some spectatorthe maternal office. I do not think it was necessary to start like that. The film is about a guy

born in Paris a few centuries ago, with an incredible gift, his nose. More incredible is, considering

the pestulence that there was in the streets of the world at that time. As he has a broken birth, he

ends up in an orphanage, where he is sold to a tanner (not a pickguard, as they say in the movie, who sells

aubergine in vinegar) of furs. And so, malviviendo reaches a master perfumer who takes him as an assistant.

Our protagonist has a unique obsession, which is to capture the essence of things, that smell thatall

wehave. Well, and a roll of the 13 essences that is very poetic. Total, that pim pam, pim pam, the thing is

complicated as the joke says "" If I came for bread, what do I do with the pants by the knees? "". But he's

killing pretty girls. What if I liked the movie? I loved it, with the exception of the first 10

minutes that were not necessary, much less. The setting seems exceptional, and the cast quite

good, with the exception of the protagonist (he does not transmit anything to me). The argument shines for its originality, and I have

to say that the resolution seemed to me the strangest I've ever seen (there will be more than one that they say

was predictable, that there are no missing pieces). The development engages and catches you, even if it does not get you

into the murderer's mind. And it is very difficult to describe odors. Nothing more to say, that you go to the cinema to see it.

Resumiendo, intriguing, dramatic, perverse, crude and essential story of a type without odor that

draws yours the fresh ones to obtain " "Perfume"". I do not dare to recommend it, given that my opinion in

this case is very personal, but I loved it.

" 1

" Recommended for those who want to attend a well-written adrenaline session, with a powerful

classic black film script, but transmuted (in spite of the old-fashioned appearance) into absolute modernity.

An arranged one, poor as a rat, discovers the coffer of the dead pirate with the plane of the island that has

the fabulous treasure. Do not cut a hair and set sail to hell: that is 13 Tzamenti, a journey to the depths

of the horror of the human soul. Paranoia, madness, shuddering, a hostel in the rough: the film that adds the

spirit of fashion Saw in any of his deliveries and a point to the Polanski from the beginning when he shot without

writing ���pulos and made perverse portrayals of ambitions and strict deontological code of evil in itsstate

purest(Cul-de-Sac and then, less sonorously Chinatown) .There is a tone crude, intimate, but there are also

thriller patterns: all very well seasoned with convincing arguments like the gui���n (irreproachable, novel

within the trite that is all in this of writing things for the cinema) or the performance of Sebastian, the

protagonist, a stupendous and, by me, unknown George Babluani, who speaks in a gesture or in a silence between

one sentence and another than others actors of val���a with a parliament of three minutes.The black and white agrees to these

shady feelings, handled c on cold washes for a new director who promises (and a lot). (Eye on your

new, announced, L'Heritage). Recommended for those who want to attend a well-written adrenaline session,

with a powerful classic black film script, but transmuted (in spite of the old-fashioned appearance) into

absolute modernity. A discovery endorsed by a huge string of awards.

" 1

" I present to you The Rocky Horror Picture Show ?, everything you will read below will change your

lives? Do you better cross-dress them? "Do not dream it, go!

When this blog was born, now I will do something more than one year ago the movie that really inspired me to do it was "" The

Rocky Horror Picture Show "". It is certainly my favorite film within what I call "" The

other cinema "", those cult films, different from the rest with a legion of fans that they adore for being what they

are, for being special, some fans that feel strange bugs to see this type of cinema but that they feel

proud of it. The film of which I am going to speak today is the summum of this type of cinema, the greatest

exponent of what we could call cult cinema, its followers would kill for her love for the film is

such that they meet to see it in conditioned rooms, full of balloons, toilet paper, rubber gloves,

confetti and transvestism. Seeing this movie is a joy for the six senses, if I say six because with the five

there is not enough to taste this marvel. I present to you "" The Rocky Horror Picture Show "", everything what you will read

next is going to change your lives? Do you know how to cross-dress them? ��� Do not dream it, watch it! Well, at first it will be

taken for granted that those who read this do not know much about the film , if you are an expert in it, I do not think you'll

find much new information, anyway you'll be encouraged to continue reading and I encourage you to leave

a comment that contributes more things that I can say, I would like that this post will reflect everything

possible about this film. If on the other hand you have never heard of this movie, or it sounds to you but younot

haveseen it, then I must tell you that you have to keep reading, do it for me, for the "" other "" cinema and for this

blog.Hecha this kind of introduction, something longer than usual (since the subject required it), let's move on

to the topic. We are in 1973, a musical is reaping great success at the theater "" Royal Cort "" in

London. That work was what it would be in the future "" The Rocky Horror Picture Show "", written by Richard O���Brien and

directed by Jim Sharman. Little by little it is becoming a cult work, that is to say, the spectators are going to

see the work more than once, they know the songs and they are part of it. A few months later it opens in

California and also has a lot of success, which encourages producers Michael White and Lou Adler to propose to

take it to the movies. I would like to talk more about this work but the truth is I am not sufficiently informed

to deal with the subject, the argument, just as the film was about two nerdy students immersed in a world

of decadence, rock���n roll, sex and science fiction. In a documentary that comes as an extra on the DVD edited in

Spain, some anecdotes of the work are told. I remember one that is when Meat Loaf attends thethe first time to

theater forrehearse and meets Tim Curry, who plays Dr. Frank N. Furter, whichlater

we will talk about, dress in stockings and a leather suit. Meat Loaf has no idea thatgoing

the play isand leaves the theater, saying he does not want to participate in something like that. Luckily in the end they

convinced him and later interpreted a great role in the film. For more similar anecdotes Iyou

recommendwatch that documentary and the interviews that come on the DVD, there are really curious things, some will

comment on them here, but it is impossible to say everything. Let's go then on what is "" The Rocky Horror Picture

Show "", the movie. Let's make a kind of synopsis, without revealing much but without hiding anything either.

Brad and Janet are a couple of the simplest, she very prudish and he is quite serious. After attending a company's

wedding, Brad asks Janet for marriage. On their return, they get lost in the car and go to a

strange mansion where an odd convention is being held. There Riff Raff receives a mysterious

butler and Magenta a maid of the most eccentric. They invite them to come and they are in a room where there is

a kind of party, everyone is dressed in strange costumes, colored hats, glitter,

masks, even costumes of Arabs. They begin to sing a song and dance. Then Frank ���n Furter appears,

the owner of the mansion dressed in leather and with fishnet stockings, introduces himself to the guests and invites them to attend

the presentation of his "" work "" that is no more or less than a kind of "" Frankenstein "" blond and with many

muscles, which he has created for his personal enjoyment. From here on the adventures that Brad and Janet will

live in the mansion will discover their sexuality hidden until then. Mmm, missing much argument in that

synopsis, many things It's all there is out there. We have other characters, Dr Scott, Eddie, Columbia?

Now is when it's time to dig a little deeper. Here I will reveal some things that it is better not to know before

watching the film, although for me the most important thing is not the argument itself, but everything Other, the music, the

choreography, the aesthetics. Visually it is really impressive and musically it is even more so, so that the

deficiencies that may be of gui���n are totally corrected. Let's go back to the beginning of everything, thewedding

"nerd", what is nerd? As wikipedia defines it as "" "traditionally is a very intelligent person, fascinated

by knowledge, especially the scientist, socially characterized as a lonely and

socially awkward person. At present, the term also refers to a socially normal person, who

has a great knowledge about a subject not dominated by the common people. Many characteristics

attributed to a certain type of nerd are often linked with Asperger's Syndrome, a mild form of

autism, sometimes confused with a sense of humor, and vice versa. " So we meet two nerds who attend

the wedding of a nerdy college student. We are in the city of Denton, a curious Church, created

expressly for the occasion, as I understand they only built the front for making the film, the

interiors were shot In other site. At the end of the wedding the bride throws the bouquet that goes to Janet .. Janet is

played by a young Susan Sarandon in one of his first performances for the big screen, and

if I do not understand, the only one in which he sings. At first this role came to him by chance as he

attended the casting only to greet Tim Curry, who was his friend. They told her to sing, but she said she

did not know, her father apparently was a singer, but she did not even dare to hum. Even so I lost my

shame and sang and it came out so well that I got the part. The character of Janet was defined by herself

as "" the fever version of the Saturday night of the naive "". Presented already all the characters and already having a

pretty clear idea of ​​where we are would have already to conclude this kind of monograph of the film,

but before I would like to contribute some as much data, curiosities or facts that happened during the filming.

Her voice is curious, very sharp, those of you who have heard some of her songs in the movie will know what

I mean, you can also listen to her for example in the video that I put below. Well, we wereto get lost in so

in the business, I do not wantmuch information. Then it's when Brad, played by Barry

Bostwick, is already with more experience in musicals and well known nowadays for his more than 50 characters

played in television series. , he proposes to Janet marriage by giving her a ring. Both this and

Susan Sarandon had not participated in the play and together with Meat Loaf they form the Americantrio

production. At that moment the first musical number begins and it is when they appear some of the characters that

later will leave in the mansion. At this moment we can see that it is not amusical at all

conventional, both the music and the choreography are totally different from what was seen until then in

musical type "" Grease "" or "" West Side Story "", although it may have some resemblance to "" Saturdayfever

night"". Here you have that first musical number In the later scene we find the couple in a car,

in the middle of a storm, listening on the radio to the resignation of Richard Nixon, something which is not

random at all and puts us in a transition period deliberately. Many things will change? in the life of Brad

and Janet .. The car breaks down, and under the storm they glimpse the mansion and sing a song that I

particularly love, especially when it appears through the window character of Riff Raff. Here is when we do not

find the mansion, one of the strongest points of the film and that has great importance in the

final aesthetic result. It is a dilapidated mansion that was found by the decorator Brian Thomson and the

artistic director Terry Ackland on the outskirts of London. The mansion was used several times to shoot

horror films. They did a great job adding modern elements such as an elevator, which reallynot

wassuch, but a hydraulic system that gave the hit. All the decorative elements were selected

meticulously by the artistic team. You can watch the video of that first contact with the mansion here. Now is

when the door opens to them Riff Raff, the character played by Richard O���Brien, composer of the musical and

true art��� It's about this wonder. Curiously, this was the first musical he wrote, and it shows

especially in the freshness and originality of both the lyrics and the choreographies. Richard O ���Brien has been

very versatile during his career, being a singer, composer, playwright and actor among other things. When

Jim Sharman proposed to him to write the musical for the theater he did not think it twice, so he wrote a

demolishing, groundbreaking, political and of course funny work. Musically we are in a time whereis

a styleflourishing, glam rock, with groups like T.Rex, David Bowie, Sweet or Roxy Music, that surely

inspired Richard O���Brien enough in the creation Den of the work. The glam rock had a short duration, and although there

have been few groups that have gone down in history within that genre, they gave a lot to talk about at the time

due to the daring of their costumes and staging. Remember groups like the New York Dolls for example,

one of my favorite bands. And that's when the fun really begins, although first I want to present another

of the characters in the movie, Magenta, interpreted by Patricia Quinn, who plays a kind of maid

of the house. This actress has participated in another film that I love "" The meaning of life "" of the Monthy

Python. When they offered the paper, she accepted it because they told her that she would sing the song of the beginning "" Science

Fiction "" one of the best of the whole film, be careful with the lyrics that are not wasted, a tribute to themovie

Bscience fiction of the 50s. Well, it turns out that in the end he did not sing the song and he only has four phrases in the

film, which he says when Brad And Janet enter the house for the first time. In the end Patricia Quinn was

satisfied because Jim Sharman proposed to record his lips singing the song, in a sequence that will go down in

history and that is one of the best known of " "The Rocky Horror Picture Show" ", the introduction of what will be

this huge musical challenge. The video is a must see and you can see it below. As I said before here is

when the fun begins, Brad and Janet are invited to move to a room where there is a strange

convention, there are no words, the choreography of the dance is magnificent, each movement was studiedthe millimeter

toto that is perfect, I do not get tired of seeing it, look at the characters, how they move, the planes,

the colors, the props in general, it's simply masterful, just to see it makes you happy the day, Serious,

if you do not believe it, check it yourselves. (Of course, it's not the same to see it here in a small way than to see it in a movie theater, I would

pay anything to see it in the cinema, or in a home cinema with full sound. ) And now it is when

Frank���n Furter makes his appearance for the first time, that kind of transvestite Dr Frankenstein that leavesindifferent

no one. Brilliantly played by Tim Curry, he is one of the most entertaining characters thathas

the celluloid worldgiven. Tim Curry found it difficult to find the tone of voice to play Dr.

Frank���n Furter, it is said that until he put on his stockings he could not get the right tone. Be that as it may, he

has a great role and his voice is impressive, both in the topics moved and in which he must express

feeling. And for what is that party that is organized in an extra�� Maa mansi���n, full of those colorful

characters ?. Well to witness the birth of Rocky, the work of Frank���N Furter, who represents theideal

sexual, a blond boy, with a perfect body, a kind of modern Frankenstein designed to satisfy the

carnal desires of the doctor. In the birth of Rocky the work of the artistic department was very important,

Rocky was born inside a kind of coffin with a liquid, the idea was that all the colors of the

rainbow could be seen , that was achieved when the doctor releases a kind of paintings located in tubes. The order was

strictly decided by Ferry Ackland, artistic director who told Tim Curry what he had to

open to give that tone. When the child is born, wrapped like a mummy, these two songs sound.

At the end of the second appears Meat Loaf, playing Eddie, Dr Even Scott's nephew who will be

brutally murdered by Frank. As a curiosity to say that Richard O���Brien wanted to eliminate that song because he

said it was impossible to sing it because he had too much lyrics and nobody could sing so much. I ask. Meat Loaf

got it and I'm perfect. The scene of the entrance with the bike was tremendously injured, a member of the

team broke his leg, the one who became a specialist, the motorcycle fell on him, Meat Loaf also fell

with the motorcycle , a camera was broken, a disaster. Lucky that in the end it was so good. To say that the videos that

I put do not have subtitles, I have not been able to find them and I have not wanted to upload the videos to youtube.

There are those that I have, I put these videos just so you can see it. Ethics and music, it is essential to see the

entire film subtitled to fully enjoy it. I need three characters to present and I will

do it quickly in this p��� paragraph. On the one hand we have Columbia, played by Nell Campbell, who has an

interesting tap dance in the opening scene. Later he will have an important role during the

development of the film. On the other hand there is Dr Everett V. Scott, a former professor of Brad and Janet, who will turn out to

be a government researcher who is dedicated to investigating aliens . His role is really

important, it's Eddie's uncle and he goes to the mansion to investigate his disappearance and finds the body in a

scene that was very curious. In that scene are eating almost all the characters in the film, a verydinner

specialin which meat is served from Eddie's body. Well, it turns out that in that sequence, at the table

where they eat, below is the body of Eddie himself. The director did not say anything to the actors and when Frank

removes the tablecloth his mutilated body is seen. The expressions of the faces of the actors are real and the scene is

very well. The last character I want to comment is the narrator. "" The Rocky Horror Picture Show "" is

narrated by Charles Gray and maybe it's what I like least about the film, I think it breaks the rhythm a bit,

although that's a very personal opinion. He tells us the story, he seems like a serious character, although

sometimes he starts dancing like the characters. It is funny and sometimes even funny, but I keep saying that

I just do not like it. Already presented all the characters and already having a pretty clear idea of ​​where we are would

have already to conclude this kind of monogr��� of the film, but before I would like to provide

some more information, curiosities or facts that occurred during the filming. For example, the character of

Frank���n Furter, apart from having clear references to Dr Frankenstein, according to the director, was also based on

Iv���n the terrible, Snow White and Cruella Vill? ah��� it's nothing. More things, because on the plat��� where they rolled they had no

heating, no sinks, the conditions were very bad. When complaining about it Susan Sarandon, who had to

go in her underwear throughout the movie, said "" These American stars are always complaining "".

Susan Sarandon pill��� a pulmon���a therefore their complaints were not unfounded. The problem was that they had to

spend many hours of filming since the makeup required a lot of time. Lastly, the film was

a commercial failure, people were shocked and He left the rooms, the projections lasted very little and he did not

even collect what he had cost. The success has come later, premiered in small cinemas wherewere

different filmsprojected, such as "" Night of the living dead "" or projected in universities, littleby

littlelittle a form of cult was formed to the film that has arrived until today. Every year there are

parties around the world paying homage to the film, I would love to be able to attend some one. Here I

leave a video of one that was made in Madrid. Here is the blog of this representation. Well, I know that I have left

the film half way, there are still a lot of things that happen in the second part, but neither it is plan to tell it

absolutely everything, so if someone has not seen it, he will surely have more desire to do it. Say "" The Rocky

Horror Picture Show "" had a continuation in 1981 "" Shock Treatment "", directed again by Jim Sharman and with

many members of the previous reappearance. The truth is that I have not seen that movie, because of the images I

have seen on the internet it does not seem to have the quality of the first part, although the soundtrack stillme a

likeslot. I hope that this I would like you to leave me some

comments, I would like you to contribute things that I did not say, or correct any mistakes that may have been in my

review, it has taken me a long time collect the information and maybe something has put it wrong.

However most of the commentary comes from my personal experience with this film, I've seen so many times that

I no longer remember.

" 1

" A plea to healthy living, to eat well, and healthy ... impossible in the times we are ... The McDonalds diet is mainly followed by children and adolescents at least five times a week. One in

four Americans suffers from obesity. The result is that 17 million of the population of the States suffer

from diabetes (60% more than 10 years ago) and cardiovascular and gallbladder diseases cause

havoc. The annual health cost of treating obesity is about 255 euros per person. Meanwhile, in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo, roughly 8.5 euros per inhabitant is spent on allservices

health. For now, McDonalds to prevent the demands of the obese as those of smokers against the

tobacco companies has already reacted by offering Veggie Burger vegetarian meals with soy and a dozen

salads. Supersize-me, which is nothing more than a communicative experiment, is sure to help raise awareness

about the amount of food needed. With an exceptional soundtrack, some pretty curran drawings, a

pretty good way to treat the idea "" Supersize "" (giant menus) that is very widespread and thatalways

wecatch like! Hala that cool! and that, according to the movie, are very harmful to health. The high

power and black hand of Mcdonals, his high popularity among, especially the smallest of the house. The high

levels of obesity in the United States and how bad the protagonist is (vomiting included). A

documentary that undoubtedly must be seen. Every time, and since I read "" Toxina "" by Robin Cook, I hate more

junk food.

" 1

" When one no longer expects surprises in the trite world of the psychokillers, there comes 'Captivity', capable of

making you laugh with their sloppy occurrences.

Jennifer, a young model, and Gary, a young ch���fer, are captured and locked in aby a mysterious

cornerpsychopath who will devote himself to exploiting his deepest fears and getting ahead of himself to all his movements. Can

Jennifer and Gary escape the clutches of their cruel captor? Until then, the synopsis of 'Captivity', the last

film by Roland Joff���, yes, that is, that of 'La Misi���n' and 'Los critos del silencio'. The script is signed by Larry Cohen,

the legendary creator of 'The Invaders', 'I'm Alive', 'Maniac Cop', 'The Flying Snake' or

'Last Call' recently. We could expect a good movie, would not we? 'Captivity' is the latest

rehash of 'Seven', with all the clichés we have been seeing / suffering since Fincher's film. Credits

included. In addition, it has details that make it a parody of the sub-genre, probably without the least

intention of it by its creators. The fact is that 'Captivity' starts with a minimum of intrigue and good

work on the part of Joff���, showing a brutal death in charge of the tared shift and extracts ofkidnapping

Jennifer'swith a certain taste and rhythm. But as the film progresses, the tone of psychothriller is diluted

among large martyrs (a New York policeman who can read in Greek "" because he studied Greek "") and no less

big blunders ( an expert in psychopaths that within ten seconds of entering the door puts the

police on the exact track of the kidnapper), and ends up being one of the candidates for comedy of the force a���oa

of pure desprop���sito. All this without any effort at the time of being original (the already named 'Seven' and 'Saw'

are very, very direct referents). Special mention deserves the already classic twists of gui���n, trampos���simos (and without

any intention that they are evident, unlike those of 'The Prestige' ) and the moments ofcomedy

absurd(the incredible intuition of the policemen, that A) They give with the key to find the suspect looking at a

shop window or B) They find the evidence of the crime � Changing channel on TV!). To make matters worse, the end

of the film comes you realize that the first scene has absolutely nothing to do with the rest of the

film, is a goop that put to give a touch 'Hostel'. What a pain. And there is more, but it is not a question of

making more blood. In the section of interpretations, from the anodyne to the offensive. Elisa Cuthbert is the typical

blonde top model and Daniel Gillies the no less typical maromo seducer and impetuous ch���fer. Laz Alonso and

Michael Harney are one of the most absurd pairs of cops in recent history. The rest of the cast is

worthy of a telefilm by William Baldwin filmed in Barcelona, ​​as much. When one no longer expects surprises in the

trite world of psychokillers, comes 'Captivity', capable of making you laugh with his sloppy occurrences. A

2, for the Cuthbert and laughter.

" 0

" From Toy Story I can not help but be amazed at the level and quality of the animations. The details,

the landscapes, everything is so real and so perfect. It's just ... magical

. Lovers of animated films have been waiting for Cars for a long time (2006), because in theory it was the

last movie. that Disney and Pixar were going to produce together. The companies had been divorced to the great sadness

of many and this was going to be their last child, therefore, the expectations were great. However, months before the

release of Cars, Disney and Pixar remarried and I think we're going to be very happy, forever?

Meanwhile. Let's enjoy. To begin with, before the film they made a short film by Pixar called El

hombre orquesta, which was very good and if anyone would like to find it on the internet, he will be eternally

grateful. I'm a very bad Internet user, so far I have not been looking for videos on the net. Excuse me. Without further

introductions, let's see what Cars is about. Here all the "" actors "" are cars with different personalities.

I never thought that machines as "square" as cars could be humanized so much, but they do. The

protagonist is Light McQueen, a very talented rookie car, but eg���latra until more not able. His

dream is to get the Pixon Cup, because he will go down in history to be the first rookie to achieve this achievement.

Lightning McQueen surrounded by mass media. It's THE AUTO of the momentRayo McQueen has it all, except the most

.important thing. friends. In his world it's all about him, he despises his technical team whom he considers unimportant

for his triumphs, he does not even know their names. He also despises his little chic sponsor, a

brand of antioxidant, because the rusted cars seem the worst. The race for Pixon is in a triple

tie that must be solved in a great final race in California. Ray McQueen and his two experienced

rivals.On the way to California, while Lightning McQueen is transported in his trailer, faithful Mack, anhappens

accidentthat causes our protagonist to leave the interstate and go down to atown

lostin the middle of the desert, Radiator Springs, where he will be caught fulfilling a sentence and

learning many more things than he expected. I do not count more, I will become a spoiler. But do

not think I do not want to die. The movie is so, so, so cute. Well, go and see it and discover that and much more. One

security that there is no loses with this movie is that the filmmaking team is the same as the

fabulous ones Incredibles and Finding Nemo. What more guarantee? From Toy Story I never cease to be amazed at the level and

quality of the animations. The details, the landscapes, everything is so real and so perfect. It is

simply. Magical And laborious, because for this film 43,000 sketches were drawn, nothing less. Data: If you see it

in English, the voice of the Ferrari Michael Shumacher is the real Michael Shumacher.Toy Cars Story: Do not get up

from your seats before that the credits end. As always Pixar guys want us to

recognize the work of the whole team and give us some surprises. In this case, a funny version

of Toy Story with auto actors. The tires: Another tribute to Toy Story we can appreciate it in the brand

of racing tires: Ligthyear.And one more: The n� The number that the protagonist McQueen has on his side is

95, this is due to the fact that Toy Story was launched in 1995. Other tributes: The name of the protagonist was

put in memory of Glenn McQueen, an animator of Pixar that died in 2002. The plate of the great character

Mater, reads "" A113 "", which is a reference to the animated hall of the Californian Institute of the Arts, where

many Pixar animators studied. Eye with the flies: Even the bugs are shaped like a car!

" 1

" It's one of those little-big films that our cinema gives us from time to time and that come to

corroborate a maxim of good cinema: before money and abundance of media, what More important are

good ideas.

The cinema is usually nourished by common places that, despite their repeated use, do not stop working. One of them we

know it well and m���sa���n in recent times, with? Remakes? recent as The Texas Chainsaw Massacre or

Hills have eyes. I refer to the location of terrible events in inhospitable places, almost depopulated,

where the days pass with an anodyne everyday life. In The Night of the Sunflowers, the debutante Jorge

S���nchez-Cabezudo situates his story in one of those places, in particular, in a typical town of Ávila in

rural Spain. Extinction days. In this calm scenario, the story of the film details the details of a

typical event of the increasingly bulky, chronic black news. And to maintain interest, the

story is told in a fragmented way, in the style of Arriaga, and introduces an interesting twist in its plot for

the viewer to recompose the puzzle of the facts. The discovery of a cave in the town it is lived

by the neighbors with expectation. The only possibility that the underground cavity has a certainvalue

archaeologicalawakens the illusions of citizens who yearn to be "back on the map". " As the

mayor of the town says, not without a certain ingenuity, the key to achieving this is in "" rural tourism "". So

the arrival of the espel���ologos is received in the plan Welcome Mr. Marshall. Before this happens,

S���nchez-Cabezudo has already sowed concern in the viewer with an event narrated at the beginning of the film: the

rape and murder of a young woman in the vicinity of the town. Thus, this plot and that of the

espel���ologos seem to run along similar paths and with common protagonists, but the gui���n will play an

intelligent dismissal that is followed with interest In the choral distribution of the tape, the most known face is that of

Carmelo G���mez, who meets the usual solvency in his role as one of the speleologists, a

secondary always stands out veros���mil, Celso Bugallo, and surprised by the interpretation of the beautiful Judith Diakhate. Manuel

Mor���n, that face already habitual in almost all the productions, big and small, of our cinema, is perfect

in the most disagreeable and complex role of the tape. Night of the sunflowers is one of those small-big

films that our cinema gives us from time to time and that come to corroborate a maxim of good cinema: before

money and abundance of media, the most important are good ideas. And despite being attached to

conventions of the thriller, his story also offers an interesting view on a rural Spain

devoured by the massive exodus to the city and that, pr� Basically, it's on its way to staying in an echo of the past. If you come

across it on a billboard, do not dismiss it with the ease, and lightness, with which we sometimes despise

our cinema. You will be rewarded, and by far, the price of your ticket.

" 1

" Simptic but very minor comedy of the (almost) always great Charles Chaplin. "" During a journey of importance, a lush young man camouflages himself as a poliz���n in the cabin of a

diplom American ethicist, not excessively honest. "" Even if the director was a true genius, it is

an accomplishment far below his possibilities. Not that it is bad, it is nice and has some

scenes, especially in its first half, achieved in white comedy. What happens is that, in my

opinion, the script is not very worked, and the realization is somewhat tiresome, if we take into account that the rhythm

gradually decreases. However other aspects are achieved: photography, sets, costumes. As for

the couple protagonist, for my taste is out of tune. Both, separately, are very good, but this

time their union does not take off sparks precisely, turning out to be somewhat cold, although sometimes fulfilling. Marlon

Brando always said that he accepted to participate in the movie without having even read the script. The one who was its

director and creator Charles Chaplin was enough to accept without hesitation. Later he regretted it, although the

relations with the genius and Sof���a Loren were very cordial.

" 0

" We are facing the weakest film of the saga, Raimi, seeing that this was going to be his last delivery,

has decided to cook a dish with too many ingredients and flavored in excess that one ends up

indigestando.

Excessive, this was the word that kept repeating me as I watched the new installment of the saga of

trepamuros, excessive. And is that Raimi, watching to come that this was to be his last installment of the saga, has

decided to cook a dish with too many ingredients and seasoned in excess that one ends up

indigestando. The large number of plots and characters does not allow you to taste each one of them as you should and

everything ends up forming a potingue that does not finish digesting very well. The love conflicts between Peter Parker

and Mary Jane do not just work, the The evolution of Harry Osborn's character is more than unbelievable, the

transformation of Peter Parker into a dark being is ridiculous and the man of sand and his involvement inlife

Parker'salmost better not to talk because it loads the essence of the character and practically the whole saga. Something better

resolved is the aversion of Eddie Brock to Parker, perhaps the best-worn plot of all, the most credible.

Another of the film's weak points lies in the humorous part. �stica that so successful results had

managed to have in the previous installments, those little touches of humor that this time are too

childish, those dances down the street and the bar scene take the cake. Although the first scene of JJ

Jameson is quite good and the appearance of the great Bruce Campbell is one of the best moments of the

film. Something that has failed me here is music too, to give an example when Peter and Harry fight sounds

a horrible music that does not fit at all with the scene. I will say that the spectacularity of the film

is very successful, but what you want me to tell you, I found much better resolved and worked the fights

against Octopus than any of these, that are solved too fast, the camera moves at such a speed

that it hardly takes time to see much and end up being somewhat repetitive, we go back to the excessive, many

fights but as a whole they know little by little and they are eager to taste with something The scenes

against the sand man or against Poison. And now, the return to repeat the same scheme of the previous

films again turning Mary Jane into a victim of the villains and that again has to be saved and

bored and tired, one expected something more original this time, apart from being the one that worse straightens the situation of

the three. The question that I pose then is because the film has not been split in two, each with a

different villain and taking the evolution of the new green goblin during these and developing everything a littlehurried

better and not in such away, the two shots simultaneously, what they want to tell us here was

for that and more , because not doing it well then and not in this way that surely will not please many. The

result is that we are facing the weakest film of the saga, the one that most concessions has to face

commerciality, which the excess of characters is a burden that is not solved well by It does not give for more. Having

seen it, more than one will not see so badly that for a future delivery, that surely there will be, a

different creative team and with a vision will be opted for. New character, maybe for good or maybe for bad, at this

point would be appreciated.

" 0

" Yimou returns to offer us a spectacular rain of colors. The costumes, the visual beauty of the

planes, the incredible choreographies of struggle, the photography and, in short, the aesthetic part, becomes

once more. It's in its great trick.

You have to take the medication every day. Without complaint and grateful. That's what we always say to the

grandmother Let him take the syrup at his time and do not complain, but then come the ailments. And she stubborn.

No, let that be swallowed by the quack. Zhang Yimou must be living a similar situation in his house,

because during the first half hour everything revolves around a happy medicine. That if I take it, that if I do not

take it, that if this does not look good, that if you take it all and that I do not know that you leave something. in short,

the first bars are rather slow, but everything goes "" in crescendo "" Set in the China of the end of, The

sXcurse of the golden flower narrates the decline of the Tang dynasty on the eve of the Chong Yang party. The

ilcitos love, family secrets and jealousies, destroy infew days to a family that should be

ejemplar.Yimou, far from intimismo of ""the Red Lantern "" or "" The On the way home ", to name a few,follows

the technique of" "The house of flying daggers" "and offers us a spectacular rain of colors again. The

costumes, the visual beauty of the planes, the incredible choreographies (although this time are not excessive), the

photography and, in short, the aesthetic part, becomes once more in its great trick. From the first

seconds, the Chinese director brings us closer to the magic of the imperial palace with a great display of images and

intoxicating sounds. The rhythm slows down for almost half an hour, without combats or other elements that

enrich the visual org���a, and the real fest llegan arrives towards the end. The lovers of the battles of "" The

Lord of the Rings "" will have here a new reason for rejoicing. You throw everywhere, rains of arrows, soldiers

carrying. in short, a pump for the senses. The delicate thing to criticize is the gui���n. I've read everything:tragedy

Greek, Shakespearian drama, cheap melodrama, shabby soap opera. It is true that there is a large cluster of, say,

dramatic events. What if this is your real mother, if that is really your sister, that if I

am the father of my granddaughter's son and my grandmother's father. that if one conspires, the other kills, the other

is killed by the other, the other by the one. Come on, I understand the negative criticisms in that sense. The

issue is that this must be seen as a Chinese story, and never better said. The Asian narrative follows other

parameters and certain licenses must be accepted, more so when it is a typical story. Now, this does not

justify the desmadre and one can be in his right to say "" this will like in your town "". In short, whether

or not it attracts history and its characters, will be a matter of sensibilities, audiovisual culture and tastes.

I say.

" 1

" A lot of sugar and little smile. Only for teenagers or for those of us who have been in New York. Enchanted, it is a Disney movie that tells the story of Princess Giselle, expelled from herland

musical and musicalto the harsh reality of the streets of Manhattan. It's a film that does not cheat. In my opinion, the sector

that can most enjoy it is the one that goes from 10 to 14 years old. And I dare say that it is not one of those who

also like adults, since the forms are pure adolescence. As someone like me, able to

withstand high doses of cake in the movies, this indigestible me without remedy with a message too

sweet, although worthy of praise: the illusion for ideal love, or almost. As for the part c� ��mica of thistape

romantic, I did not work almost no gag, getting just some isolated smile. Why did I go to see her

then? For a deceptive comment from a radio station, and because a couple of months ago I was in New

York, and for me, I only saw the Columbus Circle kiosk where I had breakfast or the sequence of Central Park, it makes it

worthwhile. Conclusion: if you had a dull day (but a lot), or you were 13 years old, or you've been in New

York, you could have a nice time. If not, you can save it without problems

" 0